The Night Watchman
Hans Speier and the Making of the American National Security State

by

Daniel Morris Bessner

Department of History
Duke University

Date:_____

Approved:

_____
Malachi Hacohen, Supervisor

_____
Edward Balleisen

_____
Dirk Bönker

_____
William Chafe

_____
Klaus Larres

_____
Martin Miller

_____
Alex Roland

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy in the Department of
History in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2013

ABSTRACT

The Night Watchman
Hans Speier and the Making of the American National Security State

by

Daniel Morris Bessner

Department of History
Duke University

Date:_____

Approved:

_____
Malachi Hacohen, Supervisor

_____
Edward Balleisen

_____
Dirk Bönker

_____
William Chafe

_____
Klaus Larres

_____
Martin Miller

_____
Alex Roland

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of
History in the Graduate School
of Duke University

2013

Abstract

What accounts for the rise of defense intellectuals in the early Cold War? Why did these academics reject university life to accept positions in the foreign policy establishment? Why were so many of German origin? *The Night Watchman* answers these questions through a contextual biography of the German exile Hans Speier, a foreign policy expert who in the 1940s and 1950s consulted for the State Department and executive branch, and helped found the RAND Corporation, Stanford University's Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and the program in international communication at MIT's Center for International Studies. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, witnessing ordinary Germans vote enthusiastically for Adolf Hitler engendered a skepticism of democracy in Speier and a cohort of social democratic intellectuals. Once Hitler assumed power in 1933, Speier and his colleagues were forced to flee Central Europe for the United States. In America, a number of these left wing exiles banded together with U.S. progressives to argue that if democracy was to survive as a viable political form in a world beset with "totalitarian" threats, intellectual experts, not ordinary people, must become the shapers of foreign policy. Only intellectuals, Speier and others argued, could ensure that the United States committed its vast resources to the defeat of totalitarianism.

World War II provided Speier and his academic cohort with the opportunity to transform their ideas into reality. Called upon by government officials who required the services of intellectuals familiar with the German language and culture, hundreds of social scientists joined the Office of War Information, Office of Strategic Services, and other new organizations of the wartime government. After the war, this first generation of

defense intellectuals, uninterested in returning to the relative tranquility of academia, allied with government and military officials to create a network of state and corporate institutions that reproduced the wartime experience on a permanent basis. Speier himself became chief of RAND's Social Science Division and a consultant responsible for advising the Ford Foundation on where to direct its resources. In the latter capacity, he counseled the foundation to fund institutions that provided a home to intellectuals concerned with refining the methods of social science to improve policy-relevant knowledge.

Speier's interwar experiences with Nazism and postwar understanding of Joseph Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe and West Berlin led him to conclude that all totalitarian societies, be they fascist or communist, were run by elites who did not wish to reach détente with the United States. For this reason, Speier declared, U.S. decision-makers should treat all Soviet diplomatic overtures as feints designed to trick the western alliance into weakening its international standing. He further argued that because totalitarian states were autocracies in which the public had no say in foreign affairs, the United States should not use propaganda to win ordinary people living in the Soviet Union to its side, but should instead employ methods of psychological warfare to disrupt the personal and professional networks of Soviet elites. Speier's position at RAND and his relationship with the State Department provided him with opportunities to disseminate his opinions throughout the foreign policy establishment. By virtue of his central location in this institutional matrix, Speier influenced a number of key U.S. foreign policies, including the inflexible negotiating position adopted by U.S. delegates at the Korean War armistice talks; the tactics of U.S. psychological warfare directed against East Germany and the

Soviet Union; and President Dwight D. Eisenhower's "Open Skies" proposal at the 1955 Geneva Summit.

By the 1960s, Speier had helped institutionalize both a system in which intellectuals had direct access to foreign policymakers and a policy culture that privileged expertise. His trajectory demonstrates that the Cold War national security state, broadly defined to include governmental, nongovernmental, and university-associated research centers, was not solely a proximate reaction to the perceived Soviet threat, as historians have argued, but was also the realization of a decades-old, expert-centered political vision formed in response to the collapse of the Weimar Republic.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Triangle and could thus serve on my committee. I thank him for our conversations, and for helping me clarify how my scholarship relates to broader trends in the history of U.S. foreign relations. I've read Bill Chafe's scholarship since I arrived at college in the autumn of 2002, and both he and his work have constantly reminded me that, although this dissertation studies elites, one must always be aware of how ordinary people experienced the major events and trends of the twentieth century.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Jody and Glen Bessner, who have, as long as I can remember, encouraged my personal and academic pursuits. They have been steadfast and generous in their support, and I know that I could not have completed this dissertation, or made it this far, without them. Indeed, this dissertation's origins are likely found in a conversation I had with my parents when I was ten years old, when they informed me about the University in Exile and how it saved many of the greatest minds of the twentieth century. For all of these, and more reasons too numerous to mention, I dedicate this dissertation to them.

Abbreviations

AAF – Army Air Forces
ADO – Division for Occupied Areas, Department of State
AMP – Applied Mathematics Panel, National Defense Research Committee
BBC – British Broadcasting Company
CASBS – Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University
CENIS – Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
CFR – Council on Foreign Relations
CIA – Central Intelligence Agency
Cominform – Communist Information Bureau
CPI - Committee on Public Information
DAC – Douglas Aircraft Company
DDP – German Democratic Party
DVP – German People's Party
EDC – European Defense Community
FBI – Federal Bureau of Investigation
FBIS – Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Federal Communications Commission
FCC – Federal Communications Commission
FRG – Federal Republic of Germany
GDR – German Democratic Republic
HAC – House Appropriations Committee
HICOG – High Commission for Occupied Germany
HUAC – House Un-American Activities Committee
ICD – Information Control Division, U.S. Army
JCS – Joint Chiefs of Staff
JWGA – Joint War Games Agency
KPD – Communist Party of Germany
NATO – North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NSA – National Security Advisor
NSC – National Security Council
NWC – Naval War College
OMGUS – Office of Military Government, United States
OOB – Overseas Operations Branch, Office of War Information
OSS – Office of Strategic Services
OWI – Office of War Information
POW – Prisoners of War
PSB – Psychological Strategy Board
PWD – Psychological Warfare Division, Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force
Rad Lab – Radiation Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
RAND – RAND Corporation
RCA – Radio Corporation of America
RIAS – Radio in American Sector
SA – Sturmabteilung (Storm Detachment)
SAC – Strategic Air Command, United States Air Force

SAIS – School of Advanced International Studies
SHAEF – Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force
SPD – Social Democratic Party of Germany
SSD – Social Science Division, RAND Corporation
SWNCC – State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee
UN – United Nations
USAF – United States Air Force
USPD – Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany
USSBS – United States Strategic Bombing Survey
VOA – Voice of America

Intellectuals' particular position [allows] them to achieve things that are of indispensable significance for the whole social and political process. ... Thus, they might play the part of watchmen in an otherwise dark night.

-- Karl Mannheim, 1929

In holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

-- Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1961

Introduction: From Weimar to Washington

In January 1961, President Dwight D. Eisenhower delivered the famous farewell address in which he identified worrisome problems with the American approach to national security. Today, the speech is best remembered for its attack on the emerging military-industrial complex, although it also contained a harsh critique of the national security research establishment.[1] Eisenhower worried that U.S. policy was becoming "the captive of a scientific-technological elite" uninterested in the pursuit of knowledge and devoted to amplifying the Soviet threat. This group aimed, more than anything, to secure federal grant money. If left unchecked, the president feared, this nonelected elite could corrupt "the principles of [the American] democratic system" by removing policymaking from public scrutiny.[2]

Eisenhower recognized that, for the first time in American history, experts exerted enormous influence on the structure and practice of U.S. national security and foreign policy. Previous conclaves, most famously Woodrow Wilson's "Inquiry" of 1919, had brought expert opinion to bear on America's role in world affairs. However, the Cold War witnessed the institutionalization of an expert-centered culture of foreign policymaking in myriad governmental and nongovernmental organizations, including the Department of Defense, RAND Corporation, National Science Foundation, and MIT's

---

[1] Major works on the military-industrial complex include Paul A.C. Koistinen, *The Military-Industrial Complex: A Historical Perspective* (New York: Praeger, 1980); Gordon Adams, *The Politics of Defense Contracting: The Iron Triangle* (Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1981); Kurt Hackemer, *The U.S. Navy and the Origins of the Military-Industrial Complex, 1847-1883* (Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2001); Alex Roland, *The Military-Industrial Complex* (Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 2002); and James Ledbetter, *Unwarranted Influence: Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Military-Industrial Complex* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012).

[2] Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Farewell Address," January 17, 1961. <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/eisenhower001.asp> [accessed May 9, 2012].

Center for International Studies. The potential for the permanent institutionalization of an

undemocratic, expert-centered policymaking culture deeply troubled Eisenhower.

Yet Eisenhower's perspective obscured several important realities of early Cold

War foreign policymaking.[3] The president focused exclusively on criticizing natural

scientists. Such a critique ignored the influential positions social scientists occupied

throughout the institutional matrix of the national security state, the collection of

governmental and federally funded nongovernmental institutions devoted to developing

the strategy, tactics, and weapons of U.S. foreign policy.[4] Furthermore, Eisenhower

---

[3] The "early Cold War" was the period between 1947 and the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, during which U.S. foreign policy elites adopted a model of geopolitics that framed the Soviet Union as an intractable totalitarian enemy bent on world domination. Eisenhower encapsulated this perspective in his farewell address when he declared the Cold War to be a struggle between a "free and religious people" and a "hostile ideology, global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method." For this periodization of the Cold War, see Anders Stephanson, "The United States," in *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe: International Perspectives*, ed. David Reynolds (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 24.

[4] On the national security state, see Michael J. Hogan, *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945-1954* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 4-5. For a critique of the very notion of a postwar national security state, see Aaron L. Friedberg, *In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 7. While Hogan and others focus on the federal institutions of the national security state, the literature on the postwar "prominstrative state" suggests that certain nongovernmental organizations must also be considered part and parcel of the national security state. See Brian Balogh, "Reorganizing the Organizational Synthesis: Federal-Professional Relations in Modern America," *Studies in American Political Development* 5, no. 1 (1991): 162-172 and Brian Balogh, *Chain Reaction: Expert Debate and Public Participation in American Commercial Nuclear Power, 1945-1975* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 1-14, 21-29, especially 12-13 and 27. The classic statement of the organizational synthesis, to which Balogh responds, is Louis Galambos, "The Emerging Organizational Synthesis in Modern American History," *Business History Review* 44, no. 3 (Autumn 1970): 279-290. For Galambos's recent take on the organizational synthesis, see Louis Galambos, "Recasting the Organizational Synthesis: Structure and Process in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries," *Business History Review* 79, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 1-38. See also Louis Galambos, *The Creative Society—and the Price Americans Paid for It* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), chapter 8 and chapter 9. Michael S. Sherry has grouped nongovernmental and governmental organizations together, but has not explicitly referenced the nongovernmental organizations as belonging to the national security state. See Michael S. Sherry, *In the Shadow of War: The United States since the 1930s* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 137-138. Mark Solovey considers governmental and nongovernmental organizations together as well. See Mark Solovey, "Cold War Social Science: Specter, Reality, or Useful Concept?" in *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, eds. Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 1-2. Joy Rohde has similarly referred to organizations like the RAND Corporation as comprising a "gray area" between a governmental and nongovernmental institution. See Joy Rohde, "From Expert Democracy to Beltway Banditry: How the Antiwar Movement Expanded the Military-Academic-Industrial Complex," in *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal*

presented the expert's rise as a purely national phenomenon, disregarding the outpouring of European-born émigré academics who fled fascism in the 1930s, achieved positions of governmental authority during World War II, and became foreign policy experts in the early Cold War. Many of the most well known "defense intellectuals" had emigrated from Germany, including Henry Kissinger and Hans Morgenthau. Indeed, the image of the German-American strategic expert so permeated the American popular consciousness in the early Cold War that in 1964 Stanley Kubrick could parody it with the titular character of his famous film, *Dr. Strangelove*.

To understand fully the making of the national security state, its culture, and a number of foreign policies, historians must consider the central role German exiles played as foreign policymakers and institution builders in early Cold War America. This dissertation analyzes the career of Hans Speier, a German exile from National Socialism who became an important foreign policy expert at the RAND Corporation, State Department, and executive branch. It is at once an intellectual biography of Speier and a larger story about the rise of the defense intellectual and the transatlantic origins of Cold War foreign policy. By focusing specifically on this pivotal émigré, we see how the crisis of democracy in interwar Germany informed several of the national security state's key cultural, institutional, and intellectual parameters. Speier's experience thus highlights the importance of "Atlantic crossings" for U.S. history at mid-twentieth century.[5]

Democracy, and Human Nature, ed. Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012), 141.

[5] The term "Atlantic Crossings" comes from Daniel Rodgers' well-known book of the same name. See Daniel Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000). For other influential works of the "transnational turn" in U.S. history, see Thomas Bender, ed., *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Thomas Bender, *A Nation among Nations: America's Place in World History* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2006); and Ian Tyrell, *Transnational Nation: United States History in Global Perspective since 1789* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). For debates about the transnational turn, see Ian Tyrell,

Speier was born in Berlin into a bourgeois Lutheran household in 1905. As an adolescent, his difficult home life, coupled with the chaos on the city's streets, led him to reject his parents' conservative, nationalist politics and embrace a moderate form of social democracy. When he entered Heidelberg University in the autumn of 1926 to pursue a Ph.D, he arrived armed with reformist socialist convictions. There, Speier met and studied with his two primary intellectual interlocutors: Karl Mannheim, the creator of the sociology of knowledge, and Emil Lederer, a socialist economist heavily involved in German party politics. Both scholars stressed the importance of intellectual engagement in political affairs, a view that deeply influenced Speier and his future career.

Upon graduating from Heidelberg with a Ph.D in sociology and national economics in 1928, Speier sought employment outside academia. However, the academic itch never abandoned him, and in 1931 he accepted a position at the *Hochschule für Politik* (College for Politics), a Berlin institute of higher education and proto-think tank dedicated to educating workers in the mores of liberal democracy. The *Hochschule* introduced Speier to the notion of policy-relevant research, and served as the institutional home for a significant portion of Germany's young, moderate, but left wing intelligentsia. Many future exiles who would work or consult for the American state, including Arnold Brecht, Hajo Holborn, Sigmund Neumann, and Hans Staudinger, spent formative years there. At the *Hochschule*, Speier, along with his moderate socialist colleagues, explored

"American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History," *American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (October 1991): 1031-1055; Michael McGerr, "The Price of the 'New Transnational History,'" *American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (October 1991): 1056-1067; C.A. Bayly, Sven Beckert, Matthew Connelly, Isabel Hofmey, Wendy Kozol, and Patricia Seed, "AHR Conversation on Transnational History," *American Historical Review* 111, no. 5 (December 2006): 1441-1464; and Johan Heilbron, Nicolas Guilhot, and Laurent Jeanpierre, "Toward a Transnational History of the Social Sciences," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 44, no. 2 (Spring 2008): 146-160. Also see the *Journal of American History* from December 1999, which contains essays on "The Nation and Beyond: Transnational Perspectives on United States History," as well as the *American Historical Review* forum from February 2013, which examines "Transnational Lives in the Twentieth Century."

strategies for transforming socialist visions into political realities. He and his cohort

argued that to bring about a social democratic future, intellectuals must educate workers'

in socialism while teaching them how to operate within the new institutions—the political

parties and the large unions—that defined German democracy. Speier's circle was

convinced that a reformulated *Bildung* (traditional German education) premised on

socialist ideology and practical education would chart the path to socialism.

However, once Speier and other young socialists came into contact with actual

workers at the *Hochschule*, their hope in the working classes waned considerably. They

became convinced that workers had no true interest in political reform, were easily duped

by extremists of the right and left, and would trade votes for beer. At the same time,

Germany's political scene augured against socialism. In March 1930, Heinrich Brüning's

anti-democratic cabinet was elected, and in September 1930, the National Socialists

achieved an electoral breakthrough partially based on working class support. These

experiences and events combined to demystify workers and the Social Democratic Party

while giving the lie to Marx's claim that, over time, a large, radicalized working class

would lead an anticapitalist revolution. By 1932, Speier and many of his colleagues

rejected communalist socialism in favor of an anti-ideological position that stressed the

need to defend the structures of democracy instead of promoting specific political

programs.

In the United States, many young left wingers who would eventually become

Cold War liberals were disabused of their political convictions as a result of Joseph

Stalin's oppressive actions in the 1930s and 1940s.[6] The confrontation with fascism led

---

[6] For the American transformation, see Norman Markowitz, "A View from the Left: From the Popular Front to Cold War Liberalism," in *The Specter: Original Essays on the Origins of McCarthyism*, eds.

this to happen years earlier in Germany. It caused Speier and his cohort of future exiles to

refocus their attention from domestic, socialist reforms to defeating Hitler. It also

engendered a deep skepticism of democracy. Young democrats like Speier began to fear

that republican governments, with their slow political process, could not hope to defeat

autocratic regimes that were premised upon decisive actions taken by one person or a

small coterie. They further worried that even a well functioning democracy faced the

possibility that ordinary people would elect anti-democrats. The Weimar experience led

many young academics to argue that the intellectual's major task was to defeat fascism

despite democracy's weaknesses. However, a tension in Speier's thought remained: how

could intellectuals assume a position of paramount political importance while retaining a

commitment to democratic norms of public participation in political life? In the early

1930s, he did not yet have an answer to this question.

Soon after the Nazis assumed power in January 1933, they dismissed Speier from

the *Hochschule*. He knew that he had to leave his country, as his left wing associations,

as well as the fact that he was married to a Jewish pediatrician, made it clear he would

have little professional or personal future in Nazi Germany. At the same time that Speier

lost his position, his old advisor, Emil Lederer, immigrated to London. In London,

Lederer and Alvin Johnson, the president of the New School for Social Research in New

---

Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis (New York: New Divisions, 1974): 90-115; Mary Sperling McAuliffe, *Crisis on the Left: Cold War Politics and American Liberals, 1947-1954* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1978), *passim*, but especially chapter 1, chapter 2, and chapter 5; Richard H. Pells, *The Liberal Mind in a Conservative Age: American Intellectuals in the 1940s and 1950s* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1985), 76-83; Alan M. Wald, *The New York Intellectuals* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 1-22 and part III, especially 311-334 for an interesting portrayal of Irving Howe's political development; Hugh Wilford, *The New York Intellectuals: From Vanguard to Institution* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), chapter 7; and Justin Vaïsse and Arthur Goldhammer, *Neoconservatism: The Biography of a Movement* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 21-30.

York City, began to create a "University in Exile" for persecuted German scholars.[7] This pair asked Speier, who as a non-Jew could travel freely between London and Germany, to serve as the transnational liaison between Johnson and Lederer and the University in Exile's founding members. Speier accepted the offer, and after completing his duties immigrated to New York in September 1933. There he became the youngest member of the University in Exile (soon renamed the Graduate Faculty in Political and Social Science) and the first editor of *Social Research*, the New School's journal.[8]

---

[7] The major book on the University in Exile remains Claus-Dieter Krohn's *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*, trans. Rita Kimber and Robert Kimber (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993). Other works on the New School include Monika Plessner, "Die deutsche 'University in Exile' in New York und ihr amerikanischer Gründer," *Frankfurt Hefte* 19 (March 1964): 181-186; Benita Luckmann, "Eine deutsche Universität im Exil: Die 'Graduate Faculty' der New School for Social Research," in *Soziologie in Deutschland und Österreich, 1918-1945: Materialien zur Entwicklung, Emigration, und Wirkungsgeschichte,* ed. M. Rainer Lepsius (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1981), 427-441; Benita Luckmann, "Exil oder Emigration: Aspekte der Amerikanisierung an der 'New School for Social Research' in New York," in *Leben im Exil: Probleme der Integration deutscher Flüchtlinge im Ausland, 1933-1945*, ed. Wolfgang Frühwald and Wolfgang Schieder (Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, 1981), 227-234; Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research* (New York: Free Press, 1986); Stanford M. Lyman, "A Haven for Homeless Intellects: The New School and Its Exile Faculties," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 7, no. 3 (Spring 1994): 493-512; William M. McClay, "Historical Research on the Refugee Intellectuals: Problems and Prospects," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 7, no. 3 (Spring 1994): 513-524; Claus-Dieter Krohn, "Differenz oder Distanz? Hybriditätsdiskurse deutscher refugee scholars im New York der 1930er Jahre," in *Exile, Entwurzelung, Identität*, ed. Claus-Dieter Krohn, Erwin Rothermund, and Lutz Winckler (Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2009), 20-39; and Daniel Bessner, "'Rather More than One-Third Had No Jewish Blood': American Progressivism and German-Jewish Cosmopolitanism at the New School for Social Research, 1933-1939," *Religions* 3, no. 1 (March 2012): 99-129. The Frankfurt School, which was also composed of German exiles, has received significantly more scholarly attention than the University in Exile. Major historical works on the Frankfurt School include Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute for Social Research, 1923-1950* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); Rolf Wiggerhaus, *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995); and Thomas Wheatland, *The Frankfurt School in Exile* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009).

[8] Speier's importance for facilitating the immigration of the largely Jewish University in Exile, as well as his embededness in the intellectual milieu of Germany's left wing Jewish intelligentsia, underlines how he, although a non-Jew, was part of Jewish history. David Hollinger and Malachi Hacohen have recently argued that Jewish historians must expand their purview to examine individuals who, although not Jewish, were bearers of specific ideologies and ideas informed by Jewish cultures and contexts. Speier fits squarely within this new scholarly paradigm, and his experience underscores the impact of Jewish culture and thought on many influential non-Jews. Mannheim and Lederer were both Jews, who, like much of the post-emancipation German-Jewish intelligentsia, used their commitment to *Bildung* as a means to assert their Germanness. When the discursive coalition that supported *Bildung* frayed in the 1920s, Mannheim and Lederer sought to reform it by promoting intellectual engagement in political and social affairs. Speier imbibed this normative value and with his exile brought it to the United States. Moreover, Speier personally identified strongly with the Jewish people, and toward the end of his life spent significant time

During his first two years in exile, Speier found himself adrift, unfamiliar with the norms and culture of the United States and American academia. His scholarly work focused almost entirely on examining the fall of the Weimar Republic. Nevertheless, in 1935 academic patronage revitalized his career. Louis Wirth and Edward Shils, members of the country's most influential sociology department at the University of Chicago, were very interested in Mannheim's sociology of knowledge. As Mannheim's first graduate student, Speier was in a special position to serve as his former advisor's intellectual translator. Wirth in particular became Speier's patron, inviting him to speak at Chicago and review Mannheim's work for the *American Journal of Sociology*. After receiving Chicago's approval, other American sociologists expressed interest in Speier's work and began asking him to lecture at their universities. At the same time, Speier worked to become familiar with the empirical methods and disciplinary norms of American social science, which eased his transition into the U.S. intellectual community.

Speier's experiences demonstrate that the assimilation of many exiles into American academia depended upon patronage networks and an individual willingness to incorporate U.S. methodologies into one's work. The positive response Speier received from American intellectuals enabled him to view exile as a moment of opportunity, a period in which he could reanalyze previously held commitments in light of new

searching for a mythical Jewish ancestor. See David A. Hollinger, "Communalist and Dispersionist Approaches to American Jewish History in an Increasingly Post-Jewish Era," *American Jewish History* 95, no. 1 (March 2009): 1-32 and Malachi Hacohen, *Jacob and Esau between Nation and Empire: A Jewish European History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming 2013). Hollinger points to Yuri Slezkine's *The Jewish Century* as providing several examples of, in Hollinger's words, non-Jews "whose lives were significantly formed by historical conditions that were unquestionably Jewish." Hollinger, "Communalist," 14. See also Yuri Slezkine, *The Jewish Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004). For the issue of German Jews' commitment to *Bildung*, see George L. Mosse, *German Jews beyond Judaism* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997), 7-8, 18-20. Here, Mosse argues that the "classical concept of *Bildung* largely determined the post-emancipatory Jewish identity." Although some scholars have questioned aspects of Mosse's thesis, most accept its general thrust. See Steven E. Aschheim, *Beyond the Border: The German-Jewish Legacy Abroad* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 128.

experiences. Speier's New School colleagues, many of whom received comparably

welcoming responses from U.S. intellectuals, embraced a similar approach to exile. This

differentiated them from several of their exile cohort associated with Max Horkheimer's

Institute of Social Research, then connected with Columbia University. In contrast to

Speier and the New School faculty, Horkheimer and his group continued to write in

German; considered exile an unpleasant, and hopefully brief, interlude in their lives; and

critiqued American positivism. Such attitudes limited their initial reception in the United

States. Comparing Speier's future career with Horkheimer's highlights how dissimilar

approaches to exile informed the American trajectories of individual German émigrés.

Whereas Speier found a suitable home in the American academy, and would soon

embrace the United States by joining the government during World War II and becoming

part of the national security state, Horkheimer moved to the west coast in 1940 and

concerned himself primarily with academic scholarship before returning to West

Germany in 1949.[9]

By the mid 1930s, Speier helped create the foundational conviction of the New

School and its University in Exile, which was that intellectuals must make productive use

of their exile and participate in the political and social life of their adopted country. The

question was how. In Germany, Speier and many of his colleagues had been active in the

SPD. Either as educators of workers or as political operatives, they had believed that

intellectuals had a central role to play in political life. Indeed, many exiles blamed

themselves, or more specifically intellectuals' lack of political engagement, for the

collapse of the Weimar Republic. In America, they set about formulating a new way of

---

[9] Theodor Adorno and Friedrich Pollock followed similar trajectories.

thinking about intellectuals' political function in order to avoid a repetition of the Weimar tragedy.

Speier argued that defending democracy required one to understand the problems and prospects of a broad-based "mass" politics. In his opinion, the Weimar experience had exposed a pivotal weakness of democratic theory: what do you do if ordinary people vote for dictatorship? In exile, Speier turned toward analyzing how intellectuals could ensure that democracy, as a political form, survived in the face of an ignorant public. This was especially important in an age when democracy faced the existential threat of "totalitarianism," the term through which he, like many German exiles, understood Nazism and Soviet communism.[10] Speier concluded that Weimar's collapse demonstrated that intellectuals could not appreciably inform political life outside of the government. Therefore, they must use knowledge in power's service by joining the institutions of the American state and ensuring that they, not the public, determined U.S. foreign policy. Speier maintained that this was morally acceptable because extreme measures were necessary in the era of crisis through which he and his colleagues lived. The crisis of democracy, he argued, allowed intellectuals to abrogate democratic norms. Speier

---

[10] German and American intellectuals mutually created the analytical term "totalitarianism" in the 1930s and 1940s to describe and explain perceived similarities of the Nazi and Soviet regimes. For the process by which this term emerged, see Les K. Adler and Thomas G. Paterson, "Red Fascism: The Merger of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia in the American Image of Totalitarianism, 1930s-1950s," *American Historical Review* 75, no. 4 (April 1970): 1046-1064; Robert A. Skotheim, *Totalitarianism and American Social Thought* (New York: Holt, Rheinhart, and Winston, Inc., 1971), 63-67; Daniel M. Smith, "Authoritarianism and American Policy Makers in Two World Wars," *Pacific Historical Review* 43, no. 3 (August 1974): 303-323; Thomas R. Maddux, "Red Fascism, Brown Bolshevism: The American Image of Totalitarianism in the 1930s," *The Historian* 40 (November 1977): 85-103; Pells, *The Liberal Mind in a Conservative Age*, 86-93; Wald, *The New York Intellectuals*, 267-280; Abbott Gleason, *Totalitarianism: The Inner History of the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), *passim*, but especially 33-50; William D. Jones, *The Lost Debate: German Socialist Intellectuals and Totalitarianism* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999), *passim*; Benjamin L. Alpers, *Dictators, Democracy, and American Public Culture: Envisioning the Totalitarian Enemy, 1920-1950* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), chapter 5; and Michaela Hönicke Moore, *Know Your Enemy: The American Debate on Nazism, 1933-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 68.

implied that once totalitarianism was defeated, democrats would no longer need to use anti-democratic methods. His diagnosis of crisis became a self-reinforcing logic that undergirded the Cold War liberalism that permeated intellectual circles in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, and helped justify McCarthyism, the Red and Lavender Scares, and intellectual persecution.

Similar discussions about the democratic public's political role had been taking place amongst American liberals since World War I, and Speier's decisive participation in these debates made his national reputation and propelled him from academia into the halls of American power. In the Great War's aftermath, congressional committees determined that the United States had entered the war on the Allies' behalf in part because its citizenry and politicians proved vulnerable to British propaganda. American intellectuals accepted this argument, and spent the 1920s and 1930s discussing how propaganda reshaped democratic theory.[11] There were two main sides of this debate, one represented by Walter Lippmann and the other by John Dewey. Lippmann argued that in the industrial age, society had become too complex for ordinary people to understand, and that propaganda too easily entranced them. For these reasons, citizens lacked the competence to direct public affairs, and could not be trusted to do so. Instead, experts, either intellectuals or professionals, had a duty to manipulate the public through propaganda to encourage citizens to make the "right" political choices. Dewey rejected this perspective, maintaining that better education could prepare democratic populations for modern political life.

---

[11] See Brett Gary, *The Nervous Liberals: Propaganda Anxieties from World War I to the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 18-53.

Since coming into contact with the working classes at the *Hochschule*, Speier had shared Lippmann and Dewey's disenchantment with ordinary people. Moreover, living in Berlin in the late 1920s and early 1930s had allowed him to witness the effectiveness of Josef Goebbels' propaganda apparatus. Initially, however, his experience with fascist propaganda made Speier reluctant to countenance its use. Yet his memory of Weimar's collapse and the Nazis' continued successes in the mid 1930s soon convinced him that the only way to defeat fascism was for intellectuals to become adept at using nondemocratic methods like propaganda. By 1937, Speier had fully embraced Lippmann's position, and over the course of the late 1930s he became a national authority on propaganda theory. In 1941, he and the Viennese psychoanalyst Ernst Kris received funds from the Rockefeller Foundation to conduct a long-term research project that analyzed Nazi propaganda. When the United States entered World War II in December, Speier sent his work to the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service (FBIS), the civilian agency in charge of analyzing Axis propaganda. Speier's work impressed the agency's directors, who soon invited him to head the Central European Section of the FBIS' Analysis Division (AD). Speier worked with many fellow exiles in the AD until 1944, when he joined the Office of War Information (OWI), which was also home to a number of German émigrés. In this new job, he oversaw all American propaganda broadcast to Germany. In 1945, he became acting chief of the State Department's Division for Occupied Areas (ADO), a position he held until 1947. In all of these jobs, Speier used the tools of social science to develop new ways to think about psychological warfare and U.S. information policy.

Speier was part of a process by which academics entered the American state as

foreign policy professionals *en masse*. Although intellectuals had occasionally consulted

for various government administrations on international issues during the Progressive Era

and New Deal, and while Franklin Delano Roosevelt had his famous "Brain Trust,"

unlike in the economic and legal realms, until World War II there had never been a large-

scale academic move from universities to government positions of foreign policy

influence. The sojourns of so many academics within the Washington war administration

laid the institutional, social, and intellectual foundations for the postwar military-

industrial-academic complex.[12] Institutionally, it legitimated government-influenced,

group-produced research. Socially, the personal relationships formed during the war

proved crucial to the makeup of the postwar national security state. For example, a

connection that Speier made at the OWI with Leo Rosten brought Speier to the RAND

Corporation. In turn, Speier recruited to RAND several of his AD colleagues, including

Alexander L. George and Nathan Leites. Intellectually, it led academics to believe that

social science could be used to change the world on a large scale, and that there was a

place for them within the American foreign policy establishment. On a variety of levels,

---

[12] This term has permeated the literature on Cold War-era social science. It is taken from Stuart Leslie's *The Cold War and American Science*, in which Leslie argues that the "'golden triangle' of military agencies, the high technology industry, and research universities" created "a new kind of postwar science." Similar arguments have been made about social science. Stuart Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), 2. For its use in the literature on social science, see Ron Theodore Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Intellectual Complex* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 4-8 and Rohde, "From Expert Democracy to Beltway Banditry," 144-145. Recent scholarship has emphasized the importance of World War II for the development of Cold War-era social science. See Solovey, "Cold War Social Science," 15-16 and David C. Engerman, "The Rise and Fall of Wartime Social Science: Harvard's Refugee Interview Project, 1950-54," in *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, eds. Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012): 25-43, especially the first footnote on page 38. For an earlier analysis of social scientists and World War II, see Peter Buck, "Adjusting to Military Life: The Social Sciences Go to War, 1941-1950," in *Military Enterprise and Technological Change: Perspectives on the American Experience*, ed. Merritt Roe Smith (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985), 203-252.

the World War II-experience helped transform the production and co-production of U.S. policy and social science.

By entering government service, social scientists like Speier formed a new epistemic community that challenged the authority and expertise of military officers, who traditionally had a heavy influence on America's foreign policy.[13] Speier and his wartime colleagues comprised the first generation of defense intellectuals, experts who appealed to academic knowledge, not professional experience or expertise, as the reason why policymakers should heed their advice. The military recognized the threat posed by this new class of civilian experts, and many did not appreciate nor respect it.[14] For their part, academic expertise became the currency with which defense intellectuals purchased entry into the highest realms of U.S. foreign policymaking throughout the 1950s and 1960s.[15] By staffing the most important wartime research and analysis divisions—the ones dealing with Nazi Germany—Speier and other German intellectuals formed an important part of the cohort of academic warriors who made the rise of the defense intellectual possible. In addition to Speier, an incomplete list of exiles who worked for the government during the war includes Franz Borkenau, Joseph Bornstein, Gerhard Colm, Felix Gilbert, Emil Gumbel, Arkady Gurman, Olaf Helmer, Hajo Holborn, Otto Kirchheimer, Jürgen Kuczynski, Leo Löwenthal, Heinz Pächter, Herbert Marcuse, Franz Neumann, Sigmund

---

[13] For a crystallized view of military expertise at mid-twentieth century, see Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981 [1957]), 8-14.

[14] Oftentimes, generals dismissed civilian expertise as naïve and ill-informed. For example, Air Force General David A. Burchinal declared that defense intellectuals "didn't understand military power. … They thought they could use it like a scalpel in a bloody hospital operation, whereas in truth military force is a pretty damn blunt instrument." Richard H. Kohn and Joseph P. Harahan, eds. *Strategic Air Warfare: An Interview with Generals Curtis E. LeMay, Leon W. Johnson, David A. Burchinal, and Jack J. Catton* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Air Force History, United States Air Force, 1988), 121.

[15] Most famously, many of Robert McNamara's so-called Whiz Kids were RAND analysts. See Fred Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), chapter 16.

Neumann, and John von Neumann.[16] German academics so permeated wartime

institutions that Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. later reported that he was "surrounded by German

Jewish refugees" in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS), while Gumbel wrote that: "In

the OSS, in the OWI, in the atomic work, the immigrants were able to collaborate

significantly. We could speak German everywhere (and even louder than necessary)."[17]

Many of the exiles continued to work for the national security state in the early Cold

War, while those who returned to the university made geopolitical analysis a significant

focus of their scholarship.[18]

     Speier's wartime experiences illuminate why so many defense intellectuals chose

to remain within the institutional matrix of postwar foreign policymaking while steering

clear of permanent government positions. By 1947, Speier had adopted a pessimistic

attitude toward government work, which he found overtly politicized and inefficient. In

1943 and 1944, enemies of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal had for

spurious reasons gutted the FBIS. Two years later, Speier found that tensions with

military occupation authorities made it impossible for him, as director of the ADO, to

---

[16] Colm worked for the Bureau of the Budget; Gilbert, Gumbel, Gurland, Holborn, Kirchheimer, Marcuse, F. Neumann, and S. Neumann all worked for the Office of Strategic Services (OSS); Borkenau, Bornstein, Löwenthal, and Pächter all worked for the OWI; Kuczynski worked for the United States Strategic Bombing Survey; and Helmer and von Neumann worked for the Office of Scientific Research and Development. Many of the exiles mentioned here worked for more than one organization, i.e., they would consult for both the OSS and OWI.

[17] Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *Journals, 1952-2000* (New York: Penguin, 2007), 676. See also Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *A Life in the Twentieth Century: Innocent Beginnings, 1917-1950* (Boston: Mariner Books, 2002), 308. The Gumbel quote is taken from Arthur David Brenner, *Emil J. Gumbel: Weimar German Pacifist and Professor* (Boston: Humanities Press, 2001), 190. For more on exiles who worked for the government during World War II, see Barry M. Katz, *Foreign Intelligence: Research and Analysis in the Office of Strategic Services, 1942-1945* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), chapter 2.

[18] Only recently have some historians begun to focus on exiles' Cold War policymaking roles. See Tim B. Müller, *Krieger und Gelehrte: Herbert Marcuse und die Denksysteme im Kalten Krieg* (Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2010); Udi Greenberg, "Cold War Weimar: German Émigrés and the Intellectual Origins of the Cold War," Ph.D Dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2010; and Noah Strote, "Emigration and the Foundation of West Germany, 1933-1963," Ph.D Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2011. The latter two works, however, focus primarily on how exiles informed postwar Europe as opposed to postwar America.

implement his desired information policies. Experiences such as these convinced Speier that working for the government entailed too many restrictions on his freedom of action. However, this judgment did not mean that Speier, or many other intellectuals who worked for the wartime government, wanted to return to academia. They found power enthralling and believed they were fighting an existential struggle for democracy, which made it difficult for them to retreat to the relative tranquility of university life. What Speier and others sought was a new type of institution in which intellectuals could fulfill their self-imposed duty to produce policy-relevant knowledge for democracy without falling prey to political constraints.

Many high-ranking military officers and governmental officials agreed; academics had proven their utility during the war, and the government would lose a significant amount of intellectual capital if these individuals all returned to university positions. Moreover, the emerging rivalries between the military services encouraged each branch to seek ways to distinguish itself. The Army Air Forces (AAF), fighting for autonomy, became especially concerned with using academic expertise to bolster its reputation. As the war came to a close in 1945, AAF General H.H. "Hap" Arnold, with the aid of engineers from the Douglas Aircraft Company, set about creating Project RAND (which eventually became the RAND Corporation), to assert the Air Force's position both within the military and amongst U.S. policymakers. RAND soon became the prototypical Cold War think tank. Unlike the private Council on Foreign Relations, RAND was heavily funded by the Air Force and its analysts were privy to highly classified nuclear information. Much more so than other think tanks, research produced at

RAND informed the course and structure of U.S. foreign policy and postwar social science, and Speier had a central role in this process.

Speier briefly returned to the New School in the autumn of 1947, spending an unhappy year attempting to create an academic program dedicated to international studies. In September, he was invited to RAND's Conference of Social Scientists, a conclave designed to find directors for RAND's incipient social science and economics divisions. RAND's goal of connecting intellectuals to policymakers appealed to Speier's aspiration to influence policy from outside the government. Furthermore, Speier saw in the Soviet Union a threat as palpable and dangerous as Nazi Germany, and believed it his moral duty to contribute to communism's defeat.[19] RAND's founders were impressed by Speier's fierce anti-communism and expertise in psychological warfare, a tactic that had begun to entrance a number of foreign policy elites, and after the conference asked him to head the Social Science Division (SSD). As Speier's case demonstrates, in the early Cold War elective affinities linked intellectuals and the new institutions of the national security state.

His position at RAND allowed Speier to influence several U.S. foreign policies. Since the 1930s, he had embraced an understanding of totalitarian societies that framed them as run solely by elites completely disinterested in using public opinion as a guide for political action. For this reason, Speier argued that U.S. programs of psychological warfare aimed at the Soviet Union must ignore the Soviet masses, and should instead focus on disrupting the functioning of Soviet political elites. In 1951, Speier's RAND connections brought him into contact with the conveners of Project TROY, a State

---

[19] This was a sentiment shared by many social scientists at midcentury. See the second part of Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens, eds. *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

Department-funded meeting of academics called to develop a strategy for combating the Soviet Union's information efforts. Participating in TROY allowed Speier to disseminate his opinions about elite-directed psychological warfare throughout the State Department, and his ideas came to influence the tactical directives of PSB D-31, the policy paper that guided U.S. psychological strategy in the early 1950s.

Around the same time, Speier's reputation led the State Department to ask him and Wallace Carroll, his former colleague from the OWI, to travel to Germany to recommend guidelines for Eastern-Bloc-directed psychological warfare campaigns. After returning from their trip in late 1950, Speier and Carroll suggested that the United States adopt an activist program of agitation that encouraged East Germans to rebel against their Soviet occupiers. Based partly on Speier and Carroll's report, for several weeks in the spring and summer of 1953 the Radio in the American Sector (RIAS) broadcast materials throughout East Germany designed to inspire an uprising. Indeed, once a revolt erupted in East Berlin in June 1953, the RIAS made an active effort to spread news about it throughout the entirety of East Germany, which helped transform a local rebellion into a national one.[20]

Speier's career illuminates how mid-level figures like him could shape Cold War foreign policy.[21] Although not a statesman, nor the author of pivotal documents like

---

[20] Christian F. Ostermann, "The United States, the East German Uprising of 1953, and the Limits of Rollback," Working Paper no. 11, Cold War International History Project, December 1994), 15-19 and Christian F. Ostermann, "'Keeping the Pot Simmering': The United States and the East German Uprising of 1953," *German Studies Review* 19, no. 1 (February 1996): 64-66.

[21] The literature on Cold War decision-makers primarily focuses on elite-level policymakers, which obscures mid-level figures' policy impact. A representative sample includes James A. Bill, *George Ball: Behind the Scenes in U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Kai Bird, *The Color of Truth: McGeorge Bundy and William Bundy: Brothers in Arms* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000); Thomas W. Zeiler, *Dean Rusk: Defending the American Mission Abroad* (Wilmington: SR Books, 2000); Robert Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power* (New York: HarperCollins, 2007); David Milne, *America's Rasputin: Walt Rostow and the Vietnam War* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2008); Robert L.

NSC-68 or influential pieces like George Kennan's Long Telegram, Speier's influence on

the tactics of psychological warfare and the June 1953 uprising indicates that at various

moments he could have an important, direct effect on U.S. foreign policy. He did so by

appealing to his expertise and by crafting ideologically acceptable responses to pressing

policy problems.[22] Speier did not, however, merely reproduce government-sanctioned

ideas for the purpose of increasing his power. Indeed, his Cold War-era work elucidates

that experts could critique government policies while retaining their positions.[23] Speier

spent the early 1950s railing against government-sanctioned mass-based propaganda

Beisner, *Dean Acheson: A Life in the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Jeremi Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009); John Acacia, *Clark Clifford: The Wise Man of Washington* (Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press, 2009); and John Lewis Gaddis, *George F. Kennan: An American Life* (New York: Penguin, 2011). This list does not include the myriad biographies of Cold War presidents.

[22] Speier formed part of an "issue network," which Hugh Heclo defines as a "shared-knowledge group having to do with some aspect (or, as defined by the network, some problem) of public policy," dedicated to defeating the Soviet Union. See Hugh Heclo, "Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment," in *The New American Political System*, ed. Anthony King (Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1978): 102-103. Speier's issue network comprised individuals working in various governmental, nongovernmental, and academic nodes of the national security state. Because his primary position was at RAND, his story speaks to how nongovernmental institutions and think tanks influence foreign policy. Significant work in political science has examined the process by which this is accomplished. See Simon James, "Influencing Government Policy Making," in *Banking on Knowledge: The Genesis of the Global Development Network*, ed. Diane Stone (London: Routledge, 2000): 162-170; Diane Stone, "Non-Governmental Policy Transfer: The Strategies of Independent Policy Institutes," *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration* 13, no. 1 (January 2000): 45-62; James M. McGann, *Think Tanks and Policy Advice in the US* (Philadelphia: Foreign Policy Research Institute, August 2005); Donald E. Abelson, *A Capitol Idea: Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006); and Thomas Medvetz, *Think Tanks in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), *passim*, but especially chapter 5. One may also consider Speier an "agenda setter," in that he helped determine the form of U.S. foreign policy. The historical literature has focused primarily on how mid-level government bureaucrats can participate in agenda setting in the domestic policy sphere. Exemplary works include Daniel P. Carpenter, *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 14-15, 18-29 and Daniel P. Carpenter, *Reputation and Power: Organizational Image and Pharmaceutical Regulation at the FDA* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 15-19. Speier points to how individuals working in nongovernmental settings can also shape agendas. Fred Kaplan and Lawrence Freedman have examined how RAND analysts accomplished this in terms of nuclear strategy, although without using the language of agenda setting. See Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon*, *passim*, but especially chapter 16 and Lawrence Freedman, *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 128-130, 166, 222-226, 360-365.

[23] This argument stands against the common-sense notion that "RAND's work buttressed dominant foreign policy perspectives rather than critiqued them," and that the think tank had a "structural impotence with respect to all but the most timid critiques." Thomas Medvetz, "Think Tanks and the Production of Policy-Knowledge in America," Ph.D Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 2007, 95-96.

campaigns directed against the Soviet Union. Yet neither his RAND superiors nor government officials reprimanded him for these attacks, because in the final analysis, Speier did not have permanent access to the highest levels of government decision-making. In a democratic society like the United States, where power flowed from politics, nonpartisan experts like Speier had difficulties permanently rising above a certain level. Government officials could heed his advice when they wanted to, and ignore it when they did not. Freedom from political patrons brought constraints on influence. Speier made the personal choice to accept circumscriptions on his power because they allowed him to function without regard to narrow partisan or intra-party considerations. In certain moments, he could have an enormous influence, but this depended upon government officials and was exercised in an *ad hoc* manner.

Speier's longest-lasting impact came in the institutional sphere. RAND relationships enabled him to become a builder of organizations that became permanent fixtures of the foreign policy establishment and helped accomplish his goal of removing the public from the foreign policymaking process. As head of the SSD, Speier became an acquaintance of H. Rowan Gaither, an early RAND supporter and high-ranking official at the Ford Foundation. Gaither had been impressed with Speier's research and administrative work and asked him to produce a report, with the aid of Donald Marquis, a University of Michigan psychologist, and Bernard Berelson, a public opinion expert from the University of Chicago, detailing how Ford should fund social science research. Speier seized the opportunity, and with the aid of Marquis and Berelson developed a program that called for Ford to support a number of university-associated research centers dedicated to refining the methods of social science for the ultimate purpose of producing

policy-relevant knowledge and connecting academics with decision-makers. At Speier's

urging, Ford created and funded Stanford University's Center for Advanced Study in the

Behavioral Sciences (CASBS) and the program in international communication

headquartered at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's (MIT) Center for

International Studies (CENIS). These two organizations became central hubs for the

development of postwar social science as well as institutional bases for a number of

academics, including Kenneth Arrow, Daniel Lerner, and Ithiel de Sola Pool, whose

research influenced Cold War foreign policy.

Speier's position as chief of RAND's SSD further provided him with an

influential perch from which he could shape the direction of postwar social science. His

decades-old interest in the functioning of elites led him to make elite studies a central

concentration of the division. Partially due to RAND's influence, elite studies quickly

spread throughout the academic and think tank worlds and became a major focus of

social scientific research.[24] Moreover, Speier ensured that the analysts in his division

practiced interdisciplinary research in small groups. Although individuals could pursue

their own projects, Speier stressed that the most useful research emerged from settings in

which a number of intellectuals from different disciplines came together to answer a

common question. Indeed, of all RAND's divisions, the SSD was the one most explicitly

devoted to interdisciplinary research, a fact that its very name implies. Interdisciplinary

---

[24] See Harold Lasswell, Daniel Lerner, and C. Easton Rothwald, *The Comparative Study of Elites: An Introduction and Bibliography* (Stanford: Stanford Univesity Press, 1952) and Alfred de Grazia, *Elite Analysis: A Manual for Methods for Discovering the Leaders of a Society and their Vulnerability to Propaganda* (Stanford: Institute of Journalistic Studies, 1955).

analysis became dominant in the early Cold War, and RAND was crucial in influencing myriad think tanks and research centers to copy its model.[25]

Speier's experiences at RAND bolster trends evident in recent histories of Cold War-era social science, which argue that the framework of "collusion" and "victimhood," which sees social scientists as either government collaborators or as victims constrained by institutional realities, does not reflect historical experience.[26] Besides the fact that most social scientists did not consider the production of national security research a moral crime, recent scholarship suggests that the interactions between social scientists and the government were complex and cannot be reduced to one or two models.[27] Therefore, as Joel Isaac argues, to frame all exchanges between social scientists and the government as either collusion or tragedy imposes a critique that elides the complex

[25] For RAND as a model think tank, see Medvetz, *Think Tanks in America*, 26. 186, 192-193, and especially chapter 3.

[26] The classic statements that frame Cold War-era social science as coopted are Allan A. Needell, "'Truth is Our Weapon': Project TROY, Political Warfare, and Government-Academic Relations in the National Security State," *Diplomatic History* 17, no. 3 (July 1993): 399-420; Noam Chomsky, et al., *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years* (New York: The New Press, 1997); and Christopher Simpson, ed., *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences during the Cold War* (New York: The New Press, 1998). In a recent essay, David Engerman has argued that there might not have been "such a thing" as "Cold War social science," a general term used in the literature, as not all social science produced during the era of Cold War was informed or affected by that larger geopolitical context. Mark Solovey has argued a similar point. However, Solovey also points out that, in some cases, "Cold War social science" as a term makes sense, as "certain methods of investigation and associated technologies," as well as "entire fields of inquiry flourished … partly and sometimes largely because of their Cold War relevance." Historians thus cannot adopt any grand narratives with reference to Cold War-era social science, but must examine each research project and program on a local basis. See Engerman, "The Rise and Fall of Wartime Social Science," 38 and Solovey, "Cold War Social Science," 16-18.

[27] This is the general thrust of many in the essays collected in the recently released volume *Cold War Social Science*. See Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens, eds. *Cold War Social Science*. See also David K. van Keuren, "Cold War Science in Black and White: US Intelligence Gathering and Its Scientific Cover at the Naval Research Laboratory, 1948-1962," *Social Studies of Science* 31, on. 2 (April 2001): 207-229 and John Cloud, "Imagining the World in a Barrel: CORONA and the Clandestine Convergence of the Earth Sciences," *Social Studies of Science* 31, no. 2 (April 2001): 231-251.

motivations of social scientists working during the Cold War, as well as ignoring the

ability of government-funded social scientists to abide by their own research agendas.[28]

Speier's freedom of action was evident not only in the content and structure of the

research pursued by the SSD, but also in his preferred, qualitative methodology. Indeed,

his methods provide a counterpoint to accounts that emphasize the triumph of a postwar

"science of politics," or positivistic political science.[29] Scholars consider RAND a major

center from which a science of politics emerged.[30] Speier, however, advocated a

historical approach to foreign policy decision-making in line with the work of traditional

international relations theorists like E.H. Carr, William T.R. Fox, Hans Morgenthau, and

Reinhold Niebuhr. Several of Speier's colleagues in RAND's SSD shared his

methodological stance. In the late 1950s, Speier and his collaborator Herbert Goldhamer

---

[28] See Joel Isaac, "The Human Sciences in Cold War America," *The Historical Journal* 50, no. 3 (September 2007): 725-746. Mark Solovey and David Engerman make similar points. See Solevey, "Cold War Social Science," 4-6, 14 and Engerman, "The Rise and Fall of Wartime Social Science," 32-36. Other essays in the *Cold War Social Science* collection echo this perspective.

[29] Narratives that argue in favor of quantification's postwar triumph include Allan A. Needell, "Project TROY and the Cold War Annexation of the Social Sciences," in *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences during the Cold War*, ed. Christopher Simpson (New York: The New Press, 1998), 3-38; Sonja M. Amadae, *Rationalizing Capitalist Democracy: The Cold War Origins of Rational Choice Liberalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Mark Solovey, "Riding Natural Scientists' Coattails onto the Endless Frontier: The SSRC and the Quest for Scientific Legitimacy," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 40, no. 4 (Fall 2004): 393-422; Philip Mirowski, "How Positivism Made a Pact with the Postwar Social Sciences in the United States," in *The Politics of Method in the Human Sciences: Positivism and Its Epistemological Others*, ed. George Steinmetz (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 142-172; David Paul Haney, *The Americanization of Social Science: Intellectuals and Public Responsibility in the Postwar United States* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008), especially the introduction and chapter 3; Robert Adcock and Mark Bevir, "Political Science," in *The History of the Social Sciences since 1945*, eds. Roger E. Backhouse and Philippe Fontaine (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 71-101; and Hamilton Cravens, "Column Right, March! Nationalism, Scientific Positivism, and the Conservative Turn in the American Social Sciences in the Cold War Era," in *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, eds. Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 131-132.

[30] Studies that point to RAND as a major impetus of postwar social science quantification include Robert J. Leonard, "War as a 'Simple Economic Problem': The Rise of an Economics of Defense," in *Economics and National Security: A History of Their Interaction*, ed. Crauford D. Goodwin (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991), 261-283; David A. Hounshell, "The Cold War, RAND, and the Generation of Knowledge," *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences* 27, no. 2 (1997): 237-268; Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy*, 6-7; and Nicolas Guilhot, "Cyborg Pantocrator: International Relations Theory from Decisionism to Rational Choice," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 47, no. 3 (Summer 2011): 287, 290.

spearheaded the development of a qualitative political game that consciously critiqued the scientistic and rationalist emphases of other defense intellectuals. The game was an instrumentalist exercise in political irrationality, seeking not to overcome chance by developing a science of strategy, but to teach decision-makers to be comfortable with it.[31] The game's presence at RAND indicates that at major centers of postwar social science, even during the "behavioral revolution" in political science, there existed a space for historical and qualitative methods. While the Economics Division was crucial to developing game theory, different approaches were emphasized in the SSD. Thus, when speaking about RAND, historians must be careful to differentiate organizationally and epistemologically heterogeneous divisions. Moreover, Speier and Goldhamer's political game, which was heavily influenced by Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge, highlights the importance of linking Cold War-era social science to interwar and transnational developments.[32]

Speier's Weimar experience had led him to embrace a political vision that sought to remove the public from the foreign policymaking process, and he institutionalized this vision at RAND, CASBS, and the program in international communication at CENIS. This suggests that transnational ideas about the public's role in policymaking and intellectuals' political function informed the creation of several organizations of the American national security state. Michael J. Hogan, the most influential historian of the

---

[31] This framing of the political game removes it from the "science" side of the scientific-traditionalist discussion that defined the "second debate" amongst political scientists in the 1950s and 1960s, which is where Nicolas Guilhot places it. For an explanation of the second debate, see Nicolas Guilhot, "The Realist Gambit: Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory," *International Political Sociology* 2, no. 4 (December 2008): 281-304.

[32] Nils Gilman, in *Mandarins of the Future*, and David Haney, in *The Americanization of Social Science*, demonstrate the importance inter- and pre-war debates had for postwar American social science. See Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 24-41 and Haney, *The Americanization of Social Science*, 14-15, 22-26, 70-87, 142, 154-156, 200-202.

national security state's origins, argues that in the 1940s and 1950s a significant portion

of the U.S. political elite subscribed to a "national security ideology" that declared that

the United States needed to defeat communism and promote international liberty.

Achieving these goals required a permanently mobilized state apparatus that "could bring

the resources of the nation to bear in the struggle against communism."[33] Daniel Yergin

similarly argues that "Riga" advocates, who saw the Cold War as a battle between two

mutually incomprehensible ideologies, defeated "Yalta" advocates, who favored peaceful

coexistence, in the internal arguments over America's postwar role.[34] The triumph of the

Riga-supporters, Yergin asserts, led many Americans to consider the Soviet Union an

immediate military threat, which necessitated a national security state. Douglas Stuart

also emphasizes ideology, but unlike Hogan and Yergin traces the national security

ideology to the experience of Pearl Harbor. In Stuart's words, Pearl Harbor "*established*

the concept of national security as the unchangeable standard against which all future

foreign policy decisions were made."[35] Finally, Michael Sherry develops an argument

based on a more diffuse cultural orientation. He maintains that in the late 1930s,

American society began to militarize, which engendered an ethos dedicated to

maintaining security at all costs, and which found organizational expression in the

institutions of the national security state.[36]

     Examining Speier's influence indicates that there were additional ideological

origins of the national security state that historians have not yet focused upon. Although

---

[33] Hogan stresses that those who endorsed the national security ideology needed to compromise with those who supported a more isolationist, "traditional" ideology. Hogan, *A Cross of Iron*, 3, 10-22, 465.

[34] Daniel Yergin, *Shattered Peace: The Origins of the Cold War and the National Security State* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977), 11-13.

[35] Stuart goes so far as to characterize the postwar national security state as the institutional manifestation of the "Pearl Harbor System." Douglas T. Stuart, *Creating the National Security State: A History of the Law that Transformed America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 2-42.

[36] Sherry, *In the Shadow of War*, ix-xi, 42-44, 138-144.

ideas about national security, statehood, and militarism were each important to the emergence of postwar foreign policymaking institutions, so too were ideas of public and intellectual participation in a modern democratic polity. Studying Speier's career underlines that the research organizations of the national security state were partially designed to remove the public from the foreign policymaking process. Indeed, in addition to his institution-building projects, Speier became a vocal public advocate of a politics of expertise. He joined a cohort of government-connected intellectuals, which included Gabriel Almond, George Kennan, and Walter Lippmann, who, through scholarly publications, speeches, and their own policy recommendations, fostered acceptance for an expert-centered foreign policymaking culture, the endorsement of which was reflected in the major textbooks and treatises on foreign relations published in the 1950s.[37] Due to the private and public efforts of Speier and others, the national security state successfully incubated a culture of expertise.

Analyzing how an ideology of expertise permeated the institutional matrix of the U.S. national security state underlines tensions between democracy and expertise that have been evident in the American approach to national security since the early Cold War. While experts like Speier claimed themselves to be defenders of liberal democracy, using the language of protecting "Enlightenment values" or "western civilization" to justify their professional and intellectual positions, they self-consciously limited the freedoms they sought to guard. It is an irony of history that many American experts who endorsed international programs of democracy promotion from Latin America, to Southeast Asia, to the Middle East, at the same time worked to create an ideological

---

[37] As Brian Balogh has argued, "precisely because the kind of politics they tended toward excluded public participation, general public support for and belief in expertise was crucial to [experts'] success." Balogh, *Chain Reaction*, 28-29.

consensus and institutions that consciously removed the public from the policymaking process. In the struggle between democracy and perceived security, Americans—both elites and a frightened public, which granted elites free reign—chose the latter.

Contextualizing Speier's career, however, provides an important insight into why defense intellectuals—many of whom were committed liberals or social democrats—adopted anti-democratic attitudes with regards national security policy. The most recent historical literature takes a very dim view of defense intellectuals and their motivations and contributions. Bruce Kuklick, for example, characterizes defense intellectuals as "blind oracles" motivated by career advancement whose "actual knowledge was minimal while their sense of self-regard and scholarly hand-waving was maximal."[38] Speier, however, belies this image of the defense intellectual. His decision to become part of the national security state was motivated not solely by a desire for power and prestige, but from a deep sense of moral duty—instilled by witnessing Hitler's triumph over German democracy—to defend liberal values. The literature's caricature of defense intellectuals as so many Dr. Strangeloves cannot adequately explain Speier and his cohort's intellectual and professional experiences and commitments. For German-born "cold warriors" like Speier, the experience and memory of Nazism's triumph became a powerful cautionary tale that justified a permanent antitotalitarianism, which in the 1950s

---

[38] Bruce Kuklick, *Blind Oracles: Intellectuals and War from Kennan to Kissinger* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 143-144, 229. A large number of histories portray the Cold War foreign policy expert as being motivated by the search for power and prestige. Exemplary works include Lloyd Gardner, *Pay Any Price: Lyndon Johnson and the Wars for Vietnam* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1995), 300-302, 363-365, 370, 376-377, 390, 397-403, 406, with its critical take on Walt Whitman Rostow; Robert D. Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001), 10-16, 38, 171; and Milne, *America's Rasputin*, 6-14. In contrast to this, however, there is a significant body of literature that is more sympathetic to defense intellectuals, while not excusing their moral lacunas. See Gregg Herken, *Counsels of War* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), xiv-xvi; Martin J. Collins, *Cold War Laboratory: RAND, the Air Force, and the American State* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001), viii, xi, xiii-xvii; and Sharon Ghamari-Tabrizi, *The Worlds of Herman Kahn: The Intuitive Science of Thermonuclear War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 2-9.

manifested as anticommunism. Although one can critique this stance from a variety of ethical and normative perspectives, it is important to consider it in historical context.

The focus on personal experience further points to the important role identity played in the careers of émigré defense intellectuals. Speier personally made frequent use of his unique hybrid identity when maneuvering through the institutional matrix of the national security state. He regularly informed American-born colleagues that, as a German who lived through Weimar's collapse, he had a distinctive understanding of German politics and society that others could not match. Throughout the 1950s, Speier appealed to his background to shore up his authority. In the 1960s, respect for that background helped him maintain his position at RAND, even as he became less interested in informing U.S. foreign policy directly. Speier's story thus adds to scholarly work that examines how minority communities strategically use identities to achieve a variety of political, professional, and personal goals.[39] Barring Jeremi Suri's writings on Henry Kissinger, few scholars of foreign relations examine how transnational identity politics informed state- and decision-making.[40]

---

[39] Entire literatures have arisen around the notion that people construct and strategically use identities. Major theoretical and historical examples include Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973); Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979); Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (London: Routledge, 1990); Mary Waters, *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990); Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Mary Bernstein, "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement," *American Journal of Sociology* 103, no. 3 (November 1997): 531-565; Judith Shklar, *Redeeming American Political Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998); Charles Tilly, *Stories, Identities, and Political Change* (Lanham, MC: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000); and Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 2006).
[40] Jeremi Suri, "Henry Kissinger, the American Dream, and the Jewish Immigrant Experience in the Cold War," *Diplomatic History* 32, no. 5 (November 2008): 719-747 and Suri, *Kissinger*. One important work that focuses on how American identities of masculinity informed policymaking is Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood*. See also Walter L. Hixson, *The Myth of American Diplomacy: National Identity and U.S. Foreign Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 6-16, which explores how foreign policy and identity mutually construct each other.

This study thus addresses several broad themes that structure the narrative. The first is the significance of the Weimar experience to Speier's later thought and actions. The second is how diagnoses of crisis have a self-justifying character that rationalizes actions and ideas that, in "normal" periods, would be considered unconscionable. The third is the importance of transatlantic connections to the formation of Cold War foreign policy. Finally, the fourth theme is the fundamental role intellectuals' self-conscious, decades-long reimagining of their sociopolitical function played in their career and intellectual choices from the 1930s onward. Together, these themes speak to the central question asked by this dissertation: Why did defense intellectuals rise to positions of authority when they did?

Taken as a whole, this study adds to recent scholarship that aims to internationalize U.S. history, and, specifically, to the new transatlantic history of the United States. Perhaps most importantly, Daniel Rodgers has argued that "Atlantic Crossings" profoundly shaped the development of social policy from the Gilded Age to the New Deal. However, Rodgers indicates that postwar America was closed to foreign influences.[41] Speier's career demonstrates that this was not the case, at least in the realms of institution building and foreign policymaking. This project further contributes to the history of the twentieth-century German-American Atlantic. Scholars such as Volker Berghahn, Victoria de Grazia, and Reinhold Wagnleitner have detailed how American ideas, institutions, and cultures penetrated postwar Europe, and also how European

---

[41] Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*, 504-508. Rodgers eloquently characterizes the postwar American view in the following manner: "Having saved the world, it [was] not thereafter … easy to imagine that there was still much to learn from it."

citizens adopted and adapted to this process of "Americanization."[42] This work has naturally focused on the United States' impact on Europe. Yet the story of Speier and his colleagues suggests that the German-American Atlantic was not defined solely by unidirectional America to Europe transfers, but by European-American crosscurrents. To understand the complexities of postwar history, these bidirectional flows must also be examined.

The dissertation proceeds as follows. The first chapter, "The Intellectual as Political Actor," analyzes Speier's youth, his entrancement and disillusionment with political and theoretical Marxism, and his embrace of the normative value that intellectuals must participate actively in political life. The second chapter, "The Opportunities of Exile," examines how Speier addressed the failure of the Weimar Republic, the rise of fascism, and the exile intellectual's social role. The third chapter, "The Prospects and Problems of Government Service," details Speier's participation in liberal debates about propaganda, his emergence as a national authority on the subject, and his entrance into government service. Chapter four, "The Rise of the Foreign Policy Expert," elucidates Speier's entry into and influence on RAND. The fifth and final

---

[42] Reinhold Wagnleitner, *Coco-Colonization and the Cold War: The Cultural Mission of the United States in Austria after the Cold War* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 1-4; Volker Berghahn, *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002); and Victoria de Grazia, *Irresistible Empire: America's Advance through Twentieth-Century Europe* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), especially 4-12. There is a massive literature on the postwar influence of the United States on Europe. For some recent examples, see Uta G. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000); Giles Scott-Smith and Hans Krabbendam, eds. *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945-1960* (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2003); Jonathan Zeitlin and Gary Herrigel, *Americanization and Its Limits: Reworking US Technology and Management in Post-war Europe and Japan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Alexander Stephan, ed., *The Americanization of Europe: Culture, Diplomacy, and Anti-Americanism after 1945* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2006); Ruth Oldenziel and Karin Zachman, eds. *Cold War Kitchen: Americanization, Technology, and European Users* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011). For a work that rejects the framework of Americanization, see Richard Pells, *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture since World War II* (New York: Basic Books/HarperCollins, 1997), xiii-xv.

chapter, "The Practice of Expert Knowledge," demonstrates how Speier developed policy influence through conclaves like Project TROY and Nelson Rockefeller's Quantico Panel. It further illuminates Speier's central role in creating CASBS and the program in international communication at CENIS. Finally, the epilogue, "An Exile's View of Germany," considers Speier's relationship to his former homeland. It demonstrates that, even after decades of domestic and international rehabilitation, Speier was unable to trust the nation that had forced his exile. He never overcame the trauma of Weimar, which remained with him until the end of his life.

Chapter One: The Intellectual as Political Actor

The belief that democracy's survival required a politically engaged intellectual elite guided Hans Speier's life and thought from the beginnings of his career in Germany to his retirement from the American foreign policy research establishment in the late 1960s. In World War I's wake, the social and economic dislocation of German academics compelled Speier and many of his colleagues to reconsider intellectuals' social function. Inspired by his doctoral advisors Karl Mannheim and Emil Lederer, two professors very much concerned with intellectuals' social role, Speier sought to assert himself in a society that seemed to have little use for him and his professional class. He did so by revising *Bildung*, the classical German concept of education, to stress political and social engagement. Speier hoped reformulating *Bildung* in this manner would help socialist intellectuals like himself realize their importance to the political process. Initially, Speier promoted an educationist vision of intellectual engagement, arguing that academics should remain teachers but move beyond the institutional confines of the university to educate workers at the grassroots level.

However, in 1930, the coalition government led by Social Democratic Chancellor Hermann Müller collapsed and was replaced by the conservative administration of Heinrich Brüning. The Brüning regime ruled with the aid of Article 48, which granted the chancellor emergency powers, and was committed to creating an authoritarian system of governance. With Brüning's rise, Speier's vision transformed to one that advocated for intellectuals to become part of the republic's machinery. No longer was education enough; academics needed to join political organizations. In Speier's conception, intellectuals would no longer be observers, only commenting on politics, but would shape

the world through action. Without intellectuals, Speier continuously asserted, no socialist

goals could be achieved. Indeed, when the Nazis seized power in January 1933, he

blamed left wing intellectuals for failing to prevent Hitler's rise. For Speier, intellectuals

stood at the center of the political process.

Speier's Early Life, 1905-1929

Hans-Heinrich Adolf Ludwig Speier was born on February 3, 1905, the only child

of Adolf and Anna (née Person).[1] Speier grew up in a conservative Lutheran household in

the Friedenau suburb of Berlin, the city of his father (his mother, an ethnic Swede, hailed

from Pomerania). Speier remembered his father, the director of the Berlin office of the

New York Insurance Company, as a free thinker who was nonetheless "Prussian" when it

came to discipline; his mother he considered a gentle woman, although mental illness led

her to ignore her only child. Despite his comfortable middle-class upbringing, his

parents' diseases—Adolf had Parkinson's and Anna was clinically depressed—made

Speier's childhood a difficult one. On the rare occasions he discussed his youth in letters

or interviews, he recalled it as lonely and occasionally traumatic. Most dramatically,

Speier once witnessed his mother try and fail to commit suicide. Perhaps these early

feelings of powerlessness pushed Speier to embrace a political vision characterized by a

desire to control the chaos of democratic life.

Speier's difficult homelife appears to have encouraged him to reject the bourgeois

values of his parents. By his early adolescence, Speier scorned his parents' conservative

---

[1] Unfortunately, the majority of Speier's correspondence from his time in Germany has been lost. Thus, I have relied on oral histories Speier gave in the last decades of his life, as well as other scattered published and unpublished reminiscences, for personal information about his German period. Hans Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954," Box 2, Folder 16, Hans Speier Papers, German and Jewish Intellectual Émigré Collection, M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections and Archives, University Libraries, University at Albany, State University of New York, Albany, New York (hereafter referred to as the Speier Papers) and "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 2-5, 58-60.

nationalism and Lutheranism. At an early age, his parents dispatched him to the

Helmholtz *Realgymnasium*, locally famous for its strict disciplinary procedures and

reactionary politics. Speier hated his education, and events demonstrated that he was an

outsider disconnected from his larger community. In 1919, he refused to receive the

traditional Lutheran confirmation blessing. Upon learning of their son's refusal, Speier's

parents were aghast and asked the minister who had overseen the botched ceremony to

convince him to accept the blessing. The minister, however, supported Speier and

informed his parents that good Lutherans must allow individuals to abide by their

conscience. Indeed, Speier never received the blessing. A stubbornness and commitment

to his ideals, regardless of popularity, remained a defining characteristic of his

personality.

Few records survive from Speier's adolescence, but it was in his teenage years

that he became politically aware and aligned himself with Germany's left wing. The post-

World War I period was a plastic moment in German political history; for the first time,

the *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands* (Social Democratic Party of Germany, or

SPD) became an important part of the political system.[2] The rise of a former opposition

party to influence no doubt appealed to a teenager who felt detached from his family and

community, and who considered himself a principled iconoclast. Yet Speier was no

radical, and was likely also attracted to the SPD's political moderation. The party stood

as a bulwark of political order, for example refusing to support the leftist revolution that

spread throughout Germany after the October 1918 sailors' uprising in Kiel. Speier,

whose life was interrupted by war when he was forced to spend months on an Eastern

---

[2] By 1912, the party was the largest one in the Reichstag, although its influence was circumscribed under the Wilhelmine government.

Prussian farm in 1918, probably found the SPD's status as a symbol of stability appealing.

Speier's desire for order led him to reject Germany's radical left and associate himself with the SPD's center. Beginning in the 1920s and continuing for the rest of his life, he maintained an "unqualified hostility" toward the "communist orthodoxy" of the *Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands* (Communist Party of Germany, or KPD), which he believed betrayed the cause of social reform and promoted violence.[3] In contrast to the communists, the SPD of the Weimar Republic was solidly reformist. During World War I, SPD centrists who supported the Kaiser-mandated civil peace had achieved victory over their more radical colleagues, many of whom left the party to form their own political organizations.[4] The revolutionaries' defection allowed party leaders to moderate the SPD in a way that likely appealed to the young Speier. In 1921, they released the reformist Görlitz Program, which replaced the revolutionary Erfurt Program of 1891. The Görlitz Program demanded that all SPD members abandon revolutionary socialism; argued in favor of the socialization of certain industries; and advocated social security and workday reforms as well as the establishment of gender equality. Although in his early years, Speier disagreed with the Görlitz Program's commitment to creating a *Volkspartei*, a political party based on a mass constituency, his rejection of revolutionary violence made the SPD a natural home for him. Throughout the 1920s, the SPD became

---

[3] Hans Speier, "Sociology or Ideology? Notes on the Sociology of the Intelligentsia," trans. Barton Byg and Volker Meja, 1930, Speier Papers, Box 7, Folder 57, 439 and Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954."

[4] This socialist split eventually led to the formation of the *Unabhängige Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands* (Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany, or USPD) and the radical *Spartakusbund* (Spartacist League) in April 1917. Members of these two groups eventually coalesced to create the KPD on the night of December 30-January 1, 1918. In 1921-1922, many members of the USPD reunited with the SPD and moved the latter party to the left.

the political base for many, like Speier, who believed German society required progressive transformation but who wanted to avoid extremism and revolution.[5]

Within his familial and social context, though, Speier's socialism was radical, and his iconoclasm soon expressed itself in the professional realm as well. After graduating *Gymnasium* in 1923, he declared his desire to pursue university studies. Adolf, concerned that his son would not find academic employment, attempted to prevent him from taking the *Abitur*.[6] In defiance of his father, Speier sat for the examinations and did well, but at Adolf's insistence found a position as an apprentice telephone boy at the joint-stock company of Sachs, Warschauer, & Company. Because the bank was located near the University of Berlin, Speier was able to attend lectures on civil law and jurisprudence during lunch hours. His decision to abide by his father's wishes and seek gainful employment points to a tension in Speier's personality. Although he would chart his own path—deciding to pursue an advanced degree—he would also defer to authority— working at a bank while pursuing his studies on the side. Speier's contradictory embrace of risk and deference often led him, throughout his life, to make perilous personal or career choices but, once these choices were made, to join organizations that guaranteed stability.

---

[5] William Smaldone, *Confronting Hitler: German Social Democrats in Defense of the Weimar Republic, 1929-1933* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2009), 9. For more on the SPD, see Heinrich August Winkler, "Klassenbewegung oder Volkspartei? Zur Programmdisussion in der Weimarer Sozialdemokratie, 1920-1925," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 8, no. 1 (1982): 9-54; Susanne Miller and Heinrich Pothoff, *A History of German Social Democracy from 1848 to the Present* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986); Peter Lösche and Franz Walter, *Die SPD: Klassenpartei-Volkspartei-Quotenpartei: Zur Entwicklung der Sozialdemokratie von Weimar bis zur deutschen Vereinigung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992); and Geoff Eley, *Forging Democracy: The History of the Left in Europe, 1850-2000* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

[6] The *Abitur* are the final exams German students interested in university take in their last year of secondary education.

In the summer of 1924, Sachs, Warschauer, & Co., like many private German

banks, was placed on a receivership due to Germany's monetary contraction. Its degraded

economic position forced the bank to fire Speier, whom his bosses considered a good

employee.[7] Speier was not out of work long, and quickly found a job as a math tutor, a

position that allowed him to continue his studies at Berlin. Speier's dedication to

pursuing his academic interests around his work schedule convinced Adolf that his son

was truly devoted to higher education. In early 1926, Speier convinced his father to allow

him to pursue a degree in National Economics at the University of Heidelberg, as Adolf

thought economics a suitably practical discipline with potential professional payoff.

Speier did not decide to attend Heidelberg out of any special conviction; he merely

wanted to get away from his parents and his depressing home life, and southwest

Germany appeared as far away from Berlin as possible.[8]

Adolf refused to pay for Speier's education, which was a fortuitous decision, as

Speier's lack of funds encouraged him to seek an assistantship with the socialist

economist Emil Lederer. Speier's relationship with Lederer was enormously important

for him both intellectually and professionally. Lederer was the first party-affiliated

socialist with whom he developed a close relationship, and it was Lederer who convinced

Speier to become the youngest founder of the New School for Social Research's

University in Exile.[9] Without Lederer, Speier's life would not have progressed as it did.

---

[7] A letter dispatched on May 31, 1924 indicates that he was a quick and intelligent worker who completed his duties with diligence, prudence, and interest. For the remainder of his career, Speier would always impress superiors. "German Documents, including school certificates, etc., 1924-1938," Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 1.

[8] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 23-25.

[9] Speier remained grateful for Lederer's help throughout his life. As he later said, "anything I could do to keep the memory of Emil Lederer alive I shall gladly undertake." Hans Speier to Gustav Radbruch, July 10, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 53.

But it was a liberal professor, Karl Mannheim, who proved to be Speier's most important intellectual interlocutor. Very lonely during his first months at Heidelberg, Speier found himself intellectually adrift and unmotivated. His attitude changed only when he heard Mannheim's inaugural lecture on "The Contemporary State of Sociology in Germany."[10] Mannheim's talk was Speier's first encounter with the new discipline of sociology, and specifically Mannheim's sociology of knowledge, which sought to trace political ideas and motivations to an individual's position in the social structure. Moreover, Mannheim's argument that intellectuals were "free-floating," able to see society objectively because they did not belong to a particular class, probably appealed to Speier's own sense of self. Due to his admiration for Mannheim's lecture, Speier enrolled in his introduction to sociology course. From that moment on, Speier pursued a dual degree in Sociology and National Economics.[11] He became a founding member of the Mannheim Circle, a group of students who coalesced around the scholar.[12] During

---

[10] Decades later, Speier remembered his and Mannheim's initial conversation in the following way. It began when Speier asked Mannheim if he could study under him: Mannheim: "What have you read of my work?" Speier: "Nothing." "Mannheim: "Come anyway." Even as he distanced himself intellectually from Mannheim beginning in the late 1920s, Speier always admired his mentor's graciousness and intelligence. "Interview with Hans Speier. Conducted by Martin Collins. April 5, 1988 in Hartsdale, New York," National Air and Space Museum Archives, Smithsonian Institution Libraries (hereafter referred to as NASM Archives), Washington, D.C., 2. For Mannheim's inaugural lecture, see David Kettler and Volker Meja, *Karl Mannheim and the Crisis of Liberalism: The Secret of These New Times* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995), 62.

[11] He took many of Mannheim's courses, including his course on conservative thought, an introduction to Max Weber, and a course, co-taught with Lederer, on imperialism. See "German Documents, including school certificates, etc., 1924-1938," Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 1.

[12] Mannheim informally oversaw Speier's major field in Sociology; as a lecturer, Mannheim could not technically advise dissertations. For bureaucratic purposes, Speier officially studied under a Professor Altmann, likely the Jewish economist Samuel Paul "Sally" Altmann, who changed his first name to Salomon in 1927. Fellow members of the early *Mannheim Kreis* included Gerhard Münzer, the Israeli politician; Hans Gerth, sociology professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and teacher of C. Wright Mills and Susan Sontag; Werner Falk, a professor of philosophy at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Svend Riemer, professor of sociology at UCLA; and Norbert Elias, the Cambridge and Leicester sociologist. Through Karl Jaspers, who advised Speier in philosophy, he came to know Hannah Arendt and Dolf Sternberger, who at the time were both part of Jaspers' circle. In 1925, Speier met Talcott Parsons, who was then an exchange student. Speier and Parsons shared similar interests, and took many of the same seminars, including one with the sociologist Carl Brinkmann. Speier's relationship with Parsons

Speier's time at university, he and Mannheim were very friendly, and the latter regularly addressed Speier as his "teacher and student."[13] Indeed, until the end of his life, Speier proudly referred to himself as Mannheim's first doctoral student.

Lederer advised Speier's other major field in theoretical National Economics, and Speier's experiences with him were of immense intellectual and personal importance.[14] Lederer dedicated himself to crossing the divide between scholarship and public policy and provided the model for the type of intellectual Speier hoped to become. In both his academic scholarship, which attempted to understand the political importance of white-collar workers, and his professional work as a consultant for the SPD, Lederer demonstrated to Speier that, although one must be interested in the world of ideas, it was important to intervene in political affairs. Speier's entire career may be read as an attempt to echo Lederer's: on the one hand, he wanted to be taken seriously as an intellectual and contribute to the creation of knowledge; on the other, he hoped to use this knowledge to transform political reality.

Speier first became involved with official left wing politics after his graduation from *Gymnasium*. He attended lectures on education reform and other socialist issues, and was even arrested in 1924 at a talk given by the communist playwright Karl August

---

later proved important, as it was Parsons who vouched for Speier to the American government when the latter immigrated to the United States. Uta Gerhardt, *Talcott Parsons: An Intellectual Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 278.

[13] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 27-28 and Hans Speier, *The Truth in Hell and Other Essays on Politics and Culture, 1935-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 6.

[14] In Heidelberg, one was required to have two major fields. Speier's other fields included philosophy, overseen by Jaspers, and modern history, likely overseen by Gustav Radbruch. (Speier never mentioned who oversaw his field in history, and the documents do not tell us. The only historian whom he discussed from his Heidelberg days, however, was Radbruch.) Speier also took courses with a number of famous scholars, including Heinrich Rickert and Alfred Weber, the latter of whom he found to be a very awkward lecturer. "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 20-21. Speier and Weber became intellectually close, though, and in 1928, Speier delivered a speech to Weber on his sixtieth birthday that referred to him as the "leading spirit of German democracy." Hans Speier, "Alfred Weber, zu seinem 60. Geburtstag," July 28, 1928, Speier Papers, Box 7, Folder 50.

Wittfogel. Speier did not belong to a political organization, however, until he

matriculated at Heidelberg and joined the Socialist Student's League.[15] His most

politically active moment at university occurred when he learned that the school planned

to honor Chancellor Otto von Bismarck. Upset at the celebration of the man who passed

the infamous "Anti-Socialist Laws," which in 1878 censured the socialist press, outlawed

trade unions, called for the arrest of SPD leaders, and limited the party's ability to

demonstrate in public, Speier approached Dean Gustav Radbruch—himself a member of

the SPD—to declare that all true socialists must do what they could to degrade

Bismarck.[16] Radbruch disagreed, which Speier found shameful.[17] Beyond this outburst,

which Speier later found embarrassing, he concerned himself chiefly with academics.

As such, Speier's early socialism expressed itself theoretically, not in political

action. An essay he wrote for Mannheim and Lederer's imperialism seminar in the

summer of 1927, "The Transformation of Power Ideology," in which he linked the rise of

realpolitische thought to changes in the economic substructure, reflected an early,

uncomplicated faith in the frameworks of orthodox Marxist social science. In this piece,

Speier critiqued Joseph Schumpeter's thesis that modern imperial expansion was an

atavistic remnant of pre-capitalist social structures. Rather, Speier declared—like

Vladimir Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg before him—that imperialism was a natural

---

[15] Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954."

[16] Ibid. For Radbruch and his relationship with socialism, see Gangolf Hübinger, "Wertideen und politische Transformation: Rudolf Hilferding und Gustav Radbruch in der Sozialdemokratischen Partei," in *Kritik und Mandat: Intellektuelle in der Deutschen Politik*, ed. Thomas Hertfelder and Gangolf Hübinger (Munich: Verlags-Anstalt, 2000), 181-189.

[17] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 21. Speier's 1928 essay "Entstehung und Geschichte des Modernen Bürgertums" expressed a similar anger over the anti-socialist laws. See Hans Speier, "Entstehung und Geschischte des Modernen Bürgertums: Zwei Vorträge auf der Deutschen Welle," November 6 and 12, 1928, Speier Papers, Box 7, Folder 51, 8.

outgrowth of capitalism.[18] Although the prime goal of imperialism, permanent global

hegemony, represented "an irrational worldview," it was very much a function of the

capitalist requirement of permanent accumulation. Imperialism was irrational not

because, as Schumpeter argued, it did not fulfill a logical function in late-capitalist

society, but because its goals of permanent conquest were impossible to achieve. Speier

maintained that the impossibility of reaching imperialism's end goal, coupled with its

popularity, underlined the fact that the "social contradictions in capitalism remain large"

and indicated the system's imminent demise.[19]

In 1929, Speier's theoretical views coexisted with a political perspective that

stressed class-based proletarian action. In his dissertation on "The Philosophy of History

of Ferdinand Lassalle," Speier critiqued Lassalle for failing to recognize that capitalist

society was defined by the struggle between classes.[20] In so doing, he implicitly criticized

the SPD's right wing, some members of which referred to themselves as "Lassalleans,"

and publicly aligned himself with the party's center.[21] Centrist members of the SPD

believed that the party should retain a commitment to class-based politics while avoiding

revolution. In contrast, right wing socialists spurned Marxist categories and argued that

the SPD should embrace a political strategy that stressed inter-class action. Speier

strongly rejected this perspective and supported the SPD's Heidelberg Program of 1925,

---

[18] Rosa Luxemburg, *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals: Ein Beitrag zur ökonomischen Erklärung des Imperialismus* (Berlin: Buchhandlung Vorwärts Paul Singer, 1913) and V.I. Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (London: Penguin, 2011 [1917])

[19] Joseph Schumpeter, "Zur Soziologie der Imperialismen," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 46 (1919): 1-39, 275-310 and Hans Speier, "Die Transformation des Machtgedankens: Referat Gehalten im Imperialismus-Seminar des Herrn Prof. Lederer und Dr. Mannheim," 1927, Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 13, 2-3, 56.

[20] Hans Speier, "Die Geschichtsphilosophie Lassalles II," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 61 (1929): 386.

[21] Donna Harsch, *German Social Democracy and the Rise of Nazism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), 24.

which committed the party to a class-based politics. He argued that Lassalle, and hence

the Lassalleans, incorrectly believed that there was "a platform in [bourgeois society]

where the morality of his [socialist] political demands can be discussed and demonstrated

as objective and generally true."[22] Lassalle did not recognize that capitalist society was

defined by permanent bourgeois oppression of the proletariat. For this reason, Speier

declared, he must not be looked to as a political guide. Influenced by Georg Lukács's

History and Class Consciousness, he argued that Marx pointed the way to socialism's

achievement by stressing the necessity of "collectivistic, anti-capitalistic [proletarian]

action with social democratic tendencies."[23] In Speier's framework, compromise with the

bourgeoisie, be they liberals or nationalists, was self-destructive.

Speier's critique of Lassalle highlighted his belief that socialism must be achieved

through a class-based politics centered on the mass-based institutions of the Weimar

Republic, the large trade unions and political parties, which mediated between ordinary

people and the government. In 1929, Speier worried that the embrace of a mass

constituency diluted the possibility of socialism, a fear intensified by political events.

Although the SPD had won a plurality of votes in the federal elections of May 1928, it

did not receive a majority, and was forced to ally with the German Democratic Party

(DDP), the Center Party (Center), and the German People's Party (DVP) in a "great

coalition." For the first time since 1923, the SPD was part of a national coalition

government, and, for the first time since 1920, the party was the government's major

stakeholder. Similar to many left-leaning centrists, Speier feared the party, which had

---

[22] Speier, "Lassalles II," 386.

[23] Ibid. and Hans Speier, "Die Geschichtsphilosophie Lassalles I," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 61 (1929): 10. Also see Georg Lukács, *Geschichte und Klassenbewußtsein* (Berlin: Hermann Luchterhand, 1968 [1923]), 172-173, 194.

received 3.8 percent more of the vote than it had won in the December 1924 elections,

would squander its mandate by compromising with its coalition partners. At this moment,

the far right did not yet worry Speier, who considered his primary antagonists to be the

SPD's bourgeois associates, whom he believed potentially threatened the achievements

of Germany's nascent welfare state.[24] But even with his fear of middle-class

encroachment on the legislative and cultural accomplishments of the working classes,

Speier never countenanced extreme measures. He wholeheartedly rejected what he

considered to be "Lukács' dogmatic acceptance of Marxian theory and proletarian

practice" in its communist form. Speier believed the present situation necessitated class-

based collectivism, not revolution. He would not endorse an SPD alliance with the

KPD.[25]

Speier had embraced a clear political position. "As a Social Democrat, I believed

that some of [Germany's] institutions should be changed in accordance with the Social

Democratic Party program, i.e., by peaceful and legal means in order to attain social and

economic gains for labor."[26] But a central question remained: with what tactics should the

SPD attempt to achieve its goals? Speier spent the next several years developing an

answer to this question that centered on intellectuals' political role. Persuaded by Karl

Mannheim's scholarship on the free-floating intelligentsia, as well as the ever-

deteriorating economic and social position of his academic cohort, Speier argued that

centrist socialist intellectuals like himself needed to assume positions of leadership within

---

[24] For more on the Weimar-era welfare state, see Detlev J.K. Peukert, *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity* (New York: The Penguin Press, 1991), chapter 6.
[25] Harsch, *German Social Democracy*, 42-43.
[26] Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954."

the party. In this way, he took the first step toward the elitist vision of democracy he promoted first in Germany and later in the United States.

The Intellectual's Social Role, 1929-1931

For German academics, the late teens and twenties were years of destabilization. High inflation led intellectuals' savings to disappear and resulted in a decrease of their real purchasing power. Many professors took second jobs or worked summers as a sense of material crisis permeated the professoriate. Academics also experienced a loss of social prestige caused by educational democratization, which made universities less rarefied spaces. Furthermore, the rise of a business elite whose status was based on the ability to organize large amounts of capital weakened intellectuals' social standing. Whereas in the late nineteenth century, academics were one of the most respected social groups in Germany, to which ordinary people and elites looked for spiritual guidance, by the late 1920s this was no longer the case.[27]

These material and social transformations engendered a crisis of *Bildung*. Traditional *Bildung* referred to the idealist-romantic process of "cultivating" oneself through extensive reading in classical texts of the Greco-Roman and German traditions and conducting original research in one's *Wissenschaft* (science).[28] Throughout the 1920s, the decline of the German academic class led the discursive coalition that had

---

[27] Fritz Ringer, "Higher Education in Germany in the Nineteenth Century," *Journal of Contemporary History* 2, no. 3 (July 1967): 123.

[28] The term *Bildung* came to refer generally to education, and not just the process of self-cultivation through education. Engagement with *Bildung* and *Wissenschaft* was designed to engender a coherent *Weltanschauung* (worldview). This worldview was intended to allow students to evaluate social life from an elevated intellectual plane. As one scholar notes, the "pursuit of truth was to lead to something like integral insight and moral certainty." A *Weltanschauung* gave meaning to the world and enabled coherent action. Throughout the long nineteenth century, a discursive coalition of academics maintained that it was only through *Bildung* that an individual could achieve a spiritual self-actualization separate from social considerations. Fritz Ringer, *Max Weber: An Intellectual Biography* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004), 9. Also see Fritz Ringer, *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969) and Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany, 1700-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 60.

defended *Bildung* for decades to deteriorate, and diagnoses of educational crisis permeated German universities.[29] Many liberal and socialist academics used this diagnosis as an opportunity to redefine *Bildung* and what it meant to be a German intellectual to promote their own political visions.

Gelehrtenpolitik (the relationship of intellectuals to politics) has a long tradition in German intellectual history.[30] Since at least the eighteenth century, German intellectuals had continuously rethought their personal relationships to the state as well as the theoretical relationship of knowledge to power. The crisis of *Bildung* and the shift from the *Kaiserreich* to the Weimar Republic, which created a new configuration of the state, participatory politics, and the public, demanded a rethinking of *Gelehrtenpolitik.* In 1917, Max Weber, Germany's most famous sociologist and economist, delivered a lecture titled "Science as Calling" that served as a clarion call for the redefinition of intellectuals' social role in the soon-to-be post-Wilhelmine era.[31] In this lecture *cum* essay, Weber encouraged intellectuals to educate Germans in objective social scientific methods divorced from political ideology while ensuring that a teacher "serve[d] the students with his knowledge and scientific experience and [did] not imprint upon them his personal political views."[32] Intellectuals, Weber argued, should imbue students with "methods of thinking, the tools and the training for thought," and nothing more.[33]

---

[29] David Kettler and Colin Loader, *Karl Mannheim's Sociology as Political Education* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002), 2.

[30] See Rüdiger vom Bruch, *Gelehrtenpolitik, Sozialwissenschaften und akademische Diskurse in Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2006).

[31] David Kettler, "Political Education for a Polity of Dissensus: Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber," *European Journal of Political Theory* 1, no. 1 (July 2002): 34 and Kettler and Loader, *Political Education*, 71.

[32] Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation," in *The Vocation Essays: Politics as a Vocation; Science as a Vocation*, trans. Rodney Livingstone, eds. David Owen and Tracy B. Strong (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing, 2004 [1918-1919]), 22.

[33] Ibid., 25.

Properly accomplished, this would enable students to recognize facts "inconvenient for their party opinions" which, Weber implied, would provide them with a "sense of responsibility" for German sociopolitical harmony.[34] For Weber, the intellectual's primary task was as an educator and scholar, jobs that required skills unrelated to those "qualities that make [one] a leader [able] to give directions in practical life or, more specifically, in politics."[35] Weber defined the intellectual as a social harmonizer, not a promoter of a particular ideology or political advisor. In the new Germany, he envisioned intellectuals as standing apart from politics but nevertheless retaining a political function.

Weber died before he could expand on "Science as Calling." It took a fellow Heidelberg sociologist, Karl Mannheim, to augment Weber's arguments about intellectuals' social role.[36] Mannheim agreed with Weber that intellectuals had an explicit political function and developed a program of "sociology as political education."[37] However, unlike Weber, he advocated an explicitly democratic perspective. In various works written during the interwar years, Mannheim maintained that intellectuals must revitalize *Bildung* by teaching students the sociology of knowledge, which would enable them to see the political totality and become "cultivators of the social mind and instructors of the democratic mass."[38] Mannheim thus transformed the question of intellectuals' social role into a problem of liberal democratic politics.

---

[34] Ibid., 22, 27.

[35] Ibid., 25.

[36] Dagmar Barnouw, *Weimar Intellectuals and the Threat of Modernity* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988), 39.

[37] Kettler and Loader, *Political Education*, x, 7, 15.

[38] David Kettler, Colin Loader, and Volker Meja, *Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber: Retrieving a Research Program* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Press, 2008), 154. For a summary of the controversy surrounding the sociology of knowledge, see David Frisby, *The Alienated Mind: The Sociology of Knowledge in Germany, 1918-1933* (London: Heineman Educational Books, 1983), 174-224 and Lee Congdon, *Exile and Social Thought: Hungarian Intellectuals in Germany and Austria, 1919-1933* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 296-300.

Once students learned the sociology of knowledge, Mannheim argued, they could study what he termed the "science of politics." He declared that training in the science of politics occurred in a classroom where academics moderated debates that addressed "events that are immediate and actual."[39] Participating in debates, Mannheim continued, taught students how to interact civilly and effectively in newly democratic Germany. In Mannheim's opinion, "there is no more favorable opportunity for gaining insight into the peculiar structure of the realm of [democratic] politics than by grappling with one's opponents about the most vital and immediate issues because on such occasions contradictory forces and points of view existing in a given period find expression."[40] Mannheim transposed Weber's general problem of integrating different ideologies for sociopolitical harmony into a specific problem of creating a functioning democratic republic. He subtly promoted liberal democracy as a universal value, taking the step Weber would not.

Mannheim and Weber greatly influenced Speier's early work. From Weber, Speier accepted that intellectuals must focus on reformulating *Bildung* to make it relevant to the modern era; from Mannheim, he borrowed the idea that as they did so they could promote particular political ideologies. Initially, Speier maintained that intellectuals should serve as educators of the emergent generation of workers, teaching them about socialism and transforming them into SPD political operatives. However, once Heinrich Brüning's conservative cabinet began governing Germany in March 1930 without majority support and with the aid of Article 48, Speier made political activism a central tenet of intellectuals' mission.

---

[39] Karl Mannheim, *Ideologie und Utopie* (Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1930 [1929]), 184.
[40] Ibid.

Ironically, Speier produced his scholarship on intellectuals when he personally retained no academic position. Upon receiving his Ph.D on April 19, 1928, he had no job prospects. As a student, Speier had not concerned himself with securing an academic job and was further plagued with self-doubt, convincing himself that he did not have "the many non-academic qualities required of an academic teacher."[41] Despite Lederer's insistence, Speier refused to embark on an academic career, although Lederer did help him receive a position as an analyst in the Berlin office of Rudolf Hilferding, who was serving in his second term as Germany's Minister of Finance.[42] Around this time, in 1928 or 1929—records are unclear—Speier joined the SPD.[43]

When Speier joined the SPD, the May 1928 election results had impelled the party to ally itself with the DDP, DVP, and Center in a "great coalition." Many of the SPD's leaders were satisfied with the election's outcome. The party had gained twenty-two seats in the *Reichstag*, and had made similar gains in Prussia and other states. SPD elites did not believe allying with the bourgeois parties, who had themselves lost votes between the 1924 and 1928 elections, would prevent the achievement of socialist reforms. However, a number of left wing newspapers argued against joining with bourgeois parties because doing so could possibly prevent socialist gains. Speier aligned

---

[41] Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954."

[42] Speier later recalled that he and fellow Heidelberg students rarely discussed money or future employment prospects, because "one was in Heidelberg as a student, in order to learn and to discuss, in order to participate in the life of the mind." It was considered déclassé to discuss material concerns. Ibid.; "German Documents, including school certificates, etc., 1924-1938," Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 1; and "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 33-34, 119.

[43] Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954." He also married his wife, Lisa, a pediatrician in Berlin's welfare office, in August 1929. Lisa was never heavily involved in Speier's academic or policy work. Their correspondence does, however, indicate a loving and respectful relationship. Speier and Lisa shared similar political viewpoints, and both were dedicated to helping the impoverished. Lisa did so by volunteering at medical shelters for the indigent. See "Speier, Lisa. Letters from Hans Speier, 1945-1946" and "Speier, Lisa. Correspondence, primarily from Hans Speier, 1948-1954," Speier Papers, Box 1, Folders 5 and 6.

with those of the SPD's center, who believed that a coalition government was preferable to opposition, but who were also concerned about potential pernicious bourgeois influence. Indeed, the centrists' doubts were justified, as the party quickly assumed a "defensive posture" that emphasized protecting already existing legislation and ignored the achievement of further goals. According to one historian, after the 1928 elections, "*responsibility* played a much bigger role in the Social Democratic vocabulary about government than *power*."[44]

Speier's writings of the late 1920s displayed the prescient fear that the great coalition would weaken socialism. To ensure that the SPD's bourgeois allies did not prevent the realization of socialism, Speier committed himself to transforming *Bildung* in a way that he believed would create a self-consciously social democratic working class. He declared that the first step in this process consisted in convincing intellectuals, whom he maintained were unconcerned with political affairs, that they had a central political role to play. Speier blamed the disengaged "current state of consciousness" of the intelligentsia on the fact that the nineteenth-century liberal *Bildung* in which they were trained was designed to create individuals who were "unpolitical" defenders of the status quo, concerned solely with developing their own "private humanistic ethic" at the expense of the social collective.[45] Traditional *Bildung*, he continued, made sense in a nineteenth century characterized by muted social antagonisms, but in the post-World War I era these antagonisms had exploded into the open. Germany therefore required an engaged intellectual class conscious of the working classes' historical mission and

---

[44] Harsch, *German Social Democracy*, 41-44.
[45] Hans Speier, "Zur Soziologie der Bürgerlichen Intelligenz in Deutschland," *Die Gesellschaft* 6 (July 1929): 60, 63-64.

dedicated to reforming *Bildung* to stress "proletarian cultural action."[46] Speier premised

his new *Bildung* on destroying the "intellectual barrier" between academics and

proletarians, arguing that the former must leave their positions of "educated aristocracy,"

i.e., university postings, to engender class consciousness in workers at the grassroots.[47] If

accomplished, this would protect the party against bourgeois infiltration and provide a

solid base for the SPD's future. Speier thus added three notions to Weber and

Mannheim's work on the intellectual's social role. First, that education must focus on

workers, not traditional university students. Second, that education must take place

outside the "aristocratic" institution of the university. Finally, that the liberal focus on the

individual should be replaced by a collectivist political and educational strategy of

Arbeiterbildung (worker's education) centered on the proletariat.[48]

From 1928 until the spring of 1930, Speier viewed the SPD's alliance with

Weimar's bourgeois parties as the main obstacle to socialist reform. However, the

ascendance of the Catholic Center's Heinrich Brüning to the chancellorship in March

1930 led Speier to display a new, alarmist attitude toward Germany's political path. Once

President Paul von Hindenburg appointed Brüning to rule without parliamentary

majorities, and the SPD subsequently left the government, the party, which retained

---

[46] Ibid., 67.

[47] Ibid., 71-72.

[48] The German workers' movement had long been concerned with education, and debates about *Arbeiterbildung* permeated the SPD. Before the Weimar era, these discussions centered on the proper content of worker's education; some argued in favor of using education to increase class solidarity, to teach workers to act together, to teach them "high culture," etc. In the 1920s, as a result of the SPD's emergence as the most important supporter of parliamentary democracy, the party shifted to a position whereby it stressed "technical education" (*Zweckbildung*). This education centered upon training functionaries to work within the party's expanding bureaucracy. In this way, the party oriented itself toward a form of practical, democratic education. Speier rejected this latter shift; workers, he declared, needed to have an identity of themselves as well as the technical knowledge to work within the bureaucracy. For more on *Arbeiterbildung*, see Frank Heidenreich, *Arbeiterbildung und Kulturpolitik: Kontroversen in der sozialdemokratischen Zeitschrift 'Kulturwille,' 1924-1933* (Berlin: Argument, 1983) and Dieter Langewiesche, "Review: The Impact of the German Labor Movement on Workers' Culture," *Journal of Modern History* 59, no. 3 (September 1987): 506-523.

control of Prussia, faced a difficult predicament. On one hand, party leaders feared that

adopting a position of vehement opposition *vis-à-vis* Brüning would strengthen the Nazis

and other parties of the far right. On the other, they worried that supporting Brüning

would itself weaken democracy. In the end, party leaders made the difficult decision to

support Brüning against Germany's far right. As part of this program, Otto Braun, the

SPD's Prime Minister of Prussia, prevented party delegates in the Prussian state

legislature from attacking the federal cabinet with too much intensity; *Vorwärts*, the

SPD's daily newspaper, adopted a moderate and conciliatory tone toward Brüning; and

party leaders expressed their willingness to compromise with the chancellor. The SPD's

position greatly angered Speier, who believed it represented the party's abandonment of

both the working classes and democracy.

Speier attributed the SPD's positive position toward Brüning to the party's lack of

intellectual leadership, never considering that perhaps the party was engaged in a triage

effort to protect the republic. In a review of Mannheim's *Ideologie und Utopie*, he argued

that Marxist functionaries incorrectly believed that intellectuals comprised a distinct

socioeconomic class, a perspective that ignored that the intelligentsia "lacks what unites

people into a class: a position in the process of commodity production."[49] In actuality,

"every class possesses its own intelligentsia to represent its interests and its will."

Socialists made their mistake because they used nineteenth century Marxist categories of

analysis to explain a modern social structure.[50] As Speier emphatically declared: "*The*

conceptual framework of the past (e.g. substructure, superstructure, class, class

consciousness) *is no longer at all adequate* in dealing with important contemporary

---

[49] Speier, "Sociology or Ideology?" 418-419, 428.
[50] Ibid., 439.

sociological problems."[51] For example, Marxist theory could not account for the rise of the white-collar workers, who were economically proletarian but ideologically bourgeoisie. To understand the modern intelligentsia, and indeed modern society, Speier maintained, Marxists needed to develop new categories of analysis. If they did not, socialism would become as atavistic as individualist liberalism. Speier had not yet abandoned Marxist social science, but his disenchantment with it began to emerge.

Considering intellectuals a distinct class, Speier continued, led Marxists to conclude that intellectuals had no function in a socialist movement to which they supposedly had no class affinity. Speier worried that this perspective engendered political and cultural paralysis, as it was the intellectuals who "produced" ideology, shaped the "mental apparatuses" of workers, and made political action meaningful.[52] Only intellectuals, he declared, were capable of expressing the interests of the working classes as a coherent political program. Speier argued that socialist intellectuals were crucial to the working class political struggle as educators and reformulators of *Bildung*; without them, socialist goals could never be achieved.

Speier attributed the failure of socialists to take account of intellectuals not only to SPD functionaries, but to socialist intellectuals as well. The intellectuals had not made it "clear to the functionary that the movement is not only a struggle for better living conditions of the proletariat," i.e., a material struggle, but was also "a struggle for a socialist culture," i.e., a socialist way of life.[53] Indeed, the former was unrealizable

---

[51] Ibid.
[52] Hans Speier, "Die Intellektuellen in der Theorie des Marxismus," *Neue Blätter für den Sozialismus* 1, no. 11 (November 1930): 505, 508-509. See also Ferdinand Tönnies, *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen* (Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1887), 97-142, 195-234.
[53] Speier, "Sociology or Ideology?" 441.

without the latter. Because they remained ensconced in the ivory tower, intellectuals did

not know how to communicate their ideas to ordinary workers. Speier strongly advocated

for intellectuals to attend party meetings, go to factories, and learn how to engage with

workers on the latters' terms. Doing so would lead intellectuals to "no longer know the

'homelessness of the spirit'" that characterized their professional lives.[54] The party, and

the movement it represented, would become their homes.[55]

The SPD, however much Speier criticized it, did not allow Brüning to run

roughshod over the Weimar constitution. In July 1930, party leaders asked the *Reichstag*

to prevent Brüning's attempt to push his finance program through the parliament by using

Article 48. The chancellor responded to the SPD's challenge by dissolving the *Reichstag*,

at which point the *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei* (National Socialist

German Workers' Party, or NSDAP), which had slowly been making inroads throughout

Germany, went into campaign overdrive. In preparation for the September 1930

elections, the Nazis prosecuted a massive propaganda campaign and held 30,000 public

rallies. Compared with the Nazis, the SPD's campaign program and propaganda effort

proved ineffective.[56] Indeed, in the September elections the NSDAP achieved their

electoral breakthrough and received 18 percent of the vote, compared with the 2.6 percent

it had in the May 1928 elections. The SPD, for its part, decreased its voting share from

29.8 percent to 24.5 percent of the total electorate. The Nazis' electoral gains shifted the

entire political landscape of the Weimar Republic. For the first time, the NSDAP was a

mass party competing for votes at the national level.

---

[54] Ibid., 442. Speier's language is clearly influenced by Jaspers and Heidegger, whom he read.
[55] Speier made similar points in "Die Intellektuellen in der Theorie des Marxismus."
[56] Harsch, *German Social Democracy*, 60-62, 79-85.

The Nazis' September success led Speier to move from a centrist to a right wing position, where defending democracy, not achieving socialism, became the most important goal. In his December 1930 essay "Intellectuals and their Social Calling," he assumed an urgent tone, pleading for socialist and liberal intellectuals—anyone who supported the republic—to use their "intellectual powers" to impel "politically correct decisions" that prevented the conservatives, fascists, or communists from achieving or retaining power.[57] Yet to Speier, it appeared that intellectuals were unwilling to do so, and he sought to explain why this was the case. Liberals, he argued, were spiritually lost because World War I had destroyed the ideals of humanism.[58] Having no guiding *Weltanschauung*, liberal intellectuals could not interact in the world effectively. Socialist intellectuals, for their part, incorrectly believed that because the SPD had succeeded in beginning the "democratization of the economy," the movement did not require their help.[59] The welfare state's creation had engendered an "intellectual inertia."[60] Ironically, then, "in the historical moment when the transformation of society to one that favors the proletariat" was possible, SPD intellectuals had removed themselves from the political sphere.[61] Speier further lambasted socialist intellectuals who believed they were accomplishing something of political importance by educating middle and upper class Germans in left wing ideology. In the era of mass politics, one was only a "true" socialist intellectual if he or she interacted in the world "as a politician, through educational work [at the grassroots], or within the workers' organization."[62] Standing at a lectern was not

---

[57] Hans Speier, "Die Intellektuellen und ihr Sozialer Beruf," *Neue Blätter für den Sozialismus* 1, no. 12 (December 1930): 549-550.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid., 551.
[60] Ibid., 552.
[61] Ibid., 552-553, 555.
[62] Ibid., 556.

enough; intellectuals needed to assert themselves more forcefully within the socialist—

and, due to the Nazis, liberal—movements.

Speier's major concern in the late 1920s and early 1930s was to achieve a

permanent socialist victory. At first, he believed this could be accomplished by educating

workers at the grassroots. However, once Brüning became chancellor, Speier encouraged

socialist intellectuals to adopt more activist positions within the movement. After the

Nazis broke through in the September elections, he doubled down on this proposition and

expanded his perspective to include pro-democratic members of the bourgeoisie, whom

he had earlier argued would dilute socialist principles. If pro-democratic intellectuals did

not become directly involved in politics, Speier worried that "apologists for anti-Reason

(*Antivernunft*)" like Brüning and Hitler would dismantle the republic.[63] Speier followed

his own advice, and in 1931 accepted a position as a Lecturer at the *Hochschule für*

Politik (College for Politics), a college dedicated to worker education. Ironically, it was

coming into close contact with workers that engendered his disavowal of Marxism.

The Hochschule für Politik

For Speier, as for most German academics, the late 1920s and early 1930s was a

period of economic difficulty, and he was forced to accept several jobs in addition to his

position under Hilferding. His main job, in which he worked from October 1928 until

June 1932, was as an editor at the Ullstein Publishing House in Berlin.[64] Speier not only

served as a writer and editor, but also managed employees, which was his introduction to

the type of administrative work he would conduct throughout his career in the American

---

[63] Hans Speier, "Politik als Wissenschaft," 1931, Speier Papers, Box 7, Folder 67: 3.

[64] "German Documents, including school certificates, etc., 1924-1938." Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 1; Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954" and "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 34.

foreign policy establishment. He excelled in his duties, and his employers considered Speier an "unusually gifted" administrator.[65] Due to financial difficulties, however, Speier was fired in June 1932. At the same time he lost his Ullstein position, he quit working for Hilferding because he could not stand the "fat cats" who populated the SPD's offices and who claimed to speak for workers about whom they knew nothing.

In addition to his main jobs, Speier accepted two new positions. The first was a lectureship in political sociology at the *Hochschule für Politik*, and the second was a renewed assistantship with Lederer, who had moved to the University of Berlin to succeed Werner Sombart as Professor of National Economics.[66] Under Lederer, Speier served as editor of the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, Weimar's leading journal of social science.[67] Speier's positions stabilized his economic life and allowed him to devote more time to political work and education. In his off hours, Speier gave lectures to young SPD members on the history of German political parties and volunteered at both the party's Labor Education office and Berlin's Social Service Organization.[68] His experiences at the *Hochschule*, in the Labor Education office, and in the Social Service Organization enabled Speier to, for the first time, come into extensive contact with Berlin's working classes. He was not impressed with what he saw.

By the time he accepted the *Hochschule* position, Speier had begun to create an academic reputation for himself. His associations with Lederer and Hilferding made him a "little well-known" amongst German intellectuals, and his essays were well received.[69]

---

[65] "German Documents, including school certificates, etc., 1924-1938," Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 1.
[66] The Lederer assistantship paid Speier 150 *Reichsmarks* per month. His title was Assistant in the Department of Economics.
[67] Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954."
[68] Ibid.
[69] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 36.

When he met the communist philosopher and sociologist Karl Korsch, for example,

Korsch remarked that Gustav Mayer informed him that Speier's dissertation on Lassalle

was "the best that existed" and a fine example of the sociology of knowledge.[70] Despite

his earlier unwillingness to commit to a teaching career, then, Speier never fully

abandoned academia. He continued to publish scholarly work, and joining the

Hochschule implied he had always kept an eye open for teaching positions.[71] His job

there turned out to be particularly important for Speier's later life, as it allowed him to

immigrate easily to the United States as a non-quota, academic immigrant.

Speier taught at the *Hochschule* from November 1931 until the spring of 1933,

when the Nazis dismissed him. His first course was an "Introduction to Sociology," and

he soon offered courses on white-collar workers.[72] Founded in October 1920 with the

intellectual support of Max Weber and other republican intellectuals, the *Hochschule* was

designed to educate ordinary Germans in the politics and mores of democracy. Ernst

Jäckh, who served as the director of the *Hochschule* throughout the Weimar era, rejected

all extremist positions of the right and left and did not allow communists or *völkisch*

nationalists to teach at the school.[73] Until the Nazis' so-called "seizure of power," the

---

[70] Ibid., 76 and Speier, "'Myself.' Personal Statement Prepared by Speier for the RAND Corporation Files, 2/23/1954."

[71] The *Hochschule* was structured in such a way that, in addition to a number of regular lecturers like Speier who taught on salary, there were politicians who were permanently associated with the university, while others were hired on a case-by-case basis. For more on the *Hochschule* structure, see Hans Simons, "Lehre und Lehrer," in *Politik als Wissenschaft: Zehn Jahre Deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, ed. Ernst Jäckh (Berlin: Hermann Reckendorf Verlag, 1931), 209 and "German Documents, including school certificates, etc., 1924-1938," Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 1.

[72] "German Documents, including school certificates, etc., 1924-1938," Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 1. Most *Hochschule* classes were taught in the evening because this was the only time workers could attend.

[73] Steven D. Korenblat, "A School for the Republic? Cosmopolitans and Their Enemies at the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, 1920-1933," *Central European History* 39, no. 3 (September 2006): 400. After the Nazis assumed power, Jäckh immigrated first to London, becoming international director of the New Commonwealth Institute. He eventually left London in 1940 to accept a position as a professor at Columbia University. At Columbia, he helped create the Columbia Near and Middle East Institute, a precursor to the university's Middle East and Asian Languages and Cultures Department, which later became the academic

Hochschule served as the institutional home for many liberal and left wing academics who later immigrated to the United States, including Werner Falk, Hajo Holborn, Franz Neumann, Sigmund Neumann, and Hans Simons.[74] In hindsight, it was one of the most vibrant intellectual spaces in Weimar Germany.[75]

The *Hochschule* also served as a proto-think tank and was Speier's introduction to policy-relevant research. Philosophically, the institution's founders sought to move beyond the *Staatswissenschaften* (sciences of state), which were designed to train civil servants, but were not focused on producing knowledge. In the words of Jäckh, the school combined "scientific planning and academic preparation" to create ideas relevant to German policymakers.[76] After the economic crisis of the mid 1920s, the *Hochschule's* ability to present itself as an institution dedicated to developing policy knowledge allowed it to attract the financial resources of the German government and private American sources, notably the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation. Its associations with Rockefeller and Carnegie had the effect of building bridges between *Hochschule* faculty, foundation administrators, and American academics, which proved

---

home of Edward Said. In 1946, Jäckh began serving as a consultant for Columbia's School of International Affairs, today the School of International and Public Affairs.

[74] Jean-Michele Palmier, *Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration to Europe and America* (New York: Verso Press, 2006), 483.

[75] The *Hochschule* was refounded in 1949, and merged with the Otto Suhr Institute for Political Science at the Free University of Berlin in 1959. Peter Gay, *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968), 37; Rainer Eisfeld, "Exile and Return: Political Science in the Context of (West) German University Development from Weimar to Bonn," *History of Higher Education Annual* 8 (1988): 9-43; Wilhelm Bleek, *Geschichte der Politikwissenschaft in Deutschland* (Leinen: C.H. Beck Verlag, 2001), 203; and Korenblat, "School for the Republic?" 398-399, 429-430.

[76] In support of this goal, Jäckh cited the *Hochschule* as being the intellectual location where the idea to stabilize the post-Versailles borders of Germany in the Treaty of Locarno was transmitted to German political leaders. Ernst Jäckh, *Politik als Wissenschaft: Zehn Jahre deutsche Hochschule für Politik* (Berlin: Hermann Reckendorf, 1931), 9, 175-178.

useful once the Nazis gained power; approximately half of the *Hochschule* faculty fled Germany, often with the aid of foundation support.[77]

The *Hochschule* had two research focuses, foreign policy and domestic policy. Jäckh himself was a foreign policy expert, which allowed the left-leaning sociological faculty, which was primarily concerned with domestic policy, to express its socialism easily. As a socialist focused on bringing the SPD to power through education and activism, Speier found the most promising aspect of the *Hochschule* to be its reformulation of *Bildung*. He was overjoyed that, in accordance with his previous claims, the worker-students "could prove through political activity that they had life experience, and this experience was considered the equivalent of *Bildung*. This was an entirely new principle."[78]

The *Hochschule* was an ideal place for Speier to work out his understanding of the relationship between *Bildung*, the working class, political action, and intellectuals. Speier envisioned the school as a training ground for working-class political officials who would spread socialist ideology by imbricating themselves in the SPD. Speier's sociologist colleagues were also reformists who offered courses that sought to bolster

---

[77] J. Eugene Harley, "The Hochschule für Politik: A Significant German Institution for the Teaching of Political Science," *American Political Science Review* 24, no. 2 (May 1930): 468; Ernst Haiger, "Politikwissenschaft und Auslandswissenschaft im 'Dritten Reich': Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, 1933-1939 und Auslandswissenschaftliche Fakultät der Berliner Universität, 1940-1945," in *Kontinuitäten und Brüche in der deutscher Politikwissenschaft*, ed. Gerhard Göhler and Bodo Zeuner (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1991), 94-136; Detlef Lehner, "'Schule der Demokratie' oder 'politische Fachhochschule'? Anspruch und Wirklichkeit einer praxisorientierten Ausbildung der Deutschen Hochschule für Politik, 1929-1933," in *Kontinuitäten und Brüche in der deutscher Politikwissenschaft*, ed. Gerhard Göhler and Bodo Zeuner (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1991), 65-93; Korenblat, "A School for the Republic?" 423-425, 395; and Craig Calhoun, "Sociology in America: An Introduction," in *Sociology in America: A History*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 1-38.
[78] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 45. One should be careful not to overemphasize the novelty of the *Hochschule's* conception of *Bildung*. At the college, *Bildung* was still premised on a "profound personal cultivation," even if this cultivation was oriented toward teaching students how to engage with the world as "political men."

support for the republic by nurturing a democratic political elite.[79] With their devotion to teaching workers, the *Hochschule* faculty members no longer functioned as a Weberian educated aristocracy, nor did they, like Mannheim's teacher of the science of politics, operate within the university system. They were partisan intellectuals devoted to the SPD, teaching workers in a new type of educational institution.

Essays by two of Speier's colleagues, Sigmund Neumann and Albert Salomon, demonstrate that, like him, after Brüning's election a number of socialist intellectuals began to worry about the republic's future. Neumann was a fellow Marxist who had also studied National Economics and Sociology at Heidelberg. He received his Ph.D in 1927, a year before Speier, and began working at the *Hochschule* as a lecturer and archivist in 1929.[80] Salomon was also an SPD member who had studied sociology at Heidelberg. He was slightly older than Speier and Neumann, and, unlike either, was Jewish. He began

---

[79] Bleek, *Geschichte der Politikwissenschaft*, 205.

[80] After Hindenburg appointed Hitler, Neumann immigrated to the United States, where he worked first at Yale and then at Wesleyan. In 1942, he published *Permanent Revolution: The Total State in a World at War*, which analyzed manifold aspects of "totalitarian" regimes and became a touchstone of totalitarian studies in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. Soon after publishing *Permanent Revolution*, in 1943 Neumann joined the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). At the OSS, he served as a Central European analyst, focusing on issues of education and postwar planning. After the war, Neumann became a founding member of the Social Science Research Council's influential Committee on Research in Comparative Politics, which guided the comparative politics subfield of political science in the early Cold War. He also played a crucial role in the postwar reformation of the Free University of Berlin and the Ludwig-Maximilian University in Munich. Due to his role in these institutions' refounding, scholars consider Neumann a father of West German political science. During the early Cold War, Neumann occupied a transnational space between German rémigré and exile, traveling back and forth between West Germany and the United States to serve as an educational consultant for both nations' governments. During his time at the *Hochschule*, Neumann was a religious socialist who taught classes with titles such as "Introduction to the Political Problems of the Day," "The Proletariat (History, Constitution, Organization)," and "Examples of a Sociology of Parties." For Neumann's courses, see "German Documents, including school certificates, etc., 1924-1938," Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 1. See also Hubertus Buchstein and Gerhard Göhler, "After the Revolution: Political Science in East Germany," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 23, no. 4 (December 1990): 668; Alfons Söllner, "Sigmund Neumann's *Permanent Revolution:* A Forgotten Classic of Comparative Research into Modern Dictatorships," in *The Totalitarian Paradigm after the End of Communism*, ed. Achim Siegel (Atlanta: Rodopi Press, 1998), 203-204; Gerhard Loewenberg, "The Influence of European Émigré Scholars on Comparative Politics, 1925-1965," *American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (November 2006): 600-604; and Palmier, *Weimar in Exile*, 610.

working at the *Hochschule* as a lecturer in 1926, receiving the position after the

publication of a well-received review essay on Weber.[81]

In essays written for the *Hochschule's* tenth anniversary, Neumann declared that

he hoped the college would contribute to the defense of democracy "by furthering

cooperation between socialists and other democratically inclined groups, renewing the

original Weimar coalition."[82] Brüning's success had led Neumann to become less

interested in socialist programs of reform and more concerned with preserving the

republic through the creation of a new generation of democratic students. Similar to

Speier, he placed intellectuals at the center of democracy's defense. Neumann wanted to

see liberal and socialist intellectuals serve as "political mediators" between students and

raw information, teaching students how to interpret correctly a diverse array of the

ideological information that comprised "multi-faceted reality."[83] Without intellectual

guidance, Neumann feared the sheer availability of information would engender political

---

[81] Salomon was a personal friend of Lukács, Lederer, and Mannheim, and during his time at Heidelberg became a member of Max Weber's inner circle. At the *Hochschule*, Salomon led, along with the economist Jakob Marschak—who later immigrated to England before accepting a position at the New School, eventually becoming a well-regarded University of Chicago economist, leading that institution's famous Cowles Commission for Research in Economics—an SPD-oriented economic and political study group. In 1928, Salomon replaced Hilferding, who left to become Finance Minister in the government of Hermann Müller, as the editor *of Die Gesellschaft*. Under Salomon's editorship, a number of well-known academics, most notably Hannah Arendt and Herbert Marcuse, published some of their earliest work. Salomon worked at the *Hochschule* until 1931, when he became the director of the Pedagogical Institute at the University of Cologne. He intended to immigrate soon after the Nazis assumed power, but contracted polio and was forced to remain in Germany until 1935, when, with Lederer's help, he found a position at the New School. From 1935 until his death in 1966, Salomon worked as a professor at the New School. During the war, he, along with Leo Strauss, Kurt Riezler, Felix Kaufmann, and others, founded the New School's Institute for World Affairs, which, along with similar institutes founded at Harvard, Yale, and other elite universities, provided a model for academic centers focused on policy research. Ulf Matthiesen, "'Im Schatten einer endlosen großen Zeit': Etappen der intellektuellen Biographie Albert Salomons," in *Exil, Wissenschaft, Identität: Die Emigration deutscher Wissenschaftler, 1933-1945*, ed. Ilja Srubar (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988), 299-350; Stephen Kalberg, "Salomon's Interpretation of Max Weber," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 6, no. 4 (Summer 1993): 585-594; and Bruce Kuklick, *Blind Oracles: Intellectuals and War from Kennan to Kissinger* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), 17-36.

[82] Sigmund Neumann, "Zehn Jahre Deutsche Hochschule für Politik," *Neue Blätter fur den Sozialismus*, 2, no. 1 (1930), unpaginated. Thanks to Korenblat, "School for the Republic?" 406, for the citation.

[83] Sigmund Neumann, "Archiv," in *Politik als Wissenschaft: Zehn Jahre deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, ed. Ernst Jäckh (Berlin: Hermann Reckendorf, 1931), 279.

apathy. If correctly educated, he believed, students would have the theoretical basis from which they could "engage in practical-political activity" that would strengthen the republic.[84]

Salomon similarly argued in favor of reorienting *Bildung* so that the primary educational goal would be imbuing students with a "moral sense of responsibility" (*Verantwortlichkeitsgefühl*) for democracy.[85] To defend democracy, Salomon declared, educators needed to teach students the qualities required to operate within its institutions.[86] Because the only way to sharpen one's political skills was through personal experience, Salomon argued that practical experience within the socialist and liberal movement must become a central tenet of *Bildung*. He hoped this practical education, coupled with the sense of personal responsibility for the state, would enable the achievement of an "overall political design" that encouraged socialists and liberals to work together.[87] Like Neumann, Salomon was first and foremost concerned with ensuring democracy's survival, without which socialist programs could not remain lasting achievements.

By 1931, socialists like Speier, Neumann, and Salomon began seriously to fear for the Weimar Republic. As a result, they engaged in a slow process of abandoning socialism for an anti-ideological position that was concerned with defending democracy as opposed to promoting specific political reforms. Echoing Mannheim's perspective, Speier, Neumann, and Salomon viewed education not as a means to create a self-conscious working class movement, but as a tool to fashion a functioning republic. Right-

---

[84] Ibid., 285.
[85] Albert Salomon, "Innenpolitische Bildung," in *Politik als Wissenschaft: Zehn Jahre Deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, ed. Ernst Jäckh (Berlin: Hermann Reckendorf Verlag, 1931), 98-99.
[86] Ibid., 96.
[87] Ibid., 100.

wing successes encouraged them to move from defending a particular ideology—

socialism—to defending a political form—democracy.

Speier's Break with Marxism, 1931-1933

Between 1931 and 1933, Speier moved away from Marxism both intellectually

and politically. He began his transformation by seeking to understand why, in his

opinion, the SPD seemed to accept the dismantling of parliamentary democracy. In the

wake of the Nazis' September 1930 breakthrough election, the SPD leadership adopted a

"policy of toleration," in which the party provided the Brüning cabinet with what one

historian has termed "passive support."[88] This policy initially angered many on both the

left- and right wings of the party, although after several months, most accepted it as a

necessary evil. They recognized that the SPD was in a very difficult position, situated

between the KPD on its left and the Nazis on its right. To many leaders and ordinary

socialists, it seemed that protecting democracy required tolerating Catholic conservatism,

at least for a time.[89]

Speier, however, would not countenance any toleration of the Brüning

government. His March 1931 essay "The Proletariat's Embourgeoisement?" expressed

harsh criticisms of what he considered to be the SPD's collaborationism. Debates about

whether the SPD should be a *Volkspartei* or *Klassenpartei* permeated the party

throughout the 1920s, and this essay was Speier's attempt to address this issue in relation

to the SPD's Brüning policy. At this point, he still promoted a class-based politics. Speier

identified the SPD's embourgeoisement, which came as a result of the structural

incentives of democratic politics, as the cause of the party's willingness to accept

---

[88] Harsch, *German Social Democracy*, 89.
[89] Ibid., 89-94.

Brüning's rule.[90] In a mass democracy, Speier noted, the "demiurge of democratic politics is the majority," and political parties needed to convince wide swaths of ordinary people to support their cause.[91] Without bourgeois voters, SPD leaders correctly recognized, they could not survive. Yet as middle class voters entered the party, they diluted socialist principles and encouraged internal political conflicts, such as the disagreements between the supporters of Lassalle and Marx. Speier recognized that the SPD was in a difficult position; it required the very bourgeois votes that caused internal party conflict.

Speier further argued that a mass-based parliamentary democracy necessitated the creation of large party bureaucracies, which weakened the SPD's connections to the working class. Since the end of World War I, he continued, the SPD had developed a huge party bureaucracy whose constituents were valued more than the rank and file. Paradoxically for a working class party, the careers of SPD "fat cats" depended upon the continuation of the social barriers that allowed the SPD to exist.[92] Party bureaucrats were thus incentivized to maintain class divisions. Speier declared that mass democracy had impelled the SPD to transform from a challenger to a defender of the status quo, willingly prostrate in the face of conservative threats. Essentially, the "high officials of different [parties had] come to resemble each other more generally," and SPD leaders were therefore sympathetic to the Brüning government.[93]

---

[90] He believed cultural *Verbürgerlichung* was most saliently expressed in the proletarian embrace of bourgeois cultural products, including the "mass-luxury industry, kitsch films, kitsch novels," clothing, and furniture. This surface embrace of bourgeois cultural products, Speier argued, masked a more serious embrace of capitalist values. Hans Speier, "Verbürgerlichung des Proletariats?" *Magazin der Wirtschaft* 13 (March 27, 1931): 591-595.
[91] Ibid., 592.
[92] Ibid., 593.
[93] Ibid.

Speier did not write about Marxist theory and politics again until May 1932's "On the Problem of Reformism." However, it was between March 1931's "The Proletariat's Embourgeoisement?" and "On the Problem of Reformism" that Speier transformed from a mild to an extreme critic of Marxism and the SPD. In the latter essay, for example, Speier rejected many of the basic categories of Marxist theory and fully discarded socialist principles. The rise of the German far right was the cause for this shift. In late 1931, Speier began genuinely to fear that the NSDAP could become a governing party that would end democracy.[94] In particular, the creation of the "Harzburg Front," which was dedicated to overthrowing the Weimar Republic and which represented the right-wing embrace of the NSDAP, engendered a deep anxiety in Speier.[95] The harsh 1932 essays in which Speier rejected socialism were written immediately after the April presidential election, in which Hitler won 36.7 percent of the vote, and the July 1932 federal elections, in which the NSDAP won 37.8 percent of the vote (compared with the SPD's 21.9 percent), and must be read as responses to the Nazis' continued successes.[96]

---

[94] Speier, *The Truth in Hell*, 9.

[95] Ibid., 10. The Front was unable to unite the disparate parties of the far fight and soon collapsed. See Volker Berghahn, "Die Harzburger Front und die Kandidatur Hindenburgs für die Präsidentschaftswahlen 1932," *Vierteljahrhefte für Zeitgeschichte* 13, no. 13 (January 1965): 64-82; Larry Eugene Jones, "'The Greatest Stupidity of My Life': Alfred Hugenberg and the Formation of the Hitler Cabinet, January 1933," *Journal of Contemporary History* 27, no.1 (January 1992): 67-69; and Larry Eugene Jones, "Nationalists, Nazis, and the Assault Against Weimar: Revisiting the Harzburg Rally of October 1931," *German Studies Review* 29, no 3 (October 2006): 483-494. For the Weimar Republic's destabilization, see Hans Mommsen, *The Rise and Fall of Weimar Democracy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 375-376, 380, 399 and Heinrich August Winkler, *Weimar in Widerstreit: Deutungen der ersten deutschen Republik im geteilten Deutschland* (Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 2002).

[96] For the Nazis' electoral rise, see P.D. Stachua, "The Ideology of the Hitler Youth in the *Kampfzeit*," *Journal of Contemporary History* 8, no. 3 (July 1973): 155-167; Jay W. Baird, "Goebbels, Horst Wessel, and the Myth of Resurrection and Return," *Journal of Contemporary History* 17, no. 4 (October 1982): 633-650; Konrad Jarausch and G. Arminger, "The German Teaching Profession and Nazi Party Membership: A Demographic Logit Model," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 20, no. 2 (Autumn 1989): 197-225; A.J. Nicholls, *Weimar and the Rise of Hitler* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991), 122; Peter Fritzsche, *Germans into Nazis* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); Michael Kater, *Hitler Youth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004); and Joshua Hagen, "Parades, Public Space, and Propaganda: The Nazi Culture Parades in Munich," *Geografiska Annaler* 90, no. 4 (2008): 349-367.

Once the SPD and other left and center-left parties—save the communists—were

unable to offer a presidential nominee for the March 1932 election, Speier lost all hope in

political socialism.[97] Instead of fielding their own candidate, SPD leaders instructed their

members to vote for President Paul von Hindenburg, the candidate against whom the

nationalist right wing had come out and whom the SPD had fought against in the 1925

election.[98] Yet SPD leaders went very far in their attempts to praise Hindenburg. For

example, in a February 25 meeting of the *Reichstag*, Otto Braun, the socialist Prime

Minister of Prussia, criticized party members for their Hindenburg apathy and declared

that the president was "the embodiment of calm and responsibility, of fidelity and a

devoted sense of duty to the whole nation."[99] The party's policy was successful, and in

the election the SPD rank and file voted overwhelmingly for Hindenburg, who defeated

Hitler.[100]

Speier believed it foolish and shameful that the SPD threw their weight behind

such a conservative president, and to him, such actions represented the party's lack of

drive and leadership. However, he never considered the goals of the SPD in context, nor

did he attempt to understand why party leaders acted as they did. Furthermore, Speier

ignored the many ways in which the party took active steps to address the political

situation and to change it to their benefit. Speier said very little about the Iron Front,

which the party founded in December 1931 in an attempt to defeat the Nazis and

communists by threatening to commit extra-legal violence against any group that tried to

---

[97] Mommsen, *Rise and Fall*, 405.

[98] Heinrich August Winkler, "Choosing the Lesser Evil: The German Social Democrats and the Fall of the Weimar Republic," *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 2/3 (May-June 1990): 205-227 and William L. Patch, *Heinrich Brüning and the Dissolution of the Weimar Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 239.

[99] Quoted in Patch, *Brüning*, 240. For more on Hindenburg, see Wolfram Pyta, *Hindenburg: Zwischen Hohenzollern und Hitler* (Munich: Siedler Verlag, 2007).

[100] Mommsen, *Rise and Fall*, 407.

overthrow the republic. Most in the SPD endorsed the front, which quickly gained

thousands of members. Speier, though, chose not to place any faith in the SPD's

paramilitary organization. The party had for too long made political decisions with which

he disagreed, and no rearguard action, he felt, could make up for the SPD's past mistakes.

Various processes playing out on Berlin's streets further indicated to Speier the

republic's weakness, the strength of the far right, and, importantly for his political

development, the political extremity of the working classes. Since the outbreak of the

depression, a "culture of radicalism" had swept through Berlin's working class

neighborhoods.[101] Working class members of the far right and far left repeatedly resorted

to physical violence to settle political disputes, and by the early 1930s, working class

Berlin experienced regular street violence that required police intervention. In the Berlin

district of Kreuzberg alone, for instance, twenty-five incidents of political violence

occurred between 1929 and 1932. In addition to larger-scale moments of violence, there

were innumerable small fights between competing political factions. Speier, who lived in

Mariendorf, a town within the Tempelhof district that abutted the Kreuzberg and

Neukölln districts—both centers of Weimar-era working class political violence—likely

witnessed and certainly knew about the street disturbances.

Speier, who began to see political extremism as the major threat to the republic,

perceived that the Nazis and communists committed most of Berlin's violence, an idea

---

[101] Pamela E. Swett, *Neighbors and Enemies: The Culture of Radicalism in Berlin, 1929-1933* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 232-285, especially 233. Swett emphasizes that this culture was not necessarily associated with any one political party. Dirk Schumann takes issue with Swett's argument that a "neighborhood-based radical culture" divorced from party allegiances defined working class culture in late-Weimar Berlin, arguing that Swett "fails to examine and therefore underestimates the influence of radical party leaders and organizations at the neighborhood level." Dirk Schumann, *Political Violence in the Weimar Republic, 1918-1933: Fight for the Streets and Fears of Civil War* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), xv-xvi. Taken together, Swett and Schumann's claims indicate why Speier would have associated radical violence with political extremism.

that was crucial for his—and others'—later perception that totalitarian radicals destroyed Weimar. One of Joseph Goebbels' major initiatives as *Gauleiter* of Berlin was to expand Ernst Röhm's *Sturmabteilung* (Storm Detachment, or SA) into a potent fighting force. He succeeded, and by 1932 the SA had tens of thousands of members.[102] In some instances, the SA was even able to confront the better-armed and better-trained Berlin police. For their part, the communists initiated numerous campaigns to attack the SA on the streets and in their places of meeting.[103] To ordinary Berliners like Speier, the republic must have appeared to be under daily attack from both the extreme right and left.

Berlin's violence led Speier to question the willingness of economic proletarians, blue- and white-collar workers who were financially lower class, to support the SPD. Moreover, his experiences with workers at the *Hochschule* and in the SPD's Labor Education Office provoked Speier to conclude that workers were not apolitical, but anti-political. When researching for a seminar on unemployment at the *Hochschule*, Speier met with dozens of workers and their families, where he "saw many families who were Nazis today, [but] tomorrow became communists, or were communists yesterday, and today they have become Nazis. It depended partly on chance, [partly on] where there was more beer, or where there was more noise. I had the feeling that there was not a very big difference" between worker support for the Nazis and communists.[104] What mattered to Speier was that workers were easily duped. By the time of his immigration, he had concluded that workers "lacked class consciousness" and the "great majority … did not

---

[102] For more on Nazi violence in Berlin, see Sven Reichardt, *Faschistische Kampfbünde: Gewalt und Gemeinschaft im italienischen Squadrismus und in der deutschen SA* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2002).
[103] Eve Rosenhaft, *Beating the Fascists? The German Communists and Political Violence, 1929-1933* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 9-23.
[104] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 16.

belong to the Social Democracy, [and] were even hostile to it."[105] In Speier's opinion,

workers wanted to become middle class and felt no sense of solidarity with fellow

proletarians. Moreover, those who were politically active were violent extremists. His

experiences convinced him that salvation was not to be found in the working classes.[106]

The intellectual path to Speier's rejection of socialism began with his disavowal

of Marxist theory. In May 1932, two months after the March elections that had forced a

runoff between Hindenburg and Hitler, Speier declared that "it would be an indulgence, if

not a cowardice of the mind, not to identify the stark gap between Marxist theory and

political practice."[107] As objective observers, he continued, intellectuals needed to

reexamine theory in light of empirical experience to determine whether "the social and

intellectual foundation of Marxism" was relevant in the modern era.[108] Speier argued that

his analysis revealed that Marx made several incorrect predictions: most importantly for

politically active socialists, history had proven Marx's claim that the majority of German

workers would develop a class consciousness that would express itself in a socialist

movement to be incorrect. If Marxist theory was to be useful, socialist intellectuals

---

[105] Hans Speier, "The Salaried Employee in Modern Society," *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 125.

[106] Liberal Americans such as Sidney Hook, C. Wright Mills, and Dwight Macdonald would retain their hopes for the working classes much later than Speier. See Dwight MacDonald, "Book Review: The British Genius: *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius*, by George Orwell," *Partisan Review* 9, no. 2 (March/April 1942): 166-169; Dwight Macdonald, "The (American) People's Century," *Partisan Review* 9, no. 4 (July/August 1942): 294-310; Dwight Macdonald, "Political Notes," *Partisan Review* 9, no. 6 (November/December 1942): 476-482; Sidney Hook, "The Failure of the Left," *Partisan Review* 10, no. 2 (March/April 1943): 165-177; and C. Wright Mills, "Book Review: The Political Gargoyles: *Business as a System of Power*, by Robert A. Brady," *The New Republic* 109, no. 15 (April 12, 1943): 482-483. This group would not abandon Marxist theory until the postwar period. See James Burnham, "Lenin's Heir," *Partisan Review* 12, no. 1 (Winter 1945): 61-72; William Phillips, "The Lion and the Foxes," *Partisan Review* 12, no. 2 (Spring 1945): 190-198; Albert Parry, "Book Review: Trotsky's Stalin: *Stalin: An Appraisal of the Man and His Influence*, by Leon Trotsky," *The New Republic* 114, no. 19 (May 13, 1946): 701-702; Philip Rahv, "Versions of Bolshevism," *Partisan Review* 13, no. 3 (Summer 1946): 365-375; James Burnham, *The Struggle for the World* (New York: John Day and Company, 1947); Harold Rosenberg, "The Communist: His Mentality and His Morals," *Commentary* 8 (July 1949): 1-9; and Philip Rahv, "The Unfuture of Utopia," *Partisan Review* 16, no. 7 (July 1949): 743-749.

[107] Hans Speier, "Zum Problem des Reformismus," *Neue Blätter für den Sozialismus* (May 1932): 43.

[108] Ibid.

needed to reform it by offering "practical corrections" based upon knowledge of "the real

conditions of the workers' movement in Germany."[109]

In a nod to his increasing worries over the republic's future and his newfound

reformism, Speier argued that only a socialist theory that led to electoral victory could be

considered successful.[110] Socialism was unachievable without democracy, especially in

the face of a far right threat that sought to destroy all structures of representative

governance. Marxist theory therefore needed to orient itself toward achieving a mass

democratic victory. Speier had clearly moved beyond his earlier worries about diluting

the class-based politics of the SPD. Forced to choose between democracy and socialism,

he chose democracy; the fascist menace made any other decision unthinkable. Still, his

desire to reform Marxist theory indicated that he had not yet completed his break with

political socialism.

By September 1932, when his essay "The Proletariat and Its Critics" appeared,

Speier had abandoned any attempt to reformulate Marxist theory. The Prussian coup that

occurred in July 1932, in which Chancellor Franz von Papen illegally deposed the SPD-

led government of Prussia without any significant resistance, engendered his complete

disavowal of theoretical and political Marxism.[111] In Speier's mind, the SPD had proven

---

[109] Ibid., 43-44. Speier emphasized that the failures of Marxist theory did not degrade Marx's considerable achievements, and claimed that the most important implications of Marx's work were moral, not economic. The basic impulse of Marxism was, in Speier's opinion, the desire to overcome "moral and social anarchy," a goal all thinking people, he believed, could support. Hans Speier, "Das Proletariat und seine Kritiker," *Die Neue Rundschau* 43 (September 1932): 304. A similarly positive appreciation for Marx's contributions may be found in the final essay Speier published before his emigration, "Marx as Sociologist." Speier concluded this piece by declaring that whenever the proletariat fought for social justice, "it honors Karl Marx." Hans Speier, "Marx als Soziologie," in *Marx, Der Denker und Kämpfer: Gedenksschrift zum 50. Todestag* (Berlin: J.H.W. Dietz, 1933), 16-23.

[110] Speier, "Zum Problem des Reformismus," 44.

[111] Unlike in the 1920 Kapp Putsch, there was no general strike to prevent this takeover. For more on this complicated episode, see Winkler, "Choosing the Lesser Evil," 213-214; Mommsen, *Rise and Fall*, 444, 448, 450-452; Larry Eugene Jones, "Hindenburg and the Conservative Dilemma," 235-259; and Swett, *Neighbors and Enemies*, 293.

it would not defend itself even in the face of a frontal assault and thus betrayed its

constituents and abandoned the republic. By embracing this position, Speier ignored

several SPD attempts to prevent von Papen's coup, most notably Police President Albert

Grzesinski's refusal to hand the federal government control of the police.[112] He also did

not consider whether it was possible for the SPD to start a civil war or an armed uprising

against the *Reichswehr*-backed government. Indeed, the socialist Prussian government

disputed the constitutionality of von Papen's actions in court. Speier, however, probably

found that this protest paled in comparison to the fact that the party offered no armed

resistance against this violation of its rights. In the coup's wake, he attempted to convince

socialist intellectuals—whom he still believed had the right political instincts—that the

fight for democracy, not the struggle for the SPD or socialism, needed to assume prime

importance in their thought.

In "The Proletariat and Its Critics," Speier carefully elucidated the ways in which

Marxist theory failed to predict reality. The theory of class consciousness, Speier argued,

assumed that workers' economic position would incite them to develop a unitary

consciousness. Empirically, however, the "proletariat has no unified class-consciousness,

neither in Germany nor in any other nation that has reached a stage of late capitalism."[113]

Despite this theory's failure, socialist intellectuals continued to believe class

consciousness would emerge, and in Speier's opinion, used class consciousness as an

excuse to avoid putting in the legwork necessary to achieve political victory. In contrast,

the Nazis understood that "the solution of the class conflict … will be found in power

politics," and they had successfully encouraged workers to "free themselves from the

---

[112] Mommsen, *Rise and Fall*, 444-449.
[113] Speier, "Das Proletariat und Seine Kritiker," 294.

[supposed] intellectual domination under which they suffered" and abandon social democracy.[114] In ignoring history and power, socialist intellectuals implicitly prohibited any active attempt to change workers' thought, and in so doing inadvertently pushed society toward its "breakdown."[115] To have any hope of a progressive future, socialist intellectuals needed to recognize that "if Karl Marx was the biggest critic of the proletariat, the history of the proletariat is a critic of Marx."[116]

Speier asserted that the rise of the far right had transformed the fight for socialism into a fight for democracy. Socialists should not overly worry about this, he continued, because the "intellectual history of socialism in Germany may be reduced to the Marxist assimilation of democratic ideas."[117] Indeed, Speier declared, the "integrationist," liberal democratic middle-class theory of history, which argued that, over time, classes would come to resemble each other in their composition and goals, had been proven correct. The white-collar workers, who were economically proletarian but ideologically bourgeoisie, proved this point. Because "the democratic idea has been more effective than Marxist theory" in advancing the goals of economic justice, socialist intellectuals needed to forsake class conflict and work with other pro-republican groups to defend against the Nazi onslaught.[118] Power, not socialist ideology, was what mattered.

On January 30, 1933, three months after "The Proletariat and Its Critics" appeared, Speier's worst fears were realized. As the result of elite-level maneuverings that occurred outside the realm of parliamentary governance, Hindenburg appointed Hitler the chancellor of a nationalist coalition government. The NSDAP quickly began to

---

[114] Ibid., 290-291.
[115] Ibid., 289.
[116] Ibid., 298.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Ibid.

restructure German society, and between January 1933 and Hindenburg's death in August 1934, the party successfully created a single-party state with a coordinated civil society. Within months of his ascension to the chancellorship, Hitler used the resources of the state and his party to place many of his political enemies under arrest; pass an Enabling Act which granted the NSDAP full legislative authority; hold "semi-free" national elections; ban the SPD; reform the German states along Nazi lines; occupy and dissolve the General Federation of German Trade Unions; and declare the NSDAP the only legal political party. As Hitler dismantled the Weimar Republic, Speier and his socialist colleagues looked on, hopeless.

Hitler's victory led Speier to disavow Marxism completely in one of the final essays from his German period, "Remarks toward an Understanding of the Social Structure," which was probably written in the spring of 1933.[119] The essay began with the strong claim that the categories of "proletariat" and "capitalist" no longer meaningfully explained the structure of modern societies, as they emphasized the economic at the expense of the cultural.[120] To understand modern social structures, Speier argued, one needed a theory that "deepen[s] our knowledge of the being, origin, distribution, and historical development of [groups'] social standing."[121] Anger at the SPD and Marxist theory for failing to prevent the victory of National Socialism permeated this essay. Not only had class conflict failed to emerge, as socialist intellectuals, and indeed Speier, had predicted in the late 1920s, but working class Germans had voted for Hitler while party

---

[119] The article appeared in the final double issue of the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* published before the Nazis terminated the journal.
[120] Hans Speier, "Bemerkungen zur Erfassung der sozialen Struktur," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaften und Sozialpolitik*. 69 (September-October 1933): 705, 707.
[121] Ibid., 724.

leaders stood by and watched. The intellectuals, in terms of both political activism and theoretical sophistication, had failed.

Conclusion

By the autumn of 1933, Speier had abandoned socialism, the SPD, and his hope in the working classes. His rejection of Marxism and its attendant commitments appeared in its final form in his 1933 monograph, *Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus*, which was to be his *Habilitationsschrift*.[122] In this piece, Speier maintained that empirical investigation demonstrated that the social status of economically poor white-collar workers did "not result from particular labor functions [or] from their economic position."[123] Instead, white-collar workers adopted political attitudes unrelated to their

---

[122] A *Habilitationsschrift* is the highest qualification a German academic may earn. The book's original title was *Die Angestellten in der Deutschen Gesellschaft* (White Collar Workers in German Society), but was retitled *Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus* (White-Collars Workers before National Socialism) when published in 1977. It eventually appeared in English in 1986 under the imprimatur of Yale University Press as *German White Collar Workers and the Rise of Hitler*. The book itself had a torturous history. Speier completed it in the spring of 1933, soon before he was expelled from the *Hochschule*. (Margit Leipnik, who, after Lisa's death in the 1960s, became Speier's second wife, typed the book's first draft. Margit and Speier had known each other since childhood, as she was the brother of his best friend. For more on their relationship, see Margit Speier, *Die Vernichtung Entkommen: Erinnerung einer Judin* (Bremen: Donat, 1999).) The book was originally slated to appear as the third in a series titled *Sociological Inquiries* published by the Ferdinand Enke press. However, the three editors of the series, Sigmund Neumann, Albert Salomon, and Alfred von Martin, were dismissed by the Nazis and replaced in the summer of 1933 by socialist lawyer Theodor Geiger and National Socialist Andreas Walther. Upon reading *Die Angestellten*, which was clearly anti-Nazi, Walther refused to publish it. Some of the data contained in *Die Angestellten* appeared in Speier's 1934 essay "The Salaried Employee in Modern Society," and the first four chapters were translated and published in 1939 as *The Salaried Employee in German Society*. The whole work remained unpublished until 1977, when the historian Jürgen Kocka urged Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht Press to release it in full. The book remains a touchstone of sociological scholarship on the white-collar workers. C. Wright Mills, whose *White Collar: The American Middle Classes* is the most well-known work in this sociological subgenre, cited Speier repeatedly and may have even become aware of the full study of white collar workers through his teacher Hans Gerth, an exile who was friends with Speier at Heidelberg. See Theodor Geiger to Hans Speier, September 9, 1933, in Hans Speier, *Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der deutschen Sozialstruktur, 1918-1933* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1977 [1933]), 165-166 and C. Wright Mills, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002 [1951]). Also see the 1930s correspondence between Mills and Speier. Charles Wright Mills Papers, Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin. Speier's interest in white-collar workers was almost certainly inspired by Lederer, who wrote one of the first books on the subject. See Emil Lederer, *Die Privatangestellten in der Modernen Wirtschaftsentwicklung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912).

[123] Speier, *Die Angestellten*, 13.

economic well being, and, indeed, "connected [their] present social destitution with the political ascent of labor."[124] As such, they took pains to show "ostentatious disrespect … for those strata [i.e., the working classes] which, according to the traditional conception of upper-class standards and styles, did not deserve respect."[125] Many went so far as to support nationalist and right wing political parties whose central platform was the repeal of labors' legislative program. The Marxist claim that an individual's economic situation determined his or her consciousness was, Speier argued, incorrect.

In *Die Angestellten*, Speier also criticized socialist intellectuals for remaining ignorant of the anti-proletarian consciousness of white-collar workers.[126] At the same moment that white-collar workers supported the NSDAP against the SPD, Marxist theorists expanded the definition of the "proletariat" to include this class. By the end of the Weimar era, Speier implied, socialist intellectuals had descended into dogmatic unreality. They could not bring themselves to jettison Marx's prediction that the proletariat would continue to grow, even though this claim was empirically false: between 1895 and 1925, the proportion of wage laborers in Germany's population shrunk by 11 percent. Speier declared that the only way socialist intellectuals could explain this discrepancy in Marxist theory was to incorporate white-collar workers into the proletariat. Intellectuals placed theory ahead of history, which came at the expense of developing an effective political program and allowed the Nazis to achieve their political victory. According to Speier, socialist intellectual failure led to the collapse of the Weimar Republic. Yet, the fact that he placed these intellectuals at the center of Weimar's failure indicated that Speier continued to believe they had a crucial political

---

[124] Ibid., 3, 83.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Ibid., 3-7.

role to play. Partially as a result of his concern over what he came to perceive as intellectuals' Weimar mistakes, in exile Speier continued to examine their social function.

Speier's thought developed during the crisis of Weimar from 1929-1933, but it was only with the formation of the Nazi regime in 1933 that his views hardened into an anti-ideological position. At this moment, significant Machiavellian elements appeared in his thought. In his future exile, Speier promoted a philosophy of power that assumed that to defend democracy, the ends pursued by pro-republican actors justified the use of illiberal means. His interest in advocating goals linked to a political ideology, be they economic justice or social equality, receded into the background. In an era of crisis, power mattered more than ideology. However, Speier did not come to this conclusion lightly. For years, he had attempted to reconcile the tension between popular democracy and what he considered to be political ignorance. Education, he initially believed, was the means by which ordinary people could come to realize that social democracy reflected their interests. But personal experience impelled him to conclude that public enlightenment was impossible, and that ideology, no matter how relevant to people's economic experience, would always lose out to power and manipulation. Such was the tragic lesson Speier learned from Weimar.

The belief with which Speier left Weimar—that workers were most concerned with social standing and had little interest in values or ideals—was his first step on a path that eventually led him to argue that the public should not serve as a guide for decision-makers who formed foreign policy. From the mid 1930s onward, Speier scorned programs of public enlightenment and education as inherently naïve projects. This

attitude displayed an intense lack of empathy for the trials that workers experienced as a result of the depression and other macrohistorical processes, such as industrialization and urbanization. He very rarely referred to the deplorable conditions in which many German workers found themselves, and did not seek to understand why they turned to Hitler when they did. In rebuffing the motivations of ordinary people as illogical, Speier rejected large segments of the Weimar Republic.

Moreover, his argument that intellectuals must assert themselves within the political system over and against ordinary people displayed a pronounced elitism that was inherently anti-democratic in the sense that it elided public participation in political life. It was this idea that undergirded the institutions of the national security state that Speier helped shape in the early Cold War. Speier's views about the public and intellectuals, though, begged an important question: How could he claim to be a democrat when he believed that society must be run by elites? Speier never resolved this fundamental tension in his thought. For his entire life, he claimed to be fighting for democracy, but in order to do so he violated a number of democratic values he asserted were central to his identity. His diagnosis of crisis, first with reference to the Nazis and later to the Soviets, became the utilitarian claim through which he justified his political positions.

Speier's analyses of the SPD further displayed a narrow understanding of politics. For all of his critiques of the SPD, he only infrequently considered the difficult position in which the party found itself. Many of the decisions SPD leaders made—tolerating Brüning, endorsing Hindenburg—were taken to defend Weimar democracy against Hitler's attacks, the goal Speier himself endorsed in the republic's final years, as well as the goal that would encourage him to support similarly anti-democratic measures in the

Cold War. Although the party clearly failed to protect democracy, Speier made few attempts to understand why party leaders made the choices they did. This lack of empathy displayed an unwillingness to take account of the contradictions and difficulties inherent in democratic politics. Indeed, Speier rarely sought to resolve such difficulties, preferring instead to bypass them.

However, critics of Speier must remember that he witnessed one of the most extreme political tragedies of the twentieth century: the rise of Adolf Hitler and the NSDAP. The extraordinary nature of the situation engendered an intense reaction in him. The short amount of time within which Speier transformed from a social democrat to a philosopher of power underlines the unique character of his historical experience. In 1928, upon his graduation from university, Speier endorsed a class-based politics focused on progressive reform and programs of worker education and enfranchisement. Four years later, he found all of these goals unrealizable and not even worth discussing. The experience of the Nazi victory transformed Speier's views of the world, politics, and society. It engendered a deep pessimism about ordinary people in an individual who had spent his youth dedicated to socialism. Speier, it is true, embraced a number of unsavory opinions about parliamentary governance, but he did so as a result of witnessing one of the most catastrophic political events in modern history.

Chapter Two: The Opportunities of Exile

The trauma of Weimar imprinted itself upon Speier, who spent the next several years discussing the reasons for Hitler's triumph. Continuing arguments begun in the late 1920s, he singled out the left wing intelligentsia for its internalist concerns and lack of political engagement, and in the process elaborated a new role for the intellectual in democratic society. Social science, he argued, was not about elaborating values, finding truth, or developing an applied philosophy or social theory for particularistic ideological purposes, as it had been for him in Germany. Rather, under the duress of a fascist threat that endangered basic Enlightenment ideals of reason, freedom, and liberty, social science must become a weapon in the arsenals of democratic states. Speier declared that, in no uncertain terms, intellectuals must use knowledge in power's service and, specifically, become manipulators of the public or advisers to government policymakers. Although not initially abandoned, by the late 1930s Speier's Weimar-era hopes in rationalist education were completely lost. Power became far more important than ideology, and democracy, although regularly appealed to, lost much of its contents.

Speier was only able to develop an activist political program because the contexts into which he immigrated were so welcoming. He never truly experienced the "essential sadness" of "the unhealable rift forced between a human being and a native place, between the self and its true home," as described by Edward Said.[1] Unlike many future refugees from Nazi-occupied Central Europe, Speier's status as an academic allowed him to enter the United States with ease, as the restrictive immigration laws of the 1920s made special provisions for intellectuals. He also arrived in America at the same time as

---

[1] Edward Said, "Reflections on Exile," in *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 173.

many of his colleagues from Heidelberg and the *Hochschule für Politik*, which allowed him to retain personal and professional connections that exile would otherwise have torn asunder. Moreover, the moment when he came to the United States was one in which U.S. sociology experienced a brief, plastic moment in which sociologists looked for new methods and frameworks to understand society. Many were attracted to European sociology, particularly Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge, which Speier was in a unique space to interpret. These legal, discursive, and intellectual conditions enabled him to consider exile a moment of opportunity, not an experience of "disorienting loss."[2]

The Founding of the University in Exile

In April 1933, the Propaganda Ministry seized the *Hochschule* and dismissed Speier. Because his wife Lisa was pregnant, he could not immediately consider leaving Germany. However, once the Nazis consolidated their power in the first half of 1933— and Lisa's Judaism led to her dismissal from her job as a pediatrician in Berlin's welfare office—the Speiers quickly realized there was no future for them in their homeland. Luckily, that summer Speier received a letter from his former advisor Emil Lederer, who had immigrated to London within months of Hitler's ascendance, which inquired as to whether Speier would be interested in helping create a "University in Exile" at the New School for Social Research in New York City.[3] The New School offer, which came with the promise of a tenured academic position, compelled Speier's emigration.

---

[2] Said, "Reflections," 181.

[3] For more on the New School and the University in Exile's founding, see Alvin Johnson, "Report to the Trustees of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School for Social Research, February 1935, by Alvin Johnson, Chairman," New School for Social Research Archives, New School for Social Research, New York, New York (hereafter referred to as the NSSRA), Box Graduate Faculty Administration Records, Folders 27-60, Folder 38, 3; Hans Speier, "Emil Lederer, Life and Work," Speier Papers, Box 7, Folder 12: 26-28, 33-34; Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research* (New York: The Free Press, 1986), 89; and Robert Jackall, "Book

Lederer believed that Speier, as a talented, young, non-Jewish intellectual, could serve as the contractual liaison between Lederer in England and the potential faculty of the University in Exile in Germany. Despite his apprehension at being seized by the Gestapo, throughout the summer of 1933 Speier traveled between London and Berlin carrying contracts to the founding members of the University in Exile (which was soon renamed the Graduate Faculty in Political and Social Science, or the Graduate Faculty for short, as it was illegal for a college with only one faculty to refer to itself as a university). Upon completing his duties, Speier moved to New York on September 15, and his family followed in October.

As an academic, Speier was legally a "non-quota" immigrant and was thus able to easily settle in the United States.[4] His early arrival in America made him one of the first of the approximately 2,000 German intellectuals who fled there between 1933 and 1939.[5]

Review: *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research* by Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott," *Contemporary Sociology* 16, no. 3 (May 1987): 276-278.

[4] For more on American immigration law from the nineteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries, see David Jacobson, *Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995); Andrew Gyory, *Closing the Gate: Race, Politics, and the Chinese Exclusion Act* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998); Mae M. Ngai, "The Architecture of Race in American Immigration Law: A Reexamination of the Immigration Act of 1924," *Journal of American History* 86, no. 1 (June 1999): 67-92; Kitty Calavita, "The Paradoxes of Race, Class, Identity, and 'Passing': Enforcing the Chinese Exclusion Acts, 1882-1910," *Law and Social Inquiry* 25, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 1-40; Erika Lee, "The Chinese Exclusion Example: Race, Immigration, and American Gatekeeping, 1882-1924," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 21, no. 3 (Spring 2002): 36-62; Roger Daniels, *Guarding the Golden Door: American Immigration Policy and Immigrants since 1882* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004); Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005); and Aristide R. Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006).

[5] For more on the number of European immigrants, see Maurice Davie, *Refugees In America: Report of the Committee for the Study of Recent Immigration from Europe* (New York: Harpers and Brothers Publishers, 1947) and Claus-Dieter Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*, trans. Rita Kimber and Robert Kimber (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 11-15. Krohn derives his numbers from High Commissioner for Refugees (Jewish and Other) Coming from Germany, ed., *A Crisis in the University World* (London: H. Mehrtens, 1935); Emil Julius Gumbel, *Freie Wissenschaft: Ein Sammelbuch aus der deutschen Emigration* (Strassburg: Sebastian Brant Verlag, 1938); Davie, *Refugees in America*; and Norman Bentwich, *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars: The Story of Displaced Scholars and Scientists* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1953). For the Nazis' affects on social science, see Edward Y. Hartshorne, *The German Universities and National Socialism* (Brooklyn: AMS Press, 1981 [1937]), 94. For the American eagerness to accept émigrés, see Martin Jay, *The*

The most important institution to aid exile intellectuals was the New School, which

accounted for almost half of the permanent academic positions Germans received in

America.[6] The New School's mission rapidly permeated the community of Jewish and

left wing German academics, and from 1935 onwards, the Graduate Faculty received

over 5,000 job applications a year, the majority of which they could unfortunately not

accept.[7] By the end of World War II, the New School had saved several of the most

influential academics of the twentieth century, including Hans Kelsen, Claude Lévi-

Strauss, Bronislaw Malinowski, Leo Strauss, and Max Wertheimer. In so doing, it

permanently altered American intellectual history. Besides the obvious influence of a

luminary like Strauss, the New School became the center for several important

intellectual trends, including Gestalt psychology, German phenomenology, and the

comparative study of governments.

The New School was founded in 1919 by a number of prominent progressives

associated with the liberal newsmagazine *The New Republic*, including Charles Beard,

John Dewey, Felix Frankfurter, and Thorstein Veblen. Influenced by Dewey and

Veblen's philosophies of education, the New School's founders considered education the

most important means through which they could create a generation of worker-students

committed to liberal values. Similar to the *Hochschule für Politik*, the New School was

part of a transatlantic trend in which liberals and social democrats established colleges of

---

Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950
(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973); Stanford M. Lyman, "A Haven for Homeless Intellects:
The New School and Its Exile Faculties," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 7, no. 3
(Spring 1994): 501-502; and Jean-Michele Palmier, *Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration to Europe
and America* (New York: Verso Press, 2006).
[6] Other important organizations that helped exiles were the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced
German Scholars, the British Academic Assistance Council, the Zurich based *Notgemeinschaft deutscher
Wissenchaftler im Ausland*, the Joint Distribution Committee, the Hicem, and the Jewish Agency for
Palestine. Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, 16.
[7] Ibid., 76-78.

higher education that sought to politicize and educate a progressive working class constituency.[8] Both the New School and the *Hochschule's* faculty dedicated themselves to using social science to solve contemporary socioeconomic problems.[9] With its left wing concerns, the New School was an institutional home into which scholars like Speier and his *Hochschule* colleague Albert Salomon easily assimilated. The New School and the *Hochschule* also shared a material basis, as the Rockefeller Foundation heavily subsidized each.

The engine behind the University in Exile was Alvin Johnson, a founder and president of the New School. Johnson was born and raised in Nebraska, receiving his BA from the University of Nebraska in the late 1890s. After serving in the army during the Spanish-American War, in 1902 he completed a Ph.D in economics at Columbia University, where he studied under E.R.A. Seligman and Franklin Giddings. He spent the next thirteen years at various academic institutions, always participating in public debates and discussions.[10] In 1915, Herbert Croly, *The New Republic's* founder, became impressed with Johnson's essay "The Soul of Capitalism" and invited him to become an editor at the magazine.[11] Johnson accepted, hoping to "get nearer to the mature lay public that the economist would have to reach if his ideas were ever to mesh with political realities."[12] Through his connections at *The New Republic*, Johnson became part of the progressive circle that created the New School. In 1921, he became the New School's

---

[8] Ibid., 60 and Johnson, "Report to the Trustees of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School for Social Research, February 1935, by Alvin Johnson, Chairman," 4.

[9] Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, 12-18; Jackall, "Book Review," 276; and Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, 60.

[10] Johnson taught at the University of Nebraska, the University of Chicago, Stanford, and Cornell. Interestingly, Seligman had studied in Germany under Karl Knies and Gustav Schmoller. Perhaps he helped stir Johnson's interest in German academia.

[11] Alvin Johnson, "The Soul of Capitalism," *The Unpopular Review* 1, no. 2 (April-June 1914): 227-244.

[12] Johnson, *Pioneer's Progress*, 241.

president after Charles Beard and James Robinson left the college due to internal

disagreements over educational policies.[13]

Transatlantic connections forged in the 1920s were the seeds of the University in

Exile's germination. Johnson was fluent in German and had since the beginning of his

career been interested in German academia. In 1924, he and the financier-statesmen

Bernard Baruch traveled to Germany to study its rapid hyperinflation. On this visit,

Johnson made Lederer's acquaintance, and the two maintained a friendship and

corresponded throughout the 1920s. In 1927, Johnson accepted his mentor Seligman's

offer to serve as associate editor of an American encyclopedia of the social sciences

modeled on the German *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften* (Dictionary of the

Sciences of State). Having little inside knowledge of German academia but wanting

European contributions, he asked Lederer to recommend colleagues to write

encyclopedia entries.[14] By the time the eventually fifteen-volume *Encyclopedia* began to

appear in the 1930s, several of Lederer's associates and future members of the University

in Exile, including Speier, Gerhard Colm, and Fritz Lehmann, had contributed articles.

His positive experience with the encyclopedia led Johnson to develop an enormous

respect for German academics. With Hitler's triumph, he felt it necessary "to create a

---

[13] Ibid., 281-282.

[14] Both the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations contributed $1.25 million to the project, which the Social Science Research Council oversaw. In the end, more German social scientists produced articles for the *Encyclopedia* than academics from any other country. Johnson, "Report to the Trustees of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School for Social Research, February 1935, by Alvin Johnson, Chairman," 3. For more on the encyclopedia, see Alvin Johnson, *Pioneer's Progress: An Autobiography* (New York: The Viking Press, 1952), chapter 29 and Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, chapter 4.

situation in which the displaced German scholars would be able to keep alive the traditions and methods that had been the glory of their universities."[15]

By May 1933, the University of Exile's wheels were in motion. Johnson had collected $120,000 from the Jewish philanthropist Hiram Halle, which allowed him to fund fifteen professorships at a salary of $4,000 per year, and continued to raise funds through connections at the Institute of International Education.[16] To gain U.S. intellectual support for his venture, he established a committee of "distinguished Americans" who believed "in freedom of thought and teaching," which included Dewey, Frankfurter, and Seligman, to endorse the University in Exile.[17] Johnson also drafted a letter, signed by

---

[15] Alvin Johnson Papers, Archives and Special Collections, Love Library, University of Nebraska at Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska (hereafter referred to as the Johnson Papers at Nebraska), Box 47, Folder Graduate Faculty-University in Exile; "Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science ('The University in Exile'), 1933-1934," in *Graduate Faculty of the New School Catalogues, Fall 1933-Summer 1937*, NSSRA; Johnson, "Report to the Trustees of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School for Social Research, February 1935, by Alvin Johnson, Chairman," 2; Alvin Johnson to Agnes deLima, April 13, 1933, Alvin Johnson Papers, Yale University Special Collections, New Haven, Connecticut (hereafter referred to as the Johnson Papers at Yale); and "Faculty of Exiles is Projected Here," *New York Times*, May 13, 1933, 7.

[16] Johnson Papers at Nebraska, Box 47, Folder Graduate Faculty-University in Exile and Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, 94. Halle was part owner of the Gulf Oil Company and associated with the Rockefeller Foundation, which spent $1.4 million helping displaced scholars. For more on the Rockefeller Foundation and the exiles, see Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, 22-24, 29-38, 35 and Marjorie Lamberti, "The Reception of Refugee Scholars from Nazi Germany: Philanthropy and Social Change in Higher Education," *Jewish Social Studies* 12, no. 3 (Spring-Summer 2006): 157-192.

[16] Johnson, "Report to the Trustees of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School for Social Research, February 1935, by Alvin Johnson, Chairman," 4-5; "Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science ('The University in Exile'), 1933-1934," in *Graduate Faculty of the New School Catalogues, Fall 1933-Summer 1937*, NSSRA; and "Interview with Hans Speier, conducted in Hartsdale, NY in November 1981 by Peter Rutkoff and William Scott," quoted in Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*. For more on Johnson's strategies to assimilate the German faculty into American intellectual life, see Daniel Bessner, "'Rather More than One-Third Had No Jewish Blood:' American Progressivism and German-Jewish Cosmopolitanism at the New School for Social Research, 1933-1939," *Religions* 3, no. 1 (March 2012): 99-129.

[17] The other members were Wilbur L. Cross, Ernest Gruening, Oliver Wendell, Robert M. Hutchins, Robert M. MacIver, William Allen, George A. Plimpton, and Herbert Bayard. Johnson, "Report to the Trustees of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School for Social Research, February 1935, by Alvin Johnson, Chairman," 4-5.

several hundred social scientists, backing his venture.[18] Armed with this support, in June

Johnson applied for and received a provisional regents charter for his undertaking.[19]

The ten founding members of the University in Exile were Karl Brandt

(agricultural science), Gerhard Colm (economics), Arthur Feiler (economics), Eduard

Heimann (economics), Erich von Hornbostel (sociology of music), Herman Kantorowicz

(law), Lederer (economics), Speier (sociology), Max Wertheimer (Gestalt psychology),

and Frieda von Wunderlich (social policy).[20] Johnson recruited these scholars because

each "supported the democratic government under the Weimar constitution."[21] The

majority were Social Democrats or held social democratic sympathies, were empirically

oriented social scientists, and were Lederer's associates.[22] Most importantly for Johnson,

each New School member was an intellectual dedicated to using social science to reach

progressive ends.[23] Speier, with his calls for intellectuals to participate in political and

social life, fit perfectly within Johnson's vision of the University in Exile, and quickly

---

[18] Ibid., 5.

[19] The New School was not permanently chartered until January 17, 1941. Until then, students took all master's and doctoral exams at New York University. Johnson Papers at Nebraska, "Absolute Charter of the New School for Social Research."

[20] Illness forced Hornbostel to cease teaching in early 1934, and Kantorowicz soon moved to the London School of Economics. To replace them, Hans Staudinger and Arnold Brecht joined the faculty.

[21] Other individuals whom Johnson hoped to bring over included Max Ascoli, Rudolf Littauer, and Werner Hegemann. All joined the New School. In 1934, Johnson added several members to the faculty, including Hans Staudinger, Albert Salomon, Alfred Kähler, Fritz Lehmann, Carl Mayer, and Hans Simons. Johnson Papers at Nebraska, "University in Exile" and Johnson, "Report to the Trustees of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School for Social Research, February 1935, by Alvin Johnson, Chairman," 8.

[22] Johnson took pains to explain that "no member of the Graduate Faculty is a Marxist as the term is understood in America." Johnson Papers at Nebraska, "University in Exile." Five faculty members—Colm, Feiler, Heimann, Lederer, and Wunderlich—were economists. In addition, two-thirds were Jewish. The New School scholars brought a variety of disciplinary and political perspectives to the table and hailed primarily from three institutions: the University of Frankfurt, the Kiel Institute for World Economics, and the *Hochschule für Politik*. Arthur J. Vidich, "Book Review: Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research*," *Contemporary Sociology* 16, no. 3 (May 1987): 275.

[23] As Johnson said, "the German social scientist stands nearer to the political and administrative life of the country [than American academics], participating in expert commissions and in national and city governmental bodies." Johnson, "Report to the Trustees of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in the New School for Social Research, February 1935, by Alvin Johnson, Chairman," 3.

became an active member of the New School's faculty, serving as the first editor of its

journal *Social Research*.

The Lessons of Weimar and the Promise of America, 1934-1936

America initially "overwhelmed" Speier, and Germany "made itself felt in almost

every [one of his] thoughts."[24] Within a year, however, he had learned English and begun

to acclimate into the U.S. sociological community. Yet his German experience left an

indelible mark on his scholarship, and he spent his first years in exile analyzing why

National Socialism succeeded. As he had in his German work, Speier blamed

intellectuals for the collapse of Weimar, but in America he extended his critique to those

on the right wing. Conservative intellectuals like Oswald Spengler, Speier declared, had

served as "prophets of anti-humanitarian sentiments and deeds" and laid the groundwork

for fascism as left wing intellectuals stood idly by.[25] He maintained that in America,

democratic intellectuals could not make the same mistakes. German exiles specifically

needed to promote universalist liberal values by asserting themselves in the "community

of spirits in which the clash of values is transcended."[26] Only by embracing the German

"secret tradition of freedom," characterized by "realistic activism and noble humanity,"

could progressive exile intellectuals defend democracy and atone for their previous

failures.[27] Nevertheless, Speier did not highlight any particular political philosophy, be it

socialism or liberalism, offering only vague entreaties to Enlightenment or democratic

values.

---

[24] Hans Speier to Alvin Johnson, undated (probably 1934 or 1935), Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 115 and Hans Speier to Alvin Johnson, October 4, 1945, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 115.

[25] Hans Speier, "Germany in Danger: Concerning Oswald Spengler's Latest Book," *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 239.

[26] Ibid., 243.

[27] Hans Speier, "Book Review: Mayer, Gustav. *Friedrich Engels, Eine Biographie*," *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 389.

Speier sought to ensure intellectuals learned the lessons of Weimar's collapse. Most importantly, they could not trust the working classes, who did not have political agency and only "imitat[e] traits" of "superior classes," to make reasonable decisions.[28] Given this premise, intellectuals must recognize that in dynamic, modern societies, where "several images of the right life compete with one another," "life threatens to dissolve into relativity."[29] Too much information was available for the political masses to determine what values they should follow. As the originators of ideology, intellectuals had the duty to give values an "explicit form and to create and diffuse" the right ideologies to the masses.[30] Doing so would build a power base able to defend democracy in the case of a right wing challenge.

Fortunately for exile intellectuals, Speier argued, the nature of American society made their task easier than it was in Germany. He maintained that Americans' faith in capitalism, a system in which social status was determined with reference to "individual success, quantitatively measured in money," made them more rational than their German counterparts.[31] Although the American value system could lead to worship of wealth, it

[28] Hans Speier, "Honor and Social Structure,' *Social Research* 2, no. 1 (February 1935): 94-95 and "Social Stratification in the Urban Community." *American Sociological Review* 1, no. 2 (April 1936): 200.
[29] Speier, "Honor and Social Structure," 94.
[30] Speier, "Social Stratification," 202.
[31] In these remarks, Speier ignored the various distinctions that delineated groups in America, most notably those based upon racial, ethnic, gender, sexual, and religious differences. Despite the cosmopolitanism of New York City in the 1930s, it was nevertheless an urban space defined by long-standing, and often strict, divisions. Speier was either blind to these cleavages or, more likely, was attempting to come to terms with the social environment in which he found himself by considering his first impressions of how American differed from Germany. Hans Speier, "The Salaried Employee in Modern Society," *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 128. For more on interwar New York City and its various divisions, see Virginia E. Sánchez-Korrol, *From Colonia to Community: The History of Puerto Ricans in New York City* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940* (New York: Basic Books, 1995); Andrea Friedman, *Prurient Interest: Gender, Democracy, and Obscenity in New York City, 1909-1945* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); Joshua B. Freeman, *In Transit: Transport Workers Union in New York City, 1933-1966* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001); Stephen Robertson, "Seduction, Sexual Violence, and Marriage in New York City, 1866-1955," *Law and History Review* 24, no. 2 (Summer 2006): 331-373; Daniel J. Opler, *For All White-Collar Workers: The Possibilities of Radicalism in New York City's*

retained a rational character. The Germans, in contrast, believed in "social fate," which allowed conservative intellectuals to promote successfully the notion that the "world evolves independently of human will, so that change is conceived as a process excluding not only human freedom but also human activity."[32] Germans' belief in fate encouraged them to accept the Nazi victory as inevitable and even desirable, and to succumb easily to the order provided by the totalitarian state. Speier maintained that individualistic Americans would never have allowed this to happen. Thus, at this moment a tension characterized his thought: on one hand, he argued that intellectuals must manipulate ordinary people, while on the other he declared that Americans would not allow themselves to be easily manipulated. Speier's impressionistic understanding of U.S. society, into which he had just arrived, likely accounted for this illogical claim. To him, Americans initially seemed more rational than the Germans. However, as the years passed, he would adopt as pessimistic an opinion about the ordinary American as he did the ordinary German.

Speier's work stood in dialogue with that of his New School colleagues, many of whom also sought to learn the lessons of Weimar. The Graduate Faculty used a variety of approaches, from economic and legal theory to political and social analysis, to explain National Socialism's triumph.[33] Reflecting the sociology of the intelligentsia that had

Department Store Unions, 1934-1953 (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2007); and Jennifer Guglielmo, *Living the Revolution: Italian Women's Resistance and Radicalism in New York City, 1880-1945* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010).

[32] Speier, "Germany in Danger," 236 and Speier, "Social Stratification," 200.

[33] For the economic explanations, see Emil Lederer, "Social Control versus Economic Law," *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 14, 20-21; Emil Lederer, "The Problem of Development and Growth in the Economic System," *Social Research* 2, no. 1 (February 1935): 18; Arthur Feiler, "The Pressure for Monetary Depreciation." *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 61-63, 79-82; Arthur Feiler, "Will Germany Devaluate?" *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 437; Gerhard Colm, "Why the Papen Plan for Industrial Recovery Failed," *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 83, 90-93; Frieda Wunderlich, "New Aspects of Unemployment in Germany," *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 97-

been popular in Weimar, many blamed democracy's collapse on intellectuals. Similar to Speier, a number of the Graduate Faculty highlighted intellectuals' inability to comprehend the realities of democratic politics as the cause of Weimar's collapse.

Lederer argued that the roots of socialist impotence in Weimar could be found in the friction between the rank and file of the SPD and intellectuals. Workers were "very suspicious" of intellectuals' influence, but without intellectual guidance, they could not understand "the complicated texture of the modern world, [and] had no idea of what it means to seize power."[34] Workers incorrectly "were convinced that intellectuals would side with the workers only because they hoped for an easy career."[35] For their part, socialist intellectuals focused too much on "abstractions" and did not understand that "ideas … rarely changed the policy of a nation unless they were backed by interests and emotions."[36] For this reason, intellectuals focused on abstract philosophy at the expense of political engagement, accepting workers' distrust as natural. Throughout the Weimar era, Lederer concluded, "there was no strong group of revolutionary intellectuals in Germany" able to exert influence on the SPD and guide it to electoral victory, leaving a space for Hitler.[37]

100; Frieda Wunderlich, "Women's Work in Germany," *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 310 and Frieda Wunderlich, "Some Aspects of Social Work in the German Democratic Republic," *Social Research* 3, no. 1 (February 1936): 33-35. For the legal explanations, see Max Ascoli, "Realism versus the Constitution," *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 183-184; Arnold Brecht, "Federalism and Business Regulation," *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 343, 348-349, 352; and Arnold Brecht, "The New Russian Constitution," *Social Research* 4, no. 2 (May 1937): 159; and Arnold Brecht, "Civil Service," *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 209-211. For the role of political and social factors, see G.A. Borgese, "The Intellectual Origins of Fascism," *Social Research* 1, no. 4 (November 1934): 464-476, 485; Albert Salomon, "Tocqueville, Moralist and Sociologist," *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 416-419; Max Ascoli, "Society through Pareto's Mind," *Social Research* 3, no. 1 (February 1935): 205-206; Hans Simons, "Some European Aspects of International Law," *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 469-470; and Hans Simons, "Collective Security," *Social Research* 3, no. 4 (November 1936): 388.

[34] Emil Lederer, "On Revolutions," *Social Research* 3, no. 1 (February 1936): 9-11, 16-17.

[35] Ibid., 16.

[36] Ibid., 10 and Emil Lederer, "Comment on Keynes, II," *Social Research* 3, no. 4 (November 1936): 487.

[37] Lederer, "On Revolutions," 16.

Eduard Heimann also accused socialist intellectuals for concerning themselves mostly with theory. Intellectuals, he argued, wrongly believed that an inevitable "final coordination through capitalism of the whole economic body under large scale production and the destruction of the propertied independent producers" would destroy capitalist society.[38] They therefore "did not even search for a constructive principle upon which to unite the majority of the diversified nation and to build up a block [sic] capable of seizing and holding power."[39] Moreover, the education propounded by Weimar democrats failed to give students a "concrete purpose in life," which "totalitarian systems of education" provided.[40] The Nazis thus had little trouble in winning Germans of all classes to their side.

Adolph Löwe echoed Speier's Weimar-era critique of *Bildung*, and maintained that traditional German education did not "satisfy [Germany's] need for individuals of social consciousness in the learned professions and in the leading political and economic institutions."[41] In the wake of industrialization, academics "stubbornly [clung] to their individualistic and intellectualistic extremism," refusing to address new social realities.[42] Most students received their "real education … in their fraternities and student corps," where "the Wilhelmian parody of Prussian tradition was instilled in them."[43] When the depression erupted, many former students were left unemployed and, having no sense of humanistic ethics or democratic responsibility, "became the propagandists and the

---

[38] Eduard Heimann, "Socialism and Democracy," *Social Research* 1, no. 3 (August 1934): 308 ff 1.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Eduard Heimann, "I," *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 398.
[41] Adolph Löwe, "The Task of Democratic Education: Pre-Hitler Germany and England," *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 383.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid., 384.

officers of the counter-revolution."[44] German intellectuals, Löwe argued, had failed to

"solve the fundamental problem of modern democracy: mass education."[45] Wunderlich

and Colm repeated this last viewpoint.[46]

Speier and his colleagues spent their first years in exile wrestling with the

problem of how to create a power base that would serve as a bulwark of democracy. They

offered a variety of solutions, most of which were centered on indoctrinating the public

with democratic norms. However, in the mid 1930s Speier transformed this vision of

indoctrination into an activist political program, which emerged from the sense of

security he felt in America. Academic patronage networks, the epistemological

heterogeneity of U.S. sociology, and the shared concerns of Speier and American

sociologists enabled him to assimilate easily into the U.S. sociological community. Speier

was lucky to have immigrated to the United States at a moment when sociology was in a

period of transition, and U.S. sociologists were willing to accept a German as one of their

own. Although in physical exile, Speier did not experience a discursive exile, which

encouraged the activist nature of his project.

The Opportunities of Exile, 1936-1938

Speier found, somewhat to his surprise, that throughout his career most American

academics were enthralled with the "German-Jewish intellectual ghetto" that was the

New School.[47] In the 1930s, he made his reputation by presenting himself as an authority

on Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge, which had aroused interest amongst U.S.

---

[44] Ibid.

[45] Ibid., 383-385.

[46] Wunderlich, "New Aspects," 109 and Gerhard Colm, "VI," *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 411-412.

[47] Speier noticed that American academics treated one "with special respect when it became known that an individual worked at the New School in the Graduate Faculty." "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 7, 146.

sociologists.[48] Soon after his immigration, Columbia University, New York University, and the American Sociological Society invited him to deliver lectures, and he gave numerous talks at the University of Chicago, home of the nation's top sociology program.[49] Several well known academics also praised his work.[50] The warm reception Speier received was instrumental in allowing him to view exile not as a burden but an opportunity, a view that permeated his work from late 1936 onward.[51]

The patronage of a number of prominent scholars fostered Speier's easy entry into the American intellectual community. The most important of these was Louis Wirth, himself a German-Jewish émigré sociologist. Speier and Wirth began their relationship in 1935, when Speier asked Wirth to recommend suggestions regarding publication of *Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus*.[52] Soon after reading Speier's work, Wirth promoted him as "one of the outstanding younger scholars" in the sociology of knowledge.[53] Wirth invited Speier to give a lecture at the American Sociological

---

[48] For more on the sociology of knowledge in the American context, see David Kettler and Volker Meja, *Karl Mannheim and the Crisis of Liberalism: The Secret of These New Times* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995).

[49] Speier also lectured at the 1940 meeting at the American Historical Association. See Hans Speier to Louis Wirth, November 2, 1936, Louis Wirth Papers, University of Chicago Special Collections, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois (hereafter referred to as the Wirth Papers), Box 11, Folder 10; Louis Wirth to Hans Speier, November 16, 1936, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10; Robert Redfield to Louis Wirth, December 10, 1936, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10; and "Abstracts of Papers Delivered at Regular Meetings, 1936-1937," University of Chicago Special Collections, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. For early sociology and the University of Chicago, see Stephen P. Turner and Jonathan H. Turner, *The Impossible Science: An Institutional Analysis of Sociology* (London: Sage Publications, 1990), 11-38.

[50] See Frank Knight to Hans Speier, February 20, 1937, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 117; Talcott Parsons to Hans Speier, November 29, 1937, Talcott Parsons Papers, Box 3, Folder Correspondence: Professional Associations, 1937, 1940, Harvard University Special Collections, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. (hereafter referred to as the Parsons Papers); and Talcott Parsons to Hans Speier, January 12, 1938, Parsons Papers, Box 3, Folder Correspondence RE: publications, reviews, etc. 1937-1940.

[51] This is not to say that the transition from Germany to America was smooth for all of the New School scholars. See Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, chapter eight for an analysis of the problems faced in general by the New School faculty.

[52] Hans Speier to Louis Wirth, September 12, 1935, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10.

[53] Louis Wirth to E.T. Hiller, December 22, 1936, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10.

93

Society's annual meeting, and to speak at Chicago.[54] Wirth provided Speier with

intellectual clout, and without him, it is unlikely Speier's career would have taken off

when and how it did.

In addition to Wirth, Robert MacIver, Edward Shils, Harold Lasswell, and others

expressed admiration for and popularized Speier's scholarship.[55] Speier's essays

appeared in the discipline's two major journals, the *American Journal of Sociology* and

the *American Sociological Review*, and colleagues regularly cited him.[56] Moreover,

numerous institutes of higher education, including the University of Michigan and

Brooklyn College, courted him.[57] Although Speier rejected these offers out of loyalty to

---

[54] Louis Wirth to Hans Speier, September 18, 1935, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10.

[55] Cecil C. North to Hans Speier, January 25, 1936, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 44; James W. Woodard to Hans Speier, April 23, 1936, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 127; R.S. Crane to Hans Speier, June 10, 1938, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 33; Cecil C. North to Hans Speier, May 10, 1938, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 44; and Walter L. Dorn to Hans Speier, October 30, 1936, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 53. Lasswell contacted Speier after reading his essay on "Militarism in the Eighteenth Century," asking Speier to speak at Lasswell's seminar on militarism at Chicago. Speier and Lasswell became personal friends, visiting each other's families when each was in town. "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 320.

[56] A selection of works that cite or refer to Speier positively include, but are not limited to, Wayne C. Grover, "Book Review: *A History of Militarism: Romance and Realities*. Alfred Vagts." *The Journal of the American Military History Foundation* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1938): 48-50; Robert K. Merton, "Science, Technology, and Society in Seventeenth Century England," *Osiris* 4 (1938): 360-632; Ray F. Harvey, "Book Review: *War in Our Time*. Edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 3, no. 3 (July 1939): 516-518; David Riesman, Jr., "Book Review: *The Process of Revolution*. G.S. Pettee," *Harvard Law Review* 52, no. 5 (March 1939): 864-865; W.G. Weaver, "Book Review. *War in Our Time*. Edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler," *American Sociological Review* 4, no. 5 (October 1939): 743-744; Hans Gerth, "The Nazi Party: Its Leadership and Composition," *American Journal of Sociology* 45, no. 4 (January 1940): 517-541; Nathan C. Leites, "Book Review: *War in Our Time*. Edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler," *American Journal of Sociology* 46, no. 2 (September 1940): 268-269; Boris Erich Nelson, "Book Review: *War in Our Time*. Edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 207 (January 1940): 224-225; Lawrence Preuss, "The Concepts of Neutrality and Nonbelligerency," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 218 (November 1941): 97-109; and Thelma Z. Lavine, "Sociological Analysis of Cognitive Norms," *Journal of Philosophy* 39, no. 13 (June 18, 1942): 342-256.

[57] R.C. Angell to Louis Wirth, February 15, 1938; Louis Wirth to R.C. Angell, February 19, 1938, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10; and Hans Speier to Miss Zeller, February 23, 1939, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 109.

the New School and his unwillingness to uproot his family, they indicate his acceptance amongst U.S. academics.[58]

American sociologists' eager reception of Speier reflected the epistemological heterogeneity of interwar sociology. For that brief moment, sociology departments were home to practitioners of different methods, and sociologists were interested in exploring European scholarship.[59] Methodological positivism, which came to dominate sociology in the postwar period, was at that time just one of many approaches.[60] Speier's colleagues were also likely attracted to his approach to intellectual life. In the depression's wake, U.S. sociologists adopted an activist attitude toward their work that echoed the New School's. In the 1920s and earlier, sociologists believed they had a public role to play, but viewed this role as passive.[61] However, as the Great Depression deepened, and

---

[58] Lisa had a difficult time adjusting to exile as she was unable to receive her medical license in America, which made Speier reluctant to further disrupt her life by constantly moving. See Harold Rypins to Lisa Speier (undated, probably early 1936); Lisa Speier to Senator Robert S. Wagner, October 16, 1936; Harold Rypins to Luise Speier, March 2, 1937; Horace L. Field to Luise Speier, April 28, 1937; and Harold Rypins to Luise Speier, June 15, 1937; Speier Papers, Box 1, Folder 4.

[59] For this heterogeneity, see Maurice Parmalee, "Three Communications from Dr. M. Parmalee," *American Journal of Sociology* 37, no. 3 (1931): 468; Patricia Lengermann, "The Founding of the *American Sociological Review*: The Anatomy of a Rebellion," *American Sociological Review* 44, no. 2 (April 1979): 189, 191-192; Robert C. Bannister, *Sociology and Scientism: The American Quest for Objectivity, 1880-1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 187-199; Peter J. Kuznick, *Beyond the Laboratory: Scientists as Political Activists in 1930s America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 28; Turner and Turner, *The Impossible Science*, 53-57, 59, 63; and Charles Camic, "On Edge: Sociology during the Great Depression and the New Deal," in *Sociology in America: A History*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 241-242.

[60] Positivism here refers to an epistemological "commitment to covering laws, that is, to the identification of Humean 'constant conjunctions' of events;" to an empiricist ontology, "according to which scientific statements link empirically observable events;" and, finally, to scientism, "the belief that the social and natural sciences should approach their objects of study in an identical fashion." George Steinmetz, "The Historical Sociology of Historical Sociology: Germany and the United States in the Twentieth Century," *Sociologica* 3 (2007): 1-28.

[61] For interwar sociology, see Craig Calhoun, "Sociology in America: An Introduction," in *Sociology in America: A History*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), 2-19 and Camic, "On Edge," 265. See also James T. Carey, *Sociology and Public Affairs: The Chicago School* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1975); Lee Harvey, *Myths of the Chicago School of Sociology* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1987); Luigi Tomasi, ed. *The Tradition of the Chicago School of Sociology* (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1998); Ross Posnock, *Color and Culture: Black Writers and the Making of the Modern Intellectual* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998); and Andrew Abbott, *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999).

particularly after the implementation of the New Deal, sociologists reimagined their

political role. Now, many argued, sociologists needed to serve within, or as advisers to,

the government.[62] Such arguments mirrored the one Speier began to develop in the mid

1930s.

Speier's smooth transition into the American academic community encouraged

him to view exile as a moment of opportunity, and he spent the mid 1930s trying to

convince fellow émigrés that they should abandon previous disagreements and work

together to defend the freedoms Hitler denied them. In the process, Speier singled out the

Frankfurt School, a group of Marxist academics then associated with Columbia

University who in the 1920s coalesced around the philosopher Max Horkheimer's

Institute for Social Research, for criticism. Speier believed the Frankfurt School, which

produced a German-language journal and remained avowedly Marxist, squandered the

opportunity of exile. Exile, he felt, was a time to shed old identities, not stubbornly cling

to them.

Speier expressed his critique of Horkheimer and his colleagues in a review of the

Institute's *Studien über Autorität und Familie* (Studies on Authority and Family).[63]

---

[62] One sees this reconsideration in a 1934 debate that appeared in *Social Forces*, in which leading sociologists argued in favor of reorienting sociology toward issues of contemporary economic importance. L.L. Bernard, "Questions for Sociology: An Informal Round Table Symposium […]," *Social Forces* 13, no. 2 (December 1934): 165-179, 189-191, 194-195, 209-210, 217-219.

[63] The review has received some attention in the historical literature. In *The Dialectical Imagination*, Martin Jay erroneously referred to it as "extremely hostile" and a significant reason why the *Studien* was poorly received in America. In actuality, the review is ambivalent, if accusatory, alternately praising and critiquing some of the volume's essays. For instance, Speier found Karl Wittfogel's contribution to be "of methodological importance," and referred to Kurt Goldstein's piece as "valuable and challenging" (although he does say Goldstein's work "is implicitly at odds with the underlying philosophy of the book"). Moreover, it is unclear how influential a review in a relatively obscure journal like *Social Research* could be. See Hans Speier, "Book Review: Horkheimer, Max, ed. *Studien über Autorität und Familie*," *Social Research* 3, no. 4 (November 1936): 501-504 and Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination*, 133. Also see Thomas Wheatland, *The Frankfurt School in Exile* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009), 210-211. General connections between the New School and the Frankfurt School are elucidated in Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, 189-197.

Speier had known the Frankfurt School's members for years. In Germany, he reviewed

several works for the Institute's *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* (Journal of Social

Research), including Carl Schmitt's *The Concept of the Political*.[64] However, although

the Graduate Faculty and Institute members knew each other personally and

professionally, in exile tensions between the two groups quickly arose.[65] Philosophically,

the Frankfurt School was comprised of left wing Marxists, while Graduate Faculty

members were mainly centrist or right-wing social democrats or liberals.

Methodologically, the Frankfurt School's use of psychoanalysis was not popular amongst

the empirically oriented Graduate Faculty. These philosophical and methodological

variations, coupled with both groups' different approaches to exile, led to intra-exile

tensions.

     Speier's review reflected these intellectual disparities. He mocked the fact that, to

make common concepts seem "alien," "the German scholars" of the Institute wrote in a

foreign language and used a difficult to penetrate argot.[66] He emphasized that the

---

[64] Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung to Hans Speier, November 30, 1931, Speier Papers, Box 5, Folder 39. Also see *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* I. That the Frankfurt School gave Speier Schmitt's review should not be read as a sign of respect for the young sociologist. It likely indicates that the School did not take Schmitt seriously, and thus gave his work to an inexperienced scholar. Thanks to David Kettler, via Thomas Wheatland, for pointing this out.

[65] Wheatland, *Frankfurt School*, 47, 88. For example, in 1935 Leo Löwenthal suggested to Horkheimer that all contact with the New School be severed, while Franz Neumann impugned the New School scholars' intellectual accomplishments. (After 1940, Löwenthal's attitude moderated. He became and remained a personal friend of Speier's, and the two regularly corresponded.) Neumann went so far as to call Speier a "sly, highly intelligent, and formally extremely clever scoundrel" in a letter to Löwenthal. See Franz Neumann to Leo Löwenthal, July 26, 1940. Quoted in Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, 194. At the same time, one should not forget that both organizations regularly met and were part of the same exile intellectual circles in New York. Adolph Löwe, in particular, united the two organizations. Horkheimer himself retained significant relationships with Gerhard Colm, Löwe, and Hans Staudinger. Yet the New School remained committed to contributing to American life in a way the Frankfurt School never was. This was demonstrated by the fact that only one of the New School faculty members from its first years, Eduard Heimann, returned to Central Europe after World War II, which stood in sharp contrast to the Frankfurt School, where Horkheimer, Adorno, and others rémigrated to postwar Europe.

[66] Speier, "Book Review: *Studien*," 503 and Hans Speier, "Talks with Max Horkheimer and Frederick Pollock, Frankfurt am Main, June 7, 1952 and Wiesbaden, early June 1952," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 4. Speier would also claim that he found the Institute's "arrogant treatment of American men out of work"

Studien's fundamental concept that "the family is important" because it was "the socio-psychological origin" for individuals' relationships with authority "is not so alien to American sociology as the terminology of the German scholars might sometimes suggest."[67] By placing the Frankfurt School in opposition to American sociologists, Speier set his colleagues apart from U.S. academics as well as the Graduate Faculty, whose journal, *Social Research*, appeared in English.

Speier further derided the "dogmatic assumptions" of the Institute's Marxism, which traced "the authoritarian structure of the family … [to] the changing economic and social order."[68] He declared the Frankfurt School's use of the psychoanalytical method to be "mildly comic," because it "tends to ignore" cultural differences between societies.[69] Speier did, however, admire Horkheimer and his colleagues' "resolute anti-authoritarian philosophy of history" and praised the "originality in their approach."[70] The review can therefore not be read simply as a rejection of the Frankfurt School, but rather as a plea for them to abandon German commitments, accept the superiority of more empirical—and "American"—approaches to social science, and become integrated into the intellectual life of their adopted homeland. Isolating one's scholarship by writing in difficult German and clinging to Marxism, Speier implied, cut off transcultural communication before it began.

---

insulting. The only English-language contributions to the *Zeitschrift* came from American scholars such as Charles Beard and Harold Lasswell. Charles A. Beard, "The Social Sciences in the United States," *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* IV, no. 1 (1936): 61-64 and Harold Lasswell, "Collective Autism as a Consequence of Cultural Contact: Notes on Religious Training and the Peyote Cult at Taos," *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* IV, no. 2 (1936): 232-247.

[67] Speier, "Book Review: *Horkheimer, Max*," 503.

[68] Ibid., 502-504. Lederer also took aim at Marxist colleagues who abided by "the dictatorship of dogma" and accepted "that the class struggle is the only concept for interpreting the social and economic structure of history." Emil Lederer, "Freedom and Science," *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 227.

[69] Speier, "Book Review: *Horkheimer, Max*," 502-504.

[70] Ibid., 504.

Horkheimer hated the review.[71] At a party thrown by Emil Lederer in 1937, Horkheimer publicly lambasted Speier and told him that he "betrayed the solidarity on which refugees from the Third Reich had to depend."[72] Speier, in contrast, considered the review to be "rather mil[d]" and expressed shock at Horkheimer's outburst, which he attributed to the latter's self-seriousness, a trait found among "many men in positions of authority."[73] Yet Horkheimer was right to detect an accusing tone in Speier's review. Speier went beyond critiquing the Frankfurt School's scholarship to criticize its way of being. He drew a clear, and public, distinction between the Institute for Social Research and the University in Exile, indicating that while the latter understood their exile as a moment of opportunity, and was ready and willing to become American, the former viewed it as a temporary burden. In essence, Speier presented the Institute as contemptuous of the United States. For Speier, solidarity amongst the exile community meant nothing if members of the community did not put their knowledge to what he considered productive use.[74]

Speier therefore advocated an assimilationist and activist approach to exile, which was reflected in a 1937 review of Louis Wirth and Edward Shils' translation of Karl Mannheim's *Ideologie und Utopie*.[75] Mannheim, who had immigrated to England in

---

[71] This may explain why the historical scholarship that addresses the review, written primarily from the Frankfurt School's perspective, takes such a dim view of it.

[72] Hans Speier, "Talks with Max Horkheimer and Frederick Pollock, Frankfurt am Main, June 7, 1952 and Wiesbaden, early June 1952," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 4, 1a.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Years later, when writing about *Studien über Autorität und Familie*, Speier called it "ambitious and interesting" work, before crossing out the word "interesting." Ibid. Furthermore, in 1954, Speier responded to a German military officer's approval of Horkheimer by saying that the officer "is undoubtedly not in a position to judge [Horkheimer's] scientific competence." Hans Speier, "5 April 1954: Interview with Axel von dem Bussche-Streithorst, Bonn, Resaurant Kranzler—2 ½ Hours" and Hans Speier, "Log Notes, 1954 (Mar. 27-Apr. 8), numbered 1-10," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 5.

[75] Speier's review became well known in disciplines outside of sociology. For instance, philosophers cited it for readers interested in reading philosophical critiques of the sociology of knowledge. See Harold A.

1933, had asked Wirth, since 1931 editor of the *American Journal of Sociology*, to invite

Speier to write the review. He wrote Wirth that Speier was "a former student of mine, and

a chap you will like."[76] Mannheim came to regret his decision, as Speier's review was a

damning critique of his epistemology and approach to politics.[77] It served as Speier's

final break with his mentor, whose scholarship he had been moving away from for the

better part of a decade.

Speier accused Mannheim of arguing that "the criterion of truth [was] historical

realization," which was a manifestation of "the professional self-hatred of the

intellectuals" who "subordinate thought to action."[78] Although Speier did not elucidate

this specific point, if Mannheim was correct, then National Socialism—which had

undoubtedly been historically realized—represented a truer ideal than liberal or social

democracy. He argued that Mannheim, similar to many German intellectuals, did not

distinguish "the differences between the thinking of philosophers and of men [of action]

who do not think philosophically."[79] In so doing, Mannheim degraded intellectual work

itself and the specific contributions intellectuals, as better thinkers who recognized "the

situation of crisis in which they live," could make to political life.[80] Speier believed

Mannheim counseled a program of intellectual passivity, repeating the mistakes

democrats had made in Weimar. Yet Speier's critique was somewhat incoherent, as he

also subordinated thought to action. He did not wish for intellectuals to sit in universities,

but rather hoped that they used their skills for activist purposes. Thus, Speier critiqued

Larrabee, "Book Review: *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction: Studies in Modern Social Structure* by Karl Mannheim," *Journal of Philosophy* 38, no. 4 (February 13, 1941): 103-107.
[76] Quoted in Kettler and Meja, *Crisis of Liberalism*, 219.
[77] Hans Speier, "Book Review: Karl Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia*," *American Journal of Sociology* 43, no. 1 (July 1937): 155-166.
[78] Ibid., 160.
[79] Ibid., 161.
[80] Hans Speier to Louis Wirth, November 26, 1936, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10.

Mannheim not for valuing action over truth, but for lacking the elitist vision he had of intellectuals' social role.

Speier was nervous about publishing the review. He had already upset Horkheimer and his group, and now he looked to make a decisive break with his former mentor. Speier wrote Wirth to let him know that he "should feel entirely free to return [his review] if you foresee any difficulties with Mannheim."[81] Speier was correct to fear Mannheim's response; when he read the review, Mannheim became very angry and wrote to Wirth that "the next generation is glad to be lifted into the saddle by us, live by our inspiration, and then, for careerist reasons, will know nothing more of it … I can't help thinking of Speier ... in this connection."[82] Speier himself referred to the review as a *Vatermord* (parricide).[83] For him, it was a frightening but necessary intellectual birth wherein he moved decidedly beyond Mannheim's scholarship and fully identified himself as an American sociologist. Although he and Mannheim no longer personally corresponded, Speier never severed fully his intellectual connections with his mentor. For decades, he continued to serve as a major interpreter of Mannheim's thought for U.S. audiences.[84]

---

[81] Hans Speier to Louis Wirth, February 1, 1937, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10.

[82] Quoted in Kettler and Meja, *Crisis of Liberalism*, 220.

[83] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 31, 95. Speier eventually visited Mannheim again in London after the war. According to him, "the old controversy [about his review] seem[ed] forgotten." Hans Speier, London, October 14, 1945, *From the Ashes of Disgrace: A Journal from Germany, 1945-1955* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981), 18.

[84] In popular publications, Speier always made sure to praise Mannheim's work and his pedagogical excellence. In academic contexts, however, he was not as kind, as can be seen in his review of *Ideology and Utopia* as well as a talk he gave at the December 1937 meeting of the American Sociological Society in Atlantic City. At the conference, Speier sat on a panel with Talcott Parsons, Alexander von Schelting—another critic of Mannheim—and Hans Gerth, a fellow Mannheim student and later professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin, to discuss "the relation of ideas to social action." At the panel, Speier served as the "principal opponent to Mannheim." Indeed, when Mannheim heard that Speier was on the panel, he asked Wirth to persuade Parsons to include Gerth, someone who would "be of great help in defending [Mannheim's] point of view." Parsons opened the talk by praising Speier for showing that the

Speier's rejection of Horkheimer and Mannheim centered on their approach to intellectual life, but his responses to their work were reactions, not positive programs. It was not until his watershed essay "The Social Conditions of the Intellectual Exile" that Speier clearly articulated his vision of exile as an opportunity for intellectuals to revaluate deeply held beliefs and embrace ideas relevant to their new American context. The forum in which the essay originally appeared underlines its programmatic nature. It began as a speech for an April 1937 conference to commemorate the University in Exile's fourth anniversary.[85] The New School faculty, members of the Frankfurt School, and American academics including Robert MacIver and Harold Lasswell attended the event.[86] The conference thus offered Speier a propitious opportunity to present publicly his views regarding intellectuals' social role.

Speier began his talk by stating in no uncertain terms that exile presented intellectuals with unimaginable opportunities as well as dangerous pitfalls. "Isolation from culture, estrangement from familiar social relations, means solitude, and solitude may destroy or elate the human being; in it he may find or lose himself; from it he may return wiser or broken."[87] Positively, exile was a moment "when the old standards reveal their dependence on acquiescence and loyalty and the new ones are still strange enough

---

empirical analysis of the role ideas play in social life must take place without the "objectionably metaphysical" prejudgments found in Mannheim's work. Indeed, Parsons claimed that Speier's scholarship was a "prolegomenon" to his own work on "distinguishing normative from existential ideas and the further subdivision of the latter into empirical and nonempirical" categories. For a recap of the debate, see Kettler and Meja, *Crisis of Liberalism*, 219-227. See also Talcott Parsons to Hans Speier, November 29, 1937, Parsons Papers, Box 3, Folder Correspondence: Professional Associations, 1937-1940."

[85] A note on dates: although Speier's review of Mannheim did not appear until July 1937, he wrote it much earlier in the year, before he gave the speech on "The Social Conditions of the Intellectual Exile." See Hans Speier to Louis Wirth, February 1, 1937, Wirth Papers, Box 11, Folder 10.

[86] A pre-circulated copy of Speier's talk may be found in Max Horkheimer's papers. See Archive Center, University Library, Frankfurt a.M., Collection Horkheimer, IX.172 (hereafter referred to as the Horkheimer Archiv).

[87] Hans Speier, "The Social Conditions of the Intellectual Exile," *Social Research* 4, no. 2 (May 1937): 317.

not to exert the absorbing forces of routine and tradition."[88] In exile, intellectuals could

reexamine their values and beliefs and alter them to fit their new contexts, achieving a

greater understanding of both themselves and the world.

Yet exile alone did not guarantee such revaluations. Speier argued that

intellectuals only reconsidered their values when their exile was difficult. When an

intellectual changes "location in a world which is so organized that he remains in the

same social stratum wherever he moves," revaluations were not pursued.[89] The majority

of German exiles in New York with whom Speier was concerned had migrated with

relative effortlessness, often with a cohort of similarly minded colleagues. In such a

stable exile, scholarship often displayed "increasing parochialism of ends and values" as

"the persistence of [old country] political cleavages … and a stubborn adherence to

obsolete political categories" led intellectual exiles to engage in "hectic activities

untouched by any awareness their context has changed."[90] This ease of exile allowed

groups like the Frankfurt School to work in America as if they remained in Germany,

offering the same Marxist theories that had failed to predict the Nazis' rise.

But, Speier concluded, there was hope. The "reality of human freedom" allowed

exiles to determine their own fates; if they chose, they could move beyond their

prejudices to discover knowledge and values that previous commitments obscured.[91]

Exiles willing to "rethink … the most precious truths" could "contribute … to the culture

of [their] new country."[92] Speier thus centered his program of exile on intellectuals'

acculturating to American life and using their knowledge for positive ends. As he would

---

[88] Ibid., 325.
[89] Ibid., 320.
[90] Ibid., 325.
[91] Ibid., 317.
[92] Ibid., 327.

elucidate, the purpose to which exile intellectuals must devote themselves was the defense of democracy.

The New School and Democracy

Speier concluded "The Social Conditions of the Intellectual Exile" with the claim that "the records of intellectual immigrants through history" demonstrated "an affinity between an external detachment from local or historical values and a comprehension of the universality of the spirit."[93] For him, democracy was the political form that best expressed this spirit, and he dedicated himself to its domestic and international defense. Similar to John Dewey and Sidney Hook, Speier adopted a procedural-institutional understanding of democracy that rested upon six criteria. First, the government must be subject to the political will of ordinary people. Second, citizens must respect the normative idea that every person was politically equal.[94] Third, the government must protect freedom of inquiry, thought, speech, and action.[95] Fourth, political problems must be resolved through debate.[96] Fifth, democracies must respect the "intellectual rights of man" by allowing individuals to decide what to think without state interference.[97] Finally, a democratic government would fight for itself when threatened.[98] Ironically, Speier's

---

[93] Ibid.

[94] Speier, "Social Stratification," 256.

[95] Hans Speier, "Treachery in War," *Social Research* 7, no. 3 (September 1940): 261.

[96] Speier, "Social Stratification," 270.

[97] Hans Speier, "On Propaganda," *Social Research* 1, no. 3 (August 1934): 377-379.

[98] Hans Speier, "Freedom and Social Planning," *American Journal of Sociology* 42, no. 4 (January 1937): 465. Several of these views echoed Lederer's, who expressed his vision of democracy in a 1934 essay: "Everyone in a democracy may think as he pleases. Every political creed may be defended. But democracy as a value, as a way of living chosen by a people, implies the exclusion of violence, intolerance, and a willful imposition of blind discipline. Democracy accepted as a value dares to defend itself, to prohibit anything that endangers the free formation of public opinion. Just as the tolerance of science toward the adoption of any evaluation does not mean a passive acquiescence in its own destruction, so the tolerance of democracy toward complete freedom for the development of public opinion does not imply the sanction of movements aiming at the oppression of opinion and thus also of democracy. Formal freedom is a fallacy in itself if through the lack of will, energy and activity it leads to the surrender of freedom." Lederer, "Freedom and Science," 224. Lederer and Speier did disagree, however, on the value of public opinion.

future actions violated a number of these principles. His diagnosis of crisis, which assumed that once totalitarianism was defeated there would no longer be the need to infringe upon democratic rights, provided him with the intellectual justification to do so. What he did not consider, however, was that the logic of crisis was self-reinforcing, and that once liberties were ignored it was difficult to return to their enforcement.

Speier's earlier rejection of socialism led him to validate the American form of capitalist democracy. He maintained that democracy did not imply socioeconomic equality, but only an "equality of *political* rights."[99] Indeed, Speier declared that capitalism served as a bulwark against militarism, the ideology that had infiltrated Germany, because capitalist governments "find it particularly difficult to embark upon large-scale armament policies … because the resistance and opposition of capitalistic classes against public spending" was high.[100] Speier maintained that capitalist systems were most conducive to freedom and progress. Unlike other societies, they exercised social control through wealth, which, for all its problems, was a more objective way of doing so than relying on "precapitalistic, preliberal, and military" values such as honor.[101] His work reflected that of a typical New Deal liberal who was willing to reform capitalist democracy to save, not transcend, it.

Speier identified the major domestic threat to capitalist democracy to be ordinary people's discontent with their economic position. As such, he maintained that the U.S. government needed to adopt some socialist methods, namely central planning, to redistribute wealth. Doing so would improve the "life of a negatively privileged majority

---

[99] Speier, "Social Stratification," 258

[100] Hans Speier, "Class Structure and 'Total War.'" *American Sociological Review* 4, no. 3 (June 1939): 375.

[101] Speier, "Freedom and Social Planning," 482.

which is exposed to great economic insecurity, comparative lack of comfort, and a certain amount of social discrimination."[102] He did not advocate this position for any specific ideological purpose, but only to mollify ordinary people. Speier believed that without social democratic measures, "partisan violence" that "endangers political stability" could emerge and threaten "to destroy the life of democracy."[103] He framed central planning as a necessary protective measure against the emergence of an anti-democratic political movement, not a moral corrective to the iniquities of capitalism.

In discussing potential economic programs, Speier carved out a special space for intellectuals as government advisers, an idea which became central to his political vision. The success of every plan, he declared, rested upon the "intellectual labor … of reason and logic."[104] It was not enough to have a "pragmatic attitude" toward work; "intelligent social action" required that one "know all there is to know before a decision can be made as to what should be done."[105] But being cognizant of facts was not enough. The government required a "theory of social planning" premised upon "a political intelligence which transcends the confines of the momentous situation" and analyzes planning in its totality.[106] Intellectuals were the only ones able to supply such intelligence, and, Speier implied, they must do so as government advisers. As he said elsewhere, "the primary task of the social scientist [is] to give advice to the statesmen."[107] With intellectual aid, U.S. decision-makers could solve the major social problems presented by the depression and avert an anti-democratic movement from finding a broad base of support.

---

[102] Ibid., 474.
[103] Speier, "Social Stratification," 259-260.
[104] Speier, "Freedom and Social Planning," 476.
[105] Ibid., 465.
[106] Ibid., 464, 483.
[107] Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler, "Introduction," in *War in Our Time*, ed. Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1939), 14.

Speier's New School colleagues also focused their energies on examining how intellectuals could contribute to democracy's defense.[108] Lederer stood closest to Speier's perspective. He attacked the "bloodless intellectualist" who claimed that "all values are scientifically of the same importance" for ignoring that "values are not merely a matter to talk about at tea time, but the very substance of our life."[109] Moreover, deciding to become an intellectual "necessarily implies that one believes in the importance of science

---

[108] In their first years in exile, the Graduate Faculty's scholarship fell into four broad categories: economic, legal, political, and work addressed to discussing intellectuals' social role. Economists dominated the New School during its early years. Johnson and Lederer were themselves economists and, at least initially, tended to recruit more economists than scholars from other disciplines. The New School economists addressed a diversity of topics in their first four years, including: the role of the state in the economy (Lederer, "Social Control versus Economic Law"); the dependence of economic theory on social reality, the compatibility of democracy and socialism, and the need for a planned economy (Eduard Heimann, "Sociological Perceptions of Economic Theory," *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 23-44; Heimann, "Socialism and Democracy"; Eduard Heimann, "Planning and the Market System," *Social Research* 1, no. 4 (November 1934): 486-504; Eduard Heimann, "Types and Potentialities of Economic Planning," *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 176-194); industrial panic (Karl Brandt, "Toward a Panic-Proof Industrial Structure," *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 45-60); monetary policy and foreign economic action (Arthur Feiler, "The Pressure for Monetary Depreciation" and Feiler, "Will Germany Devaluate?"); economic recovery, the tax structure, and unemployment relief (Colm, "Papen Plan"; Gerhard Colm, "Methods of Financing Unemployment Compensation," *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 148-167; and Gerhard Colm and Fritz Lehmann, "Public Spending and Recovery in the United States," *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 129-165); the long-term effects of unemployment on society, women's work, the socialist organization of work, and health insurance (Wunderlich, "New Aspects"; Frieda Wunderlich, "Women's Work in Germany"; Wunderlich, "Some Aspects"; and Frieda Wunderlich, "Health Insurance," *Social Research* 4, no. 4 (November 1937): 509-514); agricultural prices and American agricultural policy (Karl Brandt, "Farm Relief in Germany," *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 185-198; Karl Brandt, "The Employment Capacity of Agriculture," *Social Research* 2, no. 1 (February 1935): 1-19; Karl Brandt, "Recent Agrarian Policies in Germany, Great Britain, and the United States," *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 167-201; and Karl Brandt, "Farm Tenancy in the United States," *Social Research* 4, no. 2 (May 1937): 133-156); world trade (Arthur Feiler, "America in World Trade," *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 248-250); public utilities (Hans Staudinger, "Modern Tendencies in Public Utilities," *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 263-286); Hans Staudinger, "Social Rates in Electricity," *Social Research* 3, no. 3 (August 1936): 259-281; and Hans Staudinger, "Planning in Electricity," *Social Research* 4, no. 4 (November 1937): 417-439); the financing of small businesses (Fritz Lehmann, "The Problem of Financing Small and Intermediate Industries," *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 287-309); and general economic theory (Hans Neisser, "Monetary Expansion and the Structure of Production," *Social Research* 1, no. 4 (November 1934): 434-457; Lederer, "Problem of Development"; Emil Lederer, "On Imperfect Competition," *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 222-229; Fritz Lehmann, "New Literature on Money, Credit, and Banking, 1933-1935," *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 230-238; Alfred Kähler, "The Problem of Verifying the Theory of Technological Unemployment," *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 439-460; Emil Lederer, "Comment on Keynes, II"; Fritz Lehmann, "100% Money," *Social Research* 3, no. 1 (February 1936): 37-56; Fritz Lehmann, "Rejoinder," *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 241-244; Hans Neisser, "Commentary on Keynes," *Social Research* 3, no. 4 (November 1936): 459-478; and Alfred Kähler, "Scarcity and Abundance of Capital as Cause of Crisis," *Social Research* 4, no. 1 (February 1937): 74-90).

[109] Lederer, "Freedom and Science," 222.

and stands for the maintenance and preservation of its conditions."[110] It was therefore

ridiculous for intellectuals, dedicated as they were to science, to declare hypocritically

that they considered every value of equal relative worth. Science, premised as it was on

free and honest inquiry, was impossible without democracy, which as a political system

"implies the exclusion of violence, intolerance, and a wilful [sic] imposition of blind

discipline."[111] Totalitarian states, by contrast, encouraged a strict adherence to an official

philosophy against which nothing, not even science, could speak out. Because free

inquiry was impossible without free minds, Lederer argued that intellectuals must work

to destroy "movements aiming at the oppression of opinion and thus also of

democracy."[112]

Lederer maintained that the only way intellectuals could contribute to the defense

of democracy and science was to become men of action, "uniting and giving strength to

all those who believe in the spirit and are determined to uphold its liberty."[113] In times of

crisis like the present one, "ideas are powerless unless they lead to action, action to

defend the past and prepare the future."[114] Lederer did not specifically offer suggestions

regarding how intellectuals should become men of action, although he declared that

without science the "complicated procedures of government and administration" could

not be performed.[115] Given his own history as a consultant to the SPD, though, it is likely

that he looked favorably upon intellectual participation in government affairs.

---

[110] Ibid., 224-225.
[111] Ibid., 224.
[112] Ibid.
[113] Emil Lederer, "The Search for Truth," *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 278.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Lederer, "Freedom and Science," 222-223, 227-228.

Other New School scholars agreed that intellectuals had a special social purpose centered upon the defense of democracy. Max Ascoli argued that Americans needed to use the methods of legal sociology, legal science, and legal philosophy to understand how to firmly entrench legal institutions.[116] Without established legal institutions, society risked falling into the "primeval world of sheer violence."[117] Elsewhere, he worried that "political passion" organized in political parties helped "overheat the political atmosphere," which, "as the European experience proves," was the "simplest way of destroying democratic institutions."[118] To prevent against the emotional dominance of political life, intellectuals needed to temper the political atmosphere with "the extreme realism of factual analysis" and approach political parties, "the Achilles' heel of democracy," "with the most realistic, responsible thinking."[119] At the same time, intellectuals must be careful not to be "too clever, too Machiavellian, accepting whatever means is offered us to reach our goals."[120] Ascoli thus counseled a program of tempered intellectual engagement, making clear that in the process of becoming active, intellectuals must not abandon the commitments they worked to protect.

In a short essay on cultural interdependence, Albert Salomon highlighted the historical role exile intellectuals played in democracy's creation. He argued that "the interaction of Greek immigrant intellectuals and Roman noblemen" during an "epoc[h] of

---

[116] Ascoli, "Realism," 172-173, 176-177. Other faculty members addressed various legal topics, including: the role of the constitution in Weimar democracy's downfall and how to create legal structures that defended democracy (Arnold Brecht, "Constitutions and Leadership," *Social Research* 1, no. 3 (August 1934): 265-286); international law and collective security (Simons, "Some European Aspects" and Simons, "Collective Security"); and comparisons of German and American law written with the intent of improving American law (Rudolf Littauer, "Case Law and Systematic Law: Descriptive Comparison of American and German Legal Thinking," *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 481-502).

[117] Ascoli, "Realism," 183.

[118] Max Ascoli, "On Political Parties," *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 206.

[119] Ibid., 208.

[120] Max Ascoli, "Education in Fascist Italy," *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 347.

crisis" created humanism, which fostered the control of "the emotional and impulsive life by reason."[121] On the political level, humanism allowed "the statesman to gain from philosophy a spiritual and intellectual power which enables him to suffer the adversities of political and social life with calmness of soul … [and encourages him] to preserve freedom, dignity, and self-respect," i.e., democracy.[122] Salomon attributed humanism's emergence primarily to "open-minded" "Greek intellectuals … able to understand the greatness and achievement of the Roman republic." Although he did not explicitly analogize his own situation with that of antiquity, the implication was clear; German exile intellectuals should learn from the Greek and Roman example. They must take advantage of their own period of crisis, participate in American society and politics without prejudice, and develop ideas that promoted liberty and were relevant to policymakers.

Gerhard Colm emphasized the inherent responsibilities of democratic intellectuals. He declared that, because "human action" shaped trends of "social development," social science had a "social responsibility" to "fully realize the task it has to fulfill in a specific historical situation."[123] He identified the major problems of the era to be ending the depression and protecting against totalitarianism. Certain ideologies, namely communism and fascism, considered the present economic order "entirely disintegrated" and sought to "blaz[e] a trail to a new social organization."[124] Similar to Speier and other New Deal liberals, Colm argued that these ideologies threatened "the humanitarian achievements of the liberal age" which were historically defended by

---

[121] Albert Salomon, "II," *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 333.
[122] Ibid., 333-334.
[123] Gerhard Colm, "Economics Today," *Social Research* 4, no. 2 (May 1937): 195-196.
[124] Ibid., 198.

capitalist democracies.[125] To save democracy, Colm concluded, intellectuals needed to use social science to pave "a 'middle course' [between laissez faire and central planning] of reconstruction within the traditional social pattern."[126]

Heimann stressed the important role intellectuals played as educators of the mass public. He maintained that in the 1920s, "democratic educators" allowed "totalitarian systems of education [to] offer an answer to questions on which democratic education is silent, questions concerning a concrete tangible aim of education, for a concrete purpose in life."[127] Anticipating later arguments about how democrats should use totalitarian means to defeat their enemies, Heimann declared that the only way to imbue students with a commitment to "truth and justice" was to recognize that one cannot "stamp out" anything that is "potentially fascist or communist," as many totalitarian appeals "flatte[r] genuine features and needs of human life."[128] Therefore, the "way to fight [totalitarianism] is not to fight genuine and permanent forces of life but to respect and satisfy them and thereby prevent them from turning fascist or communist."[129] To do so, intellectuals must take "the claims of natural and economic life and … assign them to their proper place in a comprehensive and diversified structure."[130] Better indoctrination, Heimann concluded, was the basis to democracy's survival and resurgence.

Adolf Löwe similarly maintained that intellectuals needed to contribute to liberalism's revitalization through education. As he said, "the paramount fact in modern Europe [was] the progressive decay" of the material and ideological conditions from

---

[125] Ibid., 198-199.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Eduard Heimann, "I," *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 398.
[128] Ibid., 399-400.
[129] Ibid., 400.
[130] Ibid.

which "cultural liberalism" arose.[131] Presently, "democracy [stood] in a defensive against the advance of the totalitarian crusade."[132] Löwe attributed totalitarianism's successes to the fact that "humanistic doctrine" and "liberal maxims" "no longer produce benefit for all," and have instead "become instruments of power and exploitation rather than of equalization and mutual understanding."[133] The "*humanistic* solution" to this problem was to establish "a social order" that satisfied "the social and spiritual demands" to which totalitarianism responded.[134] Democratic intellectuals must therefore "surpass [their totalitarian opponents] in rational capacity and constructive imagination," using education to create "zealots for the gospel of social justice."[135]

Although they referred to different causes for the collapse of democracy and prescribed different roles for intellectuals, many members of the Graduate Faculty placed intellectuals at the center of the battle between democracy and totalitarianism. Speier, Lederer, and their colleagues refused to repeat the failures of Weimar. They declared that all exile intellectuals, regardless of discipline, must participate actively in the social, political, and intellectual life of their adopted country. Whether by becoming part of state agencies, as Speier implied, by developing theoretical work with practical uses in mind, as Lederer argued, or by invigorating liberalism, as Löwe maintained, the New School faculty believed intellectuals to be front line soldiers in the struggle for democracy.

Conclusion

In the 1930s, Speier formed a new intellectual identity. He continued to focus on his old German interest in intellectuals' social role, but transformed it in light of his

---

[131] Löwe, "Democratic Education," 388.
[132] Ibid., 382.
[133] Ibid., 389.
[134] Ibid., 390.
[135] Ibid., 390-391.

experiences in exile. He concluded that intellectuals needed to indoctrinate the public with the correct ideology and contribute to the defense of democracy by reorienting their scholarship to make it relevant to decision-makers or to become government advisers themselves. The warm welcome Speier received from U.S. sociologists, who accepted him as one of their own, encouraged him to promote this activist social science, which anticipated the type of research he produced and administered during the Cold War. In the process of promoting useful social science, Speier rejected émigré intellectuals who clung to what he considered to be dogmatic ideologies and research methods that not only failed in Weimar, but also were inappropriate to the U.S. context. For Speier, exile was a moment of opportunity, not a time to continue what he considered to be irrelevant intellectual fights, most of which related to the defense of a particular ideology. The era of crisis within which the exiles lived, he argued, necessitated a supraideological commitment to democracy.

Yet for most of the 1930s, Speier confined himself to academic scholarship. He developed a program of social science for democracy, but did little to affect the nonacademic world. However, in the late 1930s and early 1940s, Speier became interested in an issue of significant concern to U.S. decision-makers: psychological warfare. He received funding from the Rockefeller Foundation to initiate a research project that examined Nazi propaganda, the purpose of which was to develop a typology of analysis that would contribute to the creation of prophylactics against Nazi disinformation campaigns while providing a guide for the production of U.S. propaganda. Speier's work for this project made him a national authority on Nazi psychological warfare and enabled his entry into government service. By joining the government, he

realized the ideal of the politically engaged and relevant intellectual that he had championed throughout the 1930s.

Speier's argument that intellectuals' major purpose was to use their knowledge for, or serve in, the government, was the second step on the intellectual path that ended in his removal of ordinary people from democratic theory. Although in the 1930s he did not yet reject the public's role in a democratic society, the politics he promoted implied that, ultimately, it was very difficult if not impossible to educate citizens to support the republican cause. Ordinary people, he indicated, could not be reasoned with, only managed. But Speier never elucidated an educational vision that demonstrated he had genuinely considered how best to convince the public that his mission was just. The Weimar experience had crushed any elements of optimistic idealism in his thought, which had been replaced by a pessimistic realism that considered all programs of public enlightenment quixotic. The trauma of Weimar, coupled with Hitler's consolidation of power throughout the 1930s and ordinary Germans' and Americans' reluctance to combat these gains, led Speier to argue that it was necessary, as well as quicker and easier, to manipulate ordinary people or remove them from the political process. His deep contempt for the public led him to counsel a politics of expediency.

Speier's politics highlights a profound tension related to democratic intellectuals' engagement in political affairs. At base, the premise of such participation is that, by virtue of their knowledge and unique skill sets, intellectuals are able to make better decisions than ordinary people. Nonetheless, the norms and institutions of democratic society assume that ordinary people are the central arbiters of policy. For Speier, these tensions came to a head in the 1930s, when he found that democracy was under attack

from a relentless totalitarian threat about which the transatlantic public did not seem particularly concerned. Speier therefore determined that to protect democracy he needed to create new norms, projects, and institutions that manipulated or elided the public. Speier overcame the tension between public and intellectual involvement in politics by removing the former from his conception of democratic society.

Due to these premises, Speier focused on creating a German intellectual cohort dedicated to using their knowledge for purposes he deemed productive, and criticized those who embraced a different approach to exile. With this attitude, he displayed a stark lack of empathy for individuals who may have had a more difficult experience of exile than he did. For a number of reasons—his youth, his personal constitution, and his acceptance by U.S. sociologists—Speier's immigration proceeded smoothly. Yet this was not true for all of his colleagues, many of whom had not discarded their attachments to German culture. His lack of sympathy for his German cohort was reflected in his attitude toward the members of the Institute for Social Research. Speier never considered what it must have been like for the Frankfurt School, a group of committed Marxists, some of whom were older than him, to move to a country that had no strong Marxist tradition and lacked a relevant socialist political party.

Moreover, the conception of democracy Speier embraced, the ideal to which he dedicated his life, was quite limited in vision. His procedural understanding of democracy excluded conceptions of economic, racial, and gender equality that later proved crucial to making American society, and indeed American democracy, more just. Speier's narrow definition, inspired by his diagnosis of crisis, allowed him to claim simply that the United States was democratic because every citizen was equal in theory, if not practice. This

perspective may have made sense when one compared the United States to Nazi Germany, where entire classes of people were excluded from the national political community, but from a normative standpoint it represented a politics of despair. His historical experience pushed Speier to the sad conclusion that in desperate times, when the idea of republicanism was itself under threat, one could not expect democracy to be composed of more than its procedures and institutions.

But there is something to admire in the way Speier approached his exile. Instead of succumbing to hopelessness, he committed himself to what he considered to be the most important political task of his day: the defense of the west and its highest values. In hindsight, it is difficult to deny that Speier was correct in arguing that, in Nazism at least, liberal democratic states confronted an existential threat. Speier was correct to see in Hitler and the Nazis a vicious menace that would not only reshape Europe along racialized lines, but would also kill tens of millions of people in anonymous fields, concentration camps, and cruel battles. He recognized earlier than most the nefarious nature of the Nazi regime. If he overestimated the likelihood of fascism's triumph in the United States and too easily endorsed anti-democratic behavior, it was because he had already witnessed Hitler achieve the supposedly impossible. In many ways, Speier was a victim of the extreme times through which he lived.

Chapter Three: The Prospects and Problems of Government Service

Speier's research on psychological warfare was the capital with which he

purchased entry into the community of government decision-makers. In 1940, he became

co-director of the Research Project on Totalitarian Communication, one of the nation's

major research programs on National Socialist propaganda. Propaganda, which differs

from normal political communication in that it disavows interactive political exchange

and has as its explicit purpose the manipulation of people's behavior and opinions, had

been of interest to intellectuals since the end of World War I. Speier himself became

fascinated with it in the early 1930s, when he noticed its ability to convince ordinary

Germans to support Hitler.[1] Although he initially opposed propaganda on moral grounds,

by America's entry into World War II Speier endorsed its use, hoping to transform a tool

of fascist oppression into one for democracy's defense. In desperate times, he argued,

democrats needed to use totalitarian methods to defeat their enemy.

After Pearl Harbor, Speier sent his research to the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence

Service (FBIS), the civilian agency in charge of U.S. propaganda analysis. Impressed

with Speier's work, FBIS officials offered him a position as director of its Central

European Section. Speier worked for the FBIS until 1944, when, under the pressure of

enemies of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal, Congress eviscerated the

agency. Having earned a stellar reputation amongst propagandists throughout the wartime

establishment, Speier found it easy to transfer to the Office of War Information (OWI),

---

[1] Some general works on Nazi propaganda include, but are not limited to, David Welch, *Nazi Propaganda: The Power and the Limitations* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1983); David Welch, *The Third Reich: Politics and Propaganda* (London: Routledge, 2002); David Welch, "Nazi Propaganda and the Volksgemeinschaft: Constructing a People's Community," *Journal of Contemporary History* 39, no. 2 (April 2004): 213-238; Alan E. Steinweis, "The Trials of Herschel Grynszpan: Anti-Jewish Policy and German Propaganda, 1938-1942," *German Studies Review* 31, no. 3 (October 2008): 471-488; and Jeffrey Herf, *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda during World War II and the Holocaust* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

where he was placed in charge of developing and managing all post-invasion U.S. propaganda directed at Germany. At war's end, a chance encounter with William Benton, the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, led Speier to accept a position as Deputy (and later Acting) Chief of the State Department's Division for Occupied Areas (ADO), which made him responsible for creating and implementing State's reeducation and information policies in the American zone of German occupation.[2]

Speier's entrance into the government enabled him to use knowledge in power's service and realize his program of activist intellectual engagement. But, as with his earlier vision of Germany's working classes, he found that the reality of government work did not measure up to his dreams. Speier's wartime experiences, which he believed were characterized by bureaucratic inertia and internecine battles, engendered a hatred of the inefficiencies, infighting, and interdepartmental politics of government. Despite being offered positions on the State Department's Policy Planning Staff and in the Office of Military Government, Speier returned to the New School in 1947. Speier's entrancement and subsequent disillusionment with government service was paradigmatic for the generation of academics who entered state service during the war. However, Speier, and many in his cohort of "defense intellectuals," never lost the taste for power and influence they enjoyed in state service. Unhappy with their return to academia, in the late 1940s intellectuals united with government and military officials to institutionalize a foreign policy research establishment that reproduced the World War II alliance between knowledge and power on a permanent basis.

---

[2] Although there is no stated reason why the State Department referred to the Division for Occupied Areas as the ADO, it is likely because the natural acronym—DOA—would not have been appropriate, or good for morale.

Speier and Propaganda, 1934-1941

Speier's first writings on propaganda intervened in the debate between Walter

Lippmann and John Dewey that had dominated American liberal circles since the end of

World War I.[3] After America's victory, government-mandated commissions determined

that British propaganda was instrumental in engendering America's entry into the war.[4]

In response, American intellectuals analyzed the important role propaganda played in

modern society.[5] Liberals were especially concerned with the political implications of

propaganda's rise and spread. If propaganda was as effective as most believed,

---

[3] The term psychological warfare was popularized in America in the early 1940s. It was a translation of the German *Weltanschauungskrieg* ("worldview war") or *geistiger Krieg* (mental war). See Bruce Lannes Smith, "Bibliography." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 4, no. 3 (September 1940): 562; Henry William Spiegel, "Wehrwirtschaft: Economics of the Military State," *American Economic Review* 30, no. 4 (December 1940): 714-715; and Ladislas Farago, ed., *German Psychological Warfare* (New York: Putnam, 1941).

[4] There is an enormous amount of literature on propaganda's history and World War I-era propaganda and psychological warfare. Works upon which I have relied include Alice Marquis, "Words as Weapons: Propaganda in Britain and Germany during the First World War," *Journal of Contemporary History* 13, no. 3 (July 1978): 467-498; Philip M. Taylor, "The Foreign Office and British Propaganda during the First World War," *The Historical Journal* 23, no. 4 (December 1980): 875-898; Michael Sanders and Philip M. Taylor, *British Propaganda during the First World War, 1914-1918* (London: Macmillan, 1982); Nicholas Reeves, *Official British Film Propaganda during the First World War* (London: Routledge, 1986); John D. Halliday, "Censorship in Berlin and Vienna during the First World War: A Comparative View," *The Modern Language Review* 83, no. 3 (July 1988): 612-626; Gary S. Messinger, *British Propaganda and the State in the First World War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993); Eberhard Demm, "Propaganda and Caricature in the First World War," *Journal of Contemporary History* 28, no. 1 (January 1993): 163-192; Cate Haste, "The Machinery of Propaganda," in *Propaganda*, ed. Robert Jackall (New York: New York University Press, 1995): 105-136; Robert Jackall and Janice M. Hirota, "America's First Propaganda Ministry: The Committee on Public Information during the Great War," in *Propaganda*, ed. Robert Jackall (New York: New York University Press, 1995): 137-173; J. Michael Sproule, *Propaganda and Democracy: The American Experience of Media and Mass Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Nicoletta F. Gullace, "Sexual Violence and Family Honor: British Propaganda and International Law during the First World War," *American Historical Review* 102, no. 3 (June 1997): 741-747; Luke McKernan, "Propaganda, Patriotism, and Profit: Charles Urban and British Official War Films in America during the First World War," *Film History* 13, nos. 3-4 (2002): 369-389; Nicholas Martin, "'Fighting a Philosophy': The Figure of Nietzsche in British Propaganda of the First World War," *Modern Language Review* 98, no. 2 (April 2003): 367-380; Philip M. Taylor, *Munitions of the Mind: A History of Propaganda from the Ancient World to the Present Era* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003); David Bell, *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2007); and Peter Paret, "Book Review: David A Bell's *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It*," *American Historical Review* 112, no. 5 (December 2007): 1489-1491.

[5] Over fifteen hundred articles were produced on the subject by 1935. See Harold Lasswell, Ralph Casey, and Bruce Lannes Smith, eds. *Propaganda and Promotional Activities: An Annotated Bibliography* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1935).

democratic theory, premised as it was upon a public able to make informed decisions about political affairs, faced a serious challenge. In the interwar years, debates about propaganda's effect on democracy became the major site for liberals to discuss the relationship between intellectuals, experts, and a mass, enfranchised public.[6]

On one side of these debates were democratic realists, whose outstanding representative was the journalist Walter Lippmann. Lippmann and those who supported him maintained that a rational public must be removed from the center of democratic theory. Instead of the public, Lippmann hoped to place experts, trained in a specific field or discipline and willing to manipulate the public for the purpose of achieving democratic ends, at the center of the political process. Standing apart from Lippmann was a group of optimistic democrats, at the heart of which stood John Dewey. Contra Lippmann, Dewey argued that democracy could not exist without an active public. In the 1920s, the debate between Lippmann and Dewey permeated liberal intellectual circles.

Lippmann presented his political vision in two books, *Public Opinion* and *The Phantom Public*.[7] In these works, he declared that democratic theory assumed the existence of "omnicompetent" citizens able to retain "a knowledge of the world beyond their reach," which allowed them to direct public affairs.[8] In truth, however, modern societies were too complex for any individual to have knowledge of more than a few issue areas. Moreover, technology led social life to be dominated by "pseudo-environments," "representation[s] of the environment which [are] in lesser or greater

---

[6] Brett Gary, *The Nervous Liberals: Propaganda Anxieties from World War I to the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 18-53.
[7] Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Company, 1922) and Walter Lippmann, *The Phantom Public* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publichers, 1993 [1925]).
[8] Lippmann, *Public Opinion*, 31, 273, 284, 362, 364.

degree made by man himself."[9] Because modern information was mediated and manipulated, democratic citizens did not have direct access to reality. For these reasons, Lippmann declared, public opinion could not serve as the guide for political decisions.

Because the public could not be the basis of democracy, Lippmann promoted the creation of "independent, expert organization[s]" composed of scientifically trained intellectuals responsible for "making the unseen facts intelligible to those who have to make the decisions," i.e., policymakers.[10] Such expert organizations would enable decision-makers to have the knowledge necessary to take wise actions in a complex world. By the time he wrote *The Phantom Public* in 1925, however, Lippmann was disillusioned with expertise and altered the distinction between experts and the public to that between insiders and outsiders, where the former had direct knowledge of an issue. In either case, Lippmann still considered ordinary people unable to offer political guidance, and the normative problem of the public remained. Theoretically, at least, in a democracy the public determined political affairs. To overcome this obstacle, Lippmann declared that elites should use propaganda to "manufacture consent" amongst ordinary people.[11] His analysis of modern life convinced him that "knowledge needed for the management of human affairs" did not arise "spontaneously from the human heart," and that society required a democratic elite.[12] It was the unfortunate truth that the "problems that vex democracy seem to be unmanageable by democratic methods."[13]

---

[9] Ibid., 15, 20, 27, .
[10] Ibid., 31, .
[11] Ibid., 248.
[12] Political scientists, Lippmann maintained, must recognize this and work to create his proffered organization of experts. Ibid., 249.
[13] Lippmann, *The Phantom Public*, 179-180.

The anti-democratic nature of Lippmann's schema provoked outcries among fellow progressives, particularly Dewey, who responded directly to Lippmann in two book reviews published in *The New Republic* and a full-length work, *The Public and Its Problems*.[14] Dewey admitted that the democratic public was "volatile," but nevertheless asserted that if one improved the public's "methods and conditions of debate, discussion, and persuasion," ordinary people could assert themselves as informed guides of political affairs.[15] Dewey recognized that the complex modern world required "expert intellectuals," but also believed experts were as subject to manipulation as ordinary people and could not be trusted to make objective decisions.[16] Without an "articulate voice on the part of the masses," an "intellectual aristocracy" would transform democracy into oligarchy.[17] Liberalism's goal must be to educate the public, not reject it. Dewey concluded that to deny the possibility of a rational public was to deny democracy as a viable political form.

Lippmann and Dewey provided the touchstones for liberal debates about the relationship between propaganda, expertise, the public, and democracy in the 1920s and 1930s. Speier first aligned himself with Dewey against Lippmann, before switching, in the late 1930s, to Lippmann's perspective. Two factors led Speier to reject Dewey. First, the continuing triumphs of National Socialism compelled him to abandon his commitment to the idea that reason could triumph over emotion. Second, he developed an understanding of total war that emphasized the necessity of retaining domestic morale,

---

[14] John Dewey, "Public Opinion," *The New Republic* 30, no. 387 (May 3, 1922): 286-288; John Dewey, "Practical Democracy," *The New Republic* 45, no. 574 (December 2, 1925): 52-54; and John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (New York: Holt, 1927).
[15] Dewey, "Practical Democracy," 52 and Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems*, 168-169.
[16] Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems*, 205.
[17] Ibid., 204, 206.

which compelled him to embrace propaganda as a necessary evil in the struggle against fascism.[18]

Speier initially focused on domestic propaganda, asking whether it was morally acceptable for elites to use propaganda to manipulate the public to accept a given policy position. In 1934, he maintained it was not. Speier had just emigrated from Nazi Germany and associated propaganda with fascism; he could not yet countenance its use in good conscience. Indeed, Speier distinguished between autocracy and democracy with reference to propaganda:

> The fascist propagandists proclaim that which is a private vice in democracy to be the fundamental virtue of the state. They not only reduce reason to silence but also deny its right to existence, to which history testifies. They create myths, convert fictitious forces into real ones, and cultivate the taste of the crowd for illogical action instead of restraining it. They necessarily lower the intellectual level of the people.[19]

To support propaganda was to deny the "intellectual rights of man."[20] Even though public opinion was "not always so reasonable as it appeared in the original conception," all "those who respect man" will attempt to improve it through "educational, journalistic, or

---

[18] Intellectual historians have traced the modern notion of "total war" to interwar Germany. Abbott Gleason, *Totalitarianism: The Inner History of the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 25-28. Speier was particularly influenced by Ernst Jünger's 1930 pamphlet, *Die totale Mobilmachung* (Total Mobilization). Historians have demonstrated how Jünger influenced the political right, but have not focused on how he influenced the left, or people such as Speier. Ernst Jünger, *Die totale Mobilmachung* (Berlin: Verlag für Zeitkritik, 1931). Within the Marxist tradition to which Speier initially belonged, there was a history of focusing on totality that reached fruition in the twentieth century. See Martin Jay, *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986). Already in the 1930s, Lawrence Dennis, in *The Coming American Fascism*, argued that America must adopt totalitarian methods to survive in a hostile international environment. Gleason, *Totalitarianism*, 52-53. Also see Lawrence Dennis, *The Coming American Fascism* (New York: Harper, 1936). Raymond Aron and Elie Halévy were also concerned that to win the war against fascism the west would have to adopt totalitarian methods, which could themselves lead to tyranny. See Élie Halévy, *L'Ére des tyrannies* (Paris: Gallimard, 1938), Raymond Aron, "L'Ére des tyrannies d'Élie Halévy," *Revue du métaphysique et de morale* 46, no. 2 (April 1939): 283-307; and Raymond Aron, "États démocratiques et états totalitaires. Communication présentée devant la Société francaise de philosophie, le 17 juin 1939," in *Raymond Aron: penser la liberté, penser la démocratie*, ed. Nicolas Baverez (Prais: Gallimard, 2005).
[19] Hans Speier, "On Propaganda," *Social Research* 1, no. 3 (August 1934), 378.
[20] This term referred to both the French 1789 *Déclaration des droits de l'Homme et du Citoyen* and Thomas Paine's 1791 *Rights of Man*. Ibid., 377.

political" means.[21] Only "those who hold man's reason cheap"—fascists particularly, but also pseudo-liberals like Lippmann—used propaganda to deny an individual "the opportunity and … courage" to use his mind.[22] In 1934, so soon after leaving Germany, there was no intellectual space for Speier to endorse "pro-democratic" propaganda.

However, between 1934 and 1938, when Speier returned to the subject, his opinion reversed. He now embraced the utility of domestic propaganda in moments of international crisis, and declared in no uncertain terms that "the belief that the unfortunate inclination to fall for [the work of charlatans, i.e., propaganda] can be destroyed by means of enlightened reason" was empirically false.[23] Most people did not have the intellectual capacity to adjudicate between different ideas, a fact that no amount of public enlightenment could alter. The only people capable of defending against propaganda were "realists," for example intellectuals like Speier, whose knowledge of "the relation between the rational and the irrational in life" made them "'immune'" to propaganda's charms.[24]

Historical events engendered this stark shift in Speier's thought. In 1934, he could still hope that Hitler would fail; by 1938, it was clear Hitler's triumph would last. Whereas Speier had earlier condemned the working classes for their political naïveté, Hitler's continued successes led him to believe that ordinary people from all social classes were easily manipulated. The Germans displayed little opposition to the dismissal

---

[21] Ibid., 376.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Hans Speier, "Book Review: de Francesco, Grete. *Die Macht des Charlatans*," *Social Research* 5, no. 1 (February 1938), 111. Speier took a similarly skeptical view of the public's ability to navigate propaganda in a review of Bruno Lasker and Agnes Romand's *Propaganda from China and Japan*. Hans Speier, "Book Review: Lasker, Bruno and Ages Roman. *Propaganda from China and Japan*," *Pacific Affairs* 11, no. 3 (September 1938): 407-408. See also: Hans Speier, "The Social Determination of Ideas," *Social Research* 5, no. 2 (May 1938): 408.
[24] Speier, "Book Review: de Francesco, Grete," 112.

of political and racial undesirables from academic positions and offered no outcry over the draconian Nuremberg Laws and other Nazi crimes against democracy. Speier thus concluded that the public "create[d] the atmosphere in which trickeries prosper" and served as "efficient agents of [dictators'] propaganda."[25] The German case demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that ordinary people retained within them the capacity to be convinced that "'a certain mode of life is very wholesome … even if this does not prove to be the case.'"[26] Reason could not, indeed did not, serve as a prophylactic against totalitarianism.

Speier's studies of militarism further mitigated his reluctance to endorse propaganda, which he began to consider a utilitarian necessity.[27] He argued that because in modern war "workers must produce the equipment without which the soldiers cannot fight," governments needed to use propaganda "to produce a state of popular morale which enables people in modern industrial society to endure the hardships of total war."[28]

---

[25] Ibid., 110.

[26] Ibid., 111.

[27] His essays on militarism were intended to become a book, although they never appeared as such. Speier eventually published intended chapters as individual essays. These were Hans Speier, "Militarism in the Eighteenth Century," *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 304-336; Hans Speier, "Class Structure and 'Total War,'" *American Sociological Review* 4, no. 3 (June 1939): 370-380; Hans Speier, "Treachery in War," *Social Research* 7, no. 3 (September 1940): 258-279; Hans Speier, "The Social Types of War," *American Journal of Sociology* 46, no. 4 (January 1941): 445-454; and Hans Speier, "The Effect of War on the Social Order," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 218 (November 1941): 87-96. Harold Lasswell asked Speier if he would be interested in publishing his proposed book on militarism in a series Lasswell edited with Melchior Palyi titled "The Library of Political Realities." See Harold Lasswell to Hans Speier, June 21, 1938, Speier Papers, Box 5, Folder 65. Speier also began teaching classes on the sociology of war, helping inaugurate a field that would reach fruition during the early Cold War, most famously with Morris Janowitz's 1960 *The Professional Soldier* (which Speier reviewed for the *American Sociological Review*). See Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1960). Speier's interest in militarism was almost certainly inspired by Lederer, who wrote a famous 1915 essay on the subject. See Emil Lederer, "Zur Soziologie des Weltkrieges," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 39 (1915): 347-384.

[28] Speier, "The Effect of War on the Social Order," 89-90 and Hans Speier, "Ludendorff: The German Concept of Total War," in *Makers of Modern Strategy*, ed. Edward Mead Earle et al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943), 316. *Makers of Modern Strategy* became the standard textbook in military thought from its publication until the late 1950s. See Fred Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991), 17.

A civilian population that was not committed to fighting a war did not produce as much matériel, which decidedly weakened an army. Because ordinary people were easily manipulated, it was an unfortunate fact that to have them commit to a war, "the enemy has to be wholly identified—if need be at the cost of all intellectual sincerity—with the principle of evil."[29] The fascists recognized this reality, and, Speier argued, Americans needed to follow suit if they hoped to defeat Hitler in what he considered to be an inevitable war. "Not the economics of preparedness nor the propaganda of national honor … will remain an exclusive concern of dictatorship. They are the substance of modern war" regardless of political regime.[30] The exigencies of total war necessitated the temporary bridging of the moral gap between democracies and dictatorships.

Speier's justification for propaganda begged the question: if democracies used "totalitarian" methods, were they themselves not becoming totalitarian?[31] Speier offered three answers to this predicament. First, his procedural understanding of democracy

---

[29] Hans Speier, "Morale and Propaganda," in *War in Our Time,* ed. Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1939), 316.

[30] Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler, "Introduction," in *War in Our Time,* ed. Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1939), 13.

[31] Speier endorsed the classical definition of "totalitarianism," the core element of which was that a totalitarian state was a "radically intrusive state run by people who do not merely control their citizens from the outside, preventing them from challenging the elite or doing things that it does not like, but also attempt to reach into the most intimate regions of their lives. These totalitarian elites ceaselessly tried to make their subjects into beings who would be constitutionally incapable of challenging the rule of the state and those who control it." Gleason, *Totalitarianism*, 10. From the beginning, German fascism and Soviet communism were mentioned in tandem in totalitarian debates. The very concept of totalitarianism was introduced to the U.S. intellectual community by the German émigrés. For example, the first three American academic works on the subject were Ernst Fraenkel's *The Dual State*, Franz Neumann's *Behemoth,* and Sigmund Neumann's *Permanent Revolution*. See Ernst Fraenkel, *The Dual State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941); Franz Neumann, *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942); and Sigmund Neumann, *Permanent Revolution: Totalitarianism in the Age of International Civil War* (New York: Harper, 1942). For more on the early uses of totalitarianism, see Jens Petersen, "Die Entstehung des Totalitarismusbegriffs in Italien," in *Totalitarismus: Ein Studien-Reader zur Herrschaftsanalyse moderner Diktaturen*, ed. Manfred Funke (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1978), 105-128 as well as Gleason, *Totalitarianism*, chapter 1. Perhaps Jewish and Jewish-associated exile intellectuals focused on totalitarianism in the 1930s because it allowed them to emphasize solely the political, as opposed to racial, aspects of National Socialism. For this urge, see Daniel Bessner, 'Rather More than One-Third Had no Jewish Blood': American Progressivism and German-Jewish Cosmopolitanism at the New School for Social Research, 1933-1939," *Religions* 3, no. 1 (March 2012): 99-129.

allowed him to maintain that American institutions—Congress, political parties, elections—allowed citizens to exercise their democratic rights, and as long as these institutions functioned, democracy existed. Second, because "propaganda in a democracy" did "not aim at subjugating the individual and at controlling men permanently," and was used to defend freedom, liberty, and equality, it was acceptable.[32] Finally, his diagnosis of international crisis allowed Speier to adopt a Machiavellian perspective whereby the ends justified the means, at least for a brief time. Although propaganda represented a "disastrous sacrific[e] of human values," once the crisis was over, Speier implied, the United States would reassert its democratic nature.[33]

Speier wrestled with his advocacy of propaganda throughout the 1930s. In an echo of his earlier writings in which he blamed the failure of socialism on the working classes, he now accused ordinary people of forcing him to endorse propaganda. Speier argued that propaganda only worked if the public accepted it; that is to say, propaganda's very effectiveness bespoke the public's ignorance. Moreover, mass propaganda could only be created with the active participation of thousands of ordinary people. Speier pointed to the actions of the Committee on Public Information (CPI), which during World War I mobilized thousands of writers, artists, journalists, designers, and advertising agencies to produce propaganda, as an example of how ordinary people contributed to their own manipulation. He thus placed the blame for propaganda on the citizenry itself. Speier believed history had demonstrated the public's willingness to be manipulated. If

---

[32] Hans Speier and Ernst Kris, "Research Programme to be Undertaken under the Auspices of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science at the New School for Social Research," Speier Papers, Box 7, Folder 80, 2.

[33] Speier and Kähler, "Introduction," 14.

western civilization was to survive, then democrats, not fascists, must be the ones doing the manipulating.

Because he assumed that a war between Hitler and the United States would soon erupt, Speier focused on analyzing how propaganda functioned in wartime.[34] He stood apart from many of his colleagues, who viewed foreign-directed propaganda as a "superweapon" capable of destroying the Nazis without committing significant resources of manpower and matériel to the coming war.[35] Worried that too many Americans overemphasized foreign propaganda's effectiveness, Speier argued that the "power [of foreign propaganda] is limited," and a "victorious nation cannot be defeated by slogans."[36] Propaganda had little to no effect when directed against an enemy that was successful on the battlefield. Even on the domestic front, Speier maintained, the utility of propaganda was restricted. As he said, "civilians who suffer from air attacks cannot very long be fooled by *pronunciamentos* that there is no reason to fear them."[37] Speier argued that during wartime, propaganda was at best an auxiliary weapon, and therefore U.S. decision-makers needed to prepare to fight a long and difficult war on the ground against the Nazi regime. Ironically given his ambivalence about propaganda's wartime importance, Speier made his governmental career as a propaganda specialist. Given his particular skill set, he considered this the only way to enter the policy arena.

After World War II erupted in September 1939, Speier believed it only a matter of time before the United States entered the conflict. As a devoted democrat committed to

---

[34] Speier mostly analyzed radio propaganda, although he did examine other types of media. For an analysis of propagandistic maps, see Hans Speier, "Magic Geography," *Social Research* 8, no. 3 (September 1941): 310-330. For an examination of propaganda films, see Hans Speier, "Notes on Analysis of Warfilms," July 27, 1941, Speier Papers, Box 8, Folder 1.

[35] Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War; Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2006), 29.

[36] Speier, "Morale and Propaganda," 308.

[37] Ibid.

the idea that exile intellectuals needed to defeat fascism, he quickly set about making himself useful to U.S. policymakers. With the aid of colleagues and students at the New School, he developed a method of propaganda content analysis for use by U.S. analysts.[38] Specifically, Speier undertook a Research Project on Totalitarian Communication with Ernst Kris, a Viennese-born psychoanalyst and art historian who emigrated from Vienna to London in 1938 before joining the New School faculty in 1940.[39] In London, Kris had been the director of a British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) research unit that produced weekly analyses of German broadcasts for government use.[40] When he came to the New School, Kris informed Speier—who was by 1940 known amongst colleagues as a propaganda expert—that through John Salt, the director of the BBC's European Services, he had obtained classified Nazi materials for analysis. Kris asked Speier if he would be interested in working on a research project designed to develop methods of propaganda content analysis; Speier quickly agreed.[41]

---

[38] The Graduate Faculty was, as a whole, concerned with warning Americans of the coming war. This can be seen not only in the title of the New School's prewar collection *War in Our Time*, but also in the faculty's production of the first English translation of *Mein Kampf* in 1938-1939. The latter was done to popularize Hitler's extremism among American readers. Possibly through Speier, the New School's edition of *Mein Kampf* was the one used by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) and the Office of War Information (OWI). For this edition, see Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf: Complete and Unabridged, Fully Annotated* (New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1939), v, 2.

[39] The research project was part of a larger New School effort to develop projects designed to speak to contemporary issues. In addition to this one, there was a "Peace Research Project" (of which Speier's essay "Treachery in War" was a part); a project examining the "Social and Economic Controls in Germany and Russia;" a project on "Germany's Position in European Post-War Reconstruction;" one on "Contemporary Political and Legal Trends;" another on "Demand Studies;" a project on "Technological Trends and Vocational Mobility;" one on "Studies in Housing Finance;" and, finally, a project on "Studies in Gestalt Psychology and Its Consequences." See "Survey of Research Projects (January 1943), Undertaken by the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science organized under the New School for Social Research," NSSRA, Box Graduate Faculty Administration Records, Folders 27-60, Folder 38, G.F. Reports, 1935-1951.

[40] Speier and Kris, "Research Programme to be Undertaken under the Auspices of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science at the New School for Social Research," 17.

[41] Later on, Speier declared that he found Kris to be someone who did not adjudicate where his energies should go in a realistic manner, which is seen in a 1943 letter in which Speier asked Kris if they could submit the first chapter of their *German Radio Propaganda* for publication. As he said, "I would appreciate it if you would follow my example and send me remarks, criticisms, etc. *now* instead of waiting until later.

In late 1940, Speier and Kris submitted a funding application for the project to the Rockefeller Foundation. The proposal envisioned an academic-government-foundation network defined by the intellectual production of practical knowledge for government use.[42] Speier and Kris argued that their research would enable American analysts "to predict to some extent … what the next onslaught [of Nazi propaganda] would be" and take steps to neutralize it.[43] Moreover, their work would "establish whether or not certain of the German propaganda techniques are really effective and how they compare with other methods," enabling U.S. propagandists to make their own propaganda more efficient.[44] They hoped that their example would help convert universities into spaces where one could "train American social scientists for prospective government work in this field."[45] The authors showed no moral compunctions about using knowledge in power's service; to them, it was the only way to defeat fascism.

Will you be good enough also to send me copies of *all chapters* which you regard to be in semi-final shape (like the Hitler chapter) so that I can go over them as my time permits. I think this would be preferable to your storing chapters until whole parts are assembled, especially in view of the slowness with which things proceed. I was very glad to see you over the week end [sic], although I cannot help feeling that from the point of view of *work* it was a bit wasteful. Practically all the things that concerned the book could have been done by correspondence, which would have been a lot easier on me. But, it's silly always to do things only the efficient way." Hans Speier to Ernst Kris, May 31, 1943, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 134. See also Hans Speier to Ernst Kris, Saturday n.d., Ernst Kris Papers, Box 13, Folder Speier, Hans, 1940-1949, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. (hereafter referred to as the Kris Papers). In addition to *German Radio Propaganda*, the project published a glossary of National Socialist neologisms titled *Nazi-Deutsch*, released by the Office of European Economic Research in 1942 and later published. Hans Speier and Ernst Kris, *German Radio Propaganda: Report on Home Broadcasts during the War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1944) and Heinz Pächter, *Nazi-Deutsch, A Glossary of Contemporary German Usage, with Appendices on Government, Military, and Economic Institutions* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1944).

[42] The actual report used here does not state to which foundation the grant was submitted. However, in the end, the Rockefeller Foundation funded it.

[43] Speier and Kris, "Research Programme to be Undertaken under the Auspices of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science at the New School for Social Research," 2.

[44] Ibid., 11.

[45] Speier and Kris, *German Radio Propaganda*, v.

The Rockefeller Foundation agreed to fund Speier and Kris's project.[46] In March

1941, the foundation granted them $15,960 and, considering their work a success because

Speier took his methods with him to the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, granted

the project an additional $19,000 in 1942.[47] Partially because Alvin Johnson wanted to

make clear to the U.S. government and intellectual community that he was not hiding a

fifth column, an accusation regularly raised against the University in Exile throughout the

1930s, he allowed Speier, Kris, and their assistants to conduct their research in several

rooms at the New School. The project produced five reports, and by the time it ended in

January 1943, five articles based on project research appeared in published form.[48] In

1944, Oxford University Press released a manuscript, *German Radio Propaganda*, based

on the project.[49] The research project led Speier to become known as a national expert on

[46] In addition to the Research Project on Totalitarian Communication, the Rockefeller Foundation funded Paul Lazarsfeld's Princeton Radio Research Project (later the Office of Radio Research at Columbia); Harley Cantril's Princeton Public Opinion Research Project; Harold Graves', Harwood Childs', and John Whitton's Princeton Shortwave Listening Center; Douglas Waples' Graduate Library Reading Project at Chicago; John Abbott's, Iris Barry's, and Siegfried Kracauer's Film Library of the Museum of Modern Art; Donald Slesinger's American Film Center; and Lasswell's Experimental Division for the Study of Wartime Communications at the Library of Congress. For more on the Rockefeller Foundation's role in funding these projects, see Gary, *The Nervous Liberals*, 87-129.

[47] The people who worked on the research project were: Dr. Sidney Axelrad; Joe Carmichael; Rose M. Chayes; Dr. Henry Elkin; Erik Estorik; Dr. Jacob Goldstein; Dr. Hans Herma; George Hilton; Eleanor Horn; Dr. Gertrud M. Kurth; Stanley Lipkin; Janice Loeb; Rita Lowe; Margaret P. Mascret; Dr. Alexander Mintz; George A. Nelson, Jr.; Margaret Otis; Dr. Heinz Pächter; Dr. Thomas Rubinstein; Dorothy L. Sandler; Joseph Shor; Ursula Wasserman; Florence Weil; and Dr. Howard B. White.

[48] The reports were December 1941's *German Radio News Bulletins: Problems and Methods of Analysis*; January 1942's *A Study of War Communiques: Methods and Results* and *German Freedom Stations: Broadcasting to Britain*; March 1942's *German Radio Propaganda to France*; and January 1943's *A Typological Analysis of Stereotypes Used in German News Broadcasts*. The full project, marked confidential, is available in the New School archives. See "Totalitarianism Research Project," NSSRA, Box 1. For the full list of reports produced by the project, see Hans Speier and Ernst Kris, "Report of the Research Project on Totalitarian Communication in War Time, About the Work Done in the First Year of Its Existence, and Proposals for Future Research," January 31, 1942, NSSRA, Box Rutkoff Files-Deceased Faculty-2/2, Folder Speier, 8-10.

[49] This book remains the most comprehensive analysis of Nazi propaganda between the outbreak of the war and 1944. Speier and Kris sent it to various allied agencies. Walter Adams, Acting Head of the British Political Warfare Mission in Washington, D.C., called it "a magnificent piece of work." Walter Adams to Ernst Kris, May 8, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 134. When John Marshall of the Rockefeller Foundation received the book, he declared that he felt "real personal pleasure" with it, stating that he "very much … enjoyed" the relationship he, Speier, and Kris had developed and that the Foundation retained "a

German propaganda and brought him into contact with independent and government-funded groups examining the same, including Harold Lasswell's Study of Wartime Communications at the Library of Congress and the Committee for National Morale, a pet project of FDR's advisor Harold Ickes.[50]

The Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, 1942-1944

A week after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, Speier sent the FBIS, the civilian agency in charge of foreign propaganda analysis, the research project's first report.[51] The FBIS came into being as the Foreign Broadcast Monitoring Service on February 26, 1941, although it did not begin formal operations until August. The division emerged from a late 1940 meeting between Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson and FDR, in which Stimson suggested that the government create a unit to monitor foreign propaganda aimed at the United States. FDR agreed, and on February 25 allocated $150,000 from his emergency fund to found the FBIS, which quickly became the major

---

very keen personal interest" in future work of this kind. John Marshall to Ernst Kris, May 15, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 59. There were, however, some problems with the book's publication. See Hans Speier to H.T. Hatcher, September 17, 1943 and Hans Speier to Ernst Kris, December 31, 1943, Kris Papers, Box 13, Folder Speier, Hans, 1940-1949.

[50] Hans Speier and Ernst Kris, "Report of the Research Project on Totalitarian Communication in War Time, About the Work Done in the First Year of Its Existence, and Proposals for Future Research," January 31, 1942, NSSRA, Box Rutkoff Files-Deceased Faculty-2/2, Folder Speier, 3-4. The project itself became a touchstone for empirical communication research in the United States. See Kurt Lang, "The Critical Functions of Empirical Communications Research: Observations on German-American Influences," *Media, Culture, and Society* 1, no. 1 (January 1979): 87-88.

[51] Harold Graves to Hans Speier and Ernst Kris, December 23, 1941, RG 262, Entry 2, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, General Correspondence, Q-Z, Box 66, Folder n.d, National Archives II, College Park, Maryland and Lloyd Free to Hans Speier, January 31, 1942, RG 262, Entry 2, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, General Correspondence, Q-Z, Box 66, Folder n.d., National Archives II. As one scholar has noted, "geopolitics after Pearl Harbor gave a new cohort of citizens [i.e., exiles] access to power and privilege, despite their continued social exclusion." Jeremi Suri, "Henry Kissinger, the American Dream, and the Jewish Immigrant Experience in the Cold War," *Diplomatic History* 32, no. 5 (November 2008): 722.

center of analysis of open-source intelligence—intelligence gathered from public

materials—within the government.[52]

From its inception, the FBIS had connections to the Rockefeller Foundation,

which facilitated Speier's entrance into the organization. Institutionally, it had absorbed

the Rockefeller-funded Princeton Listening Center, whose director, Harold Graves,

became the FBIS's Senior Administrative Officer. Graves was responsible for assembling

the FBIS's staff, and upon receiving Speier's reports, forwarded them to his superiors

while encouraging Speier to send more.[53] Lloyd Free, the director of the FBIS, and

Goodwin Watson, the head of the FBIS's Analysis Division (AD), read Speier's work

"with the greatest of interest" and came away impressed with his sophistication.[54] In

February 1942, Watson arranged a meeting with Speier and offered him a job as Senior

Political Analyst, which is to say the head, of the AD's "Central European Section."[55]

The AD was the "heart" of the FBIS and Central Europe was considered "the most

---

[52] For the early history of the FBIS, see Alexander L. George, *Propaganda Analysis: A Study of Inferences Made from Nazi Propaganda in World War II* (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, and Co., 1959); Joseph E. Roop, "Foreign Broadcast Information Service," 1969 < https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/foreign-broadcast-information-service/index.html>; and Stephen C. Mercado, "FBIS Against the Axis, 1941-1945," 2001, <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol45no5/html/v45i5a04p.htm>. See also Harold Graves to Harwood Childs, July 24, 1941, RG 262, Entry 59 and 60, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Office of the Director, Reading File of Harold N. Graves, Jr. Apr. 1941 to Dec. 1943, Misc. Corres. of Harold N. Graves, 1941-1943, Box 6, Folder Letters Received and Copies of Letters Sent by Harold N. Graves 1941-1944, National Archives II; "Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, 1943," RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II.

[53] Harold N. Graves to Hans Speier and Ernst Kris, December 26, 1941, RG 262, Entry 2, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, General Correspondence, Q-Z, Box 66, Folder n.d, National Archives II.

[54] Goodwin Watson to Hans Speier, December 26, 1941, RG 262, Entry 2, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, General Correspondence, Q-Z, Box 66, Folder n.d, National Archives II and Lloyd Graves to Hans Speier, January 31, 1942, RG 262, Entry 2, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, General Correspondence, Q-Z, Box 66, Folder n.d, National Archives II.

[55] Hans Speier to Goodwin Watson, February 6, 1942; Goodwin Watson to Hans Speier, February 10, 1942. RG 262, Entry 75, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Correspondence, 1941-1943, Box 40, Folder n.d., National Archives II; Goodwin Watson to Harold Graves, February 20, 1942, RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 36, Folder "Personnel-Back Files," National Archives II.

important of all regions," and this position therefore provided Speier with significant influence over the methodological direction of U.S. propaganda analysis.[56] He brought many of his assistants from New York to Washington, and through his and their influence spread the New School technique of propaganda analysis, which combined quantitative and qualitative methods, throughout the AD.[57]

Speier's transition to government work did not proceed smoothly. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) heavily scrutinized all foreign nationals who attempted to work for the government, and their investigations prevented Speier from officially joining the AD for months. Although he had received U.S. citizenship in the spring of 1940, the FBI entertained "suspicions of [Speier's] having been a dangerously subversive character" because he had published on Marx in Germany, "was not a Jew and yet left Germany in 1933."[58] The fact that a neighbor of Speier's incorrectly informed federal investigators that he traveled often to Germany buttressed their fears. He therefore had to undergo months of scrutiny, before, on May 26, 1942—two months after he entered the AD—the FBI informed him that "as a result of investigation [he has] been rated eligible on suitability for the position of Senior Political Analyst."[59]

Despite these difficulties, Speier was very excited to join the AD. He wrote his New School colleague, the philosopher and diplomat Kurt Riezler, that his "new job promises to be quite interesting. … Many of the people in the section I know personally,

---

[56] Theodore Newcomb to Colonel S.A. Greenwell, December 4, 1943, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 35, Folder n.d., National Archives II and Roop, "Foreign Broadcast Information Service," 20.
[57] Gary, *The Nervous Liberals*, 121.
[58] Hans Speier to Kurt Riezler, April 12, 1942, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 57. Also see "Immigration Matters," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 1 and Hans Speier to R.D. Clark, July 26, 1940, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 1.
[59] United States Civil Service Commission to Hans Speier, May 26, 1942, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5.

and quite a few are highly qualified men."[60] Working for the FBIS allowed Speier to turn

his arguments about intellectual political engagement into action and initiated him into a

cohort of young social scientists who would rise to positions of epistemological and

policymaking authority in World War II and the early Cold War. Several of Speier's war

colleagues became lifelong friends and coworkers, including the political scientist

Alexander L. George, the Soviet expert Nathan Leites, and the psychologist Henry

Kellermann. When Speier became head of the RAND Corporation's Social Science

Division, he brought a number of his colleagues, including George and Leites, into the

organization.

The Central European Section that Speier directed was responsible for the

analysis of all broadcasts originating in Greater Germany, Scandinavia, Hungary, and the

Netherlands, and Speier was personally responsible for examining all German-language

broadcasts.[61] He had several additional duties as Senior Political Analyst: he attempted to

predict future Nazi policies; suggested methods for the production of counter-

propaganda; directed all analysts under him; and served as a liaison between the FBIS,

State Department, and the military. Speier greatly impressed his superiors and rose

rapidly within the organization. Watson praised his "extraordinarily good job of analysis"

and "uncanny memory," which he found enabled Speier "either to remember or to dig out

of his files precedents or comparisons for a given propaganda line. I know of nobody in

---

[60] Hans Speier to Kurt Riezler, April 12, 1942, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 57.
[61] "Analysis Division," August 31, 1943, RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 36, Folder Applications, National Archives II and "Regional Subdivision," RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 34, Folder "Regional Divisions," National Archives II.

the United States whom I would willingly trade for him."[62] Additionally, a staff report

commended Speier's "top-notch performance," and he regularly received the highest

"efficiency rating," "excellent," on employee reviews.[63] Speier's reputation preceded

him, and other propaganda agencies tried to poach him, although he remained dedicated

to the FBIS.[64] For example, he refused to join the Office of War Information in July

1943, which provoked Robert Leigh, who had replaced Lloyd Free as FBIS director, to

inform Speier that he was "very happy for our sake that you are remaining on the job to

carry along continuously and with greater influence the analyses of the German radio

propaganda. I seldom have the opportunity to tell you how frequently I hear of the

splendid work you are doing and the value you are to people in other agencies."[65]

Speier's abilities as a propaganda content analyst were best displayed in a

memorandum he wrote on October 29, 1943, predicting what Hitler would say in a

speech scheduled to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the failed November 8

Beer Hall Putsch.[66] Speier's "predictions showed remarkable foresight as to the line

---

[62] Goodwin Watson to Hans Speier, November 13, 1943, RG 262, Entry 73, Box 31, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Folder Administrative Memorandums, National Archives II; Goodwin Watson to Hans Speier and Frederick Schuman, February 25, 1943, RG 262, Entry 73, Box 31, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Folder Memos to Analysts, National Archives II; "Analysis Division: Personal Data," RG 262, Entry 73, Box 35, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Folder Staff Qualifications, National Archives II.
[63] "Promotions in the Analysis Division," February 8, 1943, RG 262, Entry 74, Box 36, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Folder Personnel Memos, National Archives II; T.J. Slowie to Hans Speier, "Efficiency Rating," 1943, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5; "Notice of Official Efficiency Rating, June 23, 1944" March 31, 1945, Box 2, Folder 5; "Notice of Official Efficiency Rating, June 23, 1945" March 31, 1945, Box 2, Folder 5; and "Notice of Official Efficiency Rating, June 17, 1946," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5.
[64] Theodore Newcomb to Robert Leigh, March 23, 1944, RG 262, Entry 73, Box 32, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Folder n.d., National Archives II.
[65] Robert Leigh to Hans Speier, July 30, 1943, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 5.
[66] Speier's analysis, "What Hitler Might Say on November 8," may be found in Speier Papers, Box 8, Folder 6. For excerpts and analysis of Hitler's November 8, 1943 speech, see Max Domarus, *Hitler: Speeches and Proclamations, 1932-1945, and Commentary by a Contemporary, The Chronicle of a*

which Hitler would use;" an astonishing seventeen of twenty-five (68 percent) were correct.[67] Before Hitler's speech, Speier gave his analysis to an OWI contact, Mark Abrams, who brought it to the attention of Representative Joseph Martin (R-MA) and Senator Alexander Wiley (R-WI). Martin and Wiley delivered a radio broadcast "to discount in advance any propaganda advantage Hitler might gain through his speech" and took "most of the content of their remarks … directly" from Speier's memorandum.[68] This incident spread throughout the FBIS and OWI, and boosted Speier's reputation.

In November 1942, Speier assumed the position of Principal Political Analyst, which made him a vice president of the AD and allowed him "to work with less specific direction and to receive less review of his work by the Chief Analyst."[69] In 1944,

---

Dictatorship: Volume Four, The Years 1941 to 1945 (Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc., 2004), 2831-2843.

[67] Speier correctly predicted that Hitler would: speak for less than an hour; devote half the speech to National Socialist party history and focus on its prewar history; not refer to Frederick the Great or the Seven Years War; stress the need for Germans to persevere, remain loyal, remain determined, and be fanatical; stress that although Germans were suffering, other nations, particularly Italy, suffered too; focus on Italy, vilifying Badoglio and the Italian king more than Churchill or FDR; say that Germans, by virtue of their conquests in 1941 and 1942, could afford their recent retreats; not predict whether or not the Germans will make a comeback on the Russian front; say that Germany's position was better than at the beginning of the war; emphasize British air war guilt, arguing that he always considered war against children indefensible; declare that the war was forced upon Germany and is defensive; not discuss the U-boat campaign at length, but would say that the Mediterranean is unsafe for enemy shipping; use a lot of quasi-mystical terms, such as fate, destiny, and history, and would also talk about God; focus more on degrading German defeatists than on Churchill or FDR, and would not make threats against Britain or America, except to mention air force retaliation; not mention or refer to German hegemony; and make sweeping and vague references to victory, emphasizing non-material factors, including moral steadfastness and determination. Hans Speier, "What Hitler Might Say on November 8," Speier Papers, Box 8, Folder 6.

[68] Goodwin Watson to Robert Leigh, November 10, 1943, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II.

[69] Goodwin Watson to Robert Leigh et. al., July 31, 1942, RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 36, Folder Personnel-Back Files, National Archives II. See also Goodwin Watson to Robert Leigh, September 24, 1942, RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 36, Folder Analysis Section, National Archives II; Theodore Newcomb to Harold Graves, October 29, 1942, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder Interoffice Memos, National Archives II; and "Job Descriptions," RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 36, Folder Applications, National Archives II.

Goodwin Watson left the FBIS under pressure from enemies of the New Deal, and Speier became the FBIS's Acting Chief Analyst. As Principal Political Analyst and Acting Chief Analyst, Speier was required to administer employees, and in the latter position he oversaw thirty people.[70] Speier's time at the FBIS was crucial in allowing him to develop the administrative skills that enabled him to achieve and maintain a position of authority at the RAND Corporation.

Speier was one of numerous New School faculty members to enter government service. As the major center of German exile intellectuals in America, government officials frequently looked to the University in Exile for information on Nazi Germany and Central Europe.[71] In the winter of 1939-1940, the National Defense Commission asked the New School to provide analyses for why National Socialism triumphed and to explain the economic context that allowed the German military to achieve so many quick victories in Eastern Europe.[72] At the same time, Washington organizations used intermediaries at the Rockefeller Foundation to assign projects to Graduate Faculty members, some of whom could not work directly for the government because they remained foreign nationals.

All told, New School scholars were involved in over twenty-five government-associated projects. Organizations that made use of Graduate Faculty research included the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of Foreign Economic Administration, the

---

[70] "Analysis Division," August 31, 1943, RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 36, Folder Applications, National Archives II; "FBIS Personnel," RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 36, Folder Applications, National Archives II; and "Application for Federal Employment," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5.
[71] The information contained in the following paragraphs come from Claus-Dieter Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 139-149, 165-167.
[72] Ibid., 139.

National Economic and Social Planning Association, and the Public Administration

Committee of the Social Science Research Council. Meanwhile, the Office of Strategic

Services (OSS) considered the New School the best collection of German, left-leaning

intellectuals in the United States. The New School's influence on policy further extended

beyond the impact of faculty members' research; over two hundred students who had

studied at the University in Exile worked for the government during the war. With World

War II, the Graduate Faculty realized its desire to defend the freedoms denied them in

Germany.[73]

However, when compared with other government agencies, particularly the OSS

and OWI, the FBIS did not particularly welcome German exiles. For instance, in May

1943, Watson, likely at Speier's request, submitted to Leigh a list of potential recruits for

the Central European Section. All but one was a German exile.[74] Leigh replied that he

was not pleased with the suggestions, as he wanted to hire "scholar[s] trained in

American Universities."[75] He insisted "that as a matter of personnel policy we should get

a person of American training to associate with the German group which represents the

excellent training of the German universities which, however, is different in its

viewpoints from that produced on the American soil."[76] In the end, the AD hired none of

the recommended exiles. Speier, however, made such a reputation for himself that he had

---

[73] Ibid., 119, 147, 161, 168.

[74] The list included Sigmund Neumann, Hans Simons, and Arnold Wolfers, all colleagues of Speier's from the *Hochschule für Politik*, as well as Kurt Mattusch, Eric Dale, Hans W. Weigert, and John H. Herz, who were also exiles. The only non-exile on the list was Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Chairman of the University of Chicago's Department of History. Goodwin Watson to Robert D. Leigh, May 12, 1943. RG 262, Entry 75, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, Records Relating to Personnel, 1942, Box 49, Folder New Personnel-German, National Archives II.

[75] Robert D. Leigh to Goodwin Watson, May 14, 1943. RG 262, Entry 75, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, Records Relating to Personnel, 1942, Box 49, Folder New Personnel-German, National Archives II.

[76] Ibid.

no issues within the FBIS. Indeed, in his response to Leigh, Watson agreed that as long as "Hans Speier stays, we [should] look for someone of American background and training."[77] As Watson's response implied, Speier's identity as an exile provided him with authority and allowed him to carve out a special place within the government, even as this same identity precluded other émigrés from joining the FBIS.

Speier's job at the FBIS primarily concerned analysis, although he was required "to invent and devise new [analytical] techniques" to develop "counter-propaganda."[78] In this regard, he spent significant time thinking about what would encourage ordinary people to support the fight against totalitarianism. His Weimar experiences led him to fear Americans' commitment to fighting other forms of totalitarianism after fascism's defeat, and did not believe "the United States will learn anything from *this* war," as Americans had a "sense of national security … so overdeveloped that nobody worries much about anything."[79] To prevent Americans' future isolationism, Speier studied Nazi propaganda's successes and failures closely. He learned "totalitarian methods" to defeat totalitarianism.

Speier argued that, during wartime, a domestic propagandist served as an "eliminator of dissent" who had as his "ultimate end [the] strengthening [of] the authority of the government."[80] To eliminate any anti-government sentiment, "the propagandist [was required to] present all politically relevant events as desirable from the point of view

---

[77] Robert D. Leigh to Goodwin Watson (Watson reply written on initial memorandum), May 14, 1943. RG 262, Entry 75, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, Records Relating to Personnel, 1942, Box 49, Folder New Personnel-German, National Archives II.
[78] "Job Descriptions," RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 36, Folder Applications, National Archives II.
[79] Hans Speier to Kurt Riezler, February 3, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 57.
[80] Hans Speier, "Nazi Propaganda and Its Decline," *Social Research* 10, no. 3 (September 1943): 376.

of the governed."[81] The Nazi experience demonstrated that such a task was most easily accomplished when the propagandist had good things to report, and could "follow the strategy of truth, as the facts 'speak for themselves.'"[82] However, in times of war, military setbacks were likely, and presented a major problem to the propagandist. How was one to convince a citizen that everything was all right when his or her army was losing? Speier declared that Goebbels' ignored this problem and made a crucial mistake he was unable to overcome: namely, he centered all German propaganda around the Wehrmacht's successes. Therefore, Goebbels' "strength is borrowed strength, and his weakness is a consequence of German military defeats. The story of German domestic propaganda in this war is the story of its decline as Germany's position has deteriorated on the battlefield."[83] The lesson for American propagandists was that they should not link propaganda to one theme; the best wartime propaganda was pliable, able to refer to nonmilitary ideals or events to shore up domestic morale.

Speier's analyses of Nazi propaganda only deepened his contempt for ordinary people. Although Goebbels' had made mistakes during the war, Speier still maintained that Americans could learn much from his tactics. He noted that the Nazis recognized that the most successful propaganda was experiential and based on stimulating emotional responses. In Germany, Goebbels encouraged "the masses [to] create, and participate in, a vicarious political reality consisting of parades, meetings, anniversary celebrations, and beflagged medieval towns," which engendered support for the regime.[84] The Nazis recognized that because the "social world we live in … is highly complicated and evades

---

[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid., 359 and Allan M. Winkler, *The Politics of Propaganda: The Office of War Information, 1942-1945* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 129.
[83] Speier, "Nazi Propaganda and Its Decline," 360.
[84] Ibid., 364.

immediate experience," it required too much "perspicacity, reliable information, and

mental effort to orient ourselves intelligently."[85] They immorally, but effectively,

"exploit[ed] [man's] capacity for being fooled by pleasures that prevent him from

reasoning soberly."[86] Speier deplored but was impressed with Nazi propaganda, and

began to accept many of its premises as accurate. Although Hitler and his followers were

evil, he maintained, Americans could learn from their successes.

The Office of War Information, 1944-1945

Domestic disputes initiated by enemies of the Roosevelt Administration cut short

Speier's time at the FBIS. The most serious challenge to the organization came from

Representative Martin Dies (D-TX), an anti-New Deal, anti-Labor congressman who was

the first chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), and who

had been involved with stirring up anti-exile sentiment since the late 1930s.[87] In late

1941, Dies began investigating three FBIS employees: Goodwin Watson, Frederick

Schumann, and William E. Dodd, Jr.[88] Although the FBIS supported the accused, the

Dies investigation soon led each to leave government service. Schumann, unwilling to

deal with Dies' slander, quickly returned to his post at Williams College. The FBIS

hoped to retain Watson and Dodd, but in 1943 the House Appropriations Committee

(HAC), under the influence of the HUAC, ordered that payment of their salaries be

---

[85] Speier directly echoed Lippmann's understanding of modern society. Ibid., 365.

[86] Ibid., 364.

[87] In addition to Dies, in January 1943 Representative Eugene Cox (R-GA), an avowed enemy of the New Deal and FDR, opened hearings against the FCC, accusing the commission of abusing its regulatory powers and of being "a glorified news agency that provided nothing of value to the military." Cox's inquiry came to naught, and it was closed down in January 1945. Mercado, "FBIS Against the Axis." See also Roop, "Foreign Broadcast Information Service," chapter 7 and Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, 87.

[88] Watson and Schumann belonged to the AD, and Schumann was a member of Speier's Central European Section. The other accused FBIS member was William E. Dodd, Jr., who belonged to the Report Section. Stephen Mercado suggests that Dies opened his investigation because the Central European Section had reported that Dies' remarks were appreciated in Germany, which led then-Vice President Henry Wallace to attack Dies in public. Mercado, "FBIS Against the Axis."

halted.[89] The accused were thus forced out of the FBIS, and Speier replaced Watson as

Acting Chief Analyst.[90]

Soon after the investigations, HUAC's influence impelled Congress to gut the

FBIS. In February 1944, the HAC eliminated 30 percent of the FBIS' budget, without

citing a reason.[91] The budget cuts forced FBIS administrators to eviscerate the AD, which

had recently moved to OWI headquarters.[92] By April 1944, most analysts had left the

Central European Section to join other divisions.[93] Speier was left alone, aided by only

"four inexperienced assistants."[94] In the summer of 1944, Leigh resigned and soon after

Speier left the FBIS for the OWI. By the end of 1944, the AD no longer had any

European staff, and the OWI assumed all German propaganda analysis duties. The

downfall of the FBIS led Speier's pessimism regarding government work to grow.

---

[89] In the 1946 *United States v. Lovett* hearing, the Supreme Court determined this decision to be unconstitutional.

[90] Theodore Newcomb to Colonel S.A. Greenwell, December 4, 1943. RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 35, Folder n.d., National Archives and "Application for Federal Employment," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5.

[91] In the February 15, 1944 newsletter to the FBIS, Leigh reported that: "The obvious conclusion is that the proposed cut relates to the opposition on the part of Representative Cox to FCC for reasons well known and [to] the Dodd-Watson case." Other intelligence divisions, including the OSS (in particular William L. Langer, the head of the Research and Analysis Division) came to the FBIS' defense, to no avail. Quote from Mercado, "FBIS Against the Axis." See also Theodore Newcomb to Robert Leigh, April 3, 1944, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II.

[92] Roop, "Foreign Broadcast Information Service," 211.

[93] George and Kellermann, two of Speier's closes colleagues, left to join the Research and Analysis branch of the OSS. Theodore Newcomb to Robert Leigh, February 9, 1944, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II and Theodore Newcomb to Robert Leigh, April 3, 1944, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II.

[94] Theodore Newcomb to Robert Leigh, April 3, 1944, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944,Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II.

Speier's move to the OWI was easily facilitated, as he had worked closely with its members for years.[95] Soon after the war broke out, Watson had hoped to provide the OWI, which was charged with developing counter-propaganda campaigns, with analysis and recommendations. Members of the OWI, however, were dissatisfied with the AD's information and created their own propaganda analysis division, which duplicated much of the AD's work. In the autumn of 1942, Leigh established weekly meetings between the analysis divisions of the two organizations, which, although designed to facilitate cooperation, resulted in little more than increased tensions.

Speier's 1942 remarks about the OWI reflected these tensions. In a letter to Leigh, he wrote that the OWI's propaganda lacked "any basic strategy" and was so boring that he "cannot imagine that anybody in Germany will risk his neck for listening to such broadcasts."[96] He was annoyed that "hardly anybody reads our Weekly Analysis" or counter-propaganda suggestions.[97] He found the OWI's propaganda "uninspired and uninspiring, unexciting and producing nothing but sleepiness."[98] However, in April 1943 the AD and the OWI's Bureau of Research and Analysis of the Overseas Operations Branch (OOB)—the branch that Speier would join—reached an agreement whereby the OWI would use the AD for analyzing radio broadcasts. As such, in May 1943, the AD moved to OWI headquarters, where it remained organizationally coherent, retaining

---

[95] For a list of the connections between the Central European Section and other government agencies, see "Central European Section: Contacts with Other War Agencies," RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 31, Folder Liaison, National Archives II.

[96] Hans Speier to Robert Leigh, December 14, 1942, RG 262, Entry 74, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series II), 1941-1944, Box 38, Folder Memos to T. Newcomb, National Archives II.

[97] Ibid..

[98] Ibid. For a specific critique of Geoffrey Gorer's OWI report "German Popular Psychology," see Geoffrey Gorer to Hans Speier, March 3, 1943, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 82 and Hans Speier (Central European Section, Analysis Division, FBIS) to OWI-OOB, October 13, 1943, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II.

Watson as its director.[99] The AD's new offices were contiguous with the OOB, bringing

the analysts from both agencies into close contact.[100] In certain respects, its move made

the AD part of the OOB. By February 1944, as Congress began to cut the FBIS' budget,

Speier began to eye moving to the OOB, where he believed "the work would be a little

more interesting" and he would no longer be subject to the whims of FDR's enemies.[101]

In early 1944, Speier began working on a number of OWI projects, which allowed him to

integrate slowly into the organization.[102]

On May 22, 1944, Speier officially transferred from the AD to the OOB.[103] His

immediate superior was Wallace Carroll, with whom he remained a lifelong friend and

colleague. After the war, for example, Speier and Carroll worked together as

psychological warfare consultants for the State Department and as consultants for the

Ford Foundation. Speier joined the OOB as head of the German Committee (also called

the German section) of Area One, overseeing approximately eight regional specialists.[104]

In December 1944, he assumed the position of Propaganda Policy Advisor to Germany,

---

[99] Goodwin Watson to Hans Speier, April 17, 1943, RG 262, Entry 2, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, General Correspondence, Q-Z, Box 66, Folder n.d., National Archives II; Hans Speier to Goodwin Watson, May 7, 1943, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder Speier-Memos, National Archives II; and "Weekly Report—Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, May 14, 1943," Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 5.
[100] "Weekly Report—Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, May 14, 1943," Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 5.
[101] Hans Speier to Kurt Riezler, February 3, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 57.
[102] Theodore Newcomb to Robert Leigh, April 3, 1944, RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II.
[103] Hans Speier to Robert Leigh, June 2, 1944. RG 262, Entry 73, Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, Records of the Analysis Division, General Records (Series I), 1941-1944, Box 32, Folder n.d., National Archives II.
[104] Hans Speier to Wallace Carroll, February 2, 1945. RG 208, Entry 355, Records of the Office of War Information, General Records of the Chief, 1944-1946, C, Box 1712, Folder Wallace Carroll, National Archives II and "Application for Federal Employment," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5. Unlike the FBIS, the OOB was divided continentally. For the OWI's organization, see Edward W. Barrett to All Staff Members of the OOB, March 27, 1944, RG 208, Entry 6B, Records of the Office of War Information, Records of the Historian, Records of the Historian Relating to the OOB, 1942-1945, Box 6, Folder OOB, Office of the Director, National Archives II.

where he was responsible for "all planning for the present psychological warfare operations against Germany and for the long-range propaganda which will take place inside Germany" after its defeat.[105] He personally wrote many of the propaganda directives targeted at Germany, most of which were broadcast over the famous "Voice of America" (VOA).[106]

His new position transformed Speier from an analyst to a propaganda creator. For the first time, he implemented tactical opinions regarding enemy-directed propaganda campaigns. His two years of work in the FBIS deeply informed his OWI-era propaganda. Based on his analyses of Nazi broadcasts, Speier defined the function of foreign propaganda as being "*an attempt to realize the aim of war—which is victory—without acts of physical violence or with less expenditure of physical violence than would otherwise be necessary.*"[107] During wartime, though, "bombs become more important than words" and propaganda assumed an auxiliary status.[108] Although it was a difficult task to accomplish, propaganda attempted to convince the enemy "to do anything but fight."[109] Foreign propaganda tried to do so by impelling the enemy to submit; fight the wrong opponent; cooperate; value their survival over that of the nation's; or panic. Speier declared that there were several tactical means to induce these actions, which included attacking an enemy's confidence in victory; convincing the enemy his interests were not

---

[105] Wallace Carroll to Thurman L. Bernard, December 4, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 3 and "Propaganda Policy Adviser (Germany), CAF-15 ($8,000)," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 3.
[106] The most extensive analysis of the OWI's propaganda campaign, Winkler's *The Politics of Propaganda*, misses Speier's important role in developing German propaganda. Winkler instead attributes German propaganda directives to Carroll. Although Carroll signed these directives, Speier was the one who had a central hand in creating them. Winkler, *The Politics of Propaganda*, 131-132.
[107] Hans Speier and Margaret Otis, "German Radio Propaganda to France during the Battle of France," in *Propaganda in War and Crisis: Materials for American Policy*, ed. Daniel Lerner (New York: George W. Stewart, 1951 [1944]), 210.
[108] Ibid., 211.
[109] Ibid., 212.

his nation's; excoriating the enemy for his and his nation's moral crimes; confusing the enemy's world view; or presenting an enemy's non-political values as more important than his military or political ones. If the enemy was so convinced, propaganda could mitigate the destruction of war.

However, Speier's first-hand experience overseeing propagandists led him to become very critical of U.S. psychological warfare. Any effective propaganda, he maintained, needed to account for the social structure in which it was received. U.S. propagandists, though, had no expert knowledge of Germany. Too many were journalists or advertising professionals who "did nothing more than continue their journalistic work from peacetime, without forcing themselves to think about the audience or readership of those living under entirely different conditions than those that prevailed in America."[110] Ignorance of German society led "the whole psychology of [U.S.] propaganda to be flawed" and completely ineffective.[111] What the government needed, Speier argued, was social scientists and area experts familiar with the social structure of Germany, which was knowledge that would make U.S. psychological warfare far more effective than it was.

Speier also derided the lack of coordination between propagandists and policymakers, a common refrain amongst civilian and military officials throughout World War II. The OWI had connected Speier to the highest realms of policymaking. As Propaganda Policy Advisor and director of the German Committee, he served on the interdepartmental German Propaganda Policy Committee, which coordinated civilian and military propaganda efforts; attended meetings of the Overseas Planning Board, which

---

[110] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 200.
[111] Ibid.

developed the U.S.' German policy; and belonged to the Review Board, which synchronized OWI policy.[112] He also attempted to harmonize the OWI's propaganda efforts with British officials stationed in Washington.[113] Yet these experiences led him to conclude that there was little true coordination between the propagandist and the policymaker. He argued that propaganda could only work if it created a vision of the world attractive to the enemy. For this vision to be believable, however, it must conform to the public aims of U.S. foreign policy. In short, psychological warfare was most effective when a "country's statesmen talk a soft peace" that the propagandist could echo and popularize.[114] But, Speier maintained, U.S. policymakers ignored this dictate and made statements that obliterated propaganda's potential effectiveness. For example, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau's calls to demolish Germany "gave more ammunition to Dr. Goebbels than was foreseen by the American journalists who availed themselves of the leak."[115] Moreover, calls for unconditional surrender made it very difficult for propagandists to convince Germans to fight less effectively.[116] In Speier's opinion, the total lack of coordination between the propagandist and the policymaker severely limited the potential utility of psychological warfare.

---

[112] Wallace Carroll to Thurman L. Bernard, December 4, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 3; "Propaganda Policy Adviser (Germany), CAF-15 ($8,000)," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 3; and Ethel Hoeber to Wallace Carroll, January 29, 1945, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 3.

[113] Speier became personally close with many English officials. One time, Edward Frederick Lindley Wood, the British Ambassador to America, invited him to attend a small gathering of U.K. officials at his residence. The day of the meeting was very hot, and Speier arrived at the ambassador's house without a jacket and in short-sleeves. Upon noticing the swanky surroundings of the dinner, he felt very embarrassed. The ambassador noticed Speier's discomfort, and, without saying a word, rolled up his shirtsleeves; the rest of the party followed suit. Speier was very affected by this show of solidarity and recounted it years later with emotion. "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32: 170-172.

[114] Hans Speier, "War Aims in Political Warfare," *Social Research* 12, no. 2 (May 1945): 175.

[115] Ibid., 163.

[116] Ibid., 170-171.

Speier's OWI-era scholarship demonstrated his increasing frustrations with government work. Indeed, he felt he could no longer contribute to a propaganda effort he believed had little effect and he intended to leave the government as soon as possible. However, a chance encounter with a State Department official provided Speier with the opportunity to become Acting Chief of the State Department's Division for Occupied Areas (ADO). He found the prospect too promising to reject, and in 1946 he recommitted himself to another year of government service.

The Division for Occupied Areas, 1946-1947

In August 1945 the OWI stopped operating and responsibility for civilian information policy transferred to the State Department's Interim International Information Service.[117] Speier therefore became part of State, an organization with which he was quite familiar. He had worked with State as an FBIS liaison, and, while at the OWI, regularly accompanied Carroll to State Department meetings. Through these meetings, as well as regular lectures on propaganda, Speier became acquainted with many upper-level State officials and became known as "a reliable man," that is to say a person they could trust.[118] Because he was a German propaganda expert, Speier was chosen to serve as the liaison between State and General Robert McClure, the head of the U.S. Army's Information Control Division (ICD) of the Office of Military Government,

---

[117] The OWI, which remained organizationally coherent in its move to the State Department, did not officially shutter its doors until January 1, 1946. It closed because it had come under the suspicion of the Republican Congress as a New Deal front.

[118] Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr. to Hans Speier, October 3, 1945, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5 and "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32: 169-170.

United States (OMGUS).[119] In this capacity, Speier traveled to Germany for the first time since the war broke out in October 1945.[120]

Speier was frustrated with propaganda work and was "expecting to be out of government service" by the end of 1945.[121] An encounter with William Benton, the recently appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs in charge of information policy, however, changed his mind.[122] Speier met Benton while stationed at McClure's Bad Homburg headquarters. Benton was passing through when fog delayed his trip. During this delay, he and Speier spent hours discussing psychological warfare and the future of U.S. information policy in occupied Germany. Mirroring his complaints about propagandists, Speier explained to Benton that most people who commented, analyzed, and reported on Germany actually knew very little about the nation, its culture, politics, and people.[123] Without expert and first-hand knowledge of Germany, Speier argued, American reeducation efforts were doomed to fail.

Benton was very impressed with Speier. He reported to his superiors that

> Speier has made a great impression here. … He is the best man OWI ever sent to Germany and has the best grasp and most knowledge and understanding of any man ever sent over by US. Benton queries whether Speier shouldn't be kept here in Germany in a top key role, if he can be persuaded, as the kind of staff man absolutely essential to the top civilian authority State is now seeking to send over here. … Benton queries whether Speier isn't much more valuable here than back in the States.[124]

---

[119] McClure had been the head of the Psychological Warfare Division (PWD) of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Force (SHAEF). The PWD had transformed into the ICD, which was now under the control of OMGUS. In addition to the ICD, OMGUS' Education and Religious Affairs Branch implemented reeducation and cultural policy. Ferdinand Kuhn, Jr. to Hans Speier, October 3, 1945, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5.

[120] "Travel Authorization," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5.

[121] Hans Speier to Sigmund Neumann, September 8, 1945, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 42.

[122] Benton would later become the democratic senator from Connecticut.

[123] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 174-176.

[124] William Stone and Ferdinand Kuhn to Eric Bellquist et al., November 20, 1945, Office of War Information Cable, RG 208, Entry 358, Records of the Office of War Information, Director of Overseas Operations, Area Policy Files, 1943-1946, French Indochina to Germany, Box 108, Folder Germany, Cable, National Archives II.

The State Department quickly offered Speier a position on its then-forming Policy Planning Staff, which would soon be directed by George Kennan.[125] Speier declined, and State countered with an offer for him to become Acting Deputy Chief of the newly formed ADO, which was the civilian division in charge of German education and information policies.[126] Speier accepted the position in January 1946, but planned to leave at the end of the year, as he was exhausted with government work. When the time to leave came, however, William T. Stone, Director of State's Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, "urged [Speier] to weigh the relative importance of [his] government job against that of teaching at the present time."[127] After considering the offer and deciding that "education work in Germany is of so great an importance as to warrant my postponing the return to academic life," Speier informed Stone that, as long as Stone convinced the New School to grant him another leave of absence, he would remain in the ADO.[128]

Stone acquiesced to Speier's request, and wrote Bryn Hovde, the New School's president, that the State Department "is most anxious to have Mr. Speier's continued service and would appreciate it greatly" if Hovde extended his leave of absence.[129] Stone declared that he would not have requested this extension "if it were possible for the Department to replace Mr. Speier with a person with comparable background and experience."[130] As State officials said elsewhere, Speier's "keen insight into and knowledge of conditions and problems" in Germany, as well as his "ability to analyze

---

[125] Hans Speier, November 23, 1945, *From the Ashes of Disgrace: A Journal from Germany, 1945-1955* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981), 45. The Policy Planning Staff would not come into official being until 1947, with George F. Kennan serving as its first director.
[126] The ADO was part of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs.
[127] Hans Speier to Eduard Heimann, November 3, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 96.
[128] Hans Speier to Eric Clarke, October 16, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 4.
[129] William Stone to Bryn Hovde, October 17, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 103.
[130] Ibid.

problems [and] develop sound policy proposals," far surpassed his colleagues and made

him a crucial member of the ADO.[131] Hovde grudgingly agreed to Stone's request, telling

the latter that "the New School for Social Research very badly needs the service of … Dr.

Speier," but would allow him a "leave of absence … for one more year, [if he gave] the

New School for Social Research priority upon his return afterword."[132] With Hovde's

unenthusiastic blessing, in late 1946 Speier rejoined the ADO.[133]

Although Henry P. Leverich was the ADO's nominal Acting Chief, Speier

functioned as head of the division.[134] When Leverich had become ill in the summer of

1946, Speier unofficially assumed all director's duties.[135] Upon his recovery, Leverich

was transferred out of the ADO and, in January 1947, Speier officially became Associate

(Acting) Chief of the division.[136] His main duty was to oversee twenty-five employees

---

[131] Anonymous to W. Pierce MacCoy and Henry P. Leverich, June 17, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5.

[132] Bryn J. Hovde to William Stone, November 8, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 103.

[133] For all the discussions about Speier remaining in the ADO, see Anonymous to W. Pierce MacCoy and Henry P. Leverich, June 17, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5; Hans Speier to Eric Clarke, October 16, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 4; William Stone to Bryn Hovde, October 17, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 103; Hans Speier to Leo Strauss, October 28, 1946, Leo Strauss Papers, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois (hereafter referred to as the Strauss Papers), Box 3, Folder 12; Hans Speier to Eduard Heimann, November 3, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 96; and Bryn Hovde to William Stone, November 8, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 103. See also "The Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Special Executive Faculty Meeting, January 4, 1946," GF Meeting Minutes, September 1945-June 1951, GF Meeting Minutes, NSSRA, Box 17. For Speier's take on the issue, see Hans Speier to Leo Strauss, October 28, 1946, Strauss Papers, Box 3, Folder 12.

[134] Speier was not technically allowed to be "chief" because the State Department required that a trained foreign service officer serve as the ADO's director.

[135] Hans Speier to Henry P. Leverich, July 24, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 4.

[136] In the archives, one can see how Speier's position in the ADO made him someone of whom people asked many favors. See, for example, Ernst Deutsch and Joe Glenn to Hans Speier, January 25, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 49; May 9, 1946, J.T. Hart to Hans Speier, May 9, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 91; Leon Szalet to Hans Speier, July 7, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 65; Wolfgang von Eckardt to Hans Speier, July 25, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 56; John H.E. Fried to Hans Speier, September 24, 1946, Fried Papers, Box 10, Folder 20; Alexander George to Hans Speier, November 8, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 74; George J. Eliasberg to Hans Speier, February 4, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 59; Stephan Duggan to Hans Speier, February 17, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 54; Eduard Heimann to Hans Speier, March 12, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 96; Eugen Gürster to Hans Speier, May 25, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 88; and Frieda Wunderlich to Hans Speier, July 10, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 129. A particularly important duty undertaken by Speier was to

whose task was to create policies and programs for the American reeducation effort. As

Acting Chief, he was "responsible for acting on all matters pertaining to Division

activities, [and] approving all plans and directives pertaining to [State's] information

operations in" the U.S. occupation zone.[137] In this capacity, Speier regularly met with

peers in the War Department to coordinate U.S. reeducation and information policies on

the ground. For example, Speier and War Department officials developed in tandem the

messages regarding Germany that were displayed in German textbooks and other official

publications. Speier also served on the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee

(SWNCC), which was dedicated to coordinating government and military occupation

policies and foreshadowed the National Security Council.

Despite his hopes that he would have wide latitude to determine U.S. reeducation

policy, Speier found it very difficult to implement his desired vision. The main reason for

this difficulty was the fact that the War Department and local military officers, far more

than the State Department and its officials, governed America's occupation and

reeducation efforts. Indeed, in the spring of 1946, soon after Speier joined the ADO,

operational responsibility for German reeducation activities was transferred from State to

the War Department.[138] OMGUS/ICD, under War's direction, was, like many military

organizations reformulated for peace, not primarily interested in reeducation. Because

OMGUS/ICD had far more sway than State in congressional budget-making, it

---

search for the friends and relatives of colleagues when he visited Germany as a civilian after the war. See
From the Ashes of Disgrace, Part I, *passim*.
[137] "Application for Federal Employment," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 5.
[138] Hans Speier to E.Y. Hartshorne, July 23, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 95 and Hans Speier to Paul
Tillich, January 30, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 99. See also, Hans Speier, "'Reeducation'—The
U.S. Policy," in *Social Order and the Risks of War* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1952), 405.

successfully lobbied congress to defund German reeducation efforts. From the beginning, Speier was severely restricted in his ability to influence and implement policy.

The OMGUS' dominance of the ADO was saliently illustrated by Speier's failure to have a policy paper on "Licensing of a Political Press in the United States Zone of Germany" accepted by the SWNCC Secretariat (Sub-Committee for Europe). Speier argued in his paper that "the Military Government in Germany [should] permit Germans to publish political party newspapers in addition to the non-partisan press."[139] He believed that the current publications policy, which restricted all political publications, was "a result of early [post-occupation] instructions not to authorize any political movement in Germany."[140] However, such a policy was out of date, as "OMGUS and all other occupying powers have licensed political parties."[141] Speier correctly noted that it made no sense to have political parties that could not operate political presses. Moreover, he was convinced that German democracy would not take hold unless Germans experienced democratic life. If the United States did not practice what it preached, and allow Germans the freedoms they espoused, Speier worried they would once again fall prey to reactionary nationalism.

The policy paper, which was supported by State, the Reorientation Branch of the Civil Affairs Division, and the Civil Administration Division of OMGUS, was submitted to General Lucius Clay, Commander in Chief of OMGUS, in the winter of 1946. Upon receiving it, Clay, despite claiming to have "full confidence in the political acumen of his advisors," rejected the proposal because he "had 'the hunch'" that the time was not right

---

[139] Hans Speier to William Stone, January 3, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 4.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.

for it.[142] Upon hearing of Clay's response, the War Department asked OMGUS to explain Clay's reasons for rejection to the ADO. When informed of Clay's decision, Speier angrily retorted that the stated reasons for rejection "were either invalidated in the discussion of the ADO draft … or were spurious in character."[143] Despite Speier's protestations, General John J. Hilldring, the Assistant Secretary of State for Occupied Areas, acceded to Clay's request. Speier, who was very upset at this turn of events, traveled to New York from Washington to meet with Phil Davison, Chief of Plans and Directives on McClure's staff, about the incident. Davison reported that McClure had taken the advice of Arthur Eggleston, Chief of the Press Section, on this issue, and was unwilling to stand up to Clay. Davison's remarks infuriated Speier, who declared that Eggleston had "no knowledge of German and [had] an inevitably limited familiarity with German political conditions."[144]

Besides his frustration with the ADO's weakness when compared to OMGUS/ICD and the War Department, Speier was also deeply distressed at the ways in which various government bureaucracies fought one another at the expense of effective policymaking. During the war, he maintained, these differences were present but muted. With the peace, however, bureaucratic infighting had exploded. As Speier said in a letter to Alexander George, "any encroachment on our [the ADO's] part upon the functions of the War Department would be resented, and in the interest of maintaining whatever degree of cooperation exists between War and State, it is important for me not to appear

---

[142] "History of and Draft Paper, 'Licensing of a Political Press in the US Zone of Germany, January 3, 1947,'" Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 4.
[143] Ibid.
[144] Ibid.

meddlesome."[145] Speier found the lack of interagency cooperation and trust troublesome and damaging limits on his capacity for action. He argued that agencies "talk too much among" themselves and ignored "the ideas of other intelligent people outside [their] organization."[146] Given the reality of State's weakness, there was little Speier could do to change the situation.

Speier also retained a "fundamental pessimism regarding the effectiveness of our so-called 're-education' program."[147] He did not think the ADO, or German reorientation programs generally, had any appreciable affect on German attitudes. The occupation authorities, Speier declared, did not allow the Germans to experience the democratic freedoms for which the United States supposedly fought the war. For this reason, ordinary Germans did not feel any connection with democracy or America, and displayed little interest in rehabilitation. As he said to Alexander George in late 1946, "the large proposition of Germans who think that National Socialism was a good idea badly carried out, have not substantially changed in size" since the occupation. Looking back on his government service, Speier had participated in two campaigns—the enemy-directed propaganda and reeducation efforts—that he considered to have been rendered largely useless by government inefficiencies. By 1947, all the hours he put in, all the professional sacrifices he made, did not seem worth it.

Conclusion

The realities of government service had tempered Speier's enthusiasm for devoting his life to being an intellectual decision-maker, and in September 1947 he returned to the New School. As he wrote Arnold Brecht in August,

---

[145] Hans Speier to Alexander George, December 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 74.
[146] Ibid.
[147] Ibid.

> Needless to say, I am glad to return to the faculty, because I have missed academic work for more than five years. … Last week, I received an offer from the Office of Military Government in Berlin to join their staff for two years as coordinator of all information media in the American Zone. … But I turned the offer down. … The point is that by this time I have grown tired of governmental frustrations, and I know the people and the conditions in Berlin too well not to expect more and different kinds of frustrations. For a while at least, I shall try to cope with the frustrations of an intellectual.[148]

However, Speier desired to remain close to power and did not completely sever his government ties. Before he left the State Department, he offered his consulting services to his superiors, and advised State on numerous issues for years.[149] He also retained government connections by giving regular talks on psychological warfare to Foreign Service officers.[150] Although embittered with power, he remained attracted to it.

Speier's wartime experiences led him to develop a taste for influence that academic work alone could not satiate. He "was very aware that I was connected to 'actual life' only since I left the New School."[151] His return to the Graduate Faculty in 1947-1948 confirmed to Speier that he did not merely wish to write about history, but wanted to affect it. Nevertheless, he hoped to do so outside the confines of government, whose irritations he could no longer bear. In a 1946 letter to Speier, Alexander George expressed well the issues many defense intellectuals had with government service:

> With the government one should never learn to accept any assurances or promises of any sort; it specializes in bad faith with its employees. It raises to a position of power the petty, warped characters, misfits, who can't do anything else so they turn to 'administration' (with few exceptions); they really take out their accumulated discontent with mankind. Ah well, Hans, you have had enough experience of your own.[152]

But George wrote these harsh words in a letter that asked Speier to help him recruit intelligence analysts. George, who served in the occupation government, was, like Speier,

---

[148] Hans Speier to Arnold Brecht, August 8, 1947, Brecht Papers, Box 6, Folder 37.

[149] William Benton to Hans Speier, June 25, 1947, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 4.

[150] See Hans Speier, "Propaganda and Its Setting: Address, April 10, 1950, at the Foreign Service Institute," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 35 and Hans Speier, *Psychological Warfare Reconsidered*, Washington, D.C., Department of State, Foreign Service Institute, 1951, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 36.

[151] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32: 227-228.

[152] Alexander George to Hans Speier, November 8, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 74.

unwilling to give up a position of power, and remained in Germany until 1948, when he left government service to join the RAND Corporation. Such was the attitude adopted by the first generation of defense intellectuals who constituted the institutions of the national security state: they found the ideas of power and influence alluring but their practice, within the government at least, exasperating.

For defense intellectuals like Speier and George, the war had the dual effect of engendering a desire to influence policy while instilling a hatred of government inefficiencies. In the early Cold War, defense intellectuals united with military and government officials to create new types of foreign policy institutions—think tanks and research centers—which allowed them to work outside the government but remain connected to policymakers.[153] In the process, intellectuals came to comprise an "epistemic community," a "networ[k] of knowledge-based experts" to whom decision-makers "turn[ed] for advice" on how to wage the Cold War.[154] Speier was a central actor in this drama, and became the director of the RAND Corporation's Social Science Division and a creator of Stanford University's Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences and the program in international communication at MIT's Center for International Studies. Over the course of the 1950s, Speier helped fashion organizations that made intellectuals important political actors in the foreign policy realm. By forming policy knowledge and making it available to decision-makers outside the public's purview, these institutions realized Speier's dual desire, formed in the wake of the

---

[153] Ron Theodore Robin has termed this institutional network the "military-intellectual complex." Ron Theodore Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Intellectual Complex* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).

[154] Peter Haas, "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination," *International Organization* 46, no. 1 (Winter 1992): 2.

Weimar Republic's collapse, to isolate intellectuals from political pressures and to remove ordinary people from the foreign policymaking process.

Yet tensions and contradictions characterized Speier's program of using knowledge for democracy. His government and think tank career was built upon his expertise in psychological warfare, a tool the use of which he justified with reference to the crisis in civilization represented by the fascists and communists. To Speier, the dangerous nature of the Nazi and Soviet regimes made it necessary for democrats like himself to learn to employ anti-democratic methods effectively. But Speier never considered how his and others' diagnoses of crisis had a self-reinforcing nature. Even though Speier did not believe psychological warfare was particularly useful, once he bridged what he considered to be the moral gap between democracies and dictatorships, it was a short step to endorsing other anti-democratic methods and projects with reference to the international civil war between democracy and totalitarianism. Indeed, since the early Cold War the U.S. government has justified various subversive and military measures from the Cold War to the War on Terror, including the commitment of troops to Vietnam, the prosecution of political subversion in Argentina, and the passing of the Patriot Act, by identifying a period of time as a moment of crisis.

Speier, of course, truly thought the United States faced an existential threat in the Nazi and Soviet regimes that made all other concerns unimportant. Therefore, during his time in the foreign policy establishment he rarely discussed specific ideologies or for what ideals he believed the United States was fighting. Ideology withered in the face of power. By framing the battle against Nazism and communism as existential, Speier subsumed all ideological considerations into the overarching goal of defending western

civilization. The exact nature of this civilization, though, remained obscure, save for repeated platitudes about democracy. Such omissions were reasonable during World War II, when short-term considerations no doubt seemed all-important, but Speier continued to ignore ideology in the postwar years. The extreme experience of witnessing the Nazi victory in Weimar led Speier to be forever worried about democracy's strength and viability. In this frame of mind, particularistic ideological concerns could rarely appear especially significant. It would be too much to say that fear consumed Speier, but, for decades, he remained anxious about democracy's future.

But Speier also had quotidian interests, and the pace at which he rose within the wartime organizations for which he worked highlights his ability to make effective use of his status as a German exile. Whether it was within the FBIS, where he was considered the paradigmatic representative of the entire German intellectual tradition, or when meeting William Benton, whom he convinced that he understood Germany better than most U.S. officials, Speier continuously deployed his Germanness to assert himself within the foreign policy establishment. He resourcefully used his liminal position—he was not quite German but not quite American—to his advantage. Thus, while their German identity kept a number of exiles outside the wartime establishment, as demonstrated by the FBIS' unwillingness to hire any of Speier's recommendations for analyst positions, once in the government, his status as an exile provided Speier with a useful source of professional capital.

Speier's career further underlines the *ad hoc* nature of defense intellectuals' entrance into government service. At no point did a government agency formally recruit him. It was only through seizing the initiative and sending his reports to the FBIS that he

was able to become part of the state. But this is not to say that the FBIS would have accepted anyone's work; reputation also played an important role. Speier's positive relationship with the Rockefeller Foundation, the most respected private funding source in the interwar United States, likely eased his admission into the government. Before World War II, the government remained largely the realm of protestant elites who attended the same boarding schools or Ivy League universities. Speier's association with Rockefeller, however, allowed him to elide these networks while at the same time legitimating him to Anglo-Saxon FBIS officials who were themselves connected to the foundation. Academic expertise thus served as a means with which minority communities entered state institutions. In the next decades, by virtue of the efforts of individuals like Speier, new classes of people, including exiles, Jews, and, to a lesser degree, women, slowly transformed the composition of the U.S. foreign policy establishment.

Chapter Four: The Rise of the Foreign Policy Expert

Government service left Speier disillusioned and tired, and in the autumn of 1947 he returned to the New School. His time there, however, lasted less than a year. He quickly became dissatisfied with the *vita contemplativa*. Academic work relevant to only a few intellectuals no longer satisfied him, and he further found faculty politics tedious and disheartening. But he expressed no desire to return to the government. Speier instead sought a new type of institution, connected to but separate from the state, that would allow him to use the skills he gained during the war and the knowledge he had as an intellectual to wage the battle against Soviet totalitarianism, which he believed posed as serious a threat to western civilization as Nazism. Speier found an answer to his professional problems in the RAND Corporation, whose Social Science Division he directed for a decade.

RAND represented a new kind of organization, the semi-independent think tank. It received government funding and the U.S. Air Force and other civilian and military agencies allowed RAND analysts access to highly classified information. In return, analysts spent a substantial amount of time studying issues of interest to their government patrons. Yet RAND experts had significant latitude to pursue their research independently, oftentimes coming to conclusions that contravened the government's hoped-for outcomes. Analysts' lack of connection to any political party enabled them to remain mostly free of Washington political squabbles. However, given that RAND experts and government officials agreed that the Soviet Union represented an existential threat to western civilization, in RAND's early years there was little intellectual friction between the think tank and its patrons. As Speier had no moral compunction about using

knowledge in what he considered to be democracy's service, RAND provided him with an ideal institutional home. Speier was not alone, and over the course of the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, dozens of prominent social scientists and military theorists, including Kenneth Arrow, Bernard Brodie, Daniel Ellsberg, Herman Kahn, Thomas Schelling, and Albert Wohlstetter, worked at or for RAND.

Serving as the chief of RAND's Social Science Division enabled Speier to institutionalize the vision of intellectuals' political role that he had championed since the late 1920s. He recruited a social scientific elite, united by a dedication to the defeat of Soviet totalitarianism, which conducted policy-relevant research free from public interference. Many of the most important intellectual developments of early Cold War foreign policy, from elite studies, to game theory, to balance-of-terror theory, to counterinsurgency doctrine, to Kremlinology, originated or found their most sophisticated expressed at RAND. Within several years, RAND had become the prototypical Cold War foreign policy think tank, and other prominent think tanks, including the Center for Naval Analyses, the MITRE Corporation, and the Hudson Institute, modeled or restructured themselves along RANDian lines. Speier was a central part of the process by which foreign policy experts asserted themselves within the matrix of U.S. foreign policymaking, and his intellectual interests guided the Social Science Division in its first decade.

A Brief Return to the New School, 1947-1948

Speier returned to the New School on September 9, 1947, to resume his professorship in sociology. His colleagues, some of whom had also worked for the government during the war, graciously eased his reentry into academia: they allowed him

to serve as a State Department consultant; relieved him of most committee obligations; and approved his decision to travel to Germany for an extended period.[1] However, conflicts with faculty members, as well as his thirst to inform foreign policy, quickly led to Speier's disillusionment with university life. He left the New School after only two semesters and never returned to the Graduate Faculty, or any university position, until his retirement from the foreign policy research establishment in the late 1960s.

Speier's conflicts with colleagues began during the war and centered on the New School's Institute of World Affairs, a research center funded by Doris Duke and dedicated to providing policy-relevant knowledge to decision-makers.[2] In October 1943, Albert Salomon asked Speier to join the Institute's council.[3] Speier told Salomon and Adolph Löwe, who directed the Institute, that he "would like to be helpful, if I am wanted," and inquired as to "the functions of the Council."[4] However, despite "*repeated* inquiries," Speier never heard back from Salomon or Löwe regarding his potential duties.[5] His colleagues' silence deeply annoyed him, and he came to believe that he was

---

[1] They also allowed him to take a leave of absence when he joined RAND in the spring of 1948. The faculty extended this leave of absence several times, including in 1949, 1950, and 1951. See "The Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Executive Faculty Meeting Minutes, September 9, 1947," "The Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Executive Faculty Meeting Minutes, March 17, 1948," "The Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Executive Faculty Meeting Minutes, April 6, 1949," "The Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Executive Faculty Meeting Minutes, September 13, 1950," and "The Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Executive Faculty Meeting Minutes, March 14, 1951," GF Meeting Minutes, September 1945-June 1951, GF Meeting Minutes, NSSRA, New York, NY, Box 17.

[2] The Institute of World Affairs was one of many academic centers concerned with international relations founded in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s. Similar organizations included Yale's Institute for International Studies (founded in 1935, but which received new impetus in the late 1940s, before closing after a significant number of its faculty left for Princeton in the early 1950s); the University of Chicago's Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy (founded in 1950 and headed by Hans Morgenthau, a German exile); Princeton's Center for Research in World Political Institutes (1950); Princeton's Center of International Studies (created in 1951 out of remnants of the Yale center); Columbia's Institute of War and Peace Studies (1951); and MIT's Center for International Studies (1952).

[3] Hans Speier to Alvin Johnson, March 5, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 115.

[4] Hans Speier to Hans Staudinger, March 13, 1943, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 84 and Hans Speier to Kurt Riezler, February 3, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 57.

[5] Hans Speier to Hans Staudinger, n.d., Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 84

being "used as a pawn in ridiculous faculty politics."[6] Speier became so angry that he wrote Kurt Riezler that he "fe[lt] for the first time that it might be good for me to stay in Washington until I know better what is wrong with me or the World Institute, because something must be wrong."[7]

In a heated letter to Löwe in February 1944, Speier declared that his experiences with the Institute had been nothing but "a series of baffling disappointments."[8] Löwe attempted to apologize to Speier, letting him know that his anger "came to me as a complete shock." Löwe declared that he wanted to include Speier on the Institute's council because he was "the main representative of collective research in our sociology department, and it would seem absurd to me if you did not have a full share in the future work of the Institute."[9] Moreover, Löwe informed Speier that he had not sent him information about the Institute because he had spoken with him in person, and believed this sufficient. Löwe concluded his letter by telling Speier that he had "in no way been treated differently from other members of the council, except that some others have had the advantage of being around here and available for personal talks from time to time."[10] A hint of reproach for Speier's years-long absence from the New School permeated Löwe's letter, which did little to encourage Speier to forgive his colleagues for their perceived slights. Indeed, Speier remained very upset, and harshly criticized his colleagues, accusing them of using authoritarian methods of administration:

> I have been of the opinion that the information policy [at the New School] has been handled badly; from my own experiences in the administration … I know how great the temptation is to follow a

---

[6] Ibid.; Hans Speier to Hans Staudinger, March 3, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 84; and Hans Speier to Albert Salomon, March 5, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 67.

[7] Hans Speier to Kurt Riezler, February 3, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 57.

[8] Hans Speier to Adolph Löwe, February 13, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 14, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 14.

[9] Adolph Löwe to Hans Speier, February 23, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 14.

[10] Adolph Löwe to Hans Speier, February 23, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 14.

policy of 'persuading others by establishing facts.' This is often more efficient than democratic methods and almost always time saving. I have opposed this policy throughout my life and shall continue to do so with every means at my disposal, because I don't think it works in the long run and because I dislike it for personal reasons. … I withdraw my declaration to serve on [the Institute's council] 'in principle' *pending* further information. … Specifically, if there are any 'fights' in the faculty for prestige or influence I don't want to have any part in them as a pawn. … In the meantime I must ask you not to consider me a member of the Council.[11]

Ironically, the person who advocated for the democratic adoption of totalitarian means for reasons of expediency now upbraided his colleagues for doing the same.

More than his anger at the Institute, however, Speier's letters demonstrate how his years in Washington alienated him from his former colleagues. He displayed no willingness to grant them the benefit of the doubt, an attitude that extended to his entire position on the New School. For example, when Salomon asked him to deliver a talk at a General Seminar, the University in Exile's faculty colloquium, Speier claimed he did not have enough time, although he informed Leo Strauss that he "could sneak into the cozy corners of [the New School] if I really wanted to."[12] The war, which dealt with matters of life and death, made him disdainful not only of faculty politics, but also academics generally. In Speier's mind, the Graduate Faculty, with their petty squabbles over appointments and their jockeying for academic turf, had become a "little ridiculous."[13]

Speier's eager assimilation into American life led him to deride the academic culture of his German colleagues and he openly mocked the latter's punctilious ways. For instance, in an irate letter to Hans Staudinger, the University in Exile's dean who had accused Speier of complaining to faculty members behind his back, Speier informed Staudinger that the "notes which I sent out yesterday to a considerable number of honorable friends do not constitute a new crop of letters issued in anticipation of your last

---

[11] Hans Speier to Adolph Löwe, February 25, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 14.
[12] Hans Speier to Leo Strauss, n.d., Strauss Papers, Box 3, Folder 12.
[13] Hans Speier to Leo Strauss, May 15, 1946, Strauss Papers, Box 3, Folder 12.

letter, honorable friend."[14] Speier's remarks were a clear attack on the very German, very un-American tradition of referring to academic deans as *Spektabilitäten* (notables). In another slight that expressed his separation from the New School, Speier referred to himself as "the dishonorable Hans Speier."[15] Meanwhile, in a letter to Salomon he jokingly, and insultingly, referred to the members of the Institute of World Affairs' council as the *Geheimräte* (secret councilors), a reference to the Holy Roman Empire's Privy Council of academics who provided advice to government officials.[16] Speier's letters demonstrated that, before he even returned from the war, significant social and intellectual distance had grown between him and his colleagues. From his perch in Washington, it appeared to Speier that the New School's "atmosphere of freedom has been replaced by strangely autocratic ways," and all of his experiences with the Graduate Faculty had "made a *very* unfavorable impression" on him.[17]

Intellectually, Speier was further upset with the direction taken by the sociology department. He found the department's offerings to be "heavy on the theoretical, historical, and philosophical side and *relatively* light on the side of empirical research of social conditions and of instruction in research techniques."[18] Speier correctly deduced that after the war, which had demonstrated the utility of applied social science, there would be a new demand for empirical sociology. Any department that did not offer courses in this field could not compete in the academic marketplace. To Speier, the New School's sociologists seemed mired in the traditional German focus on theory, unwilling

---

[14] Hans Speier to Hans Staudinger, March 13, 1943, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 84.
[15] Ibid.
[16] Hans Speier to Albert Salomon, March 5, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 67.
[17] Hans Speier to Kurt Riezler, February 3, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 57.
[18] Hans Speier to Hans Staudinger, n.d., Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 84 and Hans Speier to Hans Staudinger, March 3, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 84.

to embrace the American emphasis on empirical research. Speier was also personally hurt

that his colleagues in the sociology department did not appear to appreciate his

scholarship. As he wrote to Salomon, "I was a little sad when I read your characterization

of my humble talents in your memo to Staudinger. 'Specializing in propaganda'—that's

where one is pigeonholed when one leaves for Washington, and one's closest colleagues

disregard ten years of teaching."[19] The New School did not appear to welcome new

academic developments nor, Speier feared, did they welcome him.

Speier's main interest during his year at the New School, the development of a

Division of International Studies, reflected his indifference to the sociology department

and foreshadowed his vision for the interdisciplinary and policy-relevant research he

institutionalized at RAND. International studies had come together as a field during the

war, when Paul Nitze, a government official and future Secretary of the Navy, and

Christian Herter, a congressman, founded the School of Advanced International Studies

(SAIS), which soon joined Johns Hopkins University. SAIS was designed to train

students to produce theoretical and practical knowledge for decision-makers, who Nitze

and Herter believed would have to develop new ways of thinking about the world if they

were to steer the United States through the treacherous waters of postwar international

relations. After the cessation of hostilities, a number of international studies programs

inspired by SAIS emerged at America's major universities. The New School, whose

faculty consisted of dozens of prominent émigré scholars, found itself in a unique

position, able to provide first-hand, international knowledge unavailable at other top

schools.

---

[19] Hans Speier to Albert Salomon, March 5, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 67.

On December 17, 1947, Speier's colleagues elected him to found the new division, and within two months he issued a statement in which he elucidated its academic program.[20] Speier defined "international studies" as an interdisciplinary field that broadly examined "international politics," which consisted of "international conflicts and tensions," international organization, and law.[21] International studies was not properly an academic discipline, but was rather a broad practice that required one to have "competence developed through practical experience," specialized knowledge of a social science, and the ability to apply this disciplinary knowledge to a broad array of problems.[22] Given the nature of international politics, Speier argued, the student of international studies must "be a specialist with a non-specialist's state of mind," able to incorporate his or her specific insights into the larger study of international affairs.[23]

Professors were, of course, central to Speier's educational vision. Echoing Karl Mannheim, he maintained that only teachers "who have the state of mind which they want to develop in the student" should be allowed to teach in the Division of International Studies.[24] All international studies classes would be seminars co-taught by "representatives of various departments," but would differ from regular seminars in that they would "be conducted as a *study group* in which students work jointly or singly on special aspects of the problem under discussion. Whenever possible, these study teams of students formed in the seminar should be composed of students specializing in various

---

[20] "The Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Executive Faculty Meeting Minutes, December 17, 1947," and "The Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Executive Faculty Meeting Minutes, January 28, 1948," GF Meeting Minutes, September 1945-June 1951, NSSRA, Box 17, GF Meeting Minutes, September 1945-June 1951.
[21] Hans Speier, "A Prospective Division for International Studies," February 1948, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 23: 1
[22] Ibid., 4-5.
[23] Ibid., 5.
[24] Ibid., 6.

different fields."[25] Speier emphasized that the problems of the postwar world were too large and variegated to be solved by any one scholar, and must therefore be tackled in groups. He thus envisioned an interdisciplinary, team-based work environment of the sort he instituted at RAND's Social Science Division.

Speier never realized his plans to create a Division of International Studies. Despite devoting himself to its formation, he continued to feel "entirely out of touch with the [New School] faculty," many of whom were literally "strangers."[26] His assimilation into the community of U.S. decision-makers had opened a gap between Speier and his former colleagues; the old feelings of camaraderie between exiles had been lost. It quickly became clear to Speier that he longer had a home at the University in Exile, and, before he allowed himself the chance to re-acclimate to academia, he joined the RAND Corporation. RAND was the brainchild of a group of Army Air Forces officers and civilian engineers who considered the Soviet Union as deadly a threat to world peace as Nazi Germany. They united to create a new type of institution that reproduced the wartime collaboration between academics, the military, and decision-makers on a permanent basis. Speier was deeply attracted to RAND's mission, and helped guide the think tank during its first two decades.

Containment and the Early Cold War

By the time Speier returned to the New School in the autumn of 1947, U.S. decision-makers had endorsed a vision of international relations that considered the Soviet Union an intractable enemy bent on world domination. Various Soviet actions in World War II's wake had convinced American elites that they could not deal with the

---

[25] Ibid., 12-13.
[26] Hans Speier to Hans Staudinger, March 3, 1944, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 84 and Hans Speier to Alvin Johnson, October 4, 1945, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 115.

Soviet Union as a normal diplomatic actor. As a result, foreign policymakers abandoned any hope to reconcile with Stalin and instead adopted a strategy of "containment," the central premise of which was that the only way to protect the "free" world and to convince neutral nations to join the western alliance was to prevent the Soviet Union from expanding beyond its borders. At the same time, at least in the early Cold War, decision-makers attempted to use psychological warfare to "rollback" the Soviets from their sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. The philosophy of containment, coupled with elements of rollback, dominated U.S. thinking during the early Cold War and became the strategic consensus among policymakers and the first generation of defense intellectuals.

Since America allied with the Soviet Union to defeat Nazi Germany, U.S. elites debated the potential U.S.-Soviet postwar relationship. During the war, a significant number of Russian experts, including W. Averell Harriman, the ambassador to the Soviet Union, General John R. Deane, who served in the Moscow Embassy, and Roosevelt's advisers Henry Wallace, Joseph E. Davis, and James F. Byrnes, argued that the United States should deal with the Soviet Union as it would any other nation. Roosevelt agreed, and maintained a good working relationship with Stalin from 1941 until his death. FDR's successor, Harry Truman, initially agreed that, despite some early tensions with Stalin and Vyacheslav Molotov, he could follow Roosevelt's example, and in his first year in office treated the Soviet Union as an ordinary, albeit powerful and important, state. As part of this program, the president adopted a *quid pro quo* strategy *vis-à-vis* Stalin, in which the United States would compromise over issues like Eastern Europe and the occupation of Germany in exchange for a free hand in Western Europe and East Asia.

Historians remain divided as to whether the United States or Soviet Union retains primary responsibility for the Cold War's outbreak.[27] Was it the Americans, who appeared unwilling to recognize that Stalin had legitimate security concerns? Or was it Stalin, who subscribed to a world revolutionary ideology that foretold a crisis in capitalism? The opening, and subsequent closing, of Soviet archives makes it difficult to reach consensus on this point. Regardless of the reasons for U.S.-Soviet tensions, what is certain is that over the course of 1945 and 1946 the American view of the Soviet Union changed from one in which U.S. elites believed they could reach rapprochement with their erstwhile ally to one in which they maintained it was fruitless to engage in anyway with Stalin.

George Kennan, a long-time foreign service officer and, between 1944 and 1946, Deputy Chief of the United States Mission to the USSR, codified the reasons for U.S. suspicion of the Soviet Union and expressed the basic premises of the containment philosophy in his famous Long Telegram of February 1946.[28] Kennan's missive was a

---

[27] For this debate, which raged in the 1990s after Soviet-era archives opened in Russia, see David Holloway, *Stalin and the Bomb: The Soviet Union and Atomic Energy, 1939-1954* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994); Norman Naimark, "The Soviets and the Christian Democrats: The Challenge of a 'Bourgeois' Party in Eastern Germany, 1945-1949," *East European Politics and Society* 9, no. 3 (Fall 1995): 369-392; Vladislav Zubok and Constantine Pleshakov, *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War: From Stalin to Khrushchev* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996); Vojtech Mastny, *The Cold War and Soviet Insecurity: The Stalin Years* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); John Lewis Gaddis, *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); Elena Zubkova, *Russia after the War: Hopes, Illusions, and Disappointments*, trans. Hugh Ragsdale (New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1998); and Melvyn Leffler, "The Cold War: What Do 'We Now Know?'" *American Historical Review* 104, no. 2 (April 1999): 501-524.

[28] Kennan later expanded the Long Telegram into an anonymous article for *Foreign Affairs*, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." "X" [George F. Kennan], "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs* 25 (July 1947): 566-582. There is a large literature examining Kennan, his intellectual development, and his role in shaping the early Cold War. Major works include Walter Hixson, *George Kennan: Cold War Iconoclast* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991); Richard L. Russell, *George F. Kennan's Strategic Through: The Making of an American Political Realist* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1999); Robert L. Beisner, "The Secretary, the Spy, and the Sage: Dean Acheson, Alger Hiss, and George Kennan," *Diplomatic History* 27, no. 1 (January 2003): 1-14; David Engerman, *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004); Joshua Botts, "'Nothing to Seek and … Nothing to Defend:' George F. Kennan's Core Values and

proximate response to a somewhat aggressive speech given by Stalin on February 9, and

a general reaction to the failure of the *quid pro quo* strategy to ease rising U.S.-Soviet

tensions.[29] In place of Truman's unsuccessful approach, Kennan offered a strategy that

promised to avoid a third world war while constraining the Soviet Union's potential

influence. His ideas, which mirrored a growing consensus of elite strategic thinking,

undergirded the U.S. approach to geopolitics in the early Cold War.

Kennan argued that Soviet political communications elucidated four goals with

which U.S. officials must be aware:

(A) Everything must be done to advance relative strength of USSR as factor in international society. Conversely, no opportunity must be missed to reduce strength and influence, collectively as well as individually, of capitalist powers.
(B) Soviet efforts, and those of Russia's friends abroad, must be directed toward deepening and exploiting of differences and conflicts between capitalist powers. If these eventually deepen into an 'imperialist' war, this war must be turned into revolutionary upheavals within the various capitalist countries.
(C) 'Democratic-progressive' elements abroad are to be utilized to maximum to bring pressure to bear on capitalist governments along lines agreeable to Soviet interests.
(D) Relentless battle must be waged against socialist and social-democratic leaders abroad.[30]

Kennan attributed Soviet aims to the "traditional and instinctive Russian sense of

insecurity," which held that if ordinary Russians came into contact with the "political

systems of western countries," they would overthrow their leaders.[31] Soviet elites

therefore sought to reinforce their power positions by disseminating the image of a

hostile world amongst the populace. Marxism, the central tenets of which were that

"economic conflicts [were] insoluble by peaceful means" and that capitalists were eternal

---

American Foreign Policy, 1938-1993," *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 5 (November 2006): 839-866; and John Lewis Gaddis, *George F. Kennan: An American Life* (New York: Penguin 2011).

[29] John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 15-18.

[30] George Kennan to George Marshall [The Long Telegram], February 22, 1946, Harry S. Truman Administration File, George M. Elsey Papers, Truman Library, Independence, Missouri (hereafter referred to as the Elsey Papers), <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/documents/pdf/6-6.pdf>: 3 [accessed February 22, 2013].

[31] Ibid., 5.

enemies, served as "a perfect vehicle for sense of insecurity with which Bolsheviks …

were afflicted."[32] In the Soviet ideological system, the United States naturally embodied

the inveterate capitalist foe demonized by Marxism. For these reasons, the Soviet Union

was "a political force committed fanatically to the belief that with US there can be no

permanent *modus vivendi*."[33]

However, Kennan did not believe that war between the United States and the

Soviet Union was inevitable. He declared that "Soviet power, unlike that of Hitlerite

Germany, is neither schematic nor adventuristic."[34] Although "impervious to logic of

reason, … it is highly sensitive to logic of force."[35] Soviet elites also recognized they

were much weaker than the west and were reticent to fight another war in Central Europe.

Kennan therefore asserted that Soviet forces would withdraw any future attempt to

expand in Europe "when strong resistance is encountered at any point."[36] He argued that

if the United States made "clear [its] readiness to use" force, it could contain the

Soviets.[37]

Although an East-West war was not on the horizon, Kennan continued, the United

States and the Soviet Union still had divergent national interests, and tensions between

the two nations were inevitable. He thus maintained that Americans should fight the

Soviets on psychological grounds in both domestic and foreign contexts. To win the

emergent Cold War—Kennan did not use the term—"we must see that our public is

educated to realities of Russian situation. … We must formulate and put forward for

---

[32] Ibid., 6.
[33] Ibid., 14.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.

other nations a much more positive and constructive picture of sort of world we would like to see. … Many foreign peoples … are seeking guidance rather than responsibility. We should be better able than Russians to give them this."[38] Once America shored up domestic and international morale by enlightening the public, Kennan had no doubt the United States would win the Cold War without firing a bullet.

The Long Telegram quickly spread throughout the foreign policy establishment, and Kennan's opinions regarding Soviet ideology and intentions became doctrine amongst most U.S. decision-makers and foreign policy intellectuals.[39] His prescriptions gained further credence when Winston Churchill mirrored them in his "Iron Curtain" speech of March 1946, in which the former Prime Minister declared that the Soviets respected strength, feared war, but wished for "the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines."[40] Both the Long Telegram and the Iron Curtain speech expressed a new, hostile vision of international relations that those in the foreign policy establishment quickly endorsed. As Dean Acheson later reported, U.S. elites believed that Kennan correctly "predicted that Soviet policy would be to use every means to infiltrate, divide, and weaken the West. To seek a *modus vivendi* with Moscow would

---

[38] Ibid., 16-17. Bernard Baruch coined the phrase "Cold War" in an April 16, 1947 speech before the South Carolina legislature. Later that year, Walter Lippmann popularized it in a book by the same name. Bernard Baruch, "Text of Bernard Baruch's Address at Portrait Unveiling," *New York Times*, April 17, 1947, 21 and Walter Lippmann, *The Cold War: A Study in U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Harper, 1947).

[39] Melvyn Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), 108-110; Wilson D. Miscamble, *George F. Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy, 1947-1950* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 25-27; and Gaddis, *Kennan*, chapter 10.

[40] Winston Churchill, "The Sinews of Peace," in *Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' Speech Fifty Years Later*, ed. James W. Muller (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1999), 11.

prove chimerical, a process leading not to an end but only to political warfare. …

[Kennan's] predictions and warnings could not have been better."[41]

U.S. elites accepted Kennan's framing of Soviet intentions primarily because it was easy to read Soviet actions from the war's end until the early 1950s as confirming the diplomat's expectations. On February 9, 1946, he gave a speech declaring that the world wars were the "inevitable result of … monopoly capitalism," which led many American officials to worry that Stalin envisioned a coming fight between the west and the Soviet Union.[42] Soon after, in June, Stalin rejected Bernard Baruch's plan to create an international body to regulate atomic energy, despite the fact that the Soviets did not yet have nuclear capabilities. Many elites believed this indicated Stalin's commitment to develop his own atomic arsenal. Soviet activities over the next several years, including the rigging of the January 1947 Polish elections; the insistence on receiving more territorial concessions than were agreed upon at the Potsdam Conference; the transferring of Japanese arms to Chinese communists in contravention of U.S. wishes; the request for base and transit rights in the Turkish Straits; the attempt to secure bases in the Dardanelles, Tripolitania, and the Dodecanese; the refusal to remove troops from Iran; the rejection of James Byrnes' call for a twenty-five year security treaty to disarm Germany; the request, against obvious U.S. desires, to participate in the American occupation of Japan; the renewal of Stalin's rhetorical emphasis on Marxist-Leninist principles; the promotion of espionage in the United States and Canada; and the creation

---

[41] Dean Acheson, *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1969), 151.

[42] Frank Costigliola, "The Creation of Memory and Myth: Stalin's 1946 Election Speech and the Soviet Threat," in *Critical Reflections on the Cold War: Linking Rhetoric and History*, ed. Martin J. Medhurst and H.W. Brands (College Station, TX: Texas A&M Press, 2000), 39-40.

of the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform), confirmed to U.S. elites that the Soviet Union was their enemy.

Truman's famous March 1947 speech in which he announced the "Truman Doctrine" marked the public acceptance of Kennan's framework of the U.S.-Soviet relationship. Although the proximate cause of the speech was the British announcement that, beginning on March 31, it would no longer aid the Greek government in its civil war against the communist party or provide economic assistance to Turkey, the president used the moment to announce the new U.S. approach to geopolitics. Truman asked Congress to approve a $400,000,000 aid package that would allow the Greek and Turkish governments to defend themselves against communism. The president argued that the United States must be "willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. … Collapse of free institutions and loss of independence would be disastrous not only for [Greece and Turkey] but for the world."[43] The United States, Truman emphatically declared, was now committed to combating Soviet "coercion and intimidation" wherever and whenever it arose.[44]

The containment strategy enjoyed bipartisan support and was swiftly reflected in a number of American actions. In July 1947, Truman signed the National Security Act, which created a National Military Establishment able to be mobilized quickly. In March 1948, he convinced Congress to pass the Economic Cooperation Act, which instituted the Marshall Plan for European economic recovery. U.S. elites also refused to meet with Soviet leaders; between December 1947 and January 1954, there was only one East-West

---

[43] Harry S. Truman, "Address of the President to Congress, Recommending Assistance to Greece and Turkey, March 12, 1947," Elsey Papers, 3-4.
[44] Ibid., 4.

foreign ministers meeting, and there was no summit between western and Soviet heads of state.[45] In both word and deed, decision-makers expressed their belief that the Soviet Union posed a grave danger to international peace and society.[46]

Speier spent 1945 and 1946 consumed with his German reeducation work and does not appear to have devoted much thought to the nascent Cold War, which he barely mentioned in both published and unpublished writings and letters. When he first turned to the subject of East-West tensions in the winter of 1947, he argued that the United States and Soviet Union had "conflicting military, economic, and ideological interests" that could not simply be resolved through discussion and agreement, but did not express the belief that a decades-long Cold War was inevitable.[47] However, events soon convinced him that the Soviet Union was an intransigent political actor, a "dictatorial regime" equivalent in many ways to the Nazis.[48] Therefore, Speier concluded, U.S. elites could not deal with the Soviets as they would a normal state.

Events that occurred in 1947 and 1948 engendered Speier's disavowal of the Soviet Union. During this period, Stalin ended the so-called democratic interludes in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. With Soviet aid, local communist parties seized control of the political and administrative apparatuses of state. Throughout Eastern Europe, Stalinization, characterized by forced agricultural collectivization and the complete stifling of political dissent, became official Soviet policy. Most importantly for Speier, on June 24, 1948, the Soviets imposed a blockade on West Berlin to protest the creation of

---

[45] Fredrik Logevall, "A Critique of Containment," *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 4 (September 2004): 474.
[46] For the concept of international society, see Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 13-19.
[47] Hans Speier, "The Future of German Nationalism," *Social Research* 14, no. 4 (Winter 1947): 425.
[48] Hans Speier, "The Future of Psychological Warfare," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1948): 18.

the Bizone (the joint American-British zone of occupation), the U.S. strategic embargo, the implementation of the Marshall Plan, and the founding of the *Bank deutsche Länder* and the concomitant institution of the *Deutsche Mark*. Stalin blocked all land and water routes to West Berlin and cut off the city's electrical power. In response, the western allies, under American leadership, initiated the famous Berlin airlift, which brought millions of tons of necessities to the city from June 1948 until May 1949.[49] To Speier, Stalin's actions, particularly his imposition of the blockade, had demonstrated the dictator's unwillingness to negotiate with the United States in good faith.

In the midst of the airlift, Speier argued that Soviet actions demonstrated "that the Soviet approach to world politics is 'military' in fact and language."[50] The Soviets, steeped as they were in Marxist doctrine, viewed life as a conflict between "exploiters and exploited, engaged throughout history in conflict and struggle."[51] They did not recognize a difference between peace and war; for them, said Speier, "peaceful international relations are not *essentially* different from war-like relations."[52] Soviet propaganda, which accused the west of "weakness and immorality," and thus was "identical with [messages] typically to be found in war propaganda," proved this claim.[53] Because of the Soviet perspective, Speier continued, the United States could not hope to create a world system premised on peaceful cooperation, which was "rejected in Leninist-Stalinist doctrine as so much eye-wash."[54] Stalin's actions in Eastern Europe and the

---

[49] Wolfgang J. Huschke, *The Candy Bombers: The Berlin Airlift 1948/49, The Technical Conditions and Their Successful Transformation* (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag), 287.
[50] Hans Speier, "Soviet View of Diplomacy," March 1, 1949, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 28, 1.
[51] Ibid., 2.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid., 4.
[54] Ibid., 2.

blockade of West Berlin had led Speier, by early 1949, to frame the Soviet Union as a permanent enemy of the United States and the western alliance.

The Soviet acquisition of the atomic bomb in August 1949 hardened Speier's position. He believed that the Soviets' nuclear capabilities "signified not only a crisis in American foreign relations but, given Soviet-American world rivalry, an unprecedented crisis in world history."[55] Because the U.S. atomic monopoly "alone contained Soviet aggression and preserved the peace," for the first time since the Nazi defeat, "peace and Western civilization are in jeopardy."[56] Foreign policy elites, Speier argued, needed to accept that they could no longer rely on their atomic monopoly to offset "the tremendous Soviet superiority in men under arms and in various weapons categories of decisive importance for land warfare."[57] The only way to defend against the Soviets was for U.S. leaders to reorganize society along a wartime footing. With the Soviet atomic explosion, Americans could no longer avoid the "stress on the social fabric and the drain on both resources and civil liberties which large armies conscripted in peacetime constitute."[58] Speier now considered it likely that there would be a "continued conflict of national interests with a possibly increasing Soviet capability," and for this reason, the United States needed to prepare to fight a long, and existential, Cold War, militarizing society in the process.[59] To Speier, the Soviets had become as great a threat as the Nazis.

Fear again began to permeate Speier's writings, and he harshly critiqued any perceived decrease in the U.S. fighting capacity. He expressed his strong disapproval of

---

[55] Hans Speier, "Comments on Current Policy Requirements," November 21, 1949, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 32, 4.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid., 2.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid., 6.

Truman's reduction of "the number of Air Force groups considerably below the level which the Congress had approved," as well as Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson's public discussions about cutting his department's budget.[60] The current "crisis in world history" necessitated that more funds be devoted to "offensive and defensive procurements, research and development, [and] intelligence."[61] Most importantly, Speier hoped that the United States committed itself fully to "subversive warfare."[62] He admitted that his proposed program was

> profoundly repugnant to the American people and conflict with its moral and religious heritage shared by its leaders. It is possible, however, that a point has been reached in world history where some American leaders should consider themselves to be called upon to sacrifice secretly their own cherished values in order to enable their countrymen to live with these values in the future. This again is an untraditional, heterodox thought, but while it may have to be barred from the public at large, it is perhaps necessary for a few men to lift these bars.[63]

As in the 1930s, Speier's diagnosis of crisis, coupled with his tacit elitism and belief that the crisis would not last forever, allowed him to endorse anti-democratic methods in good conscience.

Many foreign policy elites agreed with Speier's perspective. Although they had supported the policy of containment for several years, and had indeed acted upon it in several instances such as the Berlin Airlift, they now doubled down on this strategy. In April 1950, the National Security Council (NSC) approved NSC-68, a document that called for an increased military budget and encouraged the United States to adopt a more active role in world affairs.[64] Soon after, in June, Truman committed U.S. troops to Korea as part of a United Nations (UN) force, and, in September, decided to send a number of divisions to Western Europe. The United States began to prepare for a long Cold War.

---

[60] Ibid., 3.
[61] Ibid., 4-6.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid., 6.
[64] For more on NSC-68, see Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment*, chapter 4 and Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power*, chapter 8.

On the cusp of the 1950s, Stalin's actions and the Soviet acquisition of nuclear

capabilities engendered a fear in Speier that impelled him to analogize the Soviet Union

and Nazi Germany. From then on, he considered the two regimes in tandem: "There are

of course differences between the Nazi and Soviet dictatorships. … While these

differences should not be overlooked, it is possible the dissimilarities … are less

significant than other factors which all totalitarian regimes have in common."[65] Because

the Soviets were as dangerous as the Nazis, Speier argued that, as they had with Hitler,

intellectuals needed to mobilize to defeat Stalin and his anti-democratic coterie. Speier

would do what he could as chief of the Social Science Division of the RAND

Corporation, a think tank based in Santa Monica, California, which became a major

intellectual and ideological resource for U.S. foreign policy elites in the early Cold War.

Social Science at the RAND Corporation

Speier expressed the foreign policy establishment consensus when he stated that,

as far as he could tell; "the Politburo will … avoid war at this juncture of Soviet-

American relations."[66] Similar to their Soviet counterparts, U.S. elites had no interest in

fighting an all-out war. However, decision-makers also wanted to contain the Soviet

Union. The dual goals of war-avoidance and containment relied upon a credible atomic

threat. At the same time, military officials instituted a strategy of defense in depth that

they believed would undergird America's rise to globalism. The Pearl Harbor experience

had demonstrated to the newly established Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) that, to defend

itself, the United States required a ring of bases that encircled the entire Western

---

[65] Hans Speier, "Stability and Instability of Totalitarian Systems of Government," November 8, 1951, Ford Foundation Archives, Ford Foundation, New York, New York (hereafter referred to as the FFA), Report 10639, 1.
[66] Speier, "Comments on Current Policy Requirements," 6.

Hemisphere. By controlling the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, the JCS hoped to make any attack against America impossible. Such a base system would also enable the United States to project its power quickly and, if necessary, strike the Soviet Union.[67]

The United States Air Force (USAF), as the deliverer of U.S. atomic bombs and a cornerstone of the base system, occupied a position of central strategic importance in the early Cold War. By the late 1940s, U.S. foreign policy and military officials recognized the Air Force as the primary branch responsible for defending the United States and asserting the nation's power.[68] USAF generals, for their part, sought to bolster their branch's influence in a variety of ways, including mobilizing expert knowledge. Since World War II, the Air Force had improved its strategy and tactics by employing academics to work on military problems. In the early Cold War, the Air Force institutionalized its connections with experts by creating Project RAND, a program designed to give the Air Force permanent access to the United States' most sophisticated and clever minds.

Project RAND initially focused on engineering and technical research. However, its founders quickly came to realize that a Cold War extensively fought with non-military means required the knowledge of social scientists concerned with the psychological and political aspects of international relations. In September 1947, Project RAND's founders invited a number of prominent defense intellectuals, including Speier, to a Conference of Social Scientists designed to identify a leader for RAND's incipient Social Science and Economics Divisions. Speier made a very favorable impression at the meeting, and soon

---

[67] Melvyn Leffler, "The American Conception of National Security and the Beginnings of the Cold War, 1945-84," *American Historical Review* 89, no. 2 (April 1984): 349-351.

[68] Stephen L. McFarland, "The Air Force in the Cold War, 1945-60: Birth of a New Defense Paradigm," *Airpower Journal* 10, no. 3 (Fall 1996): 7-8.

after, RAND's founders asked him to direct the Social Science Division (SSD). In the 1950s and 1960s, Speier's SSD produced a number of studies that informed the direction of U.S. foreign policy and social science research.

Project RAND, which became the RAND Corporation in 1948, grew out of World-War-II-era operations research.[69] During the war, civilian intellectuals and military officers came together in research groups to determine how best to use various new technologies in service of military victory.[70] Of all the armed forces, the Army Air Forces (AAF) dedicated itself most fully to operations research. In early 1944, AAF General H.H. "Hap" Arnold and Edward L. Bowles, head of MIT's Radiation Laboratory (Rad Lab), tapped Arthur E. Raymond, chief engineer of the Douglas Aircraft Company (DAC), and Franklin R. Collbohm, Raymond's aid, to direct a project analyzing the AAF's strategic bombing efforts. Under Raymond and Collbohm's supervision, the project's analysts concluded that removing the Boeing B-29 Superfortress's armor would improve the plane's range, speed, and carrying capacity. General Curtis LeMay, commander of the XXI Bomber Command in the Pacific, implemented Raymond and

---

[69] The following account of RAND's early years is based on four sources: Bruce L.R. Smith, *The RAND Corporation: Case Study of a Nonprofit Advisory Corporation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966); Fred Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991); David R. Jardini, "Out of the Blue Yonder: The RAND Corporation's Diversification into Social Welfare Research, 1946-1968," Ph.D Dissertation, Carnegie-Mellon University, 1996; and Martin Collins, *Cold War Laboratory: RAND, the Air Force, and the American State, 1945-1960* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press, 2002).

[70] Smith, *The RAND Corporation*, 34-38 and Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon*, 52-56. The most well-known operations research plan was the War Department's United States Strategic Bombing Survey (USSBS). The USSBS was a model operations research effort, bringing together dozens of specialists to analyze the effects of strategic bombing on Nazi Germany to improve U.S. bombing efforts in the Pacific Theater of Operations. For more on the USSBS, see David MacIsaac, *Strategic Bombing in World War Two: The Story of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1976); Melden E. Smith, Jr., "The Strategic Bombing Debate: The Second World War and Vietnam," *Journal of Contemporary History* 12, no. 1 (January 1977): 175-191; Gian P. Gentile, "Advocacy or Assessment? The United States Strategic Bombing Survey of Germany and Japan," *Pacific Historical Review* 66, no. 1 (February 1997): 53-79; and Gian P. Gentile, *How Effective is Strategic Bombing?: Lessons Learned from World War II to Kosovo* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 2.

Collbohm's recommendation and quickly reported its success. Arnold was delighted with the effort's favorable outcome, and came to believe that scientific knowledge was a crucial means to improve the AAF's capabilities and, in the process, allow the branch to present itself as the modern answer to the United States' military problems. The project's success and Arnold's enthusiasm were the seeds from which RAND grew.

Arnold feared that after World War II, the members of the strategic brain trust the AAF had assembled would disperse to a variety of academic institutions, which would deprive the Air Force of its competitive advantage *vis-à-vis* the other armed services and threaten its goal of becoming an independent service. In the spring of 1945, Arnold instructed Collbohm to create a peacetime organization of AAF-connected scientists and engineers. The general was particularly interested in where his proposed organization would be headquartered. He was convinced that it could not be based at a university, because analysts required security clearance, but also believed it could not be based in the government, because government salaries were too low to attract top academics. Arnold and Collbohm decided to pursue a middle-path between the government and academia, and in consultation with Donald Douglas, Arnold's personal friend and in-law, based the organization at DAC.

On October 1, 1945, Arnold, Bowles, Collbohm, Douglas, Raymond, and others met to discuss Arnold's plan. At the meeting, Raymond suggested that the project be named RAND, an acronym of Research and Development. Arnold pledged $1,000,000 to RAND, which was envisioned, according to its December charter, as "a continuing program of scientific study and research on the broad subject of air warfare with the object of recommending to the Air Force preferred methods, techniques, and

instrumentalities for this purpose."[71] Collbohm was appointed to serve as the

organization's temporary head, although his position soon became permanent. On March

1, 1946, Project RAND officially began operations.

RAND was just one of a group of military-connected, semi-independent think

tanks to emerge in the late 1940s.[72] In addition to RAND, the Department of Defenses'

Research and Development Board, the Air Forces' Human Resources Research Institute,

the Navy's Office of Naval Research, the Army's Human Relations Research Office and

Operations Research Office, and the Department of Defense-associated Institute for

Defense Analyses, were founded to connect intellectuals with military officials.[73] A

litany of university-associated institutes dedicated to policy research also arose.[74] For the

first time, intellectual experts became central participants in the formulation of U.S.

foreign policy knowledge. RAND's semi-independent status and strong connections to

the highest realms of the government and military allowed it to develop a culture of

experimentation and to attract some of America's sharpest minds, which led it to become

the most prestigious, important, and influential foreign policy think tank.

---

[71] Quoted in Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon*, 59.

[72] RAND became associated in the public mind with these types of think tanks. Part of the reason RAND became so well known was that in 1951, Collbohm allowed *Fortune* magazine to write a profile on it. Afterwards, it became "the media's go-to example as the prototype of the 'think tank,' a shadowy new Cold War entity that symbolized the possible benefits and horrors of science." Collins, *Cold War Laboratory*, 219. For the *Fortune* article detailing RAND's rise, see John MacDonald, "The War of Wits," *Fortune* 43 (March 1951): 99-158.

[73] For more on these organizations, see Ron Theodore Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Intellectual Complex* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 49-53. Speier's role on the Human Relations and Morale subcommittee of the Committee on Human Resources of the Research and Development Board was particularly important, as this was the body that had a direct impact on what communication studies were funded. See Christopher Simpson, *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945-1960* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 58.

[74] See Bruce Kuklick, *Blind Oracles: Intellectuals and War from Kennan to Kissinger* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), chapter 3.

RAND's first home was the second floor of DAC in Santa Monica, California.

RAND's founders deliberately headquartered the organization on the west coast, as they

wanted their analysts to avoid falling prey to the middle-of-the-road beltway thinking that

they asserted dominated Washington. RAND grew quickly, and by the fall of 1947

employed 150 analysts. It was around this time that tensions between DAC and RAND

emerged.[75] Donald Douglas had come to believe that the USAF rejected several of his

company's contract bids because Air Force generals wanted to avoid accusations that

they played favorites with private interests. Meanwhile, a number of RAND employees

worried that they could not retain secrecy from DAC employees, with whom they worked

in close contact. RAND also faced internal Air Force opposition from officers who

argued that civilian research distracted from the service's primary focus on strategic

bombing. These tensions led many to conclude that the project would soon close its

doors. To save RAND, Collbohm contacted H. Rowan Gaither, a former colleague of

Bowles from the Rad Lab and a wealthy attorney and banker, for advice. Gaither and

Collbohm determined that to survive, RAND needed to separate from DAC and reinvent

itself as an independent, non-profit corporation. DAC and the Air Force agreed, and on

May 14, 1948, Project RAND became the RAND Corporation.[76] However, RAND

---

[75] Janet Farrell Brodie, "Learning Secrecy in the Early Cold War: The RAND Corporation," *Diplomatic History* 35, no. 4 (September 2011): 649.

[76] With Gaither's backing, RAND lobbied for and received a $100,000 interest-free loan and $300,000 credit guarantee from Henry Ford II of the Ford Foundation, as well as a $150,000 credit line from Wells Fargo bank. The Ford Foundation continued to be a crucial early funder of RAND. In 1950, for example, it extended the $100,000 interest free loan to $1,000,000 to allow RAND to construct a new headquarters and expand its research program. The Ford Foundation eventually converted this loan into a grant. Other early financial supporters of RAND included the Carnegie Corporation, the National Science Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation. For details on RAND's founding, see Collins, *Cold War Laboratory*, 156-161.

remained intellectually and financially tethered to the USAF, which provided a

significant amount of its funding and influenced the direction of its research.[77]

RAND initially employed engineers, scientists, and mathematicians.[78]

Nevertheless, policy elites' interest in psychological warfare made it clear that the think

tank could become and remain a major center for military and foreign policy research

only if it incorporated social scientists. In his Long Telegram, Kennan had made clear the

importance of psychological factors for defeating the Soviet Union, and in 1947 and

1948, policymakers endorsed psychological warfare in several NSC resolutions and one

legislative act. In December 1947, the NSC approved NSC-4 and NSC-4-A, which

committed the United States to "the immediate strengthening and coordination of all

foreign information measures," and allowed the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to

pursue covert psychological warfare programs.[79] In January 1948, Congress passed the

Smith-Mundt Act, which created an "information service" "to promote a better

understanding of the United States in other countries, and to increase mutual

understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other

---

[77] Smith, *The RAND Corporation*, 76-83. Yet, RAND did welcome non-USAF projects. The first non-Air Force contract accepted by RAND came from the Atomic Energy Commission in the summer of 1949. "Interview with Frank Collbohm. Conducted by Martin Collins and Joseph Tatarewicz. July 28, 1987 in Palm Desert, California," National Air and Space Museum Archives, Smithsonian Institution Libraries (hereafter referred to as the NASM Archives), Washington, D.C., 18. In many ways, the USAF granted RAND significant freedom to pursue its own interests, although throughout the early Cold War it accounted for 75 percent or more of RAND's work. Despite this freedom, RAND analysts could be fired for contributing to projects that promoted interests with which the Air Force disagreed. This happened in the case of Albert Wohlstetter, who was fired from RAND in the early 1960s for advising colleagues serving in Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's Office of Systems Analysis to stand against USAF interests. Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon*, 348. For more on RAND's early years, see Hans Speier, *An Historical Look at the RAND Research Program* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, B-152, July 5, 1961), 1.
[78] Its first report, *Preliminary Design of an Experimental World-Circling Spaceship*, reflected these technical concerns. U.S. Air Force Project RAND, *Preliminary Design of an Experimental World-Circling Spaceship* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, SM-11827, May 2, 1946).
[79] National Security Council Resolution 4, December 9, 1947, and National Security Council Resolution 4-A, December 9, 1947 <http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nsc-hst/nsc-4.htm> [accessed February 20, 2013].

188

countries."[80] Six months later, the NSC endorsed NSC-10/2, which authorized "propaganda, economic warfare, preventive direct action," and other subversive measures to support "indigenous anti-communist elements in threatened countries of the free world."[81] Finally, in November, the NSC approved NSC-20/4, which endorsed a policy of "political, economic, and psychological warfare" against the Soviet Union and its satellites.[82] In the early Cold War, U.S. decision-makers hoped they could use techniques of psychological warfare to alter the hearts and minds, and thus the behavior, of Soviet and neutral populaces and in the process avoid an all-out war. If psychological warfare proved effective, policymakers hoped, the United States could win the East-West struggle without fighting a single battle.[83]

Even before the NSC resolutions and the Smith-Mundt Act, Air Force leaders recognized the growing importance of psychological warfare to civilian and military officials. As Project RAND was getting underway, General Laurence Craigie informed its founders that their program needed "to devote adequate attention to psychological warfare."[84] In response to RAND's need for intellectuals familiar with political and psychological issues, Olaf Helmer, a German exile, logician, and RAND analyst, suggested to John Davis Williams, a major RAND figure in mathematics, that the

---

[80] "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948," January 27, 1948 <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/177574.pdf> [accessed February 20, 2013].
[81] National Security Council Resolution 10/2, June 18, 1948, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1945-1950: Emergence of the Intelligence Establishment*, Document 292. < http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1945-50Intel/d292?> [accessed February 12, 2013].
[82] "U.S. Objectives with Respect to the USSR to Counter Soviet Threats to U.S. Security," *Foreign Relations of the United States*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Department of State, 1948), 663-669.
[83] Mario del Pero, "The United States and 'Psychological Warfare' in Italy, 1948-1955," *Journal of American History* 87, no. 4 (March 2001): 1304-1305.
[84] Speier, *The Rand Social Science Program*, 1.

organization adopt an avowedly social scientific focus.[85] Williams soon convinced

Collbohm of the need to found two new divisions, one in economics and the other in

social science.[86] As a consequence, in the summer of 1946 a group composed of Herbert

Goldhamer, Helmer, Frederick Mosteller, Leo Rosten, W. Allen Wallis, Warren Weaver,

and Samuel S. Wilks began to consider which social scientists to bring to RAND.[87] Based

on this committee's recommendations, in September 1947 RAND organized a

Conference of Social Scientists to recruit members to its nascent Social Science and

Economics Divisions.

RAND invited a number of German émigrés to the conference, including Speier,

Ernst Kris, and Franz Neumann.[88] Speier came to RAND's attention through Rosten,

---

[85] Kaplan, *Wizards of Armageddon*, 62. For more on Helmer and Williams, see Philip Mirowski, *Machine Dreams: Economics Becomes a Cyborg Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 211 and Sharon Ghamari-Tabrizi, *The Worlds of Herman Kahn: The Intuitive Science of Thermonuclear War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), 340 ff 28.

[86] RAND lore has it that General Curtis LeMay, who had been appointed to the new position of Deputy Chief of Air Staff for Research and Development, and was thus responsible for RAND, was initially reluctant to found an economics or social science division, and that Williams had to travel to Washington to convince LeMay personally of the utility of social scientists for U.S. national security. David Jardini has cast doubts on this story, although it was regularly repeated in oral history interviews. Jardini, "Out of the Blue Yonder," 84

[87] Collins, *Cold War Laboratory*, 125.

[88] Émigrés remained recognizably important actors within the government in the early Cold War. For example, the Office of Policy Coordination created Operation Bloodstone, which sought to recruit Eastern European exiles for intelligence and paramilitary operations. Exiles were also the main staffers of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty (both of which the CIA controlled through its National Committee for a Free Europe). For more on Bloodstone, see Christopher Simpson, *Blowback: America's Recruitment of Nazis and Its Effects on the Cold War* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1988), 99-105. The full list of participants at the RAND conference were: Armen Alchian (UCLA); Mortimer Andron (UC-Santa Barbara); Chester I. Barbard (New Jersey Bell Telephone Company); Ruth Benedict (Columbia); Bernard Berelson (Chicago); Bernard Brodie (Yale); Ansley J. Coale (Princeton); Collbohm (RAND); Charles Dollard (Carnegie Corporation); William T.R. Fox (Yale); Herbert Goldhamer (Chicago); Horace M. Gray (University of Illinois); Olaf Helmer (RAND); Lawrence J. Henderson, Jr. (RAND); Pendleton Herring (Carnegie Corporation); Charles Hitch (Oxford); Clark L. Hull (Yale); Abraham Kaplan (UCLA); Kris (New School); Lasswell (Yale); Frank Lorimer (Princeton); Donald Marquis (Michigan); Frederick Mosteller (Harvard); Neumann (Columbia); William F. Ogburn (Chicago); Louis N. Ridenour (University of Illinois); Edward Shaw (Stanford); Speier; Samuel Stouffer (Harvard); Jacob Viner (Princeton); Allen Wallis (Chicago); Warren Weaver (Rockefeller Foundation); Samuel S. Wilks (Princeton); John D. Williams (RAND); and Donald Young (Social Science Research Council). See also "Interview with Frank Collbohm. Conducted by Martin Collins and Joseph Tatarewicz. July 28, 1987 in Palm Desert, California," NASM Archives, 22.

with whom he had worked at the Office of War Information (OWI).[89] Speier had not

heard of RAND before he received the conference invitation, and asked State Department

colleagues whether or not it was a genuine enterprise. Speier's erstwhile colleagues

assured him that RAND was legitimate, and indeed had strong and direct ties to the Air

Force and government. The prospect to work for, but outside of, the government

intrigued Speier, and he accepted the invitation; he was so curious, in fact, that he met

with Larry Henderson, RAND's representative in Washington, D.C., before the meeting.

The conference made a very favorable impression on him.[90] RAND's representatives,

Collbohm and Warren Weaver, Director of the Division of Natural Sciences at the

Rockefeller Foundation and an important early RAND consultant, presented an image of

the think tank that complemented Speier's desire to have uninhibited research freedom as

well as access to policymakers.

   Most of the intellectuals who attended the RAND conference had worked for the

government during the war, but had made the choice to return to academia or the private

sector. Collbohm and Weaver thus believed that their major task was to convince the

conference's attendees that RAND combined the best of the government and academic

worlds. Collbohm began his remarks by stressing RAND's independence. He declared

that because "the RAND Project is for the purpose of advising the military what to do …

---

[89] Rosten was a Russian-Jewish writer and literary scholar. He had studied under Jacob Viner at Chicago, although he left academia to become a Hollywood screenwriter. During the war, he worked at the OWI as liaison between Washington and Hollywood. Rosten was instrumental in convincing government officials to use films for propaganda, and was responsible for convincing Walt Disney to make propaganda films. He came to RAND through Allen Wallis, who had worked with Williams and Helmer during the war on the Applied Mathematics Panel (AMP). For Rosten's activities in the late-1940s and early-1950s, see Brodie, "Learning Secrecy in the Early Cold War," 665-668.

[90] Unfortunately, no contemporary surviving materials reveal what Speier thought at the time. His early efforts to join RAND, however, indicate that his later, positive assessments of the conference likely reflected his contemporary opinion. "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 200-274 and "Interview with Hans Speier. Conducted by Martin Collins. April 5, 1988 in Hartsdale, New York," NASM Archives, 19-65.

the military cannot tell RAND what to do, but must confine itself to telling RAND what others are doing."[91] Despite RAND's independence, though, the USAF "makes available to RAND information in other fields, intelligence, plans, etc., so that RAND can base its operations on knowledge given it by the military, but not on directives given it by the military."[92] At RAND, Collbohm declared, analysts had the independence they would at a university, with the access to information they would in the government.

Weaver expanded upon Collbohm's comments to argue that intellectuals had a duty to contribute to the United States' fight against Soviet totalitarianism. He maintained that several things united all those who attended the conference: they were "fundamentally interested and devoted to what can broadly be called the rational life;" were "fundamentally interested in the state of the world, and, as a matter of fact, [were] not so very enthusiastic about it;" and were "desperately dedicated to the ideals of democracy."[93] Most importantly, the conference's attendees were "desperately concerned to do everything we can for the defense of our country."[94] RAND, Weaver continued, was a place where intellectuals could actually affect the world with their knowledge. At RAND, "every piece of knowledge that we have—every piece of knowledge we have in sociology and in economics and in political science"—would be forged into "weapons" for the defense of democracy.[95] Weaver concluded that, in a period of Cold War during

[91] Frank Collbohm, "Opening Plenary," in U.S. Air Force Project RAND, *Conference of Social Scientists, September 14-19, 1947—New York* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, R-106, June 9, 1948), 1.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Warren Weaver, "Opening Plenary," in U.S. Air Force Project RAND, *Conference of Social Scientists, September 14-19, 1947—New York* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, R-106, June 9, 1948), 2.
[94] Ibid., 3.
[95] Ibid., 8.

which the fate of western civilization hung in the balance, intellectuals had a "moral duty" to "be concerned with defense."[96]

The remarks of Weaver and Collbohm appealed to Speier, who used the conference time to demonstrate that he was a sophisticated analyst of the role psychology played in international relations.[97] He also made clear that he agreed with their view that the Cold War was a war dedicated to, as Ruth Benedict put it, "saving western civilization," and displayed his commitment to the basic premises of U.S. grand strategy.[98] At the conference, Speier fully endorsed Kennan's conception of containment and emphasized the importance of psychology to the Cold War. He declared that the "fundamental task of American foreign policy [is] to stem Communism anywhere without at the same time playing into the hands of Fascism."[99] Because not only real, but also "imagined foreign policy … has a direct bearing on [the] domestic development" of America and other countries, U.S. policymakers needed to be concerned with the psychological effects of their actions.[100] In particular, Speier declared, American elites must manipulate perceptions of the international "distribution of right and wrong," convincing the U.S. public, as well as allied and neutral nations, that the United States was morally upright while the Soviet Union was morally deficient.[101] If they were able to do so, he continued, decision-makers could shore up the U.S.' power base, erode potential Soviet influence, avoid an all-out war, and eventually win the East-West struggle. Speier presented himself as a "cold warrior" who ascribed to the basic tenets of

---

[96] Ibid.
[97] U.S. Air Force Project RAND, *Conference of Social Scientists, September 14-19, 1947—New York* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, R-106, June 9, 1948), 95-156.
[98] Ibid., 16.
[99] Ibid., 184.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid., 108.

U.S. geostrategy: America could not deal with the Soviet Union; the nation must prevent

the Soviets from expanding anywhere in the world; and it must do so without fighting a

war. At the same time, he made clear he was no unsophisticated militarist, but was rather

someone who understood the subtle relationship between psychology and international

relations in the postwar era.

Speier greatly impressed RAND's leaders, who soon offered him the position of

SSD Director. However, he had several initial reservations about accepting RAND's

offer. In 1947, RAND remained tied to DAC. Speier worried that if he worked for a

business, he would have to answer to private-sector know-nothings who would be just as

bad, if not worse, than government bureaucrats. Moreover, he was concerned about

RAND's location. He did not want to relocate his family to the west coast, nor did he

want to sever his ties to the Washington power structure.[102] Upon hearing of his concerns,

RAND representatives let Speier know that the think tank would soon leave Douglas, and

that they would allow him to base the SSD in Washington, where it remained until

1957.[103] Once RAND granted these accommodations, Speier accepted the position. He

---

[102] Hans Speier, *The RAND Social Science Program* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, D-717-PR, February 2, 1950), 1 and "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32: 212.

[103] The division moved to Santa Monica in 1957 because Speier believed RAND's directors did not give the SSD enough budgetary consideration. When he traveled to Santa Monica to complain to J. Richard Goldstein, Collbohm's Associate Director, Goldstein informed him that no one at RAND cared about the opinions of the Washington office. Speier threatened to leave over this issue, but was persuaded by Goldstein and Collbohm to stay. Speier then moved to Santa Monica, although a small contingent of social scientists remained in Washington. "Interview with Hans Speier. Conducted by Martin Collins. April 5, 1988 in Hartsdale, New York:" NASM Archives, 32-34; "Interview with Frank Collbohm. Conducted by Martin Collins and Joseph Tatarewicz. July 28, 1987 in Palm Desert, California," NASM Archives, 44; Hans Speier to Leo Strauss, April 8, 1952, Strauss Papers, Box 3, Folder 12; and Hans Speier to Leo Strauss, June 29, 1952, Strauss Papers, Box 3, Folder 12.

began working as a RAND consultant in May 1948 before officially starting as head of the SSD in July.[104]

Collbohm granted Speier complete administrative freedom, and his interests and concerns decidedly shaped the early SSD.[105] He made practical skills a requirement of employment, and only interviewed analysts who had "first-hand experience" in government service, believing the job required one to know how to "conduct … research as well as … gai[n] access to necessary government information."[106] As such, Speier hired many former colleagues from the war in whom he had faith, including Phil Davison, Alexander George, and Nathan Leites. He was also personally responsible for recruiting a number of prominent nuclear strategists to RAND, including Bernard Brodie and William Kaufmann. Finally, he employed several fellow exiles as consultants, including Leon Gouré, John H. Herz, and Otto Kirchheimer.

Speier envisioned the SSD's major purpose to be the provision of "a better understanding of the international political context in which strategic decisions are made, [and] of the arena of power which will be affected by such decisions."[107] Because of this conviction, he made certain that all of his employees "share a common interest in the study of man, his behavior, his motivations and aspirations, the way he plans and organizes his life and the ways he acts with or against others."[108] That is to say, the SSD housed humanists concerned with qualitative analysis who reflected Speier's own

---

[104] Speier, *The RAND Social Science Program*, 2 and J.S. King to Hans Speier, May 25, 1948, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 17.
[105] "Interview with Frank Collbohm. Conducted by Martin Collins and Joseph Tatarewicz. July 28, 1987 in Palm Desert, California," NASM Archives, 38-39, 41
[106] Speier, *The Rand Social Science Program*, 2.
[107] Ibid., 4.
[108] Ibid., 2.

research, which stood in the qualitative tradition of German historical sociology.[109] As part of this project, Speier not only hired social scientists, but also historians, philosophers, and linguists.[110] Indeed, in its early years, the SSD made little room for quantitatively oriented social scientists. Since the 1930s, Speier had claimed that the attempt to treat "social phenomena by methods borrowed from the natural sciences [was] a fundamental failure," and he organized the SSD around this perspective.[111] He did not try to beat the economists or physicists at their own game, and rejected mechanistic understandings of sociopolitical life. Instead, Speier carved out a qualitative space for his division in an organization that fetishized quantitative analysis.

At RAND, there existed a strong divide between the "soft" social sciences, such as sociology and political science, and the "hard" social and natural sciences, namely economics and physics, which Speier's decision to hire qualitatively oriented intellectuals helped create. Throughout his time at RAND, Speier found that "hard" scientists underestimated or denigrated the contributions social scientists could make to the study of international relations, a claim confirmed by the remarks of other RAND analysts. For example, George Tanham, a fellow social scientist, later described Speier as representative of a non-quantitative tradition derided by other divisions.[112] Albert Wohlstetter, of the Mathematics and Economics Divisions, similarly reported that the

---

[109] George Steinmetz, "The Historical Sociology of Historical Sociology: Germany and the United States in the Twentieth Century," *Sociologica* 3 (2007): 1-28.

[110] This stands against Ron Robin's claim that the SSD did not hire humanities scholars. Robin, *Cold War Enemy*, 53-55.

[111] Hans Speier, "Book Review: Homans, George C. and Curtis, Charles P. *An Introduction to Pareto: His Sociology*," *Social Research* 1, no. 4 (November 1934): 524.

[112] "Interview with George Tanham. Conducted by Martin Collins. August 19, 1987 in Washington, D.C.," NASM Archives, 11, 13. See also Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon*, 76.

members of the SSD "weren't in the mainstream of RAND" methodologically.[113] As

many of the American social sciences took a quantitative turn—a development fostered

partially by the Economics Division's embrace of game theory—analysts ridiculed the

more historically informed research of the SSD. The fact that the USAF, an organization

heavily composed of engineers and pilots, was interested in technical research more than

qualitative work further led to the SSD's institutional alienation. Indeed, Speier's internal

reports to his superiors displayed a certain defensiveness regarding his division's

research:

> The fact that [political and psychological factors] cannot be quantified does not mean they cannot
> be studied. Sometimes Social Science research can heighten the plausibility of assumptions made
> in a given design for a systems analysis [as practiced by RAND's other divisions]. … I doubt that
> it is possible to design a systems analysis which would assist in the making of what I have called
> strategic or political decisions. For example, it may be left to our choice whether we would want
> to wage war in order to attain the enemy's unconditional surrender or whether we would rather use
> force for the purpose of attaining peace by negotiation.[114]

What the social scientist could do, which the economist or physicist could not do, was

delineate the sociopolitical and psychological environment in which military and foreign

policy decisions were made, analyze their potential consequences, and determine which

decision made the most sense given a particular goal. For this reason, Speier argued, the

SSD was essential.

The culture Speier worked to create in the SSD further separated it from RAND's

other divisions. Whereas the other division heads favored bureaucracy, Speier embraced

an anti-bureaucratic management style. He believed "the health of an organization can be

gauged by the effectiveness of its informal communications," and granted his employees

---

[113] "Interview with Albert Wohlstetter. Conducted by Martin Collins and Joseph Tatarewicz. July 29, 1987 in Los Angeles, California," NASM Archives, 22.
[114] Speier, *The Rand Social Science Program*, 6.

free reign to "generat[e] research ideas within the division" without oversight.[115] Speier did all he could to avoid the "inevitable" "tendency" prevalent in "government bureaucracies" "to draw research people away from research into support of management."[116] He made certain that in the SSD, "relatively few people with research interests [were] burdened with participation in the performance of management functions."[117] Its methods, style, and physical distance from Santa Monica made the SSD a unique fiefdom within RAND that did not interact productively with other divisions. As Speier once wrote Collbohm, he could "not talk about inter-divisional criticism of Social Science research because of the lack of experiences worth talking about."[118]

The SSD's isolation did not prevent Speier from finding RAND an enlightening and stimulating organization. It was a space where he felt he connected to "real life" in a way he could not at the New School, and his position gave him a sense of self-importance. The think tank had direct access to the Air Force, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Bureau of Standards, the Navy, the Research Development Board, the State Department, and the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group, and Speier met with many of the highest-ranking foreign policy and military officials of these and other organizations.[119] Moreover, his position granted him the highest level of nuclear clearance, "Q clearance," which enabled him to visit top-secret nuclear installations, including the headquarters of the North

---

[115] Hans Speier, "Memorandum on RAND Organization and Management," October 31, 1952, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 51, 1, 3.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Ibid., 4.
[119] Collins, *Cold War Laboratory*, 149.

American Aerospace Defense Command and Strategic Air Command (SAC).[120] At RAND, Speier "had the feeling that I was every day learning infinitely more about life, about society, and especially about the … peaks of society … that made political and military decisions. And also, why these decisions were so difficult. This was all new. I had never learned any of this before."[121] He had entered the halls of American power on his own terms, and had no desire to leave.

Speier served as head of the SSD until 1960, when upper management reorganized RAND along decentralized lines. In October 1960, RAND's five divisions— Economics, Engineering, Mathematics, Physics, and Social Science—were broken up into eleven smaller departments. Goldhamer took over from Speier as head of the reorganized SSD, and the latter became a member of RAND's Research Council, which served an informal advisory role.[122] Despite receiving a number of prestigious academic offers in the 1950s and 1960s, Speier refused to leave RAND.[123] For him, the think tank was the type of institution to which he had long wanted to belong. RAND provided Speier with the opportunity to pursue research outside the confines of academia, meet with U.S. foreign policy and military elites, and defend democracy by using social science in the service of power. For his part, Speier profoundly informed the composition and direction of the SSD, in the process influencing U.S. foreign policy and U.S. intellectuals' framework of the Cold War.

---

[120] Only the most senior RAND officials and physicists working on nuclear issues had this clearance level. See Kaplan, *The Wizards of Armageddon*, 74 and Brodie, "Learning Secrecy in the Early Cold War," 8-9.
[121] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie." Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 228-229.
[122] All five division heads were promoted to serve on the Research Council.
[123] RAND gained such a reputation that many universities attempted to poach its social scientists. Speier himself received offers from Berkeley, Columbia, Michigan, MIT, Stanford, Yale, and two offers from Chicago, one to serve as dean of the social science faculty.

Speier's position enabled him to shape the issues upon which his division

focused. In the early Cold War, the most powerful U.S. foreign policy elites, including

Truman, Dean Acheson, Robert Patterson, George Marshall, John J. McCloy, and James

Forrestal, were "Europe-firsters" who believed the major strategic arena of the Cold War

was Western Europe, with Germany as its center. Unsurprisingly given his German roots,

Speier was also a Europe-firster, and the SSD concentrated its research efforts primarily

on the continent.[124] Speier firmly believed in area expertise and the importance of

practical knowledge; as he declared, an analyst could not produce useful research unless

he or she was personally familiar with a foreign nation's "specific political organizations;

with [its] traditions, customs, laws; with [its] socially approved or disapproved types of

behavior and with [its] variety of beliefs as to what is good, bad, or indifferent."[125] For

this reason, Speier opened a RAND office in Wiesbaden, Germany, and spent a

significant amount of time working to increase contact between RAND, SAC, and the

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). These connections enabled SSD analysts to

travel to Europe, learn how the Soviets appeared to people living on the continent, reside

within a government organization, interview local leaders, and thus gain the first-hand

knowledge Speier believed was a requirement for useful political research.

Speier's theoretical interests also heavily guided the SSD's work in its first

decade. Under his direction, the division engaged mostly in research related to

psychological warfare and elite studies. He argued that a major purpose of the SSD was

to inform foreign policymakers how they could change the behavior of Soviet and other

---

[124] RAND Corporation, *A Selected List of Unclassified Publications of the Social Science Department, the RAND Corporation, 1948-1962* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1403-10, October 1962), 1-44.
[125] Speier, *The Rand Social Science Program*, 7.

totalitarian elites. Although he admitted that it was "exceedingly difficult to influence the behavior of a totalitarian elite by means of political [psychological] warfare," he also declared that the SSD must study "the possibilities and feasibility of doing just that."[126] The only way to pursue this project was to analyze "the political behavior of the elite in question, … its intentions and calculations, and … the stability of its rule."[127] The SSD's publications from its first years clearly reflected Speier's concern with the psychology of elites and their role in the social structure.[128] More importantly, the division's influence on foreign policy emerged primarily from analysts' research on political elites.

Elitism Abroad

In the late 1940s, elite studies emerged as a coherent field at RAND and other organizations, most notably Stanford's Hoover Institution.[129] As early as 1948, Speier devoted the SSD to a program of "Western Elite Studies," which compared the actions of American, Soviet, and Nazi political elites, and his own earliest RAND work addressed

---

[126] Ibid., 11.

[127] Ibid.

[128] An incomplete listing of SSD work dealing with psychological factors includes J. Hungerford, *The Exploitation of Superstitions for Purposes of Psychological Warfare* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-365, April 15, 1950); Margaret Mead, *Soviet Attitudes toward Authority* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1951); and I.L. Janis, *Air War and Emotional Stress* (McGraw Hill, New York, 1951). Some examples of research addressing the psychology of totalitarian elites includes Raymond L. Garthoff, *The New Soviet Leadership* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1086, May 1, 1953), E. Bernaut and M. Ruggles, *Collective Leadership and the Political Police in the Soviet Union* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1674, March 15, 1956); H. Hinton, *Leaders of Communist China* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1845, December 20, 1956); and R. Tucker, *The Psychological Factor in Soviet Foreign Policy* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1881, March 7, 1957). For more examples, see RAND Corporation, *A Selected List of Unclassified Publications.*

[129] See Harold Lasswell, Daniel Lerner, and C. Easton Rothwell, *The Comparative Study of Elites: An Introduction and Bibliography* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952); George K. Schueller, *The Politburo* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951); Daniel Lerner, *The Nazi Elite* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951); Maxwell E. Knight, *The German Executive: 1890-1933* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951); Robert C. North, *Kuomintang and Chinese Communist Elites* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951); and Morris Janowitz, "The Systematic Analysis of Political Biography," *World Politics* 6, no. 3 (April 1954): 405-412.

the subject.[130] There were two intellectual sources for Speier's interest in elites: the

Italian sociologists Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca, who inaugurated the study of

elites in the late nineteenth century, and the left wing exile intellectuals Franz Borkenau

and Friedrich Pollock, who in the 1930s argued that political elites were the most

important group in totalitarian society. Taken together, these four theorists provided the

basis for Speier's understanding of totalitarian elites.

Speier first cited Pareto and Mosca in the 1930s.[131] Back then, he declared that the

failure of "the Marxian class scheme" to explain society compelled him to seek answers

in "the concepts of 'political class' (Mosca) and 'elite' (Pareto)."[132] In *The Ruling Class*,

Mosca argued that all societies consisted of two classes, "a class that rules and a class

that is ruled."[133] The ruling class "performs all political functions, monopolizes power,

and enjoys the advantages that power brings, whereas the second, the more numerous

class, is directed and controlled by the first."[134] Pareto similarly maintained that political

elites governed society at the expense of the masses, but focused far more on what he

termed the "circulation of elites," which was the idea that "aristocracies do not last.

Whatever the causes, it is an incontestable fact that after a certain length of time they pass

---

[130] See Speier Papers, Box 17 and Box 18; Hans Speier, "Notes on Time Perspective," September 13, 1948, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 25; and Hans Speier, "Note: Hypotheses Regarding War and Violence (U.S. Elite)," September 14, 1948, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 26; and

[131] Hans Speier, "On Propaganda," *Social Research* 1, no. 3 (August 1934): 377-378; Hans Speier, "Book Review: Michels, Robert. *Umschichtungen in den herrschenden Klassen nach den Kriege*; Taussig, F.W. and Joslyn, C.S. *American Business Leaders: A Study in Social Origins and Social Stratification*; and Vida, Imre. *Das Problem des Aufstieges*," *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 240; Hans Speier, "Book Review: Lasswell, Harold D. *World Politics and Personal Insecurity*," *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 523; and Hans Speier, "Book Review: Brinton, Crane. *The Anatomy of Revolution*," *Social Research* 6, no. 1 (February 1939): 125. For more on Pareto and Mosca's influence on twentieth-century political thought, see Robert A. Nye, *The Anti-Democratic Sources of Elite Theory* (London: Sage Publications, 1977) and Alan Zuckerman, "The Concept 'Political Elite': Lessons from Pareto and Mosca," *Journal of Politics* 39, no. 2 (May 1977): 324-244.

[132] Speier, "Book Review: Michels, Robert, etc.," 240.

[133] Gaetona Mosca, *The Ruling Class*, trans. Hannah D. Kahn (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1939), 50.

[134] Ibid.

away."[135] Most importantly for Speier, Pareto emphasized that when the "governing class crashes to ruin [it] often sweeps the whole of the nation along with it."[136] Mosca and Pareto both encouraged Speier to focus on political elites, while the latter's insight convinced him that if he were to disrupt the function of an enemy state's political elite, that state would no longer be able to function.

The work of Mosca and Pareto spread throughout the transatlantic German-speaking exile community in the 1930s and served as a basis for totalitarian theory. Of particular relevance to Speier was the scholarship of Franz Borkenau, who later became a central figure in Kremlinology, and Friedrich Pollock, an acquaintance of Speier's and long-time member of the Frankfurt School. Borkenau was heavily influenced by Pareto, and wrote a book on the sociologist in which he wrestled with the implications of Pareto's theory for Nazism and Soviet communism.[137] In this work, Borkenau argued that Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union were countries in which the struggle to control the state had led "to the complete victory of one group of citizens over all the other groups."[138] With this victory, the totalitarian political elite wielded "absolute discretionary power over all its subjects," which made it the most important group in Nazi and Soviet society.[139] Pollock similarly argued that in modern totalitarian societies, "the new ruling class," that is to say the political elite, by virtue of "its grip on the state, controls everything it wants to, the general economic plan, foreign policy, rights and

---

[135] Vilfredo Pareto, *Theory of Derivations, vol. III of the Mind and Society*, trans. Andrew Bongiorno and Arthur Livingston (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1939), 1430.
[136] Ibid.
[137] Franz Borkenau, *Pareto* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1936). See also William D. Jones, *The Lost Debate: German Socialist Intellectuals and Totalitarianism* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 91-94.
[138] Borkenau, *Pareto*, 203.
[139] Ibid.

duties, [and the] life and death of the individual."[140] These insights, coupled with Pareto's

argument that once an elite ceased functioning so did the state, led Speier to stress the

importance of undermining the Soviet elite. Although he never cited Borkenau or

Pollock, he had been aware of both since his time as an assistant editor of the *Archiv für*

Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik. At the very least, the assumptions of Speier's work

on totalitarian political elites mirrored those of Borkenau and Pollock almost exactly.

Speier argued that the "power structure" of totalitarian states was one that

prevented ordinary people's "freedom of political action."[141] "In modern despotism, i.e.,

in totalitarian regimes," "the mass of the population has no chance … to pass public

judgment on [or inform] elite decisions."[142] That is to say, totalitarian "political

preferences are shaped by the government," and ordinary people have very little space to

engage in "politically relevant action."[143] Thus, Speier declared, there was little reason

for Americans to focus their energies on studying foreign masses; all analysts needed to

understand were the inner workings of the totalitarian political elite. If they reached a

high enough level of understanding, analysts could teach U.S. decision-makers how to

encourage "deviant political behavior" amongst the political elite and disrupt this elite's

functioning.[144] With this accomplished, the United States could gain a decided advantage

against the Soviet Union or other totalitarian societies.

Speier's understanding of the social structure of totalitarian society led him to

make elite studies a central focus of the SSD. The most influential product of RAND's

---

[140] Friedrich Pollock, "State Capitalism: Its Possibilities and Limitations," in *The Frankfurt School Reader*, ed. Anderw Arato and Eike Gebhardt (New York: Continuum, 1990 [1941]), 91.
[141] Hans Speier, "International Political Communication: Elite vs. Mass," *World Politics* 4, no. 3 (April 1952): 310.
[142] Hans Speier, *Psychological Warfare Reconsidered* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-196, February 5, 1951), 14.
[143] Speier, "International Political Communication: Elite vs. Mass," 310.
[144] Speier, *Psychological Warfare Reconsidered*, 18.

elite studies was Nathan Leites' *The Operational Code of the Politburo*, which came to

inform how U.S. officials approached the Korean War armistice negotiations.[145] The

means by which Leites' book landed in the hands of U.S. negotiators illustrates the often

ad hoc nature of social scientific influence on Cold War foreign policy. After the

outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950, a group of RAND social scientists, which

included Herbert Goldhamer, Alexander George, Phil Davison, Jay Hungerford, and

Ewald Schnitzer, visited Korea, ostensibly to examine the effectiveness of the USAF's

interdiction campaign.[146] Yet, given the SSD's focus, they were primarily interested in

examining psychological issues. The RAND analysts quickly set about studying the

psychology of troops and prisoners of war (POW), which brought them into close contact

with senior military officials. In particular, Goldhamer impressed the Far East Command,

the members of which asked him to serve as a civilian adviser at the armistice talks,

which were set to begin in the summer of 1951. Once he joined the talks on August 24,

Goldhamer rapidly became a crucial player in the negotiations.

Goldhamer made certain to discuss and distribute Speier's work and Leites' *The

Operational Code* to the American negotiators. Leites was an early adopter of Speier's

elite understanding of the Cold War, and the two were very close during the 1950s. For

example, when Leites was working in Paris, he informed Speier that he "hope[d] very

---

[145] Ron Theodore Robin's *The Making of the Cold War Enemy* pointed me in the direction of the Korean War armistice negotiations. Robin gives an excellent account of how RAND social scientists, particularly Herbert Goldhamer, informed the course of the negotiations. Goldhamer's own account was also useful. See Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy*, chapter 6 and Herbert Goldhamer, *The 1951 Korean Armistice Conference: A Personal Memoir* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1994 [1951]), 186-187.

[146] The interdiction campaign was designed to eviscerate enemy infrastructure with the overwhelming use of firepower.

much that, if you come to Paris, you will accept to stay with me."[147] In his work, Leites argued that his analyses of Soviet political elites led him to discover that their actions were guided by an "operational code," which amounted to "the rules which Bolsheviks believe to be necessary for effective political conduct."[148] Leites maintained that once one discovered a political elite's operational code, one could predict, and manipulate, this elite's future actions.

In the summer of 1951, Goldhamer transferred Leites' theoretical claim from the Soviet to the North Korean context. In Goldhamer's—and Speier's—opinion, all totalitarian leaders operated according to similar operational codes. When he joined the armistice delegation, Goldhamer let the negotiators know that the "Social Science Division of RAND had … pursued inquiries highly relevant to them, and there existed papers by Dr. Speier and others in the Division and also Leites' work on the Politburo that bore very directly on the problems of the Korean negotiations. … It was possible … to apply some of these findings to the armistice negotiations at Kaesong."[149] Goldhamer distributed copies of *The Operational Code* and memoranda written by Speier to the negotiators, who read them with eagerness; indeed, Vice Admiral C. Turner Joy, the

---

[147] Speier was the first person Leites thanked in the acknowledgements of *The Operational Code*. See Nathan Leites, *The Operational Code of the Politburo* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1951), v. Speier and Leites seemed to have a mentor-mentee relationship, with Speier serving as a guide to Leites throughout the 1950s. See Nathan Leites to Hans Speier, March 18, 1953, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 6. Although Ron Theodore Robin is correct to assert that Leites was heavily informed by Freudian analysis, he is wrong to assume that Freud heavily influenced the entire SSD. Speier was vehemently anti-Freudian, and indeed encouraged Leites to remove Freudian aspects from his work. Not all RAND social scientists were, as Robin claims, "advocates of psychoanalytical personality studies of elite political groups." Robin, *Cold War Enemy*, 9-10, 48-49, 56.

[148] Leites, *The Operational Code*, xi. See also Stephan G. Walker, "The Evolution of Operational Code Analysis," *Political Psychology* 11, no. 2 (June 1990): 403-418.

[149] Goldhamer, *Memoir*, 187.

senior delegate at the talks, always carried "*The Operational Code* with him on the helicopter trips to the conference site."[150]

The underlying assumptions of the SSD's work reflected the consensus position that totalitarian governments, such as the one in North Korea, could not negotiate in good faith. Speier, Leites, and Goldhamer presumed that, for ideological reasons, all communists were bent on world domination.[151] Speier, for example, argued that "Marxist thought" led the Soviets to divide "the world into Soviet states and non-Soviet states."[152]

> Regardless of whether peace or war prevails at a given time, [this] division … implies that the policy makers of the non-Soviet states are *enemies*. Negotiating with them means negotiating with an enemy. Being allied with them means being temporarily allied with an enemy. … It follows … that wars are not fought for the establishment of peace, if peace is to be understood as the absence of 'international tension,' i.e., the cessation of struggle and enmity.[153]

Wars, he continued, were fought to increase communist power. Speier thus concluded that the totalitarians of the world would never countenance a peace with the capitalist west, and it was therefore foolish for U.S. elites to negotiate with them as they would representatives of a normal state.

In *The Operational Code,* Leites similarly assumed that the "fundamental law [of the Soviets] is to do all that enhances the power of the Party, the great and only instrument in the realization of communism, the great and only goal."[154] Thus, any "political technique—from giving a reception to giving poison—must be regarded merely as a weapon in the Party's arsenal, to be used or not depending on the situation."[155] "These attitudes," Leites determined, "imply that a 'settlement' with the Western Powers

---

[150] Robert C. Tucker, "A Stalin Biographer's Memoir," in *Psychology and Historical Interpretation*, ed. William McKinley Runyon (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 66.

[151] As Robin notes, the index to *The Operational Code* did not have a listing for the word "compromise," but did contain listings of the words "vacillation," "simulated friendliness," and "zigzags." Robin, *Cold War Enemy*, 135.

[152] Speier, "Soviet View of Diplomacy," 2.

[153] Ibid.

[154] Leites, *The Operational Code*, 7.

[155] Ibid., 10.

… is inconceivable to the Politburo, although arrangements with them, codifying the momentary relationship of forces, are always considered."[156] When transposed to the Korean context, this meant that American negotiators needed to be careful about reaching a deal with enemy forces whom they could not trust; doing so would merely grant the Chinese and North Koreans a reprieve during which they would regroup and become stronger.

The findings of Leites and Speier permeated the thought of the negotiating committee and helps account for why the armistice talks lasted two years.[157] The negotiators adopted inflexible positions the Chinese were bound to ignore. For example, on April 28, 1952, the delegates presented a final, nonnegotiable proposal that demanded voluntary repatriation for UN-captured POW who wanted to remain in the west. The Chinese, unsurprisingly, rejected the offer. The Americans responded on October 8 by suspending talks. The U.S. view of totalitarians as a "one-dimensional enemy," which was partially inspired by SSD research and frameworks, presented an ideological obstacle that made it difficult for U.S. delegates to reach agreement at the Korean War negotiations.[158] This perspective, in turn, helped the war last until July 1953.

Elitism at Home

Speier's writings on domestic affairs also reflected his elitism. Throughout his career as a defense intellectual, the distrust for ordinary people that the Weimar experience instilled in him led Speier to retain an acute anxiety about the American

---

[156] Ibid., 90.
[157] Ron Robin made this claim, which I find convincing. During these long negotiations, 45 percent of the war's casualties occurred, with the United Nations forces suffering 125 thousand casualties. Robin, *Making of the Cold War Enemy*, 139-143.
[158] The term "one-dimensional enemy" comes from Ibid., 139.

public's willingness to commit itself to defeating Soviet totalitarianism.[159] Thus, one of

his major intellectual projects was to elucidate and promote a political vision that took as

its basis the notion that it was acceptable for policymakers to ignore public opinion when

making decisions about foreign affairs. Along with other intellectuals interested in

international relations, most notably George Kennan, Gabriel Almond, Walter Lippmann,

and Thomas Bailey, Speier helped create an intellectual consensus that maintained that

public opinion "provides very dubious foundations for a sound foreign policy."[160]

Although they had arrived at this conclusion from a variety of perspectives, in the early

Cold War a number of intellectuals agreed that decision-makers must circumvent, ignore,

or trick the public.

As early as 1947, Speier rejected the notion that "intensive participation in

political process is generally desirable," believing there were "certain areas of political or

military policy-making in which minimization of popular participation is desirable." It

was a fallacy, Speier continued, to believe that "democracy prospers when there is

intensive participation in the political processes."[161] Ordinary Germans had demonstrated

how "the much praised reforms of modern society might prepare civilized mankind for

submission to a rule of force if the sword were ever entrusted to those who detest

---

[159] The issue of the relationship between opinion polls and willingness to fight began to be researched in the postwar period. See Benjamin H. Williams, "Public Opinion in a World of Power Politics," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 11, no. 3 (Autumn 1947): 361-366. Contemporary research generally indicated the public was not interested in foreign affairs. See Klaus Knorr, "What Manner of Union?" *World Politics* 1, no. 2 (January 1949): 238 and George Gallup, "The Absorption Rate of Ideas," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (Autumn 1955): 238.
[160] Ole R. Holsti, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus," *International Studies Quarterly* 36, no. 4 (December 1992): 441-442.
[161] Project RAND, *Conference*, 137.

civilized life."[162] The Weimar example proved that intellectuals and elites could not rely upon ordinary people to make correct, i.e., pro-democratic, political decisions. Speier further maintained that recent American history demonstrated the truth of this claim. He noted that during World War II, the average U.S. soldier did not have "strong beliefs about national war aims nor a highly developed sense of personal commitment to the war effort."[163] If such attitudes could not be fostered in an all-out war against Nazism, Speier implied, there was little hope they could be encouraged in a Cold War against Bolshevism.

For these reasons, Speier believed that decision-makers needed to ignore the public in the foreign policymaking process. He discussed the relationship between democracy and public opinion at length in a 1950 essay entitled "Historical Development of Public Opinion." In this piece, Speier argued that history had demonstrated that it "is difficult to have the public face the dangers to cherished forms of life in true perspective."[164] More often than not, ordinary people were willing to ignore a crisis situation rather than confront it. Thus, when faced with an existential threat like Nazi Germany or the Soviet Union, "popular opinion should [not] govern the actions of governments."[165] Rather, in times of duress "men of judgment [must] deal prudently with popular opinion," ignoring it and committing their nation to fight the existential struggle that many hoped to avoid.[166] Speier thus declared that democratic elites, for the greater good, must adopt autocratic understandings of their political role, and in so doing

---

[162] Hans Speier, "The American Soldier and the Sociology of Military Organization," in *Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of 'The American Soldier,'* ed. Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1950), 112.
[163] Ibid., 116.
[164] Hans Speier, "The Historical Development of Public Opinion," *American Journal of Sociology* 55, no. 4 (January 1950): 388.
[165] Ibid., 378.
[166] Ibid., 379.

reiterated the argument, first offered in the 1930s, about the necessity of using totalitarian methods in times of crisis.

Speier maintained that the very premise that government officials in a democracy could speak openly with, or listen to, their constituents represented a misunderstanding of the Enlightenment notion that rational education promoted a reasonable public opinion. In actuality, he declared, history repeatedly demonstrated that it was impossible to use reason to convince the public to support a just cause. Enlightenment intellectuals, in fact, were very aware of "the emotional facets of life" and advocated the use of expert-created propaganda and spectacle "to evoke enthusiasm for common causes and enlist the sentiments of those who did not think."[167] These intellectuals, unlike naïve or moralistic U.S. policymakers, who "continue to address public opinion in order to obtain ultimate approval of their actions," recognized that ordinary people did not know enough to make correct decisions and must therefore be "indoctrinated" with the right opinions. In modern society "the complex structure of world politics in which the individual citizen finds himself involved, often beyond his understanding, … emaciates the effective functioning of public opinion in foreign policy."[168] Speier affirmed that, in the era of the atomic bomb, in which not only the fate of the United States but also the fate of the human species rested on the shoulders of American leaders, elites must assert themselves as the nation's sole foreign policy decision-makers and abandon the chimerical search to create a "responsible public opinion."[169]

---

[167] Speier attributed this perspective to Thomasius, Sieyés, Weckherlin, Mercier de la Riviére, Quesnay, Diderot, Condorcet, and Rousseau. SIbid., 383.
[168] Ibid., 387.
[169] Ibid.

Speier explicitly excused elites like himself from democratic responsibility. "In the struggle for power the totalitarian enemy forces upon us the use of" methods and means "which are not congenial to the Western heritage. We must learn to use them and use them responsibly, without taking pleasure in plotting and with due respect for the interests and devotion of those abroad who, like us, want to erase tyranny from the face of the earth."[170] As elites, Speier maintained, experts had a moral responsibility to higher ideals that trumped the need to abide by democratic norms. Speier thus concluded that to defend democracy in the long run, the United States needed to adopt anti-democratic methods in the short. In the era of crisis—which was increasingly every era—the logic of totalitarianism needed to govern U.S. foreign policymaking.

Other intellectuals had similar worries about the potential effects of public opinion on U.S. foreign policy. In his 1951 collection *American Diplomacy*, George Kennan argued "that a good deal of our trouble [i.e., the inability of the U.S. government to respond adequately and quickly to potential threats] seems to have stemmed from the extent to which the executive has felt itself beholden to short-term trends of public opinion … and from what we might call the erratic and subjective nature of public reaction to foreign-policy questions."[171] Public opinion, Kennan continued, was "easily led astray into areas of emotionalism and subjectivity which make it a poor and inadequate guide for national action."[172] Similar to Speier, Kennan retained significant doubts about the "spiritual and social potential of our own people here at home" to

---

[170] Hans Speier, "Psychological and Political Strategy: Notes on Talk Given at the National War College, February 11, 1952," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 47, 17.
[171] George F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 93.
[172] Ibid.

commit themselves to fighting a third world war against the Soviets.[173] Therefore, "many

of our ideas about democracy may have to be modified and changed … if we are to cope

with the problems of modern times."[174]

> Before this government can function effectively in foreign affairs, there will have to be … a more courageous acceptance of the fact that power must be delegated and delegated power must be respected. I believe that there can be far greater concentration of authority within the operating branches of our Government without detriment to the essentials of democracy.[175]

Kennan's worries derived from his understanding of recent American history.

Most importantly, he attributed the U.S. demands for unconditional surrender during

World War I and World War II to an irrational public opinion.[176] During World War I,

the creators of public opinion, "politicians, commentators, and publicity-seekers of all

sorts," took "refuge in … pat and chauvinistic slogans" and offered "counsels of

impatience and hatred" that "fann[ed] … mass emotions" and "sow[ed] … bitterness,

suspicion, and intolerance" among ordinary people.[177] This propaganda effort led

ordinary Americans to become "interested only in total victory over Germany," which

was, Kennan argued, a major cause of Hitler's later victory.[178] In the Second World War,

Americans similarly experienced a "profound irritation over the fact that other people

have finally provoked us to the point where we had no alternative but to take up arms,"

which gave "the democratic war effort a basically punitive note, rather than one of

expediency."[179] In both wars, the public had exacerbated death and destruction. Kennan

therefore argued that to make rational foreign policy, the executive needed to assert itself

---

[173] George F. Kennan, "Planning of Foreign Policy (June 18, 1947)," in *Measures Short of War: The George F. Kennan Lectures at the National War College, 1946-47*, ed. Giles D. Harlow and George C. Maerz (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1991), 214.
[174] Ibid.
[175] Ibid., 214-215.
[176] Kennan, *American Diplomacy*, 61, 84.
[177] Ibid., 62.
[178] Ibid., 63.
[179] Ibid., 84.

over and against the irrational and ill-informed public. For both Speier and Kennan, Cold War victory was only possible if elites asserted themselves against an irrational public.

Walter Lippmann, the old progressive whose writings inspired Speier in the 1930s, also advocated for the revitalization of executive power. Lippmann argued that since World War I,

> there has developed a functional derangement of the relationship between the mass of the people and the government. The people have acquired power which they are incapable of exercising, and the governments they elect have lost powers which they must recover if they are to govern. … Where mass opinion dominates the government, there is a morbid derangement of the true functions of power. The derangement brings about the enfeeblement, verging on paralysis, of the capacity to govern. This breakdown in the constitutional order is the cause of the precipitate and catastrophic decline of Western society. It may, if it cannot be arrested and reversed, bring about the fall of the West.[180]

Lippmann declared that public opinion could not be trusted because "mass opinions" were subject to an "inertia" that led them to be "out of gear with the cycle of objective developments."[181] "It takes time to inform and to persuade and to arouse large scattered varied multitudes of persons. So before the multitude have caught up with the old events there are likely to be new ones … with which the government should be preparing to deal."[182] Yet, presidents could be elected only if they culled together "blocs of voters" and attended to the whims of ordinary people.[183] This structural incentive made it necessary for the president to listen to an anachronistic public opinion, which "imposed a veto upon the judgments of informed and responsible officials."[184]

Lippmann believed ordinary people allowed their capriciousness to determine policy because they no longer accepted a major premise of liberal democracy, which was that executives "owe their primary allegiance not to the opinions of the voters but to the

---

[180] Walter Lippmann, *Essays in the Public Philosophy* (New York: Little, Brown, and Company, 1955), 14-15.
[181] Ibid., 20.
[182] Ibid., 20-21.
[183] Ibid., 56.
[184] Ibid., 20.

law, … to their own conscientious and responsible convictions of their duty within the rules and the frame of reference they have sworn to respect."[185] To remedy this problem of public opinion, Lippmann continued, philosophers must help reverse the present "devitalization of the executive power."[186] Similar to Speier, Lippmann did not believe the public had the capacity to be convinced via reason. He argued that the only way to impel ordinary people to respect the executive's authority was for philosophers, "the teachers of the teachers," to convince intellectuals that the president must have the authority to ignore the public.[187] Once intellectuals, defined as lawyers, government advisers, administrators, teachers, doctors, and clergy, learned about and accepted the truth of the executive's claim to power, they would disseminate it throughout society. In Lippmann's schema, it was only through intellectuals "that doctrines are made to operate in practical affairs."[188] With the executive's power restored, "the decline of the West under the misrule of the people [could possibly] be halted."[189]

Gabriel Almond, a professor of political science at Princeton and consultant for the State Department, Office of Naval Research, RAND, and numerous other organizations, emphasized that empirical research demonstrated that the public displayed "widespread mass ignorance and indifference" to foreign policy."[190] At the same time, however, ordinary people still had attitudes about foreign policy that, due to their ignorance and indifference, were characteristically volatile. According to Almond, "the gravest general problem confronting policymakers is that of the instability of mass

---

[185] Ibid., 51.
[186] Ibid., 47.
[187] Ibid., 177.
[188] Ibid.
[189] Ibid., 179.
[190] Gabriel Almond, *The American People and Foreign Policy* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950), 230. For more on Almond, see Ido Oren, *Our Enemies and US: America's Rivalries and the Making of Political Science* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), 134-147.

moods, the cyclical fluctuations which stand in the way of policy stability."[191] If policymakers relied upon public opinion, he argued, they could not create a coherent and effective U.S. foreign policy.[192]

Almond sought to discover how decision-makers could prevent the inherent capriciousness of public opinion from damaging U.S. foreign policy. He maintained that elites could not enlighten the public, as recent experiences with domestic propaganda campaigns indicated that ordinary people displayed a "mass immunity to information on foreign policy problems:" "The point seems to be that the masses are already predisposed to want automobiles, refrigerators, and toothpaste, but are not predisposed to want information about the United Nations or the control of atomic energy."[193] When making decisions about public affairs, Almond asserted, the "general public looks for *cues* or *mood responses* in public discussion of foreign policy," not reasoned analysis.[194] Elites needed to alter their actions to fit this unfortunate reality. Unlike Speier, Kennan, and Lippmann, though, Almond did not promote increased activism amongst power holders. He instead argued that elites needed to use their knowledge of the American social structure to tame public opinion. Almond avowed that in modern democratic societies, the public could be divided into two strata: a small group that shaped opinions, which he termed the "attentive public," and a mass that listened to this group. Elites should focus their energies primarily on convincing the attentive public that their foreign policy preferences—particularly the need to fight a long Cold War—were the right ones. If

---

[191] Almond *American People*, 239.
[192] Ibid.
[193] Ibid., 232.
[194] Ibid.

elites created "a disciplined democratic elite [i.e., a disciplined attentive public] …

foreign policy moods may be contained and gross fluctuations in attitude checked."[195]

Almond declared that, because the majority of the attentive public was college

educated, "educational elites," particularly social scientists teaching at the university

level, were the group most capable of creating an informed attentive public. Social

scientists could foster a "democratic ideological consensus" through teaching the

"analytical and integrative modes of thought so essential in policymakers."[196] If this goal

was not accomplished, Almond feared public opinion would remain "unprepared for the

power game" that defined the U.S.-Soviet relationship.[197] An unprepared public was far

more likely to respond to increased "Soviet pressure" with "fluctuations in readiness to

sacrifice" that would lead to the defeat of the United States in the Cold War.[198] Almond

did not have as pessimistic a view about the public as Speier, Kennan, and Lippmann,

and he believed certain elements of it could be educated. For the most part, however, he

argued that the mass of ordinary people should be ignored.

Thomas A. Bailey, a Stanford diplomatic historian, lamented the fact that

electoral incentives led public opinion, despite being "so apathetic and preoccupied, so

changeful and impulsive, so ill-informed and misinformed," to wield "sovereign power"

and determine U.S. foreign policy.[199] He bemoaned that the power of public opinion had

historically encouraged politicians to take actions that were "good for the party but bad

---

[195] Ibid.
[196] Ibid., 234-235.
[197] Ibid., 243.
[198] Ibid., 239-240.
[199] Thomas A. Bailey, *The Man in the Street: The Impact of American Public Opinion on Foreign Policy* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), 1. For more on Bailey, see Alexander Deconde, "Thomas A. Bailey: Teacher, Scholar, Popularizer," *Pacific Historical Review* 56, no. 2 (May 1987): 161-193.

for the country."[200] However, Bailey declared, in an era of Cold War, in which the United

States served as the bulwark of western civilization, it was irresponsible for U.S.

decision-makers to allow public opinion to guide them. Bailey argued that

> because the masses are notoriously shortsighted, and generally cannot see danger until it is at their
> throats, our statesmen are forced to deceive them into an awareness of their own long-run
> interests. This is clearly what Roosevelt had to do [when he tricked Americans into committing to
> World War II], and who shall say that posterity will not thank him for it? Deception of the people
> may in fact become increasingly necessary, unless we are willing to give our leaders in
> Washington a freer hand. … In the days of the atomic bomb we may have to move more rapidly
> than a lumbering public opinion will permit. Just as the yielding of some of our national
> sovereignty is the price that we must pay for effective international organization, so the yielding of
> some of our democratic control of foreign affairs is the price that we may have to pay for greater
> physical security.

Bailey did not think it possible to use other means, be they public education or

persuasion, to lead the public to the "right" decisions. The imperatives of the Cold War,

he affirmed, necessitated the public's removal from the foreign policymaking process.

Many of Speier's exile colleagues were similarly skeptical of the public's ability

to inform democratic decision-making.[201] Indeed, this became a central tenet of the realist

tradition of American political science that exiles helped create.[202] Henry W. Ehrmann,

Waldemar Gurian, John H. Herz, Henry Kissinger, Hans Morgenthau, and Saul K

Padover all argued against public participation in foreign policymaking.[203] The Weimar

---

[200] Bailey, *The Man in the Street*, 3.
[201] Suri talks about this issue at length in his biography of Kissinger. See Jeremi Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), chapter 1. This opinion was not, of course, shared by all German exiles. For more skeptical opinions regarding removing the public from foreign policy decision-making, see Arnold Wolfers, "Statesmanship and Moral Choice," *World Politics* 1, no. 2 (January 1949): 191 and Hajo Holborn, "The Collapse of the European Political System, 1914-45," *World Politics* 1, no. 4 (July 1949): 462.
[202] Holsti, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy," 440.
[203] Earlier, Emil Lederer displayed his own distrust of the masses in his 1940 *State of the Masses* (which Speier completed and edited). Emil Lederer, *State of the Masses: The Threat of the Classless Society* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1940). See also Waldemar Gurian, "The German Question," *World Politics* 1, no. 1 (October 1948): 120-126; Hans Morgenthau, "The Political Science of E.H. Carr," *World Politics* 1, no. 1 (October 1949): 128; Saul K. Padover, "France in Defeat: Causes and Consequences," *World Politics* 2, no. 3 (April 1950): 311, 327; John H. Herz, "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 2, no. 2 (January 1950): 157-180; John H. Herz, *Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study in Theories and Realities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951); and Henry W.

experience, as well as postwar revelations of Nazi atrocities, led exiles to conclude that ordinary people could not be relied upon to make wise, or even humane, political decisions. Like their American colleagues, exiles argued that the only solution to this problem, particularly in a moment of existential crisis, was the creation of an elitist and pro-democratic political vanguard. With their diagnosis of crisis, German and American defense intellectuals shed their commitment to democratic norms of public participation in political life to embrace an anti-public perspective they believed responded appropriately to the events of recent history and the current state of geopolitics.[204]

Not all scholars of public opinion agreed with Speier and his colleagues' elitist perspectives. Indeed, many prominent academics favored public enlightenment as a means to reconcile the need to fight a rigorous Cold War with the desire for democratic control of foreign policy. Bernard Berelson, the president of the American Association for Public Opinion Research and director—at Speier's suggestion—of the Behavioral Sciences Division of the Ford Foundation, agreed with Speier and others that opinion research demonstrated "that the public is not particularly well informed about the specific issues of the day."[205] However, Berelson rejected the idea that this meant one should abandon the traditional norms of democratic theory. Instead, he declared, intellectuals must contribute to "the basic, continuous struggle to bring democratic practice more and more into harmony with the requirements and the assumptions—that is, with the ideals—

Ehrmann, "The French Trade Associations and the Ratification of the Schuman Plan," *World Politics* 6, no. 4 (July 1954): 475. For Kissinger, see Suri, "Henry Kissinger and the American Dream," 17, 46.

[204] Of course, not all exiles were liberal. Of the above listed individuals, for example, Gurian and Kissinger were politically conservative.

[205] Bernard Berelson, "Democratic Theory and Public Opinion," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (Autumn 1952): 318.

of democratic theory."[206] As Byron Price, Director of the Office of Censorship during

World War II, declared: "Under a government by the people, the virility and general

health of public opinion must be an object of perpetual concern to all good citizens.

Under such a government, public opinion is no less than the bloodstream of the body

politic."[207] To abandon the public was, in Berelson and Price's opinion, tantamount to

abandoning democracy.

In many ways, the early Cold War debate over the public's role in foreign

policymaking mirrored the Lippmann-Dewey debate of the interwar period. On one side

stood Speier, Kennan, Lippmann, and other pessimists who encouraged the public's

removal from the policymaking process; on the other stood Berelson and those who

argued in favor of programs of enlightenment and reform.[208] As in the interwar era, the

pessimists won. Over the course of the 1950s, the view that public opinion could not

serve as the basis of sound policymaking permeated the "important textbooks and

treatises" of international relations scholars.[209]

---

[206] Ibid., 330.

[207] Byron Price, "Maintaining a Healthy Public Opinion," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (Summer 1945): 140.

[208] For more examples of democratic optimists, see Edward L. Bernays, "Attitude Polls—Servants or Masters?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (Autumn 1945): 264-268; John C. Raney, "Do the Polls Serve Democracy?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 10, no. 3 (Autumn 1946): 349-360; Stuart C. Dodd, "The Washington Public Opinion Laboratory," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1948): 118-124; Lester J. Markel, et al., *Public Opinion and Foreign Policy* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949); Samuel A. Stouffer, "1665 and 1954," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (Autumn 1954): 233-238; and Gallup, "The Absorption Rate of Ideas." For a discussion on the relationship between polling and democracy, see Harry H. Field, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Claude G. Robinson, and Edward L. Bernays, "The Discussion Goes On," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 9. No. 4 (Winter 1945-1946): 403-410; and Lindsay Rogers, *The Pollsters: Public Opinion, Politics, and Democratic Leadership* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949). Dewey's scholarship on education as enlightenment deeply influenced this work. For example, Price recommended, in a framework that echoed Dewey's, that to maintain a healthy public opinion U.S. journalists must always convey the truth to their citizenry; the government must educate the people better; the public needed to devote itself to learning more; and officials needed to be sure to consult the public on issues of importance. As he had in the 1930s, Speier found such claims utopian.

[209] William R. Caspary, "The 'Mood Theory': A Study of Public Opinion and Foreign Policy," *American Political Science Review* 64, no. 2 (June 1970): 536.

In Charles Schleicher's *Introduction to International Relations*, for example, the author declared that it was "doubtful that people as poorly informed on … matters [of foreign policy] as most Americans are … can decide intelligently most of the issues which confront them as citizens and voters. Perhaps the burdens of modern citizenship are too heavy. If so, it raises some serious questions for a democratic society."[210] The problem, ultimately, was that "most people simply do not have their minds organized to think about international relations."[211] Edgar Furniss and Richard Snyder also argued that "for a democratic society, an informed, stable, and mature public opinion is one foundation stone of an effective foreign policy."[212] However, as "Professor Almond suggests," "the American public 'mood' tends to vacillate widely between extremes. … In general, the number of American citizens who are capable of doing reasonably sophisticated thinking about foreign affairs is considerably below the required majority."[213] Benjamin Cohen and Ivo Duchacek similarly maintained that "typical American attitudes" toward foreign policy were volatile and unable to provide a solid basis for political action.[214] Only a concentration of power in the elite, Cohen and Duchacek argued, could solve the problem of public opinion. By 1960, therefore, most specialists in international relations accepted the claim that decision-makers must ignore the public when deciding foreign policy. Speier's political vision had become the intellectual consensus.

---

[210] Charles P. Schleicher, *Introduction to International Relations* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1954), 12.
[211] Ibid., 16.
[212] Edgar S. Furniss, Jr. and Richard C. Snyder, *Introduction to American Foreign Policy* (New York: Rinehart & Company, 1955), 197.
[213] Ibid., 198.
[214] Bernard C. Cohen, *The Political Process and Foreign Policy: The Making of the Japanese Peace Settlement* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951), 53-56 and Ivo D. Duchacek, *Conflict and Cooperation among Nations* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1960), 142-144.

Conclusion

Speier was one of the many intellectuals whose experiences in World War II imbued them with a taste for influence as well as a hatred of government politics and bureaucracy. In the RAND Corporation, Speier found an institution that allowed him to remain connected to power while being free of what he considered to be the petty oversight of government officials. At RAND, he helped shape an institution that became the model for postwar foreign policy think tanks, administered and produced influential studies that informed U.S. foreign policy, and contributed to an anti-democratic intellectual consensus that dominated academic discussions of foreign policy in the 1950s and 1960s. Speier became a defense intellectual, a typological figure that first emerged in the early Cold War, and in so doing realized the intellectual project of bringing knowledge to bear on policy that he had championed since the fall of the Weimar Republic.

Speier's position at RAND made him a centrally located actor in the foreign policy establishment, and provided him with connections to high-ranking policymakers and foundation administrators. Over the course of the 1950s, Speier used these connections to inform the direction of U.S. psychological warfare and to create institutions designed to provide policy-interested academics with an organizational base from which they could freely pursue their research and refine their methods. In the process, he demonstrated the influence intellectuals could have on the structure and practice of the Cold War. As a result of efforts like Speier's, decision-makers regularly used defense intellectuals as epistemological resources. The apex of this development occurred in the 1960s, when Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara invited a number of

RAND analysts to join the Department of Defense in official capacities and as consultants.[215] From these positions, the former members of RAND had an enormous influence on the direction of U.S. nuclear strategy and other defense policies.

An elitist vision undergirded the RAND project. It was in the late 1940s that Speier explicitly abandoned what he referred to as the "cherished values" of democracy. In particular, the detonation of the atomic bomb led him to endorse in public the idea that, in a period of international crisis, democrats were required to use totalitarian methods to ensure that decision-makers enacted the "correct" foreign policies. It is difficult to critique Speier for his extreme response to the Soviet acquisition of nuclear weapons; it was true that, for the first time in history, the west and humanity as a whole could be wiped out in minutes. For an individual who had already seen the impossible happen once with Hitler's rise to power, no event, not even the eradication of civilization, seemed too incredible. The tremendous nature of the Soviet atomic threat made it difficult for Speier to moderate his opinion, and the nuclear problem cast a shadow over his writings in the 1950s and 1960s. Indeed, the Soviet's detonation of their bomb encouraged Speier to state in terms more explicit than he ever had before that U.S. decision-makers only trusted the public at their, and society's, own peril. Speier had already witnessed ordinary people fail to protect democracy, and he would not allow frightened Americans to repeat the mistakes of their German forbears and push the United States toward a position of isolationism or lowered defenses. Even though there was no real threat of American capitulation to the Soviet Union, the trauma of Weimar

---

[215] Howard Brick, *Age of Contradiction: American Thought and Culture in the 1960s* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 168; Sonja M. Amadae, *Rationalizing Capitalist Democracy: The Cold War Origins of Rational Choice Liberalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 60-71; and Thomas G. Mahnken, *Technology and the American Way of War since 1945* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 60-61.

and fear of its repetition led Speier to adopt an extreme position with relation to the public.

In removing the public from the practice of democracy, Speier placed an inordinate amount of faith in U.S. elites that is somewhat difficult to understand given his own stated preferences. It is clear that Speier believed intellectuals knew more and had more developed analytical skills than ordinary people, which is why it makes sense that he supported their participation in the policymaking process as opposed to the public's. However, one of the reasons that he promoted intellectual participation in government affairs was because he did not believe policymakers themselves had the necessary knowledge or skills to make effective political decisions. Indeed, Speier's experiences in government highlighted to him how petty politics, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and ideological positions divorced from any higher purpose often informed the decision-making process. Moreover, throughout the early Cold War he critiqued the "moralism" of U.S. elites, which he believed resulted in poor policies.[216] Despite this, Speier endorsed decision-makers over and against the public.

The only way to explain this intellectual choice is through Weimar. That experience, even decades later, made it impossible for Speier to see in the public anything but an ignorant mass ready and willing to support the next Hitler at the first sign of hardship or trouble. Speier thus concluded that decision-makers, though often victims of their own trivial interests, were at least of a generally higher mindset than ordinary people and were therefore the best option available to pro-democratic intellectuals. In adopting this position, Speier took no cognizance of the ways in which Heinrich Brüning

---

[216] Hans Speier, "Hypotheses Regarding War and Violence (U.S. Elite)," September 13, 1948, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 26.

and other conservatives had delegitimized the Weimar system in the years before Hitler came to power, and further ignored the myriad economic, political, and social factors that contributed to the Nazis' electoral successes. The lack of documents makes it difficult to know exactly why Speier chose to blame the public for Weimar's failure, as opposed to supporting any of the other explanations available to intellectuals seeking to understand the events of 1933. Whatever the reason may be, Speier's interpretation of the collapse of Weimar made him unable to overcome his distrust of ordinary people. For this reason, he did what he could, as an individual and an institution builder, to prevent the public from participating in the process of foreign policymaking.

Chapter Five: The Practice of Expert Knowledge

Speier's position at RAND provided him with the opportunity to disseminate his strategic opinions and the research from which these arose to government decision-makers. In the early 1950s, he consulted on psychological warfare for the State Department and participated in State's Project TROY, one of the first interdisciplinary conferences to bring social scientists and natural scientists into elite policymaking circles. These opportunities enabled him to propagate his elite-based understanding of Soviet political structure, a framework that informed the tactics of U.S. psychological strategy. His reputation as an expert on psychological warfare eventually brought him to the attention of Nelson A. Rockefeller, a consultant to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who invited him to serve on a panel of experts that influenced the strategy adopted by U.S. delegates at the 1955 Geneva Summit. Partially due to Speier's efforts, the panel helped convince the delegates that the summit should be viewed primarily as an exercise in public relations and not as an opportunity to reach détente with the Soviet Union.

But Speier did more than consult on specific foreign policy issues; he also created the institutional matrix within which defense intellectuals moved. Speier helped found two paradigmatic knowledge-producing institutions of the early Cold War, Stanford University's Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS) and the program in international communication at MIT's Center for International Studies (CENIS). Speier also shaped the methods through which decision-makers understood and made foreign policy. Most importantly, he, along with his colleague Herbert Goldhamer, designed the modern political game, a simulation meant to increase the knowledge and abilities of America's foreign policy elites. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, RAND and

Pentagon analysts, as well as the president's closest advisers and members of the Joint

Chiefs of Staff, played the game before determining a number of foreign policies, such as

the decision to escalate in Vietnam. From RAND, Speier shaped the policies,

epistemologies, and methods of U.S. foreign policymakers.

Psychological Warfare against the Soviet Union and Project TROY

Speier's national reputation as a psychological warfare expert led decision-makers

to seek him out when, in the autumn of 1950, they convened an expert group to examine

how to combat Soviet jamming of U.S. propaganda to the Eastern Bloc. Psychological

warfare entranced foreign policy elites in the early Cold War. Immediately after World

War II, President Harry Truman transferred responsibility for America's propaganda

efforts to the State Department.[1] In 1947 and 1948, the NSC approved NSC-4, NSC-4A,

and NSC-10/2, which called for increased funding of U.S. information efforts, authorized

overt and covert psychological warfare, and created the Office of Policy Coordination, a

CIA-connected group charged with prosecuting America's information campaigns.[2]

Decision-makers' emphasis on, and hope in, psychological warfare continued to increase,

and in April 1950 NSC-68 repeated earlier appeals for better-funded and more expansive

information programs. By 1952, the State Department budgeted $115 million for

information efforts, compared to the $20 million it had in 1948.[3]

---

[1] Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2006), 32-103.

[2] Although it started with a 1949 budget of only $4.7 million and 302 employees, by 1952 it employed 3,142 people and its budget had risen to $82 million. Importantly, the CIA, although officially restricted from conducting propaganda campaigns in America, did so anyway, most blatantly with its decade long Crusade for Freedom. This "crusade" masked itself as a funding effort for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, but was actually a domestic propaganda campaign created to engender anti-communism amongst American citizens. Osgood, *Total Cold War*, 41.

[3] There is a vast amount of literature on early Cold War psychological warfare. Some important examples include Christopher Simpson, *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945-1960* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Scott Lucas, "The Campaigns of Truth: The

Alongside the emergence of psychological warfare as a well-recognized, and well-funded, means to fight the Cold War, there arose a cohort of defense intellectuals dedicated to analyzing and improving U.S. information strategy. Speier's understanding of the structure of Soviet society led him to become a major proponent of an "elite focused" strategy, the central premise of which was that all anti-Soviet psychological warfare campaigns must be directed primarily against the Soviet political elite. If Americans were able to disrupt the functioning of Soviet elites, Speier argued, they could destabilize Soviet society and "rollback" the Red Army from Eastern Europe and, if lucky, permanently weaken it. Speier's participation in Project TROY allowed him to disseminate this perspective amongst policymakers, who made elite-focused tactics a central aspect of psychological warfare strategy.

Debates about psychological strategy and tactics permeated the foreign policy establishment in the early Cold War. In World War II's wake, a significant contingent of foreign policy elites subscribed to the belief that revealing the "truth" of democratic life's superiority to people under Soviet control would enlighten them to the point where they would revolt against their authoritarian masters. For example, in March 1947 Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs Spruille Braden argued that a "strong light

---

Psychological Strategy Board and American Ideology, 1951-1953," *International History Review* 18, no. 2 (May 1996): 279-302; Walter L. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1997); Michael J. Sproule, *Propaganda and Democracy: The American Experience of Media and Mass Persuasion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Brett Gary, *The Nervous Liberals: Propaganda Anxieties from World War I to the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); Gary D. Rawnsley, ed. *Cold War Propaganda in the 1950s* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1999); David F. Krugler, *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000); Mario Del Pero, "The United States and 'Psychological Warfare' in Italy, 1948-1955," *Journal of American History* 87, no. 4 (March 2001): 1304-1334; Shawn J. Parry-Giles, *The Rhetorical Presidency: Propaganda and the Cold War, 1945-1955* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002); Osgood, *Total Cold War*; Nicholas J. Cull, *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Cultural Diplomacy, 1945-1989* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008); and Sarah-Jane Corke, *US Covert Operations and Cold War Strategy: Truman, Secret Warfare, and the CIA, 1945-53* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

of truth" shined upon the Soviet Union would win the population to the western side.[4]

Soon after, in January 1948, Congress passed the Smith-Mundt Act partly "to promote a

better understanding of the United States in other countries."[5] As it became clear that the

United States would prosecute the European Cold War primarily on ideological grounds,

public officials expressed increased support for programs of international enlightenment.

In March 1950, for instance, William Benton, the junior democratic senator from

Connecticut who had earlier brought Speier into the State Department, called for a

"Marshall Plan of Ideas" to enlighten foreign peoples.[6]

A month later, Truman endorsed Benton's idea, and in a speech given to a

national association of newspaper editors announced a formal "Campaign of Truth." In

his speech, the president framed the Cold War as "a struggle, above all else, for the minds

of men."[7] Thus, "propaganda is one of the most powerful weapons the Communists"

had.[8] Indeed, Truman declared, the Soviets "systematically used" "deceit, distortion, and

---

[4] "Braden Denounces Fascism in Any Hue: Black or Red: It Blocks March of Civilization and Should be Exterminated, He Says," *New York Times* March 20, 1947, 5 and Abbott Gleason, "The Truman Doctrine and the Rhetoric of Totalitarianism," in *The Soviet Empire Reconsidered: Essays in Honor of Adam B. Ulam*, eds. Sanford R. Lieberman, David E. Powell, Carol R. Saivetz, and Sarah M. Terry (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994), 17.

[5] "An Act to Promote the Better Understanding of the United States among the Peoples of the World and to Strengthen Cooperative International Relations," January 27, 1948 <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/177574.pdf > [accessed February 21, 2013].

[6] William Benton, *The Struggle for the Minds and Loyalties of Mankind: Proposing a Marshall Plan of Ideas* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 22, 1950). The original speech may be found in William Benton, "Marshall Plan of Ideas," March 15, 1950, Senate Speech, William Benton Papers, University of Chicago Special Collections, Chicago, Illinois, Series IIA: Speech Files, Index. For more on the "Marshall Plan of Ideas," see Walter F. Wanger, "Donald Duck and Diplomacy," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1950): 443-452 and Brooks Emeny, "A Marshall Plan of Ideas," *ALA Bulletin* 44, no. 7 (July-August 1950): 273-277. Benton had long advocated a strategy of truth. See "Russia Accused on Propaganda: Benton Says, 'Psychological Warfare' Is Being Waged Against the United States," *New York Times*, March 29, 1947, 5. Also see Krugler, *The Voice of America and Domestic Propaganda Battles,* 110-111 and Wilson P. Dizard, *Inventing Public Diplomacy: The Story of the U.S. Information Agency* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004), 48.

[7] Harry S. Truman, "Address on Foreign Policy at a Luncheon of the American Society of Newspaper Editors," April 20, 1950 < http://www.trumanlibrary.org/publicpapers/index.php?pid=715> [accessed February 21, 2013].

[8] Ibid.

lies" to convince people to support their rule. The only way Soviet "propaganda can be

overcome" was for U.S. propaganda to present "the truth—plain, simple, unvarnished

truth"—to the nations of the world.[9] The problem, however, was that people living under

Soviet domination "do not have a chance to learn the truth" of "our way of life."[10] This

situation, Truman continued,

> presents one of the greatest tasks facing the free nations today. That task is nothing less than to meet false propaganda with truth all around the globe. Everywhere that the propaganda of the Communist totalitarianism is spread, we must meet it and overcome it with honest information about freedom and democracy. … Unless we get the real story across to the people in other countries, we will lose the battle for men's minds by pure default. … We are the ones who must make sure that the truth about communism is known everywhere. … Our task is to present the truth to millions of people who are uninformed or misinformed or unconvinced. … We must make ourselves heard round the world in a great campaign of truth.[11]

Truman assumed that if people learned of democracy's freedoms, they would be more

inclined to turn against communism.

In the months following Truman's speech, a number of prominent Americans on

both sides of the political aisle endorsed the Campaign of Truth. Dwight Eisenhower,

then president of Columbia University, argued that in the Cold War, "truth could almost

be classified as our T-bomb (truth bomb)."[12] Others, including Dean Acheson, John

Foster Dulles, Senator H. Alexander Smith (R-NJ), Senator Brien McMahon (D-CT), and

Senator John J. Sparkman (D-AL), expressed public support for the campaign.[13] Several

books, including Paul G. Hoffmann's *Peace Can Be Won* and, later, Edward W. Barrett's

Truth Is Our Weapon, popularized the notion of foreign public enlightenment amongst

ordinary Americans.[14] In 1950 and 1951, the idea that mass-based public enlightenment

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Ibid.

[12] "'Campaign of Truth' Plans are Drafted," *News and Courier*, July 6, 1950, 1

[13] Parry-Giles, *The Rhetorical Presidency,* 59-63.

[14] Paul G. Hoffman, *Peace Can Be Won* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1951) and Edward W. Barrett, *Truth is Our Weapon* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1953).

campaigns were an important means by which the United States could win the Cold War became accepted by many foreign policy elites and ordinary people.[15]

Speier had for years vehemently railed against foreign programs of public enlightenment, and he renewed his attacks in the Campaign of Truth's wake. In a series of talks and essays, Speier elucidated his reasons, strategy, and tactics for an elite-focused program of psychological warfare. He began from the premise that, during both all-out and cold wars, "not everybody in a nation is really fighting."[16] Analysts therefore needed to study carefully the societies they wished to affect. Only by learning the social structure of an enemy society could analysts determine which subpopulations took meaningful political action. Once this was discovered, propagandists could target and disrupt the functioning of social groups whose decline would affect the stability of the society they governed.

---

[15] For more on Truman's Campaign of Truth, see Scott Lucas, "Campaigns of Truth." For more on the campaign's domestic elements, see N.E. Bernhard, "Clearer than Truth: Public Affairs Television and the State Department's Domestic Information Campaigns, 1947-1952," *Diplomatic History* 21, no. 4 (Fall 1997): 545-567. The Campaign of Truth was an early example of Cold War cultural diplomacy. For more on early Cold War cultural diplomacy, particularly in Europe, see Howland H. Sargant, "Information and Cultural Representation Overseas," in *The Representation of the United States Abroad*, ed. Vincent M. Barnett, Jr. (New York: The American Assembly, 1956), 96-102; Hansjörg Gehring, *Amerikanische Literaturpolitik in Deutschland, 1945-1953: Ein Aspekt des Re-Education-Programms* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags Anstalt, 1976); Gary E. Kraske, *Missionaries of the Book: The American Library Profession and the Origins of United States Cultural Diplomacy* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985); Walter L. Hixson, *Parting the Curtain*; Liping Bu, "Educational Exchange and Cultural Diplomacy in the Cold War," *Journal of American Studies* 33, no. 3 (December 1999): 393-415; Naima Prevots, *Dance for Export: Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1999); Jessica C.E. Gienow-Hect, *Transmission Impossible: American Journalism as Cultural Diplomacy in Postwar Germany, 1945-1955* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999); Jessica C.E. Gienow-Hecht, "Shame on US? Academics, Cultural Transfer, and the Cold War—A Critical Review," *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 3 (Summer 2000), 465-494; Tony Shaw, "The Politics of Cold War Culture," *Journal of Cold War Studies* 3, no. 3 (Fall 2001): 59-76; Hans Krabbendam and Giles Scott-Smith, eds. *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945-60* (New York: Routledge, 2004); David Caute, *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); and S.E. Graham, "The (Real)Politics of Culture: U.S. Cultural Diplomacy in UNESCO, 1946-1954," *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 2 (April 2006): 231-251.

[16] Hans Speier, *Psychological Warfare Reconsidered* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-196, February 5, 1951), 6.

His elitist understanding of totalitarianism prompted Speier to argue that in Soviet society, only the political elite made consequential decisions. He warned propagandists to be wary of what he termed "the democratic fallacy in propaganda," which

> consists in believing that power always resides in 'the people,' i.e. the broad masses. … In democracies, the people are expected to take an active and intelligent interest in politics, foreign as well as domestic. In dictatorships this is not so. For that reason dictators find it easier to change their policies 'erratically.' They don't need to prepare public opinion for changes in foreign policy, however drastic those changes are. The masses are in a less favorable position to act in a politically relevant way, i.e., to influence foreign policy decisions. … Perhaps we have given too little attention in propaganda to elite communication [against the Soviet Union] and have put our minds too exclusively to mass communication, merely because in democracies this is the natural thing to do. … [Propagandists must] replace images by intelligence, i.e., [they must] learn as much as possible about the actual characteristics of each audience addressed.[17]

In "totalitarian regimes," "those who hold political power, or the political elite for short … determine the policy of the nation as a whole."[18] The elite paid no attention to "the mass of the population," which was "tightly organized and thus controlled," and "has no chance … to pass public judgment on elite decisions."[19] "In view of these considerations it is folly to expect that the dissemination of another ideology by foreign propagandists can convert the masses of a population living under despotic rule to become adherents to a new ideology. … The population at large is no rewarding target of conversion propaganda from abroad."[20] Speier therefore argued that the Campaign of Truth was pointless. The sole worthy target of the U.S. propagandist was, in his opinion, the Soviet political elite.

Speier declared that the goal of elite-directed psychological warfare was to induce "deviant, politically relevant behavior," such as sabotage, which "weakens the ability of

---

[17] Hans Speier, "Propaganda and Its Setting: Address, April 10, 1950, at the Foreign Service Institute," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 35, 11-13.
[18] Speier, *Psychological Warfare Reconsidered*, 7.
[19] Ibid., 14.
[20] Ibid., 14-15.

the elites to govern and command."[21] To induce deviant behavior, propagandists must

"attack the cooperation among elite members."[22] Because "cooperation is dependent

upon a modicum of trust," propagandists should promote distrust amongst Soviet elites

by spreading false rumors or otherwise encouraging dissent.[23] It was therefore important

for analysts to be aware of "frictions within the enemy elite," the knowledge of which

would allow them to create socially relevant information campaigns.[24]

Another crucial means to weaken the Soviet Union was "to interfere with the

performance of staff functions" of the elite and its auxiliary personnel, the bureaucrats,

engineers, and intellectuals without whom the elite could not govern.[25] Speier maintained

that the best way to do so was to "create erroneous estimates of enemy [i.e., western]

capabilities or intentions and thus … induc[e] counter-moves which are wrong but appear

to be right."[26] If done correctly, deception would cause Soviet political elites to waste

time, energy, and resources on pointless actions. By sowing distrust and impelling useless

actions, U.S. propagandists could reduce Soviet power-holders' ability to govern. Speier

also hoped that psychological warfare could inspire members of the political elite to

defect, which would provide the United States with intelligence and present "great

opportunities" for public exploitation.[27]

Many defense intellectuals agreed with the idea that political elites were the most

important targets of psychological warfare. In 1955, Alfred de Grazia, the director of the

Ford-Foundation-funded Committee for Research in the Social Sciences and a professor

---

[21] Ibid., 17.
[22] Ibid., 30.
[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid., 31.
[25] Ibid., 32.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid., 31.

of political science at Stanford, received funding from the Department of State to produce a manual on elite analysis that repeated many of Speier's assumptions. Indeed, the manual's bibliography cited four of Speier's works, more than any other author except Alvin Gouldner, Harold Laski, and Harold Lasswell. According to de Grazia, "the groups whose behaviors are most likely to be important to [a nation's] policies are the … political elite."[28] For this reason, "propaganda tactics that fail to select the crucial elite from the uninfluential mass … are uneconomical and less effective."[29] De Grazia created his manual to teach officials "to inquire into the constitution of the elite in any country" and "enable [them] to identify priority targets."[30] If accomplished, State Department analysts could make U.S. propaganda more effective and avoid wasteful programs of mass-based psychological warfare.

However, a number of prominent communications theorists and propagandists disagreed with Speier's elite focused approach. Daniel Lerner, who served in the Psychological Warfare Division (PWD) of the U.S. Army as Chief Editor of the Intelligence Branch, and who later collaborated with Speier on the multivolume *Propaganda and Communication in World History*, argued that in the era of total war, "psychological warfare takes a new turn. It no longer aims mainly, if at all, at the rival rulers. Its target includes 'the man behind the man behind the gun,' i.e., the whole productive force of the enemy."[31] Analogous to Speier, Lerner believed totalitarian

---

[28] Alfred de Grazia, *Elite Analysis: A Manual for Methods for Discovering the Leaders of a Society and their Vulnerability to Propaganda* (Stanford: Institute of Journalistic Studies, 1955), summary, n.p.
[29] Ibid., 2.
[30] Ibid., 2-3.
[31] Daniel Lerner, *Sykewar: Psychological Warfare against Germany, D-Day to VE-Day* (New York: George W. Stewart. Inc., 1949), 8. For more on Lerner, see Hemant Shah, *The Production of Modernization: Daniel Lerner, Mass Media, and the Passing of Traditional Society* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011). Ironically given his interest in mass-based psychological warfare, Lerner quotes Speier extensively in the introduction to *Sykewar*.

societies presented a unique problem to U.S. propagandists, but he made it both a technical and structural issue. Referencing Nazi Germany, he declared that American propagandists needed to overcome the fact that the "Nazis had completely monopolized the channels of communication in Germany" and that Germany, as a police state, watched "all aspects of the life of its subjects."[32] Lerner assumed that if propagandists could break through these technical and social barriers, they could convince ordinary civilians and soldiers to take actions that destabilized an authoritarian regime. For Lerner, "the average people, including the nonpolitical, … constitute the chief target of Sykewar in any country."[33]

R.B. Lockhart, the Director-General of the Political Warfare Executive, Britain's wartime propaganda organization, likewise believed that propaganda directed against ordinary people living in totalitarian societies was useful:

> Evidence received since the war shows that the Germans listened-in regularly to our German broadcasts and in order to do so were prepared to risk severe penalties. … Our secret propaganda had a very considerable effect in sapping and undermining the efficiency of the Nazi war-machine. … When the Germans surrendered, the collapse was devastating in its completeness and … it would be difficult to deny to British leaflets and to British radio some share in the demoralization of the German people.[34]

Similarly, in his writings on the "Sovietization" of Korea, Yu Chin O, a consultant for the USAF's Human Resources Research Institute, endorsed mass-based propaganda campaigns. According to Yu, broad-based leaflet and radio campaigns designed to "propagandize the good points of democracy," "criticize the faults of communism," and provide ordinary people with "definite, planned-in-advance, decided guidance," could

---

[32] Lerner, *Sykewar*, 132-133.
[33] Ibid., 134.
[34] R.B. Lockhart, *Comes the Reckoning* (London: Putnam and Company, 1948), 373.

undermine totalitarian states.[35] Indeed, U.S. decision-makers agreed, and mass-based

propaganda campaigns remained a major focus of psychological warfare operations

throughout the 1950s.[36]

Yet Speier's connections provided him with the opportunity to disseminate

successfully his opinion that at least some psychological warfare programs should focus

on elites. By virtue of his positions at RAND and the State Department, Speier was asked

to participate in Project TROY, a government-convened conference whose attendees

were tasked with recommending to Secretary of State Dean Acheson the best possible

course of U.S. information policy.[37] The conference was the result of a meeting between

David Sarnoff, Chairman of the Radio Corporation of America (RCA), and Truman, in

which Sarnoff criticized the operations of the Voice of America (VOA), the organization

in charge of official U.S. foreign broadcasts. Upon hearing Sarnoff's complaints, Truman

requested that Acheson investigate the RCA chair's criticisms. Acheson, in turn, asked

James E. Webb, Undersecretary of State, and William Barrett, head of the Public Affairs

Office, to examine VOA operations. In April 1950, Barrett organized a group of experts,

---

[35] Yu Chin O, "Political Re-Orientation Campaigns in North and South Korean," in *A Preliminary Study of the Impact of Communism upon Korea. Psychological Warfare Research, Report no. 1*, ed. John Pelzel, John Riley, and Wilbur Schramm (Maxwell Airforce Base, Alabama: Human Resources Research Institute, 1951), 314.

[36] See Osgood, *Total Cold War*, chapters 5-10.

[37] The information on TROY comes from "Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Project TROY, Report to the Secretary of State, Volume 1, February 1, 1951," RG 59, Entry 52-283, General Records of the Department of State, Lot 52-283, International Information Agency, Office of Policy and Plans, Records Relating to Project Troy, Box 1, Folder Records Relating to Project Troy, 1950-1951, National Archives II, viii-ix; Allan A. Needell, "'Truth is Our Weapon': Project TROY, Political Warfare, and Government-Academic Relations in the National Security State," *Diplomatic History* 17, no. 3 (July 1993): 399-420: and Allan A. Needell, *Science, Cold War, and the American State: Lloyd V. Berkner and the Balance of Professional Ideals* (London: Routledge, 2000), chapter six, which updates and expands Needell's earlier article.

which included Speier, to discuss psychological strategy, tactics, and organization.[38] That

summer, Webb contacted James Killian, President of MIT, and John Burchard, the first

dean of MIT's School of Humanities and Social Science, to discuss the possibility of

hosting a group of social scientists dedicated to examining Soviet jamming of U.S. radio

transmissions.[39] Killian and Burchard accepted the proposal, and the latter agreed to

direct the nascent project.[40]

Two relationships fostered Speier's entrance into TROY. First, he was already a

State Department consultant for psychological warfare and was therefore known to Webb

and Barrett. Second, Edward M. Purcell, a Harvard-based physicist who had worked at

the Rad Lab during the war and likely knew a number of RAND analysts, staffed TROY.

As Speier's admission into TROY indicates, the institutional networks that defined the

early Cold War academic-think-tank-government matrix were quite small, and the same

few dozen individuals navigated them for years. In addition to Speier, an interdisciplinary

group of twenty other academics, engineers, policymakers, and intellectuals participated

in the TROY sessions.[41] The attendees first met for several days in Washington in

October 1950, before moving to Cambridge, Massachusetts until January 1951.

---

[38] Barrett would later claim that he had helped Truman prepare his Campaign of Truth speech partially with reference to the April symposium's conclusions. Speier's advocacy of elite-based psychological warfare was obviously not heeded.

[39] For more on Killian, see James R. Killian, Jr., *The Education of a College President: A Memoir* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985).

[40] TROY was an outgrowth of the so-called "summer studies" previously conducted by the Air Force and Navy, which were intended for the armed services to take advantage of academics' summer breaks by engaging them in military- and policy-relevant research. The Air Force summer study, codenamed LEXINGTON, examined the feasibility of creating a nuclear-powered airplane. The Navy study, codenamed HARTWELL, analyzed how the United States could avoid Soviet submarines and in so doing retain constant access to international transport routes.

[41] The TROY participants were: Dana K. Bailey (National Bureau of Standards and a radio engineer); Alex Bavelas (MIT, Psychologist); Lloyd V. Berkner (Carnegie Institution of Washington, Physicist); Jerome S. Bruner (Harvard, Psychologist); John Ely Burchard (MIT, Administrator); Martin Deutsch (MIT, Physicist); Francis L. Friedman (MIT, Physicist); A.G. Hill; (MIT, Physicist); Burnham Kelly (MIT, Law and City Planning); Clyde K.M. Kluckhohn (Harvard, Anthropologist); Elting E. Morison (MIT,

The TROY report was written anonymously, but the similarities between Speier's writings and the report's declarations about psychological warfare generally and against the Soviet Union specifically make clear that he was a primary author of these sections. The report began with the central question Speier posed throughout 1950 and 1951: "What is the nature of the people to whom the United States' messages are and ought to be directed?"[42] The given answer mirrored Speier's: "The immediate object of our political warfare is to reduce the Russian power or will to destroy. Control of the power is, today, concentrated in the hands of a little group of Soviet leaders [i.e., the political elite]. They are skilled in shaping the Russian will. These men, therefore, present an important target for our political warfare operations."[43] The report continued by elucidating the means by which to target the Soviet political elite, each of which echoed Speier's. First, Americans could produce "deterioration in the administrative structure" of the Soviet system.[44] While Speier did not offer the specific suggested means of overloading the Soviet system with information, the report's focus on disrupting the functioning of the Soviet "intelligentsia, skilled workers, [and] bureaucrats," was the same as Speier's.[45] Second, like Speier, the report argued that Americans should focus on increasing Soviet defection. Defection, however, was a common tactic for U.S. elites at the time, and does not indicate any special influence of Speier's. More important was the

---

Historian); Robert S. Morison (Rockefeller Foundation, Physician); John A. Morrison (University of Maryland, Geographer); John R. Pierce (Bell Labs, Engineer); Edward M. Purcell (Harvard, Physicist); Winfield W. Salisbury (Collins Radio Company, Sound Engineer); Speier (whom Needell incorrectly lists as a political scientist); Merle A. Tuve (Carnegie Institution of Washington, Physicist); Jerome B. Wiesner (MIT, Electrical Engineer); and Robert L. Wolff (Harvard, Historian). McGeorge Bundy, Robert Merton, and George Kennan were asked to participate in TROY, but could not due to other commitments. The reports' final date was listed as February 1, and Acheson received it on February 15.
[42] "Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Project TROY, Report to the Secretary of State, Volume 1, February 1, 1951," 3.
[43] Ibid., 41.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid., 45.

report's third suggestion, which declared that propagandists must "stimulate mutual distrust" amongst the Soviet political elite through deception.[46] This "main goal" of making "the top Party people suspicious of each other" matched Speier's, and the report even justified it in a way similar to him: "One of the really new political realities in the world is that people outside the apparatus of power [in totalitarian states] cannot revolt against the regime."[47] That is to say, ordinary people could not take meaningful political action, and therefore represented a poor target for psychological warfare.

The State Department enthusiastically endorsed many of TROY's recommendations. In a letter to Paul Nitze, head of the Policy Planning Staff, Robert Hooker, a staff member, declared that the report reflected "a very high order of technical competence, political sophistication, and common sense. … It lays down principles and techniques for the conduct of political warfare which, with few exceptions, seem worthy of adoption."[48] Hooker repeated to Nitze the report's recommendations on Soviet-directed psychological warfare and offered no critiques of the approach. Other State officials praised the TROY report as an "extraordinary piece of work" that "blazed important new paths" for U.S. psychological efforts.[49] The Soviet chapter in particular was lauded as "one of the most thoughtful and penetrating treatments of this subject [State has] seen recently," which would have "important implications in the economic as well as the political and psychological fields."[50]

---

[46] Ibid., 41.

[47] Ibid., 42.

[48] Robert J. Hooker to Paul Nitze, March 26, 1951, RG 59, S/P Files, Lot 64 D 563, Political and Psychological Warfare, Box 11A, National Archives II, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950-1955, The Intelligence Community, 1950-1955, Document 59* < http://2001-2009.state.gov/documents/organization/96783.pdf> [accessed February 13, 2013].

[49] Quoted in Needell, "'Truth Is Our Weapon,'" 413-414.

[50] Quoted in Ibid., 414. TROY also recommended the use of balloons for psychological warfare purposes. For more on balloon operations, see William J, Scripps to C. Tracy Barnes re The Friendship-Balloon Lift,

After TROY, sowing distrust amongst Soviet and communist political elites and their auxiliary personnel became a tactic emphasized in U.S. psychological strategy. In the summer of 1952, the Strategic Concept Panel, a collection of State, Defense Department, CIA, and Psychological Strategy Board (PSB) personnel that had met for months to discuss psychological strategy, issued PSB D-31, "A Strategic Concept for a National Psychological Program."[51] The report declared that U.S. psychological warfare must be focused on increasing the "suspicion [between Soviet and communist elites] to the point of systematic removal or elimination of personnel in important and effective positions."[52] "Breeding distrust" and engendering individual elite's removal from positions of authority, the report continued, was an important way to "disrupt the system" of Soviet rule.[53] The paper thus endorsed three of Speier's arguments about the Soviet Union's political structure: first, it was a regime run by elites; second, attacking elites would have a major impact on the Soviet Union and its satellites; and third, creating distrust was an important means to tear this political elite asunder.

February 10, 1953; C. Tracy Barnes to William J. Scripps, February 17, 1953; C. Tracy Barnes to Deputy Director (Plans) re The Friendship-Balloon Lift; February 17, 1953; and C. Tracy Barnes to George A. Morgan, re The Friendship-Balloon Lift, February 25, 1953; Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Abilene, Kansas, National Security Council Staff Papers, PSB Central Files, Box 28, PSB 452.4.

[51] For the PSB, for which Speier would consult, see Needell, "'Truth Is Our Weapon,'" 414 and Osgood, *Total Cold War*, 43-45. Before the creation of the PSB, which was staffed by individuals from State, Defense, the CIA, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, information efforts were prosecuted by a variety of these and other organizations without centralized organization. For more on PSB D-31, see Gregory Mitrovich, *Undermining the Kremlin: America's Strategy to Subvert the Soviet Bloc, 1947-1956* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), 101-114.

[52] PSB D-31, "A Strategic Concept for a National Psychological Program with Particular Reference to Cold War Operations under NSC-10/5," November 26, 1952, RG 59, S/S-NSC Files, Lot 62 D 333, National Archives II. *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950-1955, The Intelligence Community, 1950-1955, Document 139* < http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1950-55Intel/d139> [accessed February 13, 2013].

[53] Ibid.

Psychological Warfare against East Germany

The policy of containment was somewhat of a misnomer, as in the 1950s foreign policy elites expressed a significant desire to rollback the Soviet Union from Eastern Europe. In November 1948, for example, the NSC approved NSC-20/4, which declared that the United States hoped to "use methods short of war … to encourage and promote the gradual retraction of undue Russian power from the present perimeter areas around traditional Russian boundaries and [to encourage] the emergence of the satellite countries as entities independent of the USSR."[54] Similarly, April 1950's NSC-68 stated that the nation should use techniques of both "overt" and "covert" psychological warfare "with a view to fomenting and supporting unrest and revolt in selected strategic satellite countries."[55] Indeed, in the early Cold War psychological warfare was the primary means through which foreign policymakers attempted to attenuate Soviet authority in its sphere of influence.[56]

Speier became an important part of the effort to use psychological warfare to push the Soviet Union out of East Germany. At the request of Shepard Stone, Director of the Office of Public Affairs in the High Commission for Occupied Germany (HICOG), in the autumn of 1950 Speier and his former colleague from the Office of War Information (OWI), Wallace Carroll, visited Germany as State Department consultants charged with analyzing and offering recommendations on U.S. propaganda policy. On their trip, Speier and Carroll met with dozens of high-ranking American and German officials, as well as

---

[54] NSC-20/4, "U.S. Objectives with Respect to USSR to Counter Soviet Threats to U.S. Security," November 23, 1948, *Foreign Relations of the United States, vol. 1* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, Department of State, 1983), 668.
[55] NSC-68, "United States Objectives and Programs for National Security," April 14, 1950, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1950: National Security Affairs, Foreign Economic Policy, vol. 1* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1950), 285.
[56] Osgood, *Total Cold War*, 39-42.

ordinary people, to discuss German attitudes toward the Cold War. When they returned to

the United States, Speier and Carroll produced a report, *Psychological Warfare in

Germany*, which suggested strategic and tactical directions for America's psychological

policies.[57] The report's primary recommendation of using psychological warfare to

"destroy Soviet power in Germany" fit in squarely with the U.S. aspiration to rollback the

Soviets from Eastern Europe.[58]

Speier and Carroll presented the *Deutsche Demokratische Republik* (German

Democratic Republic, or GDR) as the Soviet Union's strategic linchpin:

> In Soviet offensive strategy, East Germany is the springboard for Soviet ambitions in the much
> more attractive areas to the West. The Soviet army in the East Zone is an instrument of blackmail,
> which the Kremlin would hate to give up. In Soviet defensive strategy, East Germany is an
> important part of the buffer between the homeland and Western power. Twenty-five of the forty
> Soviet airdromes in satellite areas are in the East Zone. That zone is also counted upon for a
> contribution to the war economy of the Soviet Union.[59]

If the United States proved capable of encouraging East Germans to rebel and expel the

Soviets from the GDR, Speier and Carroll declared, it could have a massive effect on the

Cold War. They therefore argued that the United States should bombard East Germany

with propaganda messages that "change[d] the mood of the people to favor large-scale

purposeful resistance."[60] Although it was true that "there is little we can do at the moment

to move the people within the boundaries of the Soviet Union, … outside those

boundaries, in Eastern Germany, Austria, Poland and the other satellites"—states that had

---

[57] Wallace Carroll and Hans Speier, "Psychological Warfare in Germany: A Report to the United States
High Commissioner for Germany and the Department of State, Frankfurt am Main, December 1, 1950,"
RG 466, Berlin Element, Eastern Affairs Division, Security-Segregated General Rec., 1948-1952, Pepco,
Box 3, Folder US Western Strategy Tactics, Policy, 1949-53, National Archives II.
[58] Ibid., 3.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid., 18.

not yet crystallized into immoveable totalitarian structures—resistance was possible.[61] In these dynamic nations, ordinary people could take effective political action.

Speier and Carroll maintained that propaganda was the most efficient, non-military means to promote an insurgency within the GDR, and their report spent several pages delineating the content of the type of East-German-directed propaganda they alleged would embolden resistance. According to the authors, successful U.S. propaganda would: create the belief among East German anti-communists that there was a strong resistance movement within the Soviet Zone ready to fight; convince Germans that East Germany would be freed without a war; persuade ordinary people that the United States was dedicated to reunification; and transform those who died fighting the Soviets into "legendary martyrs" whose myths would inspire further opposition.[62] Themes Speier and Carroll believed would resonate with East Germans included the *Verbrüderung* (fraternization) of East and West Germans; the liberation of enslaved Germans; and the reintegration of a united Germany into Europe.[63] Because they assumed that GDR leaders were corrupt and controlled by Soviet authorities, the authors explicitly envisioned their propaganda program as focused on the masses. If prosecuted properly, Speier and Carroll declared that psychological warfare would prepare the stage for "phases of resistance proper, which would include the infiltration of selected Soviet zone organizations, … sabotage, abduction, direct action against selected, high placed functionaries, etc."[64]

Speier and Carroll delivered their report in late 1950, although it did not provoke a response within the government until after Stalin sent his famous "peace note" of

---

[61] Ibid., 25.
[62] Ibid., 20-21.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid., 19.

March 1952.[65] In this note, Stalin proposed that the four powers call an "appropriate

international conf[erence] with participation of all interested govts [sic]" to conclude a

final peace treaty with Germany.[66] In the draft treaty appended to the note, Stalin offered

his conditions for Germany's future, which included the stipulations that East and West

Germany be "re-established as a unified state;" that "all armed forces … be withdrawn

from Ger[many];" that "all foreign military bases on territory of Ger[many] … be

liquidated;" that unified Germany "have its own national armed forces;" and that the

nation become a neutral power barred from entering "into any kind of coalition or

military alliance."[67] Over the spring and summer, elites from the United States, the

United Kingdom, France, and West Germany discussed the proposal amongst themselves

and with the Soviets. However, America's three allies had no interest in pursuing an

agreement, while foreign policy elites wanted to maintain a hardline against Stalin and

ensure German commitment to the west, which they feared reunification would weaken.

For these reasons, the United States rejected the Soviet overtures and Germany remained

divided.[68] Indeed, Stalin's last note, from August, was particularly aggressive and

motivated U.S. elites to reconsider their psychological strategy against Germany.[69] These

internal U.S. discussions led to the reevaluation of Speier and Carroll's earlier memo and,

---

[65] See Ruud van Dijk, "The 1952 Stalin Note Debate: Myth or Missed Opportunity for German
Unification?" Working Paper No. 14, Cold War International History Project, May 1996.
[66] "The Soviet Note of March 10 and the Western Reply of March 25," *Foreign Relations of the United
States, 1952-1954, vol. 7: Germany and Austria* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986),
169.
[67] Ibid., 171-172.
[68] For more on U.S. strategic considerations and Germany's reunification, see Christopher Layne, *The
Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University
Press, 2006), 64-70.
[69] Christian F. Ostermann, "'Little Room for Maneuver': Relations between the United States and the
GDR," in *The United States and Germany in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1968*, ed. Detlef Junker
(Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute Press, 2004), 173.

in October 1952, to the endorsement of PSB D-21, which elucidated a new "National Psychological Strategy with Respect to Germany."

PSB D-21 began with the assertion that "it will not be possible in the foreseeable future to agree with the Soviet Union on a formula guaranteeing a satisfactory basis for the unification [of Germany] and for the conclusion of a peace treaty."[70] At the same time, the report's authors assumed that "the population of the Soviet Zone [East Germany] will remain fundamentally opposed to communism but the Soviet Union, through its East German puppet authorities will continue to tighten its controls, isolate East Germany from the West, and proceed with its attempts to set up a satellite state with an army of its own."[71] Compared with the other Eastern satellites, which were "firmly under Soviet control now and will be in the foreseeable future," the East German population presented the only potential hope for rollback in the GDR.[72] The report thus declared that a major goal of U.S. strategy must be "to maintain contact with the population in the Soviet Zone and East Berlin in order to stiffen their resistance to Soviet-communist rule and thus (a) to weaken the political, economic, and military system in the Soviet Zone; and (b) to lay the groundwork for eventual incorporation in the free Western Community."[73] An appendix to PSB D-21 suggested several "tasks" that echoed those offered by Speier and Carroll. These were:

> a. To encourage in the Soviet Zone disaffection towards the regime and defection from the Soviet and East German military or para-military forces in accordance with existing policies.

---

[70] PSB D-21, "National Psychological Strategy with Respect to Germany," October 9, 1952, < http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v07p1/d156> [accessed February 12, 2013]. For a paper connected with PSB D-21, see "Appendix, Guidance for the Peacetime Conduct of Military Activities in Support of U.S. National Strategy with Respect to Germany," Eisenhower Library, NSC Staff Papers, PSB Central Files, Box 12, PSB 091 Germany (5).
[71] PSB-D1, "National Psychological Strategy with Respect to Germany," October 9, 1952.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Ibid.

b. To reduce the effectiveness of the Soviet and communist administrative and control apparatus by conducting in a non-attributable manner psychological, political, and economic harassment activities in the Soviet Zone, and to prepare, under controlled conditions, for such more active forms of resistance as may later be authorized.

c. To keep the population informed of world events and of U.S. and Western policies, particularly with respect to Germany.

d. To maintain hope in the Soviet Zone population for a unified and democratic Germany integrated within the European Community.

e. To weaken the confidence and ability of the Soviet authorities and communist leaders to maintain or extend their controls in the Soviet Zone, or their influence in West Berlin or the Federal Republic.[74]

PSB D-21 quickly became "the principal basis for public affairs operations within Germany," and "almost all of the operations guidances issued by [HICOG] to operators in other parts of Germany and in [its] own staff were pegged to PSB D-21."[75] A recently declassified "Report on the Implementation of PSB D-21" illuminates the types of actions the strategy inspired. In a section titled "encourage defection and defeatism," an official reported that the United States gave financial assistance to a West Berlin newspaper publisher to distribute "50,000 fake copies of the official Soviet Zone labor organ, *Tribuene*," for the purpose of "providing Soviet Zone resistance elements with ideological arguments in their efforts to convert fellow-workers to an anti-Communist point of view."[76] As this exploit indicates, U.S. authorities took an active interest in promoting dissent within the GDR.

In addition to actions undertaken in the print media, the PSB D-21 appendix stressed that an important means to promote East German resistance—if not rebellion— was to use "news programs and overt propaganda," as well as "armed forces radio and news outlets," to "create a climate conducive to disaffection in the Soviet Zone and East

---

[74] "Appendix, Guidance for the Peacetime Conduct of Military Activities in Support of U.S. National Strategy with Respect to Germany," 12.

[75] John Anspacher for Mallory Browne re Notes on PSB D-21 Coordination, June 12, 1953, Eisenhower Library, NSC Staff Papers, PSB Central Files, Box 12, PSB 091 Germany (6).

[76] "Report on Implementation of PSB D-21 Psychological Warfare Program Part C," n.d. (likely spring or summer of 1953), Eisenhower Library, NSC Staff Papers, PSB Central Files, Box 12, PSB 091 Germany (6), 7.

Berlin."[77] One of the most popular radio stations in East Germany was the American-controlled, German-staffed *Rundfunk im amerikanischen Sektor* (Radio in American Sector, or RIAS), which proved crucial in encouraging East Berliners to revolt in the summer of 1953.[78] In the weeks prior to the outbreak of unrest on June 16, RIAS came "close to giving instructions for rebellion," and after the insurgency's eruption its broadcasts "were instrumental in spreading the uprising."[79] Indeed, by June 17 U.S. officials determined that they "should give all possible moral support to the East Berliners' efforts to improve their conditions, in order to help them achieve actual benefits or to stimulate further Soviet repression" that would be exploited for propaganda purposes.[80] Emphasizing the Administration's hopes in rollback, occupation officials wanted "to capitalize on the Berlin developments in other parts of the world, especially where some resistance has shown its head, such as Czechoslovakia, Rumania, etc."[81] Based partially on Speier and Carroll's report, foreign policy elites believed it possible to pursue an aggressive course of rollback in the GDR.

Building the Cold War Research Establishment

TROY had brought social scientific research to bear on foreign policy. However, Speier believed that the social sciences themselves remained woefully underdeveloped. If

---

[77] There is a checkmark next to this paragraph. "Appendix, Guidance for the Peacetime Conduct of Military Activities in Support of U.S. National Strategy with Respect to Germany," 6-8.

[78] Speier praised RIAS as employing some of the best "young, alert, and handpicked people with an unusual sense of political responsibility. They know that they are running not only the best but also the most important political radio station in the world, are proud of their success, are in very close touch with their audience from whom they receive hundreds of visits from the East German Zone, and are devoted to their political mission." Hans Speier, "Interview with Mr. Ewing, Berlin, June 14," *Log Notes, 1952 (May 25-June 17), numbered 42-48, 50-58, 60*, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 4.

[79] Christian F. Ostermann, "The United States, the East German Uprising of 1953, and the Limits of Rollback," Working Paper no. 11, Cold War International History Project, December 1994), 15-19 and Christian F. Ostermann, "'Keeping the Pot Simmering': The United States and the East German Uprising of 1953," *German Studies Review* 19, no. 1 (February 1996): 64-66.

[80] John Anspacher to George Morgan re Working-Group Berlin, June 17, 1953, Eisenhower Library, NSC Staff Papers, PSB Central Files, Box 12, PSB 091 Germany (6).

[81] Ibid.

social science was to become a resource for decision-makers—as well as improve for purely academic reasons—Speier maintained that intellectuals needed to refine their methods, datasets, and skills. Without these improvements, the intellectual elite of the type Speier envisioned could not be effective. The RAND Social Science Division (SSD) was a good and important start, but it was too focused on immediate problems. For social science to evolve, Speier declared, intellectuals required institutional bodies that provided them with the time and space necessary to commit fully to basic research in an open and collaborative environment. In 1951, Speier's connections with the Ford Foundation provided him with the opportunity to create such organizations, where intellectuals could free themselves of departmental responsibilities and focus solely on research.

The Ford Foundation, along with the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation, was one of the most important financial resources for social scientists working during the Cold War. It had a somewhat distasteful origin, as it emerged from Henry Ford's desire to avoid taxation on his heirs' wealth. The 1936 New Deal Revenue Act contained a loophole that exempted charity bequests from taxation, which led Ford to leave 90 percent of his family's holdings in the Ford Motor Company to a philanthropic foundation named after him. In 1947, Henry Ford II, who became chairman of the foundation after his grandfather's death, wanted to realign the organization, which had functioned without a coherent mission, to focus primarily on problems of global importance. He thus asked H. Rowan Gaither, a wealthy San Francisco lawyer and former member of the Rad Lab, to direct a study to determine where Ford's future philanthropic efforts should lay.[82]

---

[82] Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of MIT and Stanford* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 193-195. For recent works on foundations and the early

248

Gaither organized a study committee which, in November 1949, released a report that suggested that, in an era of Cold War, the foundation could make its most effective contributions to global society by taking "affirmative action toward the elimination of the basic causes of war, the advancement of democracy on a broad front, and the strengthening of [democratic] institutions and processes."[83] The report argued that Ford should focus on establishing peace, strengthening democracy and the economy, educating people about democracy, and improving the human sciences.[84] This last funding emphasis, termed Program Area Five, would primarily consist of supporting "scientific activities designed to increase knowledge of factors which influence or determine human conduct, and to extend such knowledge for the maximum benefit of individuals and of society."[85] The committee, however, offered no definite suggestions regarding the course of Program Five. For that, Gaither turned to Speier.

Gaither was the individual who, with Frank Collbohm, decided to transform RAND into a private corporation, and he was heavily involved with the think tank in its early years. Through RAND, Speier and Gaither became acquaintances. In late 1950, Gaither asked Speier and Donald Q. Marquis, a University of Michigan psychologist, for

---

Cold War, see John Krige, "The Ford Foundation, European Physics, and the Cold War," *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences* 29, no. 2 (1999): 333-361; Inderjeet Parmar, "American Foundations and the Development of International Knowledge Networks," *Global Networks* 2, no. 1 (January 2002): 13-30; Emily Hauptmann, "From Opposition to Accommodation: How Rockefeller Foundation Grants Redefined Relations between Political Theory and the Social Sciences in the 1950s," *American Political Science Review* 100 (2006): 643-649; Nicholas Guilhot, ed., *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011); Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations and the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012); and Mark Solovey, *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America* (New Brunswick, NY: Rutgers University Press, 2013). See also the comprehensive bibliography contained in Ellen Condiffe Lagemann, *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).
[83] H. Rowan Gaither, et al., *Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program* (Detroit: Ford Foundation, 1949), 21.
[84] Ibid., 52, 62, 70, 79.
[85] Ibid., 90.

advice on the direction of Program Five.[86] In the course of their discussions, Speier

introduced Gaither to Bernard Berelson, a public opinion polling expert, who Gaither

appointed, at Speier's recommendation, the director of Program Five. Gaither soon

determined that to gain fully the benefits of Speier and Marquis's participation, they

needed to take leaves of absence from their positions. Once this was arranged, throughout

1951 Speier, Marquis, and Berelson regularly met to discuss Program Five's future.[87] In

the process, they interviewed dozens of their colleagues, including Harold Lasswell, Paul

Lazarsfeld, Nathan Leites, Leo Löwenthal, Talcott Parsons, and Samuel Stouffer, about

the program's future.[88] In December 1951, the three social scientists presented Gaither

with their "Proposed Plan for the Development of the Behavioral Sciences Program."[89]

---

[86] Marquis had worked for the government in World War II, first as a member of the National Research Council's Office of Psychological Personnel and then as an aid to the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which provided many RAND analysts. He had also been on Gaither's study committee, had attended the RAND Conference of Social Scientists, had served on Project TROY, and had worked with Speier on the Department of Defense's Human Resources Committee. Speier did not much like Marquis. Years later, he claimed not even to remember his name. He was particularly upset that Marquis argued that Weber was a generalizer who was not statistically sophisticated. "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 318-319. Speier's continued dedication to Weber may also be seen in a letter he wrote to Leo Strauss, praising the latter's work on Weber, which would eventually appear as the second chapter in his *Natural Right and History*. Hans Speier to Leo Strauss, April 1, 1951, Strauss Papers, Box 3, Folder 12 and Leo Strauss, *Natural Right and History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), chapter 2.

[87] J.R. Goldstein to H. Rowan Gaither, June 15, 1951, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 69; The Ford Foundation to the RAND Corporation and Hans Speier, June 15, 1951, Box 3, Folder 69; Joseph M. McDaniel, Jr. to Hans Speier, June 26, 1951, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 69; and J.R. Goldstein to H. Rowan Gaither, June 28, 1951, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 69. See also the rest of the correspondence contained in the Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 69.

[88] Bernard Berelson to Rowan Gaither, December 12, 1951, Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA and Hans Speier and Bernard Berelson to H. Rowan Gaither, August 24, 1951, Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA. See also Hans Speier to Leo Löwenthal, October 3, 1952 and Hans Speier to Leo Löwenthal, October 20, 1952, Leo Löwenthal Papers, Frankfurt School Archives, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Frankfurt am Main, Germany (hereafter referred to as the Löwenthal Archiv), A-826.

[89] For the discussions that led to this report, see Hans Speier to Rowan Gaither, June 12, 1951, Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; Leo Doyle to Rowan Gaither, June 20, 1951, Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; Hans Speier and Bernard Berelson to Rowan Gaither, August 27, 1951, Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; Hans Speier, Donald Marquis, and Bernard Berelson, "General Remarks on Opinion Studies of Foreign Populations," Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; Hans Speier, Donald Marquis, and Bernard Berelson, "Study of Opinion Leaders Abroad," Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; Hans Speier,

Speier and his coauthors' report argued that Program Five's most important goal must be to improve "the quality of [social scientific] personnel, for both research and teaching purposes."[90] Speier, Berelson, and Marquis thus declared that "major efforts should be devoted to the development of top-flight people, of whom too few are now available. … This can perhaps be done best by providing appropriate arrangements by which [social scientists] can work directly with outstanding scholars on a variety of problems."[91] In this regard, the authors recommended

> the establishment of a central institute for advanced education and training in the behavioral sciences. … The institute would be a sort of professional school for the behavioral sciences. … The 'graduates' of the institute would move back into the universities, where they could raise the level of the behavioral sciences in a matter of years. … In addition to its central purposes [of education and training], the institute would (1) carry on its own research program under favorable conditions, large parts of which would fit the Foundation's interests; (2) produce research publications which could generally serve as models for the field; (3) provide a place for cooperation with foreign scholars in the field and for the advanced training of foreign behavioral scientists; (4) produce training materials for use in the field; (5) advance work on such central matters as the integration of theory and research and the interrelation of fields; (6) provide a place for the advanced training of … behavioral scientists; (7) serve to guide the research of large numbers of people in the field. … If the institute were successful in attracting a staff and a student body on a consistently high level, it would for the first time avoid the intellectual dilution which derives from the presence of lesser qualified people on either level, a situation which is standard in even the better universities at present.[92]

The center would thus contribute to the "effort to increase knowledge of human behavior through basic scientific research oriented to major problem areas covering a wide range of subjects" while bringing about the "over-all integration of the behavioral sciences."[93]

Donald Marquis, and Bernard Berelson, "Explaining Foreign Policy," Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; Hans Speier, Donald Marquis, and Bernard Berelson, "Ideological Aspects of the Cold War," Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; Hans Speier, Donald Marquis, and Bernard Berelson, "Communist Deviation," Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; Hans Speier, Donald Marquis, and Bernard Berelson, "German Nationalism," Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA; and Hans Speier to Milton Katz, November 6, 1951, Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA. I

[90] Hans Speier, Donald Marquis, and Bernard Berelson, "The Ford Foundation Behavioral Sciences Program: Proposed Plan for the Development of the Behavioral Sciences Program, December 1951," Report #002072, FFA, 27.

[91] Ibid.

[92] Ibid., 39-40.

[93] Ibid., 4, 12

Although not stated explicitly in the report, an essential premise from which

Speier and his coauthors began was that social science should "be helpful to those who

make political decisions … eliminating or narrowing down the area of uncertainty in

which the consequences or alternative courses of action are judged to lie. [Ford must

study and learn how to] maximize the productivity and applicability of 'policy research'

and the effective communication of its results to those who make decisions."[94] As such,

two of the three initial projects that the authors recommended Ford pursue were in the

field of "political behavior" and had explicit policy relevance. The first was a "Research

Center on International Communication," which Speier, Marquis, and Berelson justified

due to "the increased importance of international communication in American foreign

policy as a consequence of this country's rise in status as a world power."[95] The second

project was a "Research Project on the Stability and Instability of Totalitarian

Governments." The authors argued that "for American foreign policy it is of great

importance to estimate as accurately as possible the stability of the Soviet regime."[96] By

studying "the factors that made for stability and instability in the Nazi system," which as

a totalitarian society was structurally similar to the Soviet Union, U.S. analysts could

provide decision-makers with the knowledge of how to destabilize Soviet society.[97]

Speier and his coauthors thus envisioned Program Five as having a dual purpose: first, it

would improve the social sciences, which would have significant scientific—and

---

[94] Hans Speier, Donald Marquis, and Bernard Berelson, "Organizational Research," October 8, 1951, Roll No. #1139, General Correspondence 1951-Congressional Luncheon, FFA. Elsewhere, Speier and Berelson noted that when examining applications to Program V, their first consideration would be the relevance of the proposed research to "social policy." See Hans Speier and Bernard Berelson to H. Rowan Gaither, August 27, 1951, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 69.
[95] Speier et al., "Proposed Plan for the Development of the Behavioral Sciences Program," 46.
[96] Ibid., 47.
[97] Ibid.

eventually policy—benefits. Second, and just as important, it would focus on projects

relevant to U.S. foreign policy.

In March 1952, Ford convened a group of administrators and social scientists to

consider the report's recommendations. From this meeting emerged a unanimous

consensus that Ford should fund a "Center for Advanced Study" dedicated to social

science research.[98] In May, a planning group consisting of Ralph Tyler, Thomas Carroll,

Harold Lasswell, Marquis, Douglas McGregor, Robert Merton, and Samuel Stouffer—

Speier could not participate because he was in Germany for RAND—met in New York to

discuss the details of the center. The committee endorsed Speier and his coauthors'

claims about the need to train better behavioral scientists and suggested that Ford support

"a center for advanced study where younger and older scientists, i.e., junior and senior

fellows, can explore the frontiers of knowledge about human behavior in an atmosphere

free from distractions and dedicated to the development of competencies and

knowledge."[99] The committee also maintained that the center be connected with, but

independent from, a major east coast university, which would provide the necessary

resources for intense study.[100] In late June 1952, Ford trustees approved the planning

group's proposals.

However, the center would up being located at Stanford. Gaither, who was based

in California, had since 1950 been discussing the future of the behavioral sciences with

J.E. Wallace Sterling, Stanford's president.[101] By virtue of this connection, Ford granted

---

[98] Ralph Tyler, Thomas Carroll, Harold Lasswell, Donald Marquis, Douglas McGregor, Robert Merton and Samuel Stouffer, "The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences: Report of the Planning Group, May 1952," Report #010824, FFA, 1.
[99] Ibid., 5.
[100] Ibid., 25.
[101] The information in this paragraph is taken from Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University*, 197-205.

Stanford a $100,000 grant to fund behavioral science research.[102] Upon receiving the grant, Sterling created the Committee for Research in the Social Sciences, with which a number of social scientists who would become part of the Center for Advanced Study, including Daniel Lerner and Ithiel de Sola Pool, were associated. As the Ford trustees began investigating where to locate their center, they determined that there was no suitable space for it on the east coast, and their previous relationship with Stanford led them to suggest that the center be located there.[103]

In September 1954, the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (CASBS) opened at Stanford. Ralph W. Tyler, the Dean of the Social Sciences Division at the University of Chicago and head of the May 1952 planning committee, served as CASBS's first director. In the center's first years, a number of prominent defense- and policy-interested-intellectuals, including Gabriel Almond, Kenneth Arrow, Alex Bavelas, Milton Friedman, Herbert Goldhamer, Alex Inkeles, Morris Janowitz, Clyde Kluckhohn, Frank Knight, Klaus Knorr, Harold Lasswell, Paul Lazarsfeld, Leo Löwenthal, Jacob Marschak, Wilbur Schramm, and Edward Shils, studied there. Moreover, several of the twentieth-century's most influential academics, such as Daniel Bell, Crane Brinton, E.H. Carr, Karl W. Deutsch, Clifford Geertz, Roman Jakobson, Leonard Krieger, Thomas Kuhn, Talcott Parsons, Karl Popper, Carl Schorske, Fritz Stern, and Leo Strauss,

---

[102] Along with Harvard, Chicago, Columbia, MIT, Yale, and Berkeley, Stanford became one of the top recipients of early Cold War Ford aid. Roger L. Geiger, "American Foundations and Academic Social Science, 1945-1960," *Minerva* 26, no. 3 (Autumn 1988): 333-334.

[103] Ford continued to fund Stanford. In 1954, the foundation awarded the university an additional $400,000 to increase its behavioral science faculty. Stanford, seeking to improve its reputation both nationally and within the government, eagerly accepted the funding. This grant allowed Stanford to hire a number of nationally known social scientists, the most important of which was Wilbur Schramm, a top communications researcher. Speier knew Schramm from his work at OWI, where Schramm was education director (Speier had also referenced Schramm's postwar communications studies program at the University in Illinois in his proposal to found a New School program in international studies). For a short summary of Schramm's career, see "Memorial Resolution: Wilbur Lang Schramm (1907-1987)," < http://histsoc.stanford.edu/pdfmem/SchrammW.pdf> [accessed January 24, 2012].

accepted offers to spend a year as a CASBS fellow. Speier himself spent the 1956-1957

academic year at the center.[104] It became, and remains, an important location for social

science research, much of which has implicit or explicit policy relevance.

CASBS was one of two research centers Speier helped shape in the 1950s. The

other was MIT's Center for International Studies (CENIS), whose research program on

international communication Speier heavily influenced.[105] CENIS emerged from Project

TROY. James Killian, MIT's president and a TROY convener, was so pleased with the

project's outcome that he set about organizing a "second-phase" consisting of four

research initiatives, one of which concerned the creation of a State Department-funded

institute similar to the one Marquis recommended in the eleventh annex of the TROY

---

[104] While at the center, Speier worked on topics related to U.S. foreign policy in Germany and international communication (particularly differential discourse). Hans Speier to Nathan Leites, March 25, 1957, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 6. The fellows there at the same time as Speier were: Gabriel Almond (Political Science, Yale); Kenneth J. Arrow (Economics, Stanford); Fred Attneave (Psychology, Oregon (Eugene)); Wilhelm Aubert (Sociology, Institute for Social Research at the University of Oslo); Daniel E. Berlyne (Psychology, Boston University); Carl Bridenbaugh (History, Berkeley); Ernst Caspari (Biology, Rochester); Gordon A. Craig (History, Stanford); E. Lane Davis (Political Science, Iowa (Iowa City)); Kingsley Davis (Sociology, Berkeley); Karl W. Deutsch (Political Science, Yale); Robert Dubin (Sociology, Oregon (Eugene)); E.E. Evans-Pritchard (Social Anthropology, All Souls College, Oxford); Alexander George (Political Science, RAND); Harold Guetzkow (Psychology, Northwestern); A.H. Halsey (Sociology, Birmingham); David A. Hamburg (Psychiatry, Stanford Medical Center); Ernest R. Hilgard (Psychology, Stanford School of Medicine); Stuart Hughes (History, Harvard's Widener Library); Harold H. Kelley (Psychology, Minnesota's Laboratory for Research in Social Relations); Frank Knight (Economics, Chicago); Leonard Krieger (History, Yale); William Lambert (Psychology, Cornell); Robert Lane (Political Science, Yale); W.A. Lewis (Economics, University of West Indies); William Madow (Statistics, Stanford Research Institute); Sheldon Messinger (Sociology, Berkeley); Walter F. Metzger (History, Columbia); Charles Morris (Philosophy, Florida); Theodore W. Newcomb (Psychology, Michigan); Morris E. Opler (Anthropology, Cornell); Karl Popper (Philosophy of Science, London School of Economics and Political Science); John W. Roberts (Anthropology, Cornell); A.K. Romney (Anthropology, Stanford); Morris Rosenberg (Sociology, National Institute of Mental Health); Jerome Rothenberg (Economics, Northwestern); T.W. Schultz (Economics, Chicago); Richard Snyder (Political Science, Northwestern); Speier; George D. Spindler (Anthropology, Stanford); John W. Thibaut (Psychology, University of North Carolina); Evon Z. Vogt (Anthropology, Harvard); W. Allen Wallis (Statistics, Chicago); Sherwood L. Washburn (Anthropology, Berkeley); Andrew M. Weitzenhoffer (Psychology, Stanford); Harrison White (Sociology, Chicago); John W.M. Whiting (Anthropology, Harvard); Harold L. Wilensky (Sociology, Michigan); Robert N. Wilson (Sociology, Yale); and Joseph R. Wolpe (Psychiatry, Virginia).

[105] Today, the Center for International Studies is referred to by the acronym CIS, but in the 1950s it was referred to as CENIS, which is the acronym I use.

report.[106] CENIS, the name of the eventual center, began operating in the fall of 1951, and in February 1952, Max Millikan, an economics professor who had spent a year at the CIA, accepted the offer to serve as its first director.

Soon after moving to CENIS, Millikan asked Gaither for Ford funds.[107] At the exact moment he did so, Ford trustees were considering Speier, Marquis, and Berelson's plans for Program Five. The first project Speier and his coauthors recommended Ford finance was a research program dedicated to studying international communication. Indeed, this was Speier's pet project. In August 1951, Speier and Berelson emphasized to Gaither the need to create an "Institute of International Communications" designed "to plan research in communication studies, to conduct basic studies, to develop methods, and to train graduate and post-graduate students in this field."[108] When Speier learned that Millikan sought Ford funds, he visited him in February 1952 to discuss the creation of such a center. Millikan was reticent about the idea, believing that MIT's comparative advantage lay in economic and political studies, but Speier convinced him otherwise.[109] Due to the latter's efforts, in the spring of 1952 Ford trustees granted CENIS $875,000 to found a research program in international communication. The trustees asked Speier to serve as head of the planning committee charged with determining the program's direction, a request that he accepted. Between September 1952 and February 1953, the committee, whose members included Jerome Bruner, Wallace Carroll, Harold Lasswell, Paul Lazarsfeld, Edward Shils, and Ithiel de Sola Pool, met six times and consulted with

---

[106] Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 2000), 157-158 and Donald L. M. Blackmer, *The MIT Center for International Studies: The Founding Years, 1951-1969* (Cambridge: MIT Center for International Studies, 2002), 18.
[107] Blackmer, *The Founding Years*, 36-42.
[108] Hans Speier and Bernard Berelson to H. Rowan Gaither, August 21, 1951, Speier Papers, Box 3, Folder 69, 5 and Speier et al., "The Ford Foundation Behavioral Sciences Program: Proposed Plan for the Development of the Behavioral Sciences Program, December 1951," Report #002072, FFA, 46.
[109] Blackmer, *The Founding Years*, 38.

numerous scholars and defense intellectuals.[110] Finally, in June, Speier and his colleagues released their report.

Unlike CASBS, the program in international communication was explicitly oriented toward policy research. Speier and his colleagues unequivocally stated that "in this age of insecurity we know too little about the forces which move man as an individual and society as a whole. The secret of these forces presents one of the great challenges of history to the scientific mind and to all who hope for the survival of our civilization."[111] For this reason, they continued, the program's research must be "useful not only to the scientist but also to the statesman in his effort to preserve peace and promote understanding among men."[112] Speier's "committee [therefore] tried to chart a course so that the program would produce work … which might prove helpful to policy-makers in the difficult times ahead."[113] They recommended that the "program's studies … be concentrated in areas of the highest political significance—the conflict between the Kremlin and the free world, the integration or disintegration of Europe, [and] the rise of nationalism in Asia and Africa."[114] As the report declared:

> The great political problems of our time offer an inescapable challenge to scientists of all kinds. There is, therefore, every reason why the program, in selecting its research projects, should keep in mind … issues of major political significance. … The conflict between the communist and the free worlds is of decisive importance to the balance of power and the future character of our civilization. Far from being merely a struggle for power, this conflict is also a contest of ideas and

---

[110] Pool eventually became the program's research director, after Speier turned the position down. Academics consulted included Gabriel Almond, Raymond Aron, Alex Bavelas, Bernard Berelson, McGeorge Bundy, Karl Deutsch, Merle Fainsod, William T.R. Fox, Geoffrey Gorer, Harold Isaacs, Paul Kecskemeti, Clyde Kluckohn, Nathan Leites, Eric Lenneberg, Daniel Lerner, Leo Löwenthal, Margaret Mead, George Morgan, Waldemar Nielsen, Walt Whitman Rostow, Richard Sheldon, Wilbur Schramm, and Bruce Lannes Smith.

[111] Hans Speier, Jerome Bruner, Wallace Carroll, Harold Lasswell, Paul Lazarsfeld, Edward Shils, and Ithiel de Sola Pool, *Research in International Communication: An Advisory Report of the Planning Committee* (Cambridge: Center for International Studies, June 1953), v.

[112] Ibid.

[113] Ibid., vi.

[114] Ibid.

ideals for the hearts and minds of men both in the Soviet empire and in the vast 'neutral' areas of the world which lie outside either sphere of influence.[115]

Reflecting Speier's own interests, the committee recommended that the center focus on analyzing "communications to and from the wielders of power and influence. It should examine the influence of the middlemen who work between the mass media and their ultimate audience. It should study the communications network of a given society and how the nature of that society influences the effectiveness of messages from outside."[116] That is to say, it should teach decision-makers how to more effectively make use of propaganda and political communications to elites, and, when possible, the attentive public. The program thus had from the beginning an instrumental purpose, and the committee declared that its "success or failure will be judged by how much it has improved our ability to say what is likely to prove effective or ineffective communication."[117]

Yet Speier and his colleagues understood that the relationship between knowledge and power was problematic. They emphasized that the program would "be devoted to the attainment of knowledge. It will not be an agency that makes or executes political decisions, nor will its primary function be to recommend particular courses of action. … Whatever advice it may be asked to give can only flow from its work."[118] Speier and the committee members recognized that if, at some point, the program considered "assistance to specific governmental activities as its primary concern … the scientific character of its work would be jeopardized."[119] In that case, a program researcher would abandon "the

---

[115] Ibid., 10.
[116] Ibid., vi.
[117] Ibid., 14.
[118] Ibid., 23.
[119] Ibid., 23-24.

vantage point of an [objective] observer."[120] However, the report's authors were not

naïve; they understood that the "more successful the program is in its work on political

problems, the more likely it is that the Center will be asked for advice, and the desire to

furnish advice will grow in intensity."[121] Therefore, they suggested that "operational

analyses for government agencies be excluded from this program."[122] Instead, social

scientists associated with it should be sure to maintain informal contact with government

agencies, which would allow them to become aware of the practical problems associated

with international communication, gain access to otherwise unobtainable data, and bring

their research to the attention of decision-makers. Their concerns over power's corruption

of knowledge led Speier and his colleagues to take precautions to protect the objective

character of their work. Nevertheless, they were only willing to go so far, as their vision

of the Cold War as a civilizational and existential struggle made them believe it was

necessary to risk intellectual perversion to save democracy.

Ithiel de Sola Pool assumed the position of program director, and soon put

together a staff of five that included Raymond Bauer, Daniel Lerner, Harold Isaacs,

Howard Perlmutter, and Eric Lenneberg. The program's first projects analyzed the

business and government response to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act's renewal;

how communications functioned within the Middle East; what the French felt about

European integration; and how Americans viewed Asia. Following Speier, Pool declared

that the projects were united by a desire to analyze "those events which lead private

individuals in influential positions in society to take effective action to influence

---

[120] Ibid., 24.
[121] Ibid., 23.
[122] Ibid., 24.

government policy."[123] Elite studies remained an important focus of the program, and over the course of the 1950s, Lerner in particular moved toward analyzing elite communications in Europe. In the 1960s, Fred Frey and Frank Bonilla continued the program's focus on elites by producing studies that examined elite attitudes in the developing world.[124] The program quickly became a major hub for communication research, and a number of leading social scientists, including Clifford Geertz, Roman Jakobson, and Edward Shils, made use of its resources.[125]

The Quantico Panel

Until the mid 1950s, government officials continued to call on Speier for advice. The most notable service he provided was participating in the famous June 1955 "Quantico Panel" held before the Geneva Summit in July. Nelson Rockefeller, Eisenhower's Special Assistant for Cold War Planning, which was essentially the president's adviser on psychological warfare, convened a group of experts to develop U.S. psychological strategy for the July Geneva Summit.[126] The summit was the first and only time in the early Cold War that the leaders of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France met with the ostensible goal of reducing international tensions. Indeed, tensions had risen in the year and a half before the summit due to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' announcement of the strategy of "massive retaliation" in

---

[123] Quoted in Blackmer, *The Founding Years,* 61. The information in this paragraph comes from this source. For more on the international communication program, see Ibid., chapter 2.

[124] Ibid., 152-153.

[125] Ibid., 62-63.

[126] See "Administrative Arrangements for Quantico Panel Discussion, June 5 thru June 10, 1955," Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 60. See also Gunter Bischof and Saki Dockrill, eds. *Cold War Respite: The Geneva Summit of 1955* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000). When inviting him to participate, Rockefeller told Speier that he long "looked forward to an opportunity to meet with you and others who have given so much thought to the psychological aspects of our relations with other nations and, in particular, our relations with the Soviet Union." Nelson Rockefeller to Hans Speier, May 25, 1955, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 60.

January 1954 and West Germany's rise to sovereign status over the course of 1954 and 1955.[127] As they prepared for the conference, Eisenhower Administration officials recognized that it presented an enormous psychological opportunity for the United States, in which the nation could present itself as the peace-seeking leader of the free and neutral worlds.

To take advantage of the occasion, Rockefeller brought together a group of experts "who have given so much thought to the psychological aspects of our relations with other nations and, in particular, our relations with the Soviet Union."[128] The panel met at the Marine Corps Schools in Quantico, Virginia, between June 5 and June 10, and its composition represented the very close links that had developed between the government, think tanks, industry, and the academy. It was chaired by Walt Whitman Rostow (MIT, Economic History), and included Frederick Dunn (Yale, Center of International Studies); C.D. Jackson (Time Life and Rockefeller's predecessor as Special Assistant for Cold War Planning); Ellis A. Johnson (Director, Operations Research Office); Paul Linebarger (Johns Hopkins, School of Advanced International Studies); Max Millikan (MIT, Center of International Studies); Philip Moseley (Columbia, Russian Institute); George Pettee (Deputy Director, Operations Research Office); Stefan Possony (Air Intelligence Specialist, Department of the Air Force); Speier; and Charles A. H. Thomson (Brookings Institution).[129] The sessions covered a wide range of topics, from a

---

[127] John Foster Dulles, "The Evolution of Foreign Policy," Speech given before the Council of Foreign Relations, New York, NY, *Department of State Press Release No. 81* (January 12, 1954).

[128] Nelson A. Rockefeller to Hans Speier, May 25, 1955, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 60.

[129] In addition, Henry Kissinger attended some sessions, as did members of the State and Defense Departments, CIA, Operations Coordinating Board, and NSC. Gordon H. Chang, *Friends and Enemies: The United States, China, and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990), 151.

general strategic assessment of American and Soviet capabilities to the psychological

effects various conference events might have on domestic and international opinion.[130]

Speier's notes from the meeting demonstrate how little his strategic vision had

changed between the autumn of 1949, when the Soviets acquired the atomic bomb, and

the summer of 1955. He reiterated the basic framework of the Cold War he had ascribed

to for years:

> According to the Communist view of foreign affairs the power struggle between Communism and the non-Communist world never ceases. There cannot be an easing of tension, although it may be advantageous to speak of such a relaxation of tensions either in order to deceive those who believe that the international struggle for power can cease or in order to use such foolish language for the purpose of gaining an advantage for the Communist cause in the struggle for power. The current disposition of the Soviet leaders to sit down at the 'summit' cannot be traced to a genuine interest on their part to ease any tensions for the sake of peace and harmony. It must be traced to a specific Communist interest in improving its position in the international struggle for power.[131]

Therefore, "the United States would play into the hands of the Soviet Union if it were to

approach the conference with the hope to 'ease tensions.' It should meet the Soviet

leaders with the intention to force them to retreat."[132] However, Speier continued, the

conference could be useful because it "present[ed] a unique opportunity to the United

States for inflicting a diplomatic defeat upon the Soviet Union, to reassert the ideals of

the Free World and to buttress peace under American leadership."[133] Speier thus

abandoned the Geneva Summit before it began. The Quantico Panel report, which

reprinted many of Speier's opinions verbatim, similarly expressed the belief that the

---

[130] Walt Whitman Rostow to Nelson Rockefeller, June 10, 1955, *Report of the Quantico Vulnerabilities Panel, June 10, 1955* <http://www.foia.cia.gov/sites/default/files/document_conversions/5829/CIA-RDP86B00269R000800070001-5.pdf> [accessed February 4, 2013]. For the full Quantico itinerary, see "Quantico Panel Discussion Topics," Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 60.
[131] Hans Speier, "U.S. Strategy at the Forthcoming Conference," Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 60, 2.
[132] Ibid., 2-3.
[133] Ibid., 5.

summit was most useful as a forum for public relations than as a space to come to an understanding with the Soviets.[134]

Rockefeller took the panel's report quite seriously. On July 11, a week before the Geneva Summit was set to begin, he sent Eisenhower a memo detailing a proposed "Psychological Strategy at Geneva," which he based heavily on the panel's report. Rockefeller informed Eisenhower that the consensus position was that "the USSR uses conferences more often to achieve psychological and propaganda advantage than to conduct serious diplomatic negotiations. … A true settlement with the Western Powers is inconceivable although [for the Soviets] concrete agreements—for specific Soviet advantages—are acceptable."[135] Thus, "the propaganda stakes at Geneva may prove more significant than the actual conference results."[136] Rockefeller thus presented the summit as Speier and the Quantico Panel had, as primarily a moment to gain a psychological advantage over the Soviets.

In his draft memo for the Quantico Panel, Speier argued that "the United States should seize the initiative by presenting the Soviet Union with heavy demands for major concessions."[137] The panel added to this the notion that if the United States offered proposals that the Soviet Union could not accept, "large and important segments of world public opinion" would determine that the Soviets "are not really ready to work toward international agreements favoring peace," and would therefore shift their support to the

---

[134] "Report of the Quantico Vulnerabilities Panel," *Report of the Quantico Vulnerabilities Panel, June 10, 1955*, 1-3.
[135] Nelson A. Rockefeller to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, July 11, 1955, *FRUS, 1955-1957, volume V, Austrian State Treaty; Summit and Foreign Ministers Meetings, 1955, Document 154*. < http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1955-57v05/d154> [accessed February 13, 2013].
[136] Ibid.
[137] Speier, "U.S. Strategy at the Upcoming Conference," 4-5.

western alliance.[138] The first two bold proposals the panel recommended were an

"agreement for mutual inspection of military installations, forces, and armaments,

without limitations provisions" and "a convention insuring the right of any nationality to

fly over the territory of any country for peaceful purposes."[139] Rockefeller agreed with

the panel's argument that forcing the Soviets to reject a proposal that appeared to ease

tensions would be of psychological use to the United States, and on July 6 hand-delivered

the president a note recommending that he propose a regime of mutual aerial inspection.

Five days later, in his memo on "Psychological Strategy at Geneva," Rockefeller

reiterated the importance of mutual inspection. Over the course of the next week, he

discussed this idea with Dulles and Eisenhower.[140] Finally, on July 21, Eisenhower made

his famous "Open Skies" proposal, in which he proposed a regime of mutual U.S.-Soviet

aerial inspections of military preparedness.[141] That day, Rockefeller cabled Speier and the

other members of the panel to tell them they "should be reading newspapers tonight with

great pride and satisfaction."[142] First Secretary of the Communist Party Nikita

Khrushchev, unsurprisingly, promptly rebuffed the offer, an action which—following the

panel's prediction—made it appear to domestic and world opinion that the United States,

not the Soviets, was interested in détente. Despite Khrushchev's rejection, there was a

---

[138] "Proposals to Test Soviet Willingness to Make Concessions and to Improve the U.S. Position," *Report of the Quantico Vulnerabilities Panel, June 10, 1955*, 5.

[139] Ibid., 1-2 and "Report of the Quantico Vulnerabilities Panel," *Report of the Quantico Vulnerabilities Panel, June 10, 1955*, 13.

[140] John Prados, "Open Skies and Closed Minds: American Disarmament Policy at the Geneva Summit," in *Cold War Respite: The Geneva Summit of 1955* ed. Günter Bischof and Saki Dockrill, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 221-226 and Walt Whitman Rostow, *Concept and Controversy: Sixty Years of Taking Ideas to Market* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003), 154-155

[141] For more on Open Skies, see R.C. Hall, *The Origins of U.S. Space Policy: Eisenhower, Open Skies, and Freedom of Space* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1992); Michael J. Hogan, "Eisenhower and Open Skies: A Case Study in 'Psychological Warfare," in *Eisenhower's War of Words: Rhetoric and Leadership*, ed. Martin J. Medhurst (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1994), 137-156; and David Tal, "Eisenhower's Disarmament Dilemma: From Change for Peace to Open Skies Proposal," *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 12, no. 2 (January 2001): 175-196.

[142] Nelson A. Rockefeller to Hans Speier, July 21, 1955, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 60.

brief upsurge in hope that the Cold War could end if the "spirit of Geneva" lasted beyond the conference.[143] Of course, as the spirit of Geneva was itself a fabrication, it did not.

Rockefeller was very happy with the panel's achievements, and soon after the summit organized another version, termed Quantico Panel II, to "study and review … the psychological aspects of future U.S. strategy."[144] Rockefeller again invited Speier to participate in the meeting, but he had to decline because he had planned a trip to Germany for RAND.[145] Instead of Speier, another German exile, Henry Kissinger, then a professor of political science at Harvard, attended. This meeting proved crucial to Kissinger's career; Rockefeller quickly became his political patron and helped ease the exile's entry into the policymaking world.[146] Soon after Quantico II, Rockefeller resigned his position and created a "Special Studies Project" for which Kissinger became the

---

[143] For examples of references to "the spirit of Geneva" and how it informed both international and domestic perceptions, see: Henry R. Lieberman, "Peiping Pressing Formosan Issue: Talks Also Urged on U.N. Seat and Indochina in Accord 'With Spirit of Geneva,'" *Special to the New York Times*, July 26, 1955; Richard Kasischke, "Aerial Arms Inspection Under Study: Premier Declares in Surprise Speech that Foreign Press Misunderstood Him," *The Washington Post*, August 6, 1955, 1; "The Communists to Make Hay," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 8, 1955; Clifton Daniels, "Soviet Makes Bid to Western Art: Actors, Singers, and Painters Listed by Cultural Leaders in 'Spirit of Geneva,'" *Special to the New York Times*, August 11, 1955, 15; "Propaganda Backfires," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, August 12, 1955, 14; Henry R. Lieberman, "Terms 'Imperialists' and 'Warmongers' Have Been Missing in Recent Weeks," *Special to the New York Times*, August 21, 1955, 153; Harrison E. Salisbury, "U.S. Experts Note Propaganda Curb: Declare Both U.S. and Soviet Agencies Have Mitigated Attacks on Each Other," *Special to the New York Times*, August 13, 1955, 1; "President Moves to Brake 'Spirit of Geneva' Optimism," *Special to the New York Times*, August 25, 1955, 1; "The Quest for Peace," *New York Times*, August 25, 1955; "Dulles Joins Drive of Ike to Check Peace Optimism," *The Washington Post*, August 26, 1955, 51; "34% of Public Likes Idea of Visiting Russia," *The Washington Post*, August 27, 1955, 19; "First Test of Geneva," *New York Times*, August 29, 1955, 18; "Eisenhower Sees a Test of Geneva: Says U.N. Committee Parley Will Succeed if Spirit of Big 4 Talks is Kept," *New York Times*, August 30, 1955, 1; and Marvin L. Arrowsmith, "Ike Sees Arms Talks Easing Tension If Held in Spirit of Geneva," *The Washington Post,* August 30, 1955, 1.

[144] Nelson Rockefeller to Hans Speier, August 16, 1955, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 60.

[145] The second Quantico panel ran from September 25 to 29, 1955, exactly when Speier was in Germany. James Desmond, *Nelson Rockefeller, a Political Biography* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), 151.

[146] The two had met when Kissinger consulted at the first Quantico panel. Walter Isaacson, *Kissinger: A Biography* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005), 90-91 and Suri, *Kissinger*, 164.

director.[147] Speier never again consulted for the executive branch, although he did work with Kissinger's project.[148]

Speier's decisions after 1955 indicate that he was less concerned with joining the highest realms of policymaking than one might naturally assume, given his actions between 1948 and the Geneva Summit. First, he increasingly turned toward examining West Germany and its role in the Cold War, and became less interested in questions of psychological warfare, although he did continue to analyze the psychological effects of Soviet international actions.[149] However, he no longer marketed himself primarily as a psychological expert, but rather as an expert on Germany. Second, he seems to have become more interested in academic as opposed to policy issues. When he spent the 1956-1957 year at CASBS, for example, he was consumed with rather abstract subjects. That year he wrote Nathan Leites that "my reading on differential discourse and double meaning has taken me far afield although in a way that interests me greatly," and spent two pages discussing, in detail, how authors throughout history, from Plato to Dante, have expressed meaning in their work.[150] Speier's fascination with literature, which he had abandoned in the late 1920s, thus reemerged in the 1960s, and he published extensively on the early modern German author Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen.[151] Finally, it was in 1957 that the SSD moved from Washington to

---

[147] The reports produced by the project's seven subcommittees eventually appeared in 1961. See Rockefeller Brothers Fund, *Prospect for America: The Rockefeller Panel Reports* (New York: Doubleday, 1961).

[148] Nelson Rockefeller to Hans Speier, May 25, 1956, Speier Papers, Box 4, Folder 60.

[149] Hans Speier, *Soviet Atomic Blackmail and the North Atlantic Alliance* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1837, December 12, 1956); Hans Speier, *The Soviet Threat to Berlin* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-1912-1, April 15, 1960); and Hans Speier, *Divided Berlin: The Anatomy of Soviet Political Blackmail* (New York: Praeger, 1961).

[150] Hans Speier to Nathan Leites, March 25, 1957, Box 4, Folder 6.

[151] Hans Speier, "A Woman Named Courage," in *The Arts in Society*, ed. Robert Neal Wilson (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1964), 191-252; Hans Speier, "Grimmelshausen's Laugher," in *Ancient and*

Santa Monica, putting Speier at a physical distance from policymakers. Indeed, his final consulting work, for the Air Force's Scientific Advisory Board, came through west coast connections at RAND. This is not to claim that Speier became uninterested in policy questions; in fact, he spent the 1960s writing extensively about U.S. policy toward West Germany. Rather, though the lack of documentary evidence makes it difficult to know why, after Quantico he appears to have become less concerned with having access to the highest level of decision-makers. Perhaps for this reason, he dedicated himself to creating a simulation of foreign policy decision-making—the political game—that he hoped would teach analysts and policymakers to be more effective. In this way, he could inform foreign policy without himself being a foreign policymaker.

The Political Game

Historians argue that postwar, "behavioralist" social science was different from prewar social science because postwar intellectuals were more concerned with methodology; emphasized quantitative data; were positivists who sought to mirror natural scientific approaches; looked for transhistorical, political "laws" that could guide academic and policy research; and retained a normative commitment to democracy and western civilization.[152] However, Speier, who was head of the SSD, a division many historians point to as being a paradigmatic home for behavioral social science, belies these claims. Although he did share a normative commitment to democracy, he

---

Moderns: Essays on the Tradition of Political Philosophy in Honor of Leo Strauss, ed. Joseph Cropsey (New York: Basic Books, 1964), 177-212; and Hans Speier, "Introduction," in Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen, *Courage, The Adventuress, and the False Messiah*, trans. Hans Speier, 3-79 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964).

[152] Narratives that argue in favor of quantification's postwar triumph include Mark Solovey, "Riding Natural Scientists' Coattails onto the Endless Frontier: The SSRC and the Quest for Scientific Legitimacy," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 40, no. 4 (Fall 2004): 393-422 and David Paul Haney, *The Americanization of Social Science: Intellectuals and Public Responsibility in the Postwar United States* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008).

envisioned himself as a champion of the "great tradition of the humanistic understanding of man," and is best understood as an anti-positivist advocate of a historical approach to social science and foreign policymaking.[153]

Speier expressed his humanistic-historical perspective on social science most clearly in his development, with Herbert Goldhamer, of the qualitative political game.[154] The modern war game was developed in early modern Germany, migrated to America in the late 1860s, and was popularized when Army Captain William Roscoe Livermore published his textbook *The American Kriegsspiel*, the very title of which bespoke the game's German origins.[155] In 1887, McCarthy Little, a professor at the newly established

---

[153] Speier et al., "The Ford Foundation Behavioral Sciences Program: Proposed Plan for the Development of the Behavioral Sciences Program, December 1951," Report #002072, FFA, 30. He had displayed his anti-positivism for years. When introducing Nathan Leites to Leo Strauss in 1943, for example, he referred to Leites as "hopelessly positivistic." Hans Speier to Leo Strauss, September 2, 1943, Strauss Papers, Box 3, Folder 12.

[154] Speier also stressed the importance of qualitative analysis in other areas. For example, in the collection he edited on West German foreign policy elites, he declared that interviews had several advantages over quantitative surveys. Speier strongly supported the "growing number of studies in political science in which 'field work' supplements library research, and in which the study of 'subjective' factors is added to the observer's customary concern with recorded events and the structure of institutions." Hans Speier, "Introduction: The German Political Scene," in *West German Leadership and Foreign Policy*, eds. Hans Speier and W. Phillips Davison (White Plains, NY: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957), 6.

[155] War games have a provenance dating back to antiquity. Beginning with games such as *Chaturanga, Dash-guti*, and *Go*, and continuing with chess and games that modified chess's rules such as Christoph Weickhmann's 1664 "King's Game," Johann C.L. Helwig's 1780 "Tactical Game," and George Vinturinus' 1798 "New War Game," war games were played well before G.H.L. von Reisswitz, a war counselor to the Prussian court, created the first modern war game (*Kriegsspiel*) in 1811. Departing from previous war games, von Reisswitz's game simulated battles by using figurines on a large sand table to represent soldiers and artillery. It was von Reisswitz's son, G.H.L. von Reisswitz the Second, however, who made crucial innovations to the game in 1824, when he moved it from the sand table to topographical maps and, most importantly, published an elaborate rulebook. Through military counselors, Prince Friedrich Wilhelm IV heard of von Reisswitz II's game and introduced it to his father, King Friedrich Wilhelm III, who issued a royal edict ordering the Prussian army to adopt it. The game remained relatively unchanged until the 1870s, when Jakob Meckel, a Prussian General, and Julius von Verdy du Vernois, a Prussian General and staff officer who served under Moltke the Elder, updated it by calling for the abolition of the game's rules and restrictions. This innovation resulted in the division of war games into "free" and "rigid" games, with the latter being continuations of von Reisswitz's rule-focused game and the former being simulations where a referee directed a game's progress. Before World War I, both of these types of games were used in the German military context. Speier and Goldhamer's political game was a free one. See Christoph Weickhmann, *Neu erfundenes grosses Königs-Spiel* (Ulm: Bei Balthasar Kühnen, 1664); Johann C. L. Hellwig, *Versuch eines aufs Schachspiel gebaueten Tacktischen Spiels* (Leipzig: Crusius, 1780); George Venturinus, *Beschreibung und Regeln eines neuen Krieges-Spiel* (Schleswig, 1798); G. H. L. von Reisswitz, *Anleitung zur Darstellung militärischer Manöver mit dem Apparate des*

Naval War College (NWC), developed a lecture series on war gaming that proved popular, and war gaming became and remained part of the NWC's curriculum.[156] In the following decades, army officers began to publish on war gaming, and after World War I instructors began to teach war games at both the Army Command and General Staff College and the Army War College.[157] These games each simulated strategic and tactical military decision-making, but offered no space for players to participate in the political processes that usually occurred before a nation deployed its armed forces.

In 1944, Central European émigrés John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern published their *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*, which formalized game theory, "the mathematical discipline which studies situations of competition and cooperation between several involved parties."[158] A number of works released during the early Cold War, including John D. Williams' *The Compleat Strategyst*, O.G. Haywood's "Military Decision and Game Theory," and Captain R.P. Beebe's "Military Decisions from the Viewpoint of Game Theory," built upon von Neumann and Morgenstern's

Kriegsspiels (Berlin, 1824); W. von Tschischwitz and Thilo von Trotha *Anleitung zur Darstellung von Gefechtsbildern mittelt des Kriegsspielapparatus* (Berlin, 1870); Jakob Meckel, *Studien über das Kriegsspiel* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1873); and Julius von Verdy du Vernois, *Beitrag zum Kriegsspiel* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1876). For a complete bibliography on war gaming, see Francis J. McHugh, *The Fundamentals of War Gaming* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2012). A good but complicated introduction to war games is Philipp von Hilgers. *War Games: A History of War on Paper*, trans. Ross Benjamin (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013). For the American war game, see W.R. Livermore, *The American Kriegsspiel* (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1882). Soon after, two more works on the American *Kriegsspiel* appeared: Charles A.L. Totten, *Strategos: A Series of American Games of War Based upon Military Principles* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1880) and Charles W. Raymond, *Kriegsspiel* (Hampton, VA: Fortress Monroe, 1881).

[156] William McCarthy Little, "The Strategic War Game or Chart Maneuver," *US Naval Institute Proceedings XXXVIII* (December 1912): 1213-1233.

[157] Eben Swift translated Verdy du Vernois' work as Verdy du Vernois, *A Simplified War Game* (Kansas City, MO: Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Company, 1897). Also see Farrand Sayre, *Map Maneuvers and Tactical Rides* (Springfield, MA: Springfield Printing and Binding Company, 1908).

[158] John von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern, *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944). See also Robert Leonard, *Von Neumann, Morgenstern, and the Creation of Game Theory: From Chess to Social Science, 1900-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). The definition of game theory comes from Hans Peters, *Game Theory: A Multi-Leveled Approach* (Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2008), 1.

scholarship to apply game theory to military decision-making.[159] In the 1950s and 1960s, game theory enthralled defense intellectuals searching for a way to quantify war and thus assert themselves over and against military officers, whose authority was based on professional and not disciplinary knowledge. RAND, where von Neumann served as a consultant and which was populated by hundreds of quantitatively-assured physicists, economists, and mathematicians, quickly became a major center for the development of game theory specifically and quantitative social science generally.[160] As Herbert A. Simon, the Nobel Prize winning political scientist, declared in his autobiography, "for centrality to the postwar quantitative social sciences … the RAND Corporation [was] definitely the plac[e] to see and be seen."[161]

In the mid 1950s, Speier and Goldhamer developed their political game as a reaction to game theory and quantification's dominance of RAND.[162] Speier found that game theory was useful, but that RAND's "ignorant mathematicians" did not appreciate the historical contexts in which policymakers made decisions.[163] Along with Goldhamer, he sought to remedy this situation by creating a heuristic tool that would teach analysts

---

[159] John D. Williams, *The Compleat Strategyst: Being a Primer on the Theory of Games and Strategy* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1954); O. G. Haywood, Jr. "Military Decision and Game Theory," *Operations Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1954): 365-385; and Robert P. Beebe, "Military Decision from the Viewpoint of Game Theory," *Naval War College Review* 10, no. 2 (October 1957): 27-76.

[160] See RAND Corporation, *A Bibliography of Selected RAND Publications: Game Theory* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1988). Also see David A. Hounshell, "The Cold War, RAND, and the Generation of Knowledge," *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences* 27, no. 2 (1997): 253-254.

[161] Herbert A. Simon, *Models of My Life: The Remarkable Autobiography of the Nobel Prize Winning Social Scientist and the Father of Artificial Intelligence* (New York: Basic Books, 1991), 116. For more on Simon, see Hunter Heyck, *Herbert A. Simon: The Bounds of Reason in Modern America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005).

[162] The most extensive account of the political game's influence may be found in Sharon Ghamari-Tabrizi, "Simulating the Unthinkable: Gaming Future War in the 1950s and 1960s," *Social Studies of Science* 30, no. 2 (April 2000): 163-223 and Sharon Ghamari-Tabrizi, *The Worlds of Herman Kahn: The Intuitive Science of Thermonuclear War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005), chapter 6.

[163] Hans Speier, *An Historical Look at the RAND Research Program* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, B-152, July 5, 1961), 31 and "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 266.

the importance of understanding context in its geopolitical and institutional forms. Both Speier and Goldhamer had personal knowledge of the political-bureaucratic process. Speier gained his during World War II at the myriad agencies for which he worked, while Goldhamer had participated in the Korean War armistice talks. They knew first-hand how rational calculations based on analyses of power were not the only factors, nor necessarily the most important factors, that determined policymakers' decisions. Culture, events, institutions, and politics all mattered, yet the majority of RAND's analysts completely ignored these issues. Speier believed this led the insights of game theory, when taken alone, to be "nonsense" (*Unfug*).[164] If analysts wanted to provide useful knowledge to decision-makers, Speier and Goldhamer argued, they needed to appreciate the importance of context. This was especially true in an era of nuclear war, the destructiveness of which made policymakers' decisions particularly subject to "psychological difficulties and contingent circumstances."[165] Speier and Goldhamer hoped that teaching RAND analysts to appreciate the difficulties politicians faced when confronting the nuclear problem would enable them to offer their government patrons advice that could allow the United States to achieve its objectives while avoiding nuclear war.[166] Moreover, they believed that, if successful, the game could migrate from RAND to the government, where decision-makers themselves could hone their skills by playing it.

Speier and Goldhamer's "political" game thus moved beyond traditional games of military strategy and tactics to simulate the political process that preceded and then

---

[164] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 269.
[165] Ibid., 264.
[166] Ibid., 269.

continued during a war. In their game, the focus was not on battles, but on diplomacy and war's political consequences. Speier and Goldhamer believed that participating in an explicitly political simulation would force analysts to immerse themselves in, and learn about, the experience of policymaking. They trusted that encouraging players to make political decisions as if they were policymakers would teach them the "political thought process" and improve their analytical skills.[167]

The game ran as follows. Before it commenced, referees presented players with a scenario written by a political scientist, historian, or military analyst; a delimited field of conflict; specific roles—for example, two or three people would be the Russian government, while others would be the United States or France; and different interests to pursue. Referees, who "played the role of God," oversaw and managed the game.[168] Four requirements undergirded the simulations, each intended to contribute to their realism. First, games were minimally formalized. Real life did not have hard and fast rules, so neither did the game. Second, they were played with incomplete and incorrect information, which mirrored the reality of international relations. Third, random events formed a core element of the game, as Speier and Goldhamer argued that a major skill of an effective political leader was the ability to respond adequately to unforeseen events. Finally, players were required to act as they thought the leaders they portrayed would. For this reason, players were area specialists, or at least had a working knowledge of the region they portrayed. Importantly, players could not make a move without justifying it

---

[167] Ibid., 268.
[168] Ibid., 267.

in writing with reference to their expert knowledge, which prevented them from making outrageous decisions.[169]

Educators have long used simulations to instruct students to think like professionals. In addition to traditional war games, since at least the early twentieth century U.S. professors, particularly those in business schools, employed case studies to simulate real world experiences.[170] Moreover, in the 1930s and 1940s the German and Japanese militaries played political games that foreshadowed the one created by Speier and Goldhamer.[171] Yet the authors were unaware of these antecedents, and historians must therefore look to other sources to find the origins of the Cold War political game.[172] If one examines the intellectual field in which Speier and Goldhamer matured, it becomes clear that in many ways their political game mirrored the pedagogical goals and method developed in the 1920s by Karl Mannheim, Speier's mentor, and someone with whom Goldhamer studied when he spent time at the London School of Economics—to which Mannheim immigrated—in the early 1930s. Similar to Speier and Goldhamer, Mannheim hoped to train an elite cadre to interact in a complex and unknown political environment. For Mannheim, the context was newly democratic Germany; for Speier and Goldhamer, it was the era of nuclear war. Mannheim believed the only way to overcome the chaos that characterized Weimar politics was to foster a new generation of political leaders able

---

[169] Herbert Goldhamer and Hans Speier, "Some Observations on Political Gaming," *World Politics* 12, no. 1 (October 1959): 75-77.

[170] Matthew Stewart, *The Management Myth: Why the Experts Keep Getting it Wrong* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2009), 136.

[171] Goldhamer and Speier, "Some Observations," 71-72.

[172] Speier even claimed that he was not familiar with the case study method. See Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 269. For the concept of intellectual field, which comes from Pierre Bourdieu, and its relationship to intellectual history, see Fritz Ringer, "The Intellectual Field, Intellectual History, and the Sociology of Knowledge," *Theory and Society* 19, no. 3 (June 1990): 269-294. For Bourdieu's original work on the subject, see Pierre Bourdieu, "Intellectual Field and Creative Project," *Social Science Information* 8, no. 2 (April 1969): 89-119.

to act justly and effectively within Germany's nascent democratic system. Speier and Goldhamer thought the same with regards taming the nuclear problem. For all three intellectuals, simulation became the means through which to ensure that the worst outcomes—the collapse of democracy and nuclear war—were avoided.

Mannheim developed a pedagogical method that he believed simulated the process of democratic political life.[173] In developing his pedagogy, he started from the premise that there were two educational approaches prevalent in the modern era, the lecture and the workshop. The embodiment of teaching "purely classificatory [scientific] knowledge" was the lecture, while the embodiment of training in the "arts" was the workshop.[174] However, Mannheim declared that neither the lecture nor the workshop was appropriate for teaching the democratic way of thinking, as neither took the non-schematized character of politics into account. In Mannheim's opinion, the only way to familiarize students with the democratic political process was to recreate its atmosphere, which he defined as heated and intense. To do so, one needed to combine the workshop with the discussion seminar. In Mannheim's proposed classroom, professors guided students, who were required to react to current events and discuss how politicians could respond to these events, in ways that reached a given goal. In this way, Mannheim argued, students experienced the democratic political sphere and learned how to interact within it effectively.[175]

Mannheim's pedagogy heavily influenced Speier and Goldhamer's game. Whereas Mannheim contended that participating in his simulation of the political process enabled students to learn to think like democrats, Speier and Goldhamer argued that it

---

[173] Karl Mannheim, *Ideologie und Utopie* (Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1930 [1929]), 150.
[174] Ibid., 152.
[175] Ibid., 159.

was only by participating in their simulation of international relations that analysts learned to think like decision-makers. Mannheim believed that enabling students to act as politicians forced them to face their own suppositions more harshly than if they merely thought as theorists; Speier and Goldhamer thought the same about their political game, which they hoped transformed "fantasy" into a "somewhat truer reality."[176] As Speier said, it was only with the game that "one considered: I'll do this. What can my opponents do to answer this? Then you say to yourself: Well, this and that. And what can one do in this first case, and what can one do in this second case? Then finally you stop and do something."[177] That is to say, Speier believed the game taught analysts to think in real time, as a policymaker would. Essentially, both Mannheim's pedagogy and Speier and Goldhamer's game were designed to teach a "thought process" each intellectual believed crucial to the future.

Speier and Goldhamer argued that the game had three main benefits, each of which echoed Mannheim's pedagogy. First, "the political game provides a lively setting in which students of politics … can learn a good deal about the structure of the contemporary political world and about some of the reasons behind political decisions."[178] Second, the game enabled players to achieve a holistic understanding of decision-making, drawing links between areas of specialization previously thought to be disconnected. In other words, it engendered a "total" view of geopolitics that mirrored the "total" view of society that Mannheim hoped to foster with his sociology of knowledge. Finally, the game gave players "new insight into the pressures, the uncertainties, and the

---

[176] "Gesprächsweise Mitteilungen zu einer intellektuellen Autobiographie," Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 32, 264.
[177] Ibid., 268.
[178] Goldhamer and Speier, "Some Observations," 79.

moral and intellectual difficulties under which foreign policy decisions are made."[179]

Similar to Mannheim's pedagogy, it hoped to expose players to the realities, not just the

ideals, of political interaction, with the purpose of instructing students how to address

problems central to modern politics.

In 1955 and 1956, four games were played at RAND. The first two lasted several

days, and the third an entire month.[180] When the game began, RAND analysts from the

Social Science, Economics, and Physics Divisions were its only players. Because of

RAND's prestige and connections, however, information about the game soon spread

throughout the foreign policy establishment. By the middle of the first game, Speier

received calls from the State Department asking him if their own analysts could join.[181]

Other government officials, including members of the Defense Department, participated

in later simulations.

Academic networks also helped disseminate the game.[182] Beginning in 1956,

Speier, Goldhamer, and other RAND analysts took efforts to promote it at a variety of

scholarly conferences and military institutions. In the summer of 1956, Speier gave a

presentation on the game at the Social Science Research Council's summer institute in

Denver, and in 1957 he did the same at CASBS. Goldhamer lectured on the game at the

Army War College, while Joseph Goldsen discussed it at Yale and at a Princeton meeting

---

[179] Ibid.

[180] Although the game soon permeated other nodes of the foreign policy establishment, RAND analysts eventually concluded it was too time consuming to take them away from other work.

[181] State Department officials who played in the fourth game included Harold Hoskins, director of its Foreign Service Institute, Albert Franklin, Dean of the Foreign Service Institute's School of International Studies, Dean Franklin, Edward Page, and Jeffrey Kitchen. At the game's conclusion, several State officials declared they considered the game a useful pedagogical tool. Ghamari-Tabrizi, "Simulating the Unthinkable," 176, 212.

[182] The information in the following three paragraphs comes from Ghamari-Tabrizi, "Simulating the Unthinkable" and Ghamari-Tabrizi, *The Worlds of Herman Kahn*, chapter 6, which are the best accounts of the political game.

of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. In June 1959, Speier and others

presented on the game at West Point. RAND analysts also discussed it with colleagues at

the Brookings Institution, Harvard's Center for International Affairs, and other policy-

oriented organizations. Influenced by the RAND analysts, several universities, including

West Point, Columbia, and MIT, began their own games.[183]

MIT became a particularly important center for the diffusion of the political

game. Paul Kecskemeti, a member of the SSD who played in all of RAND's games,

visited MIT in 1957 to help Lincoln Bloomfield, a former State Department official who

had moved to CENIS, design a political game. In 1958, Bloomfield began games both in

his undergraduate classes and for senior government officials. The most important of the

latter occurred in 1960, when CENIS hosted a game, termed POLEX II, which focused

on a regional crisis in the Middle East. Its participants considered the simulation a

success and knowledge about it came to Defense Department officials through Henry

Rowen, a former RAND researcher then working as an aide to John McNaughton, the

Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. The Joint Chiefs of

Staff (JCS) had already created a Joint War Games Agency (JWGA), headquartered in

the Pentagon, with the intent of increasing communication between defense intellectuals,

the JCS, and the State and Defense Departments. Upon Rowen's recommendation, this

new agency adopted the political game.

---

[183] Goldhamer and Speier, "Some Observations," 81-82. These games were overseen by Major Abbott Greenleaf (West Point), Warner Schilling (Columbia), and Phil Davison, Lucian Pye, and Warner Schilling (MIT). For more on MIT's role as a Cold War university, see Stuart W. Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994). See also Hans Speier, "Political Games and Scenarios," May 6, 1961, Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 17, 5. Today, simulations remain an active part of academic curricula, including at Yale and Duke. Interestingly, in 1957 two professors from Northwestern, Harold Guetzjow and Richard Snyder, developed a similar game independently of RAND. In 1958, Oliver Benson of the University of Oklahoma created a computer program of the Northwestern game. Ghamari-Tabrizi, *The Worlds of Herman Kahn*, 156.

Speier and Goldhamer's game soon became a part of the policymaking process. From September 8 to 11, and again from September 29 to October 1, 1961, the JWGA arranged two games about the Second Berlin Crisis, which was precipitated by the Soviet Union's demand that all western forces withdraw from Berlin.[184] Thomas Schelling, a RAND consultant, wrote the scenario and directed the games, which were played by senior government officials. A number of well-known figures, including DeWitt Armstrong, McGeorge Bundy, Alain Enthoven, Carl Kaysen, Henry Kissinger, Robert Komer, McNaughton, Rowen. and Seymour Weiss, played the game. Kaysen, President John F. Kennedy's aide, later briefed him on its outcomes.[185]

A method with intellectual roots in Weimar Germany thus came to affect the foreign policymaking process. The shift from Weimar Germany to Cold War America, however, brought changes to the contours and emphasis of the political game. Its goal transformed from training students to training experts and high-level administrators, while its focus moved from domestic politics to international relations. Despite these changes, Speier and Goldhamer's political game reflected its roots: it remained premised on the belief that a realistic simulation of a political situation could teach the skills and habits of thought necessary to defend democracy, except this time on a global, not nation-wide, scale.

The game also served as a way for Speier to bridge the humanities-social sciences gap that defined RAND and isolated the SSD. International relations, the game implicitly argued, required all forms of knowledge. Speier rejected the notion that game theory by itself provided a base from which decision-makers or analysts producing policy-relevant

---

[184] The games were played from September 8-11 at Camp David in Maryland, and from September 29 to October 1 at the Military Assistance Institute in Arlington, Virginia.
[185] In the early 1950s, Kaysen had served as a RAND consultant on targeting studies.

knowledge could pivot. The political game made clear through action and experience that knowledge of history and political context was required for those who studied and influenced international affairs. Social science without history, Speier's game argued, was at best worthless and at worst misleading. Quantification may have dominated at RAND, but as Speier's case demonstrated, it did not go unchallenged.

Conclusion

Speier's expert knowledge of psychological warfare and his job at RAND allowed him to assume a position as a centrally located member of the emerging Cold War foreign policy establishment. He used his position to influence the direction of specific U.S. foreign policies as well as the research organizations that provided institutional homes to social scientists and other academics interested in refining their data and methods and, in many cases, speaking to issues of international relations. Speier helped build the structures that supported an intellectual elite of the type he had championed since the days of the Weimar Republic. Due to efforts like his, defense intellectuals had access to organizations that supported them; connections to policymakers; and contact with funding sources that allowed them to pursue research outside the university system.

The institutions that Speier helped form existed between the traditional nodes of the policymaking matrix. They were at once part of, yet distinct from, the government, the military, universities, and private foundations. They combined elements of each to create something new. Ideologically, these institutions presented themselves as apolitical, although in practice they conformed to the dominant Cold War foreign policy consensus. However, they did exist outside the political process in the sense that they were not connected to either of the major political parties. Thus, the intellectuals who worked for

these organizations could be—and were—called upon by both Democratic and Republican administrations for advice and guidance. In his efforts, Speier consciously removed defense intellectuals from politics because he did not want them to feel pressure to alter their recommendations to correspond to the wishes of what he considered to be an ignorant and volatile public opinion. In so doing, he guaranteed the long-term viability of think tanks, and indeed, these institutions remain not only resources for decision-makers, but have also become the shapers of policy agendas themselves.[186]

The apolitical nature of the foreign policy research establishment encouraged the public's removal from elements of the policymaking process. In his policy writings from the Cold War, Speier never once referred to public opinion, not only because he believed it to be a poor guide of political affairs, but also because, as a defense intellectual, he did not need to consider it. Speier did not have to be elected and his position was not dependent on any specific political patronage; he was essentially a "wise man" free of political anxieties. The supposedly objective nature of his research allowed Speier to present himself as a mere observer offering decision-makers disinterested knowledge. Partially due to this claim, which was the general assertion of analysts from all think tanks, the institutions within which Speier operated were only rarely the subject of public or legislative interest.[187]

---

[186] For this process, see Donald E. Abelson, *A Capitol Idea: Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006).

[187] One instance in which a RAND study came under scrutiny was when Paul Kecksmeti analyzed when and if it would ever be prudent for the United States to make a "strategic surrender." The book resulted in a firestorm of anger and condemnation, and eventually led Congress to pass a resolution that forbade the funding of any studies that could be seen as defeatist. See Paul Kecskemeti, *Strategic Surrender: The Politics of Victory and Defeat* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958). For a contemporary account of the hearings, see James E. King, Jr., "Strategic Surrender: The Senate Debate and the Book," *World Politics* 11, no. 3 (April 1959): 418-429. For more on Congress's critiques of RAND, see Robin, *The Making of the Cold War Enemy*, 49.

This lack of oversight implicitly placed a high degree of faith in the ability of defense intellectuals to engage in a continuous process of self-assessment and to promote actions deemed to be in an amorphously defined "national interest." Reflecting Speier and others' sense of themselves as objective analysts of international relations, the culture of these institutions assumed that little stood in the way of intellectuals' self-critique. However, Speier's own static opinions regarding the Soviet Union, the very fact that he forever analogized it with Nazi Germany, demonstrate how removing policy experts from the political process can lead to intellectual inertia. Moreover, because the livelihoods of defense intellectuals relied upon maintaining the Cold War, it was in their self-interest—whether conscious or not—to promote East-West antagonism. Speier and his colleagues were unable to view the Soviet Union as a dynamic society that transformed over time and could not see the changing character of the Soviet threat. Perhaps for this reason, RAND's lasting contributions to the theory and practice of international relations often came in the realm of methodology, such as the development of the political game and game theory, as opposed to substantive research that analyzed more humanistic subject matter, such as the nature of Soviet society.

Speier's mission to bring intellectuals to bear on foreign policy was largely successful. Two of the organizations he helped found, RAND and CASBS, remain influential in their respective spheres, while the program in international communication at MIT lasted until the 1980s and produced numerous significant studies.[188] More importantly, the culture of expertise these institutions incubated continues to define the

---

[188] See Blackmer, *The Founding Years*, chapter 2 and chapter 5, for the program in international communication. Unfortunately, as far as I am aware, there is no general history of CASBS, although its archives may be found at Stanford University. See Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University Records, SC1055, Department of Special Collections and University Archives, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

foreign policy research establishment and has come to affect the backgrounds of decision-makers themselves. Partly due to the labors' of people like Speier, elite foreign policy positions are no longer the sole province of blue-blooded Americans who all hail from the same class and ethnic background. Instead, women and racial and religious minorities have used expertise to assert themselves in the foreign policymaking sphere. In the last decades alone, a number of high-ranking officials, including Condoleezza Rice, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Paul Wolfowitz, have used their Ph.Ds as a means to enter the highest realms of foreign policymaking. Today, expert intellectuals, although not the all-powerful counselors that Speier might have hoped for or envisioned, exert a significant influence on the direction of U.S. foreign policy. With RAND and similar institutions, the influence of Speier and the first generation of defense intellectuals endures. The think tanks and research centers they created and the culture they produced continue to structure how Americans create foreign policy. Thus, the Weimar Republic is not merely history. Its memory—and its failures—shape how the United States interacts in the world.

Epilogue: An Exile's View of Germany

Exile was a deeply personal experience, and it is difficult to typologize the ebbs and flows of an exile's relationship with his or her nation of origin. Speier himself had ambivalent feelings about Germany. When he first returned to the American zone of occupation in the immediate postwar period, he displayed a paradoxical attitude toward the conquered nation and its people. He argued that German suffering was the proper outcome for the horrors Hitler had caused, while at the same time he expressed a deep sympathy for ordinary Germans' plight. Speier's writings evince the tensions inherent in someone whose life was deeply informed by the culture and society of a place that had forced him to leave. In the 1940s, his emotions alternated between anger and compassion, never committing fully to either.

Yet Germany proved professionally important to Speier. When he no longer attempted to influence U.S. foreign policy directly, his policy writing focused primarily on German affairs. Indeed, it was his expertise on Germany that allowed Speier to retain a privileged position within the foreign policy establishment, both at RAND and, in 1964-1965, at the Council on Foreign Relations.[1] He regularly traveled to the *Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Federal Republic of Germany, or FRG) throughout the 1950s and 1960s, writing detailed reports on German politics, society, and culture. His writings allow historians to analyze the complicated emotions that arise within an exile who made his career as an expert on the homeland that expelled him.

After initially worrying about the resurgence of German nationalism and radicalism, by the early 1950s Speier adopted a more sanguine attitude toward the FRG

---

[1] See Council on Foreign Relations, Study Group on German Foreign Policy, 1964-1965, Speier Papers, Box 14, Folder 15.

and its commitment to the western alliance. Still, throughout the decade he cautioned that

U.S. policymakers should be forever wary about the resurgence of German nationalism.

It was only with the Second Berlin Crisis, which began in 1958, that Speier accepted that

the FRG was a dedicated member of the western alliance. Although a wary tone

permeated his writings, Speier continued to champion West Germany until the emergence

of activist student movements in the late 1960s. The student rebellions stimulated old

fears in Speier, who compared them to the radicalism of the late Weimar period. Speier

thus ended his career with renewed worries about the FRG and its relationship with the

United States. Even after forty years, he found reflections of Weimar's tragedy in

contemporary events.

Occupying Germany, 1945-1950

Speier first returned to Germany as Assistant and later Acting Chief of the State

Department's Division for Occupied Areas (ADO). Similar to all occupation officials, he

was charged with using his position to stamp out Nazism, Pan-Germanism, and

militarism. From the beginning, however, Speier, doubted the efficacy of the U.S.

reeducation effort. He believed that economic hardships, coupled with hunger, made it

impossible to convince Germans in the American zone that supporting U.S. interests was

important for their well being.[2] Yet there was no way for officials to improve the living

conditions of Germans, Speier declared, because under the influence of Secretary of the

Treasury Henry Morgenthau, U.S. policy in the occupation zone was punitive and

organized against reconstruction.[3] Given U.S. policy, Speier continued, occupation

---

[2] Hans Speier, "Immediate and Future Responsibilities of the Department of State for the Reeducation of Germany," May 28, 1946, Speier Papers, Box 8, Folder 11.
[3] James F. Tent, *Mission on the Rhine: 'Reeducation and Denazification in American-Occupied Germany* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 32.

authorities could not persuade Germans to support democracy. Speier expressed a deep anxiety that the United States was in the process of repeating the mistakes of the immediate post-World War I period, where high reparations, high inflation, and high unemployment engendered Nazism's rise.

Speier also feared that their poor living conditions would encourage Germans to look toward the Soviet Union for aid and comfort. He maintained that the Soviets presented Germans with "the most articulate answers regarding [their] political future."[4] In contrast, U.S. officials did not offer coherent reasons for why ordinary Germans should support the western alliance. Speier blamed the tactics of U.S. officials, particularly their unwillingness to embrace the noncommunist left, the long-standing bastion of anti-Nazi sentiment, for failing to bring Germans to their side. He was further vexed by the fact that the Americans made it difficult for the Germans to express their political views in public, arguing that if Germans' only experience with "democracy" was deprivation and hardship, U.S. officials could not hope to eradicate Nazism. Germans would only support the west, Speier maintained, if they experienced the positive aspects of democracy. The quick creation of democratic institutions, be they political parties or parliaments, would not lead to Germany's democratization. Speier avowed that if Germans did not live democracy in their everyday lives, they would blame the United States and its allies for their suffering and would lend their support to a reactionary hyper-nationalism, the Soviet Union, or both.[5]

---

[4] Speier, "Responsibilities," 3.
[5] For more on bringing Germany into the western alliance, see Marc Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), 55.

Speier's opinion of the occupation echoed those of other exiles.[6] After the war, the most extensive monograph on the U.S. military occupation was the Yale historian and exile Hajo Holborn's *American Military Government*. In this book, Holborn similarly critiqued the U.S. occupation policy for its lack of political coherence and its disinterest in improving the material conditions of ordinary Germans. The United States, Holborn declared, was making it difficult for Germans to become democrats. Holborn agreed with Speier's notion that the appearance of democratic institutions did not a democracy make, and pointed to Weimar as an example of this political fact.[7] Both Holborn and Speier worried about repeating the mistakes of the interwar period. Indeed, the latter highlighted several signs that indicated a recurrence of Weimar, including references to the occupation as the harbinger of a new "'unholy dictate of Versailles.'"[8] The repetition of such post-World War I phrases troubled Speier, who believed that "the imposition of denazification from without by the victors has strengthened solidarity between Nazis and non-Nazis" and undermined Germany's democratization before it began.[9]

For all his claims that poor living conditions made it difficult for the Germans to experience democracy, in the early postwar years Speier could not wholeheartedly commit to the occupation zone's rehabilitation. Initially, at least, personal experience and memory trumped geopolitical considerations and fears of the Soviet domination of Europe. In particular, he fretted over the political repercussions of the German economy's stabilization. Speier worried that too much economic stability would allow ordinary

---

[6] For the often-quixotic plans for postwar Germany developed by émigrés during the war, see Thomas Koebner, Gert Sautermeiser, and Sigrid Schneider, *Deutschland nach Hitler: Zukunftspläne im Exil und aus der Besatzungszeit* (Opladen: Verlag für Sozialwisssenschaften, 1987).
[7] Hajo Holborn, *American Military Government: Its Organization and Policies* (Washington: Infantry Journal Press, 1947), 105-112.
[8] Hans Speier, "The Future of German Nationalism," *Social Research* 14, no. 4 (Winter 1947): 436.
[9] Ibid., 437.

Germans to devote their time to politics, which would encourage nationalism to metastasize. He therefore encouraged U.S. officials to deemphasize economic recovery programs until a democratic culture permeated Germany, although at no moment did he explain the mechanisms by which such a culture would spread. If recovery preceded democracy, Speier argued, "nihilism and disorientation, bitterness and indifference, social atomization, and lack of moral seriousness" would combine with the absence of a strong German democratic tradition to "provide a dangerous recruiting ground for any future nationalist revival on a large scale."[10] This claim stood in opposition to his argument that Germans would not embrace democracy unless their living conditions improved. Irreconcilable tensions, engendered by Speier's desire to avoid a repetition of Weimar, characterized his thought in the 1940s.

In his personal writings on Germany and Germans, Speier also evinced sharp tensions. His first letters from Germany vacillate between sympathy for ordinary people, disgust at Nazi crimes, and a sense that Germany's suffering was just.[11] Speier was a victor who identified strongly with the vanquished, but who nevertheless felt that they were responsible for horrible crimes against humanity for which they must be punished. In every town and city to which he traveled, Speier reported in stark detail the degraded conditions in which ordinary Germans lived. He was particularly amazed that Germans lived without any "heat, hot and cold running water, [and] radio."[12] Although Speier repeatedly declaimed that the Germans deserved their suffering, he displayed a deep sense of guilt regarding the better living conditions he enjoyed as an American official.

[10] Hans Speier, "Notes on German Nationalism," September 1949, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 31, 5.
[11] For Speier's letters from his first trips to Germany, see Hans Speier, *From the Ashes of Disgrace: A Journal from Germany, 1945-1955* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981), 17-65. This section relies on these letters.
[12] Hans Speier, Bad Homburg, October 28, 1945, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 20.

Speier was aghast that "in the street, everybody, or almost everybody, has the color of yellow paste," while he "lived in a house with all the comfort of civilization."[13] His emotions alternated between a righteous indignation at Germans' crimes and heartfelt sympathy for their suffering.

Speier's compassion and indignation was tempered by anger, an emotion that emerged most clearly in a conversation he had with his former advisor Karl Jaspers.[14] Speier found it very insulting that, at least in his interpretation, Jaspers claimed that it was the Nazis, not ordinary Germans, who were guilty of crimes against peace and humanity.[15] After all, Speier asked, was it not ordinary Germans who "make it possible for criminals to prosper and command respect or at least enjoy impunity?"[16] Did not "millions of Germans … shar[e] in the looting of Europe?"[17] To some degree, Speier believed the political masses were as much to blame for World War II and the Holocaust as Hitler, and that to excuse them was to excuse moral crimes that had no historical precedent.

Speier further found Jaspers' idea of "inner emigration," namely that there were intellectuals who stayed in Germany after 1933 but who could not be considered responsible for Nazi crimes, ridiculous. Speier argued that "men like Jaspers … appear not to have realized what the Germans did to Europe. Instead, they concentrate on what the Nazis did to Germany." [18] He believed such a position to be a cover for what was in actuality Jaspers' and other intellectuals' simple unwillingness to abandon familiar

---

[13] Ibid. and Hans Speier, Bad Homburg, October 31, 1945, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 23-24.
[14] Hans Speier, Heidelberg, November 18, 1945, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 35-40.
[15] For Jaspers and the idea of German guilt, see Karl Jaspers, *Die Schuldfrage: Ein Beitrag zur Deutschen Frage* (Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 1946).
[16] Speier, Heidelberg, November 18, 1945, 37.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid., 38.

comforts for a difficult exile. Speier's postwar conversation with Jaspers reveals how he subtly, and unfavorably, compared the latter with Emil Lederer. Unlike Jaspers, Lederer was willing to take a public stand for democracy and freedom; unlike Jaspers, Lederer—and Speier, by implication—fulfilled the intellectual's proper social role.[19] After all, Speier and Lederer were intellectuals who had emigrated and, especially in Speier's case, took an active effort to defeat Nazism. He therefore found it ridiculous that Jaspers equated his own experience in Germany with Speier's experience in the United States. Speier found all of Jaspers' postwar justifications for remaining in Germany to be little more than untenable excuses that had the psychological purpose of protecting the philosopher from shame.

If German democracy was to have a future, Speier thought that shame needed to become a defining cultural characteristic of postwar Germany. It was for this reason that one of his early projects for the ADO was promoting *Die Todesmühlen* (The Death Mills), a film about the concentration camps.[20] Speier argued that unless they experienced shame for World War II and the Holocaust, Hitler would continue to exert a strong "grip on the souls of many Germans."[21] Indeed, he retained his pessimism about Germany and Germans throughout the late 1940s. As living conditions improved, whatever sympathy he had abated and he began to argue that the American policies of denazification, reeducation, and democratization had utterly failed, and that "the political and moral disorientation of the large masses of the German population has progressed after the

---

[19] Hans Speier, Bad Homburg, November 18, 1945, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 35-40.
[20] Hans Speier, Bad Homburg, November 14, 1945, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 30-33.
[21] Speier, "Future of German Nationalism," 434.

collapse of the Nazi regime."[22] For years, Speier could not bring himself to trust his

erstwhile countrymen.

German Rearmament, 1950-1958

As the Cold War intensified, Speier advocated for policy positions, namely

German rearmament, which he would have found untenable in the immediate postwar

period. Speier's work on German rearmament displayed his commitment to the

militarized Cold War that dominated U.S. strategic thinking in the early 1950s. After the

endorsement of NSC-68 in April 1950 and the outbreak of the Korean War in June, most

U.S. officials argued that the Cold War stalemate depended upon a strong West European

defense maintained by a large German contribution of manpower.[23] Despite his

apprehensions about Germans' commitment to democracy and the west, Speier agreed

that:

> The participation of Western Germany in European defense appears to be almost indispensable if the military balance of forces is soberly reviewed. Western Germany has a population of fifty million people. … Its military manpower resources are untapped, since Germany has no colonies and no territories to defend in Asia or Africa. … Moreover, by virtue of Germany's location in Europe, German reserves would not have to be moved into the initial combat area in case of war: they are where they might be needed. Former German officers of all ranks and millions of German men have experience in fighting Soviet forces. Millions of Germans have had close contact with Soviet communism and with the Red Army as an occupation force; they are therefore no ready victims of communist propaganda.[24]

The Cold War, Speier implied, could not be fought, let alone won, without the FRG,

which was officially founded in May 1949. With utilitarian justifications, Speier declared

that although the Germans were by no means democrats, the need to defend Western

---

[22] Speier, "Notes on German Nationalism," 2.

[23] Even before Korea, the Americans allowed the Germans to rearm in various ways. See David Clay Large, *Germans to the Front: West German Rearmament in the Adenauer Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 26-27.

[24] Hans Speier, "Foreign Policy and International Communication, Prepared for the 1953 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, September 10-12, 1953," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 61, 8.

Europe from the Soviets must assume the place of primary importance in policymakers' strategic considerations.

For this reason, German neutralism, not nationalism, was the ideology that most troubled Speier in the 1950s. This was not only because neutralism had the potential to weaken the United States' position *vis-à-vis* the Soviet Union, but also because it strengthened Germany's negotiating power with the west. By presenting themselves as having neutralist sympathies, Speier feared that German politicians could "exploi[t] the defense issue in Germany's favor" by demanding concessions from U.S. policymakers in exchange for equal participation in and control of European defense.[25] Such a requirement would place the United States in an incredibly difficult position. France, a country where "everybody talks about German rearmament and nobody likes it," understandably dreaded the FRG's military resurgence and could not accept even a militarily semi-independent Germany.[26] Speier was therefore concerned that the necessary addition of West German forces to the west would weaken the French commitment to the Cold War. For its part, the Soviet Union recognized that German rearmament presented a potential threat, which was why "the primary aim of Soviet policy in Germany [was to prevent] re-armament" and promote neutralism.[27] Speier argued that Americans must stamp out German neutralism as quickly as possible and make clear to the Germans that they existed as a sovereign nation because of, not in spite of, the United States. Although Speier now argued in favor of making Germany a central participant in Western Europe's defense, he continued to distrust the Germans.

---

[25] Hans Speier, "Report of Visit in 1950," Washington, D.C., December 7, 1950, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 98.

[26] Hans Speier, Paris, November 5, 1950, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 66.

[27] Hans Speier, "Notes on My Trip to Germany in 1950, Washington, D.C., December 7, 1950," *German Diary, 1945-1955 ('45-'51)*, Speier Papers, Box 2, Folder 18, 25.

In September 1950, the United States proposed that Germany be rearmed within the context of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and that this rearmament occur under the umbrella of a U.S. commitment to maintain troops in Europe. The French, fearing both a rearmed Germany but also an aggressive Soviet Union, countered the American proposal with a plan for a European Defense Community (EDC). Unlike the U.S. plan, the French project argued in favor of a Pan-European defense force in which West German military units would be integrated and controlled within a larger European command structure. In this way, the French hoped to ensure that Germany would not have an independent military force. In July 1951, Truman accepted the proposal, and in May 1952, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg signed a treaty establishing the EDC. The path toward an integrated European defense appeared to be paved.

In 1951 and 1952, as American and West European leaders discussed the EDC, Speier emphasized the importance of rearmament to democracy, arguing that "unless we can solve the problem of German and European defense, democracy will have no chance of survival in Germany—or, for that matter, anywhere on the continent"—as an unarmed Germany could be easily overrun by the Soviet Union.[28] To understand the prospects of rearmament, he interviewed dozens of ex-Wehrmacht officers about their political and military opinions. He found that the overwhelming majority of ex-officers were pro-American, anti-Nazi, and anti-Soviet, and that they were unsurprisingly eager to

---

[28] Wallace Carroll and Hans Speier, "Psychological Warfare in Germany: A Report to the United States High Commissioner for Germany and the Department of State, Frankfurt am Main, December 1, 1950," RG 466, Berlin Element, Eastern Affairs Division, Security-Segregated General Rec., 1948-1952, Pepco, Box 3, Folder US Western Strategy Tactics, Policy, 1949-53, National Archives II, 31.

participate in European defense.[29] Moreover, Speier was impressed by what he

considered to be the officers' strategic mettle. Despite these positive feelings, Weimar's

shadow continued to inform how he viewed the officers. Speier feared that too many

were "conservative experts who do not see any need for departing from old traditions.

Military expertness is no guarantee of firm political loyalty and may, in fact, be combined

conveniently with politically opportunistic behavior."[30] No matter their claims, in the

end, Speier doubted Germans' commitment to democracy and the west.

No side of the political spectrum was free from Speier's criticism. Over the course

of the 1950s, he became quite critical of his old party, the *Sozialdemokratische Partei*

Deutschlands (SPD), which he lambasted for speaking against West German Chancellor

Konrad Adenauer's pro-western perspective. In particular, Speier derided Kurt

Schumacher, the chairman of the SPD, for referring to Adenauer as "Chancellor of the

Allies" and for "intimat[ing] that an act of treason had been committed by Adenauer"

when he supported the EDC.[31] He also found the fact that the SPD initiated a legal crisis

by challenging the constitutionality of the EDC treaties very disconcerting.[32] Speier

attributed socialist intransigence to the historical memory of Weimar:

> After the end of the first World War the Social Democrats supported the Weimar Republic and the
> peace treaty of Versailles, thus enabling the radical right to reap the fruits of irresponsible
> nationalism which ruined democracy in Germany a few years later. This time the Social
> Democratic Party decided not to share the responsibility for cooperation with the policy of the
> victorious Western powers. Instead, the Socialists exploited the tactical advantage of being in the
> opposition and disregarded the urgent need for national solidarity on the armament issue.[33]

---

[29] Hans Speier, "Bonn and Berlin," November 10, 1950, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 67; Hans Speier,
"Notes on German Veterans Organizations," December 12, 1951, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 45, 5-6;
Hans Speier, "Interview with Erich Dethleffsen, May 15, Frankfurt," *Log Notes, 1952 (May 15-24),
numbered 31-35, 37, 39-41*, Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 2; and Hans Speier, "Interview with R. Gehlen,
June 17, 1952," *Log Notes, 1952 (May 25-June 17), numbered 42-48, 50-58, 60*, Speier Papers, Box 9,
Folder 4.
[30] Speier, "Foreign Policy and International Communication," 27.
[31] Ibid., 10 and Speier, *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 79.
[32] Speier, "Foreign Policy and International Communication," 10.
[33] Ibid., 11.

In essence, Speier accused the SPD of learning the wrong lessons of Weimar. He found

that socialists ignored the reality that the occupation authorities of the 1950s were not the

same as the allies who weakened Germany's economy in the 1920s. Disregarding this,

"the Socialists perverted the political meaning of the [EDC] treaties by presenting them

as the crowning event of the occupation period" and discounted "that a new phase of

international relations," one in which the FRG would become a partner with the west,

"would begin for Western Germany with the ratification of the treaties."[34] In the early

1950s, Speier remained disappointed that his former party overlooked the manifest Soviet

threat in favor of adopting what he considered to be a position of intransigent, and

damaging, opposition.

  After several years of negotiations between the United States, France, and West

Germany, in August 1954 the French parliament refused to ratify the EDC treaties.

Instead, in May 1955 the Americans allowed Germany to join NATO and begin to rearm,

in exchange for guarantees that the nation would never develop atomic, biological, and

chemical weapons. With these events, Speier's views about his nation of origin became

more hopeful. Indeed, even before France rejected the EDC and Germany joined NATO,

Speier argued that German support for rearmament indicated that most Germans

recognized that "the United States is the bulwark of Western civilization in the face of

which fact all other matters are relatively insignificant," which was of course his own

perspective.[35] Even more significantly, West German elites believed they had a "political

---

[34] Ibid., 10.
[35] Hans Speier, "5 April 1954: Interview with Axel von dem Bussche-Streithorst, Bonn, Restaurant Kranzler—2 ½ Hours," "Log Notes, 1954 (Mar. 27-Apr. 8), numbered 1-10," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 5.

responsibility to defend the west."[36] Speier was further impressed by the *Wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle), and marveled at the goods one could purchase in a nation that had only a decade before been devastated. As he said, "from modern and antique furniture to airplane tickets, from barometers to leather goods, from fur coats to French perfume, from radios and mechanical household equipment to books and pictures," everything one could imagine was available.[37] In some sense, Speier understood that Germany had begun a serious process of international rehabilitation.

But for all these positive developments, Speier still worried about German neutralism and West Germany's true commitment to the western alliance. He declared that the FRG was "a democracy that hasn't passed through an economic or political crisis," and thus had not proven itself resilient.[38] "Many people," Speier declared, "fear the instability of democracy and there are signs of what the Germans label the unstableness of the situation."[39]

> You sense, for a number reasons, you get the impression in many people of a somewhat cynical attitude toward politics. Or you might call it an even amoral attitude toward politics. They are not indignant really by anything that fails to function in this democracy or any case of corruption that comes to light. But they accept this with a kind of attitude—what else can you expect in Germany?—and this extends even to the behavior of very high-ranking officials in the government including the Chancellor. … You get the impression … that the citizens lack a feeling of responsibility [for their government].[40]

A full decade after the end of World War II, Speier refused to accept the stability of German democracy. For him, the FRG remained one severe crisis away from collapse.

---

[36] Ibid. and Hans Speier, "7 May 1954: Interview with Professor Freiherr von der Heydte, Bodenheim near Mainz, Duration: 3 Hours, "Log Notes, 1954 (May 5-16, numbered 26-38)," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 7.

[37] Hans Speier. "Economic Life," *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 96 and Hans Speier, "Cultural Life," *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, 99

[38] Hans Speier, "Excerpts from Briefing Delivered to Washington Staff by Hans Speier, Friday, Dec. 9, 1955," Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 2, 4. Speier repeated this claim throughout the 1950s and 1960s. See, for example, Hans Speier, *Germany, the Continuing Challenge* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-3355, April 1966), 5.

[39] Speier, "Excerpts," 4.

[40] Ibid., 5-6.

The Second Berlin Crisis, 1958-1962

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Second Berlin Crisis led Speier to shed

some of the perpetual anxieties he had long retained about the FRG, and for the first time

in the postwar period, his fears about Germany became less intense. The Second Berlin

Crisis began in November 1958, when Nikita Khrushchev publicly called for both the

United States and the Soviet Union to recognize the *de facto* reality: that two separate,

German states existed. In tandem with this proposal, Khrushchev declared that the four

allied powers should cede control of Berlin and turn the city into an international,

demilitarized, and independent zone. The secretary further stated that if the western

powers did not agree to his proposals within six months, he would grant the *Deutsche

Demokratische Republik* (German Democratic Republic, or GDR) control of all access

routes to Berlin, which would effectively cut the city off from the west. Implied in these

statements was the threat of nuclear war. For several reasons, the western powers quickly

refused Khrushchev's proposals. If they agreed to his plan, the west would essentially

cede their claim that the FRG represented all Germans; would make clear that they were

not committed to German reunification; would deprive themselves of a major propaganda

asset in West Berlin; and would abandon their only operating base in eastern territory. All

these actions would likely anger a West Germany upon whose back European defense

rested. Moreover, President Dwight D. Eisenhower had no desire to show weakness by

acceding to Soviet demands. Although meetings at Geneva between the American and

Soviet foreign ministers in May 1959 and between Eisenhower and Khrushchev at Camp

David in September briefly diminished U.S.-Soviet tensions, after the Soviets shot down

a U-2 spy plane in May 1960, these tensions reemerged and intensified. A later

conference in Vienna in June 1961 between President John F. Kennedy and Khrushchev

also did not result in a solution to the Berlin problem. It was against this geopolitical

backdrop, one in which it appeared the United States and Soviet Union might go to war,

that Speier began to place more faith in the FRG.

By the time of the Second Berlin Crisis, Germany had begun to rearm and the

Adenauer administration and most German elites—save for a minority Gaullist Fronde

that supported the anti-U.S., or from another perspective, the independent, policies of

President Charles de Gaulle in France—endorsed the U.S. position on the Cold War.

However, Speier still distrusted German commitment to the west, although during this

period he believed the United States was significantly responsible for engendering

German worries. Speier was concerned that the "paradox of NATO," which was the fact

that "American nuclear protection is needed and yet feared by our allies," would weaken

Germany's desire to defend Europe.[41] This paradox consisted of the fact that West

Germans understood that the U.S. nuclear umbrella protected them from Soviet bombs,

but worried that either the United States would not live up to its defensive commitments

or that strategic miscalculations would result in a nuclear war whose main battleground

would be Central Europe. The Soviets, Speier continued, recognized these fears and

adeptly exploited them to create fissures in the western alliance.[42] For this reason, he

argued that the United States must demonstrate its "readiness to undertake military action

---

[41] Hans Speier, *Disengagement* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-1400, May 18, 1958), 7.
[42] Hans Speier, "Soviet Atomic Blackmail and the North Atlantic Alliance," *World Politics* 9, no. 3 (April 1957): 314-317 and Hans Speier, "Soviet Intentions and Disengagement (On George F. Kennan's *Russia, the Atom, and the West*)," March 26, 1958, Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 7.

in defense of its [and Western Europe's] rights."[43] If they did so, U.S. elites could strengthen German commitment to the west.

The crisis led Speier to adopt a sympathetic view to his former homeland. He argued that German and West European fears about nuclear war were understandable given the United States' extensive reliance on its strategic nuclear deterrent, a dependence that limited the American room for maneuver in Europe. Speier recommended that the United States "develop a force structure and strategy for NATO which will enable the alliance to meet various forces of Communist aggression by controlled responses [instead of overtly or subtly threatening nuclear war]. Diplomatic blackmail, border incidents, or minor aggressions should not confront us with a choice between total nuclear response or political surrender. To take care of the whole spectrum of possible kinds of aggression, the West needs stronger conventional, limited war forces and flexible strategy."[44] Speier, perhaps sensing the way the political winds were blowing, thus endorsed the "flexible response" strategy implemented by Kennedy after he assumed office in 1961.

Speier's sympathy for the anxieties of the FRG and Western Europe demonstrated the attenuation of his suspicions regarding German commitment to the Cold War, a position change partially impelled by domestic German political developments. Soon after the Second Berlin Crisis began, he noted with relief that "since the Soviet ultimatum of November [1958], the foreign policy views of the socialist opposition [to Adenauer]

---

[43] Hans Speier, W. Phillips Davison, and Leon Gouré, *The German Crisis: A Field Report, January-February 1959* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-2340, March 20, 1959), v. See also Hans Speier, *Soviet Atomic Blackmail and the North Atlantic Alliance* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1837, December 10, 1956); Speier, "Soviet Atomic Blackmail;" and Hans Speier, *Divided Berlin: The Anatomy of Soviet Political Blackmail* (New York: Praeger, 1961).
[44] Hans Speier, "The Future of Alliance Systems," April 4, 1961, Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 16, 38-39.

have moved closer to those of the government. Both agree without question that West

Berlin must be held. No reputable politician in Germany, regardless of political

persuasion, sees the status of Berlin as being negotiable."[45] Because all sections of "the

government and people are keenly aware that West Germany's political future depends

decisively on American protection," there was little need to worry about whether or not

Germany would fight alongside the United States in the event of a conventional European

war.[46] Speier thus displayed a modicum of faith in the FRG and its support for the

western alliance. For the moment at least, the West Germans had redeemed themselves in

his eyes.

The Second Berlin Crisis ended without much incident. After a period of relative

quiet, tensions over Berlin erupted in May 1960 when the Soviets shot down an

American U-2 spy plane, which scuttled any possible effect an upcoming four-power

summit meeting in Paris could have possibly had. In June 1961, Khrushchev repeated his

ultimatum about Berlin to Kennedy, and in response to Khrushchev's threats, the

president delivered a televised speech reemphasizing the U.S. commitment to Berlin. At

the same time, Kennedy called for increases in the military budget as well as renewed

spending on civil defense. In August, with Soviet backing, the East Germans cut off the

access routes between East and West Berlin and began building the Berlin Wall.

Nevertheless, the Soviet Union ensured that the GDR did not block western access to the

city, indicating that Khrushchev did not desire war. In October, Soviet and American

tanks faced each other in a tense standoff at Checkpoint Charlie, although the

confrontation ended without incident. After both sides stood down at Checkpoint Charlie,

---

[45] Speier, Davison, and Gouré, *German Crisis*, viii.
[46] Ibid., ix.

decision-makers in the United States and Soviet Union mutually determined that they were not willing to fight a nuclear war over Berlin, and the crisis abated.

From Distrust to Trust, 1963-1967

Speier's feelings about Germany ebbed and flowed in the mid 1960s. In 1963, he worried that the West Germans were shifting their allegiance from the United States to France. However, a year later he avowed that the FRG was firmly on the American side and that U.S. foreign policymakers had nothing to worry about in terms of the nation's dedication to the Cold War. Speier's easily swayed opinions were likely the result of the trauma and memory of the Weimar experience. Although Adenauer and his successor Ludwig Erhard had demonstrated that they followed U.S. orders, he could never relax when it came to his former homeland. Thus, events pushed Speier's perspective from one extreme to the other. For him, no matter what happened, German democracy remained unstable.

In the wake of the Second Berlin Crisis, Speier's worries appeared around the so-called Gaullist Fronde, West German elites who wished to transfer FRG support from the United States to France. During this era, French intransigence regarding the United States' European policies extended well beyond the nation's former opposition to the EDC. Between the late 1950s and late 1960s, De Gaulle felt confident enough in France's power position to pursue a foreign policy independent of the United States. Most notably, he vetoed the United Kingdom's attempts to join the European Economic Community; established diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China; withdrew the Mediterranean Fleet and the Atlantic Fleet from NATO; removed France from NATO's integrated command; and expelled NATO forces from French territory. While de Gaulle

pursued his independent foreign policy, a small group of West German elites argued that the FRG's future would be more secure if it aligned with France. In fact, the two nations did begin to interact outside the U.S. purview, and in January 1963 Franco-West German détente reached its high point when De Gaulle and Adenauer signed a "Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation." The treaty committed France and the FRG to regular meetings between the heads of state and other high ranking officials, and emphasized inter-state collaboration in the fields of defense, education, and youth. Speier found West German Gaullists to be "more of an irritant and challenge to American foreign policy than … Khrushchev," and representative of a "latent-anti-Americanism" in German society.[47]

In Speier's opinion, the January 1963 treaty "baldly defied American policy toward Europe. … The treaty symbolizes a conception of Europe, or at least of a European future, that is strongly at odds with the American idea of a future unified Europe."[48] The treaty demonstrated that "politicians and political observers in the Federal Republic are not in full agreement with current American policy toward … the relaxation of East-West tensions and the building of bridges across the gulf which has divided Eastern Europe from the West."[49] Moreover, Speier found the "righteous" terms in which Germans spoke about reunification troubling. As he said,

> The irritating air of righteousness in German postwar foreign policy is both the reverse side of docility toward the West and an expression of doubt in the reliability of the West. … The righteousness of German foreign policy … reflects deep-seated German suspicions nourished by political 'realism' or cynicism and sometimes by feelings of guilt, that the Western allies will not live up to their solemn promises regarding reunification.[50]

---

[47] Hans Speier, "Comment on French-German Relationship," Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 21 and Hans Speier, "Source of German Gaullism," "Short Texts, 1963," Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 21.
[48] Speier, "Comment on French-German Relationship."
[49] Hans Speier, "Relaxation of Tension—German versus American Interests (Re: Erhard Visit to Washington, June 1964," Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 28, 12.
[50] Hans Speier, "The Hallstein Doctrine," June 17, 1965, Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 38, 10-11.

The Germans, Speier concluded, could not bring themselves to trust the United States.

But the smooth transition between Adenauer and his successor Erhard in October 1963, as well as the fact that Erhard's government "has for all practical purposes sided with the United States rather than with France" in matters of geopolitics, led Speier's worries about the Franco-German relationship to disappear.[51] It is probable that the Adenauer-Erhard transfer of power demonstrated to Speier that the FRG was truly a democratic republic with stable institutions. Thus, a month after the elections that brought Erhard to power, Speier characterized West Germany as "a free capitalist country with a democratic constitution, democratic political parties which compete for voters' favor in free communal, state and national elections, a free press, and a welter of voluntary, social organizations."[52] Moreover, neither the extreme right- nor left-wings were represented to any serious degree in the *Bundestag*, which indicated that "the chances that radicalism of the right or of the left will destabilize the political order in the Federal Republic are very low indeed."[53] Speier further declared that Germany's continuing stability could be predicted by virtue of the attitudes of its youthful population, which was "puzzled by the question as to how it was possible for Hitler to attain so much dictatorial power, to have mass murder committed in his name and to lead the nation and the world into war and ruin. These people are curious about the past morality of their elders rather than eager to imitate them."[54] He therefore believed that any "fears" about the creation of a new "Rapallo," the 1922 agreement between Germany and the Soviet Union, were

---

[51] Hans Speier, "Divided Germany in World Affairs," November 1964, Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 33, 15.
[52] Ibid., 3.
[53] Ibid., 9.
[54] Ibid., 9.

"unfounded."[55] Between late 1963 and 1964, Speier concluded that "there is n[o] sign of any grass roots movement in West Germany that wants to take the country out of the Western Alliance into neutrality or into the Communist camp."[56]

At the request of John J. McCloy, in 1964 Speier accepted a Senior Fellowship at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) to study the United States' relationship with Germany. The four reports he produced for CFR were part of the "Atlantic Policy Studies" research program, the steering committee of which consisted of numerous luminaries.[57] In these reports, Speier continued to express his optimism about the FRG's future. As he said, "from 1948 to date the Federal Republic has moved toward a two-party system, and all parties represented in the *Bundestag* are democratic in outlook."[58] Moreover, the FRG had in almost all cases supported the United States' position on the Cold War. Indeed, Speier worried that the major threat to the U.S.-West German relationship was the moralism of U.S. policymakers, some of whom could never forgive Germany for Hitler's crimes. He thus implored foreign policy elites to remember that "the foreign policy toward a country can never be derived from feelings toward its inhabitants or from moral judgments of their past behavior. American policy on Germany must be judged in terms of its service to American political and military interests. … The

---

[55] Hans Speier, "Aspects of German Foreign Policy (Notes for Talk Given at Institute of Strategic Analysis, London)," July 13, 1964, Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 31, 12-13, 24.

[56] Ibid., 10.

[57] The Steering Committee included Charles M. Spofford (Chairman), Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Gabriel Hauge, Henry Kissinger, Klaus Knorr, Ben T. Moore, Alfred C. Neal, James A. Perkins, Eugene V. Rostow, and David W. MacEachron. Other authors who wrote for this research program included Zbigniew Brzezinski, Henry Kissinger, Hedley Bull, Bela Balassa, Miriam Camps, Stanley Hoffman, and Harold von B. Cleveland. As Speier completed drafts of his project, a study group discussed them. The Study Group consisted of: Arnold Wolfers, Chairman; Frank Altschul; William Bader; Robert R. Bowie; Gerald Freund; Lt. General A.J. Goodpaster, Stanley Hoffman, Richard C. Hottelot, Thomas L. Hughes, James E. King, Jr., Kissinger, Jeffrey C. Kitchen, Klaus Knorr, Wilfrid Kohl, John J. McCloy, Robert N. Magill, Horst Mendershausen, Philip E. Mosely, Alfred Puhan, Henry L. Roberts, Nathaniel Samuels, Shepard Stone, Henry C. Wallich, and William R. Tyler.

[58] Speier, "German Foreign Policy and the American Interest," October 13, 1964, Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 32, 2.

future [cannot] be predicted from the past."[59] To critique Germany for World War II, Speier argued, was to get lost in the past at the expense of the present. Since the Second Berlin Crisis, Speier found a renewed faith in West Germany, which lasted until the group he considered to be harbingers of political stability—the youth—began to rebel against authority in the late 1960s.

Mirrors of the Weimar Republic, 1967-1969

After Kurt Kiesinger assumed the chancellorship in December 1966 and student rebellions erupted throughout the FRG in 1967 and 1968, Speier expressed renewed anxieties about the future of West Germany. In particular, the student revolts seemed to him to augur for a repetition of the political events of the late 1920s and early 1930s. He argued that under Kiesinger, "an intense and pervasive mood of anti-Americanism" permeated the country.[60] What was most troubling for Speier was that, unlike in the past, "this mood is no longer confined to Christian Democratic die-hards," but could be found amongst "virtually all Christian Democrats … [to] many Social Democrats, to business, and to many of the former anti-Gaullist liberal publicists. At the moment, U.S. policy is left with few admirers in West Germany."[61] Speier worried that an economically and politically stable Germany that disagreed with the United States could pursue an independent foreign policy that weakened the American position with regards the Soviet Union:

> Germany is rearmed, she is our ally, and she is economically powerful, but she has less bargaining power on many issues deemed to be of great importance to her national interest [than she did in the 1950s, when the United States required West German commitment to European defense]. Thus, Germany is becoming more nationalistic and less closely associated with the United States. … The Kiesinger government may well mark the transition from the pro-American Atlanticist phase of postwar German history to a period in which the Federal Republic will try to maneuver

---

[59] Ibid., 6.
[60] Hans Speier, "The New German Foreign Policy," April 1967, Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 45, 11.
[61] Ibid., 11-12.

between Washington, Moscow, and Paris. If so, the Russians will not have won the cold war, but they would be in an advantageous position to resume it, should they choose to do so.[62]

For the first time, the Germans refused "to do [many things] which they might have done without a murmur in 1945."[63] Speier pointed to the "shrill and hysterical" opposition to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, in which Germans across the political spectrum referred to the treaty as a "super-Versailles" or "an invitation to the Germans to sign their death warrant," as evidence of this claim.[64] Going forward, he implied, the United States could not rely on a trustworthy West Germany ready and willing to support it against the Soviet Union.

Speier was anxious not only about the actions of the government, but also the rise of the student protest movement, whose representatives he referred to as the "extreme left."[65] He found in the FRG's disenchanted students a threat as palpable as the radicals whom he believed destroyed the first experiment in German democracy, and echoes of Weimar were clearly evident in his work from the late 1960s. For example, Speier feared that the German "authorities at the moment … seem to be quite incapable of dealing with this left wing [student] opposition efficiently and effectively," just as they had been unable to deal with the right wing in the 1920s and 1930s.[66] This incompetence was dangerous, he continued, because Germany's "current students … are far more radical" than anyone in the past.[67] Speier was apoplectic that at demonstrations, he witnessed

---

[62] Ibid., 24.
[63] Ibid., 23.
[64] Ibid., 17-18.
[65] Hans Speier, "Trip Report, 1968 (Feb. 8-24)," Speier Papers, Box 9, Folder 16, 20. For more on the West German student protest movement, see Martin Klimke, *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010) and Belinda Davis, Wilfried Mausbach, Martin Klimke, and Carla Macdougall, eds., *Changing the World, Changing Oneself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the U.S. in the 1960s and 1970s* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010).
[66] Speier, "Trip Report, 1968 (Feb. 8-24)," 18.
[67] Ibid., 20.

students "bearing Viet Cong flags, waving them, wearing Viet Cong emblems, not calling

for peace in Viet Nam but for more Viet Nams to defeat the United States, for the end of

NATO, not for the end of the Warsaw Pact, … not a word about terror of the North

Vietnamese but about germicide and immorality of the Americans in Vietnam and

elsewhere."[68] He argued that the "radical students of the SDS [Students for a Democratic

Society]" and "the terror … the provocation, the violence, and the unmanageability of the

people, and the undermining of authority," mirrored the Nazis and their tactics.[69]

Speier displayed absolutely no sympathy for the student protesters or their views

on Vietnam. He found it ridiculous that students in West Berlin, a city "which owes its

continued freedom to American protection," protested the United States' involvement in

Southeast Asia.[70] He reported with indignation that, though "the police [only] once in a

while … lose control" and murder a student, which occurred in the case of Benno

Ohnesorg in June 1967, "all the students in Germany are on the side of the student

generation against the police brutality."[71] He found students to be little more than ruffians

who did all they could "to subvert the political institutions of the German republic by

provocation."[72] Speier was deeply concerned that the students' actions would engender a

"backlash … on the right" that would stir the sentiments of ordinary Germans against

moderates.[73] In the twilight of his career, Speier feared that he was witnessing a repetition

of Weimar's collapse.

---

[68] Ibid., 21.
[69] Ibid., 26.
[70] Speier, *Germany, the Continuing Challenge*, 24.
[71] Speier, "Trip Report, 1968 (Feb. 8-24)," 24.
[72] Hans Speier, "Untitled," "Short Texts, 1968," Speier Papers, Box 10, Folder 46.
[73] Speier, "Trip Report, 1968 (Feb. 8-24)," 26.

Speier thus assimilated the student rebellions into his own personal experiences in and memories of interwar Germany. Because he thought their tactics mirrored the Nazis, he made no effort to understand why the students protested as they did. Speier had been in the establishment for so long, and had worked so hard to defend democracy in a way he saw fit, that he could not countenance any resistance to the moral claims of the United States, claims that had sustained him for decades. The world had changed, but Speier did not, perhaps could not, change with it. It was a propitious moment for him to retire, and in 1969, he left the foreign policy establishment to accept a position as professor of sociology at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. With this move, Speier's career as a defense intellectual came to an end.

Conclusion

Speier spent the rest of his career in academia, disconnected from the power structures of Washington. He published a variety of essays on political humor, communication, and literature, as well as several book reviews.[1] He traded on his expertise in psychological warfare, and the crowning achievement from this last stage of his career was his editing, along with Harold Lasswell and Daniel Lerner, a three volume series on *Propaganda and Communication in World History*, which remains the major collection on the history of psychological warfare.[2] It was during his final decades that Speier wholeheartedly embraced his exile roots. He became a major reviewer of scholarship on German exiles and the New School, and began to publish on and participate in exile events.[3] He also released a number of autobiographical works, as well

---

[1] Hans Speier, "Book Review: His-Huey Liang, *The Berlin Police Force in the Weimar Republic*," *Central European History* 4, no. 1 (March 1971): 86-89; Hans Speier, "Book Review: Oran Reed Young, *The Politics of Force: Bargaining during International Crises*," *Political Science Quarterly* 86, no. 3 (September 1971): 537-538; Hans Speier, "Über den politischen Witz," *Freiburger Universitätsblätter* 11, no. 36 (1972): 13-26; Hans Speier, "Book Review: Samuel Noah Eisenstadt, *Political Sociology: A Reader*," *Policy Sciences* 3, no. 2 (July 1972): 267-269; Hans Speier, "Book Review: Detlev Grieswelle, *Propaganda der Friedlosigkeit. Eine Studie zu Hitler's Rhetorik, 1920-1933*," *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36, no. 4 (Winter 1972-1973): 637-638; Hans Speier, *Witz und Politik. Essay über die Macht und das Lachen* (Zürich/Osnabrück: Edition Interfrom/Fromm, 1975); Hans Speier, "The Chances for Peace," *Social Research* 42, no. 1 (Spring 1975): 35-51; Hans Speier, "The Truth in Hell: Maurice Joly on Modern Despotism," *Polity* 10, no. 1 (Autumn 1977): 18-32; Hans Speier, "The Communication of Hidden Meaning," *Social Research* 44, no. 3 (Autumn 1977): 471-501; and Hans Speier, "Book Review: Kendall L. Baker, Russell J. Dalton, Kai Hildebrandt, *Germany Transformed: Political Culture and the New Politics*," *German Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (May 1982): 477-478.

[2] Hans Speier, Harold Lasswell, and Daniel Lerner, *Propaganda and Communication in World History, volume 1: The Symbolic Instrument in Early Times* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1979); Hans Speier, Harold Lasswell, and Daniel Lerner, *Propaganda and Communication in World History, volume 2: Emergence of Public Opinion in the West* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980); and Hans Speier, Harold Lasswell, and Daniel Lerner, *Propaganda and Communication in World History, volume 3: A Pluralizing World in Formation* (Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980).

[3] Hans Speier, "Book Review: Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*," *American Political Science Review* 70, no. 4 (December 1976): 1276-1278; Hans Speier, "Emil Lederer: Personal Reminiscences," 1977, Speier Papers, Box 7, Folder 1; Hans Speier, "Speech Notes: New School for Social Research," May 20, 1977, Speier Papers, Box 8, Folder 51; Hans Speier, "Emil Lederer (1882-1939). Leben und Werk," in *Kapitalismus, Klassenstruktur und Probleme der Demokratie in Deutschland, 1910-1940. Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Emil Lederer*, ed. Jürgen Kocka (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979): 253-273; Hans Speier, "Historians: Frankfurt vs. New School," after 1980, Speier Papers, Box 8, Folder 57; Hans Speier,

as an intellectual retrospective that emphasized his hybrid German-American identity.[4]

The trauma of Weimar, which structured Speier's career and interests, remained the

defining experience of his life. This came through in the title of one his final essays,

which declared that "it was not exile, but the triumph of Hitler, that was [his] most

important experience."[5]

Despite Speier's retirement from the national security state, the culture and

institutions of policymaking he and his cohort created continue to inform how U.S.

foreign policy is made. RAND became and remains the paradigmatic model of the

foreign policy think tank.[6] It inspired the creation of a number of other organizations,

including the Aspen Institute (1951); the Foreign Policy Research Institute (1955); the

MITRE Corporation (1958); the Hudson Institute (created by RAND exile Herman Kahn)

(1961); the Center for Strategic and International Studies (1962); and the Institute for

Policy Studies (1963), all of which support research that informs the course of U.S.

foreign policy. RAND proved so influential that the government-connected research

centers formed in the immediate aftermath of World War II, the Center for Naval

---

"Remarks by Hans Speier, New School Convocation, Berlin," December 7, 1984, Speier Papers, Box 8, Folder 58; and Hans Speier, "Book Review: Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research*," *Contemporary Sociology* 16, no. 3 (May 1987): 278-279.

[4] Hans Speier, *From the Ashes of Disgrace: A Journal from Germany, 1945-1955* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981); Hans Speier, "Nicht die Auswanderung, sondern der Triumph Hitlers war die wichtige Erfahrung. Autobiographisches Notizen eines Soziologen," *Exilforschung* 6 (1988): 152-173; and Hans Speier, *The Truth in Hell and Other Essays on Politics and Culture, 1935-1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

[5] Speier, "Nicht die Auswanderung."

[6] Paul Dickson, *Think Tanks* (New York: Atheneum, 1971), 51-92; James A. Smith, *The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite* (New York: Macmillan/Free Press, 1991), 116; Donald E. Abelson, "Think Tanks in the United States," in *Think Tanks across Nations: A Comparative Approach*, eds. Diane Stone, Andrew Denham, and Mark Garnett (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), 112; John B. Judis, *The Paradox of American Democracy: Elites, Special Interests, and the Betrayal of Public Trust* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 78; Raymond L. Garthoff, *A Journey through the Cold War: A Memoir of Containment and Coexistence* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001), 9; Donald Abelson, *A Capitol Idea: Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006); and Thomas Matthew Medvetz, "Think Tanks and the Production of Policy-Knowledge in America," Ph.D Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 2007, 14, 92, 107, 344.

Analyses and the Institute for Defense Analyses, soon modeled themselves after it.

RAND was not only influential domestically, but internationally as well.[7] Due to Speier

and his colleagues, dozens of foreign policy think tanks pepper Washington, D.C.,

London, Beijing, Mexico City, and other world capitals. On the macro-level, RAND

embodied a new type of institutional structure in which the boundaries between

governmental and nongovernmental foreign policy institutions became, if not

meaningless, less important than previously. As a result of RAND's impact, since the

early Cold War the leading "private" and "semi-private" think tanks receive most of their

funding from government contracts, have access to the highest realms of policymaking,

and in some cases, provide the personnel who staff the administrative structures of the

state. RAND and similar organizations have come to form a shadow establishment,

influencing foreign policy outside the purview of the voting public.

The assumptions that undergirded Speier's intellectual career have also shaped the

culture of foreign policymaking. In the past half century, RAND's culture of expertise

has permeated the highest levels of government. Beginning with the Kennedy

Administration, the first presidential administration to value academic credentials in

appointments to high-level defense and national security positions, experts have occupied

the nation's most elite foreign policy jobs.[8] For example, of the seventeen national

security advisors (NSA) since 1961, seven (41 percent) pursued advanced research in a

---

[7] James G. McGann, "Think Tanks and the Transnationalization of U.S. Foreign Policy," *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda* 7, no. 3 (November 2002): 13-18 and James G. McGann, "The Global 'Go-To' Think Tanks: The Leading Public Policy Research Organizations in the World," Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program, International Relations Program, University of Pennsylvania, 2008.

[8] In the past, most elite policymakers were lawyers or businessmen connected with America's Protestant elite. Robert D. Dean's *Imperial Brotherhood* explains this phenomenon in detail. See Robert D. Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001). Jeremi Suri examines the "internationalization" of this elite in his Kissinger biography. See Jeremi Suri, *Henry Kissinger and the American Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009). One can also speak of the "academicization" or "intellectualization" of this elite.

social or policy science.[9] When one eliminates military NSAs, this percentage rises to 58

percent. Of the individuals who directed the State Department's Policy Planning Staff

since 1961, seventeen (77 percent) have an advanced social science degree.[10] As these

numbers indicate, at least two of the highest-ranking foreign policy positions in the

government explicitly value academic expertise.[11]

Concomitant with the rise of foreign policy experts and institutions like RAND is

the American public's continued inability to determine and shape U.S. foreign policy. It

is true that in in the 1930s and early 1940s, many foreign policy elites believed that

experts needed to guide foreign policy.[12] However, this perspective did not become

institutionalized until the early Cold War. Since the late 1940s, the public has primarily

---

[9] These were McGeorge Bundy (Harvard Society of Fellows, where he focused on international relations); Walt Whitman Rostow (Ph.D, economics); Henry Kissinger (Ph.D, political science); Zbigniew Brzezinksi (Ph.D, political science); Richard V. Allen (Master's Degree, political science); W. Anthony Lake (Ph.D, public policy); and Condoleezza Rice (Ph.D, political science).

[10] These were Walt Whitman Rostow (Ph.D, economics); William I. Cargo (Ph.D, political science); Winston Lord (Master's Degree, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy); W. Anthony Lake (Ph.D, public policy); Paul Wolfowitz (Ph.D, political science); Peter Rodman (Master's Degree, Oxford University); Richard H. Solomon (Ph.D, political science); Dennis Ross (Ph.D, political science); Samuel W. Lewis (Master's Degree, international relations); Gregory Craig (Master's Degree, Cambridge University); Morton H. Halperin (Ph.D, political science); Richard N. Haass (Ph.D, international relations); Mitchell B. Reiss (Master's Degree, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy); Stephen D. Krasner (Ph.D, political science); David F. Gordon (Ph.D, political science and economics); Anne-Marie Slaughter (Ph.D., international relations); and Jake Sullivan (M.Phil, international relations).

[11] Since the early Cold War, the American military has also made extensive use of social scientists. The most recent example is the implementation of the Human Terrain System, a program in which the army used social scientists and other academics, including anthropologists, political scientists, and sociologists, to provide local intelligence in Iraq and Afghanistan. See "Human Terrain System," <http://humanterrainsystem.army.mil/> [accessed July 26, 2012] and American Anthropological Association Executive Board, "Statement on the Human Terrain System Project," October 31, 2005 http://www.aaanet.org/pdf/EB_Resolution_110807.pdf [accessed July 26, 2012]. See also R.J. González, *American Counterinsurgency: Human Science and the Human Terrain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007) and R.J. González, "'Human Terrain': Past, Present, and Future Applications," in *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader*, eds. C.G.M. Robben and Jeffrey A. Sluka (Oxford: John Wiley and Sons, 2012), 593-604. Sections of the military have attempted to meet the defense intellectuals on their own terms; now, many military officers, including General David Petraeus (Ret.) and his coterie, have Ph.Ds. See Thomas E. Ricks, "Officers With PhDs Advising War Effort," *Washington Post*, February 5, 2007 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/02/04/AR2007020401196.html> [accessed July 28, 2012].

[12] See, for example, Elihu Root, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs* 9, no. 2 (January 1931): iii-vii. For arguments against the view expressed by Root, see Jerome S. Bruner, "Public Opinion and America's Foreign Policy," *American Sociological Review* 9, no. 1 (February 1944): 50-56.

exerted influence on U.S. foreign policy in times of crisis.[13] For the most part, it is not a central variable in leaders' decision-making calculus; at best, public opinion constrains policy, rarely serving as a guide for it.[14] Mostly, leaders attempt to avoid the "activation" of public opinion and regularly manipulate it to support their own policy preferences.[15] Indeed, instead of the public, decision-makers rely upon experts to furnish them with policy options.[16]

Speier and his colleagues also created a framework of geopolitics that continues to structure how Americans understand foreign policy. German defense intellectuals' most lasting contribution came with their introduction of the concepts of totalitarianism and an international civil war to U.S. intellectuals and foreign policy elites.[17] The idea that the United States fought the Cold War to defend democracy against totalitarian

---

[13] T. Knecht and M.S. Weatherford, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: The Stages of Presidential Decision-Making," *International Studies Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (September 2006): 705-727 and Matthew A. Baum, "Public Opinion, Presidential Rhetoric, and the *Domestic* Politics of Audience Costs in U.S. Foreign Policy Crises," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48, no. 5 (October 2004): 603-631.

[14] Thomas Hartley and Bruce Russett, "Public Opinion and the Common Defense: Who Governs Military Spending in the United States?" *American Political Science Review* 86, no. 4 (December 1992): 905-915 and Richard Sobel, *The Impact of Public Opinion on U.S. Foreign Policy since Vietnam: Constraining the Colossus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[15] Philip J. Powlick and Andrew Z. Katz, "Defining the American Public Opinion/Foreign Policy Nexus," *Mershon International Studies Review* 42, no. 1 (May 1998): 29-61; Robert M. Entman, *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004); and Lawrence R. Jacobs and Benjamin I. Page, "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 1 (February 2005): 107-123. Analyzing this phenomenon is complicated by the fact that, often times, domestic and elite opinions on foreign policy converge. See Robert C. Luskin, James S. Fishkin, and Shantyo Iyengar, "Considered Opinions on U.S. Foreign Policy: Evidence from Online and Face-to-Face Deliberative Polling," Center for Deliberative Democracy, Research Papers, Stanford University <http://cdd.stanford.edu/research/papers/2006/foreign-policy.pdf?> [accessed July 26, 2012].

[16] See especially Peter Haas, "Epistemic Communities and International Political Coordination," *International Organization* 46, no. 1 (Winter 1992): 1-35 and Jacobs and Page, "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" See also Eric Alterman, *Who Speaks for America?: Why Democracy Matters for Foreign Policy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998) and Sara Zahra Kutchesfahani, "Politics and the Bomb: Exploring the Role of Epistemic Communities in Nuclear Non-Proliferation Outcomes," Ph.D Dissertation, University College London, 2010. It should be noted that significant research analyzing the historical role public opinion played in influencing Cold War U.S. foreign policy remains to be done.

[17] See Ernst Fraenkel, *The Dual State* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941); Franz Neumann, *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942); Sigmund Neumann, *Permanent Revolution: Totalitarianism in the Age of International Civil War* (New York: Harper, 1942); and Sigmund Neumann, "The International Civil War," *World Politics* 1, no. 3 (April 1949): 333-350.

encroachment became very popular in the 1950s. Although with détente, this image of a totalitarian Soviet Union receded, President Ronald Reagan easily revived it during the "Second Cold War" of 1979-1985.[18] Reagan's presentation of the Cold War as a "struggle between right and wrong and good and evil" mirrored exactly the geopolitical framework of the pre-détente era, when President Harry Truman encouraged the United States to fight "aggressive movements that seek to impose … totalitarian regimes" upon the "free peoples" of the world.[19] More recently, President George W. Bush echoed Truman and Reagan's framework of geopolitics when he argued that Iran, Iraq, and North Korea comprised an "axis of evil" bent on the destruction of the American way of life.[20] The language of the Cold War also continues to shape how Americans analyze international relations. Although far divorced from their original contexts, the phrases "totalitarianism" and "containment," and the value assumptions inherent within them, have been assimilated into the vocabulary of politicians, foreign policy experts, journalists, and pundits.[21] Early Cold War geopolitical and linguistic structures thus

---

[18] Some scholars date the Second Cold War as lasting until 1986 or until German reunification in 1989. In the early 1980s, there was significant attention paid to the resurgence of Cold War tensions in the wake of the Soviet Union's 1979 invasion of Afghanistan. The term Second Cold War comes from Fred Halliday, *The Making of the Second Cold War* (London: Verso Press, 1983). See also Noam Chomsky, Jonathan Steele, and John Giddings, *Superpowers in Collision: The Cold War Now* (London: Penguin, 1982). For a contemporary analysis of this period, see Michael Cox, "Whatever Happened to the 'Second' Cold War? Soviet-American Relations: 1980-1988," *Review of International Studies* 16, no. 2 (April 1990): 155-172.

[19] Harry S. Truman, "Address of the President to Congress, Recommending Assistance to Greece and Turkey, March 12, 1947," Elsey Papers, 3 and Ronald Reagan, "Remarks at the Annual Convention of the National Association of Evangelicals in Orlando, Florida," March 8, 1983 <http://www.reaganfoundation.org/pdf/Remarks_Annual_Convention_National_Association_Evangelicals_030883.pdf> [accessed July 26, 2012].

[20] George W. Bush, "The President's State of the Union Address," January 29, 2002 < http://whitehouse.georgewbush.org/news/2002/012902-SOTU.asp> [accessed July 26, 2012].

[21] Roger Cohen, "Contain and Constrain Iran," November 14, 2011, *New York Times*, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/15/opinion/cohen-contain-and-constrain-iran.html?scp=1&sq=containment+iran&st=nyt> [accessed July 26, 2012]; Trip Gabriel, "Gingrich's Foreign Policy Words Summon the Cold War, but Enemy is Iran," *New York Times*, December 15, 2011, A26; Mark Landler, "Obama Says Option to Strike Iran Not a Bluff," *New York Times*, March 2, 2012, A4; Bill Keller, "The Day After," *New York Times*, April 30, 2012, A25; and David D. Kirkpatrick, "Libya Holds Vote after 40 Years of Dictatorship," *New York Times*, July 8, 2012, A1.

endure, influencing how Americans understand the world and implicitly limiting the types of policies available to decision-makers. For example, how could one negotiate with a "totalitarian" North Korea or Cuba?[22] One simply could not. This is not to say, of course, that it is in the interest of U.S. decision-makers to negotiate with Pyongyang or Havana; it is only to point out that presenting these states as totalitarian regimes removes a number of policy options that would be otherwise available.

The problem of expertise and democracy has long been a preoccupation of philosophers and political theorists.[23] Most scholars have focused on the normative question of what, in a liberal democracy, is experts' proper role. As a historical study, this dissertation did not focus on this issue. What it did seek to examine was how certain ideas about expertise evolved in a transatlantic context, and what the implications of this evolution were for U.S. foreign policy and state making. Yet the paradigmatic experience of Speier, a journey that transformed him from a Social Democrat unwilling to countenance propaganda's use to a cold warrior prepared to sacrifice cherished values for democracy, speaks to questions that have troubled liberal democrats since the American and French Revolutions. How does one navigate the difficult terrain between defending democracy in an obvious time of crisis and ensuring that, once the crisis is over, abrogated freedoms return? How does one ensure that diagnoses of crisis do not become a weapon in the arsenal of decision-makers, ready to be deployed whenever a leader wants to increase her or his authority? How do liberal democrats prevent ideological and

---

[22] Damien Cave, "Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on U.S. Embargo," *New York Times*, November 20, 2012, A1; "Fleeing North Korea is Becoming Harder," *New York Times*, January 5, 2013, A5; "Delegation From U.S. Urges Web Access in North Korea," *New York Times*, January 10, 2013, A10.
[23] Major early works include Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (Balbourg, VA: Wilder Publications, 2010 [1922]); Walter Lippmann, *The Phantom Public* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1993 [1925]); and John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (New York: Holt, 1927).

institutional inertia from taking hold? The history of the post-Cold-War-era, and particularly the post-9/11-era, with its Patriot Act and presidential "kill list," has demonstrated the willingness of Americans to sacrifice democratic norms for security in the face of a perceived existential threat.[24] This practice, which Speier declared would be forsaken with the defeat of the Soviet Union, has proven to be not so quickly discarded. There is, of course, no simple way to nullify the ancient tension between democracy and security. However, it is important for all concerned with defending democratic freedoms to recognize that these freedoms, while easily abandoned—even with the best and most noble intentions—are not so easily recovered.

---

[24] Charlie Savage, "Deal Reached on Extension of Patriot Act," *New York Times*, May 20, 2011, A16; Charlie Savage, "Democratic Senators Issue Strong Warning About Use of the Patriot Act," *New York Times*, March 16, 2012, A12; Charlie Savage, "Election Will Decide Future of Interrogation Methods for Terrorism Suspects," *New York Times*, September 28, 2012, A4; Jo Becker and Scott Shane, "Secret 'Kill List' Proves a Test of Obama's Principles and Will," *New York Times*, May 29, 2012, A1; and Scott Shane, "A Court to Vet Kill Lists," *New York Times*, February 9, 2013, A1.

Works Cited

Hans Speier's bibliography has been collected in Hans Speier, *Die Intellektuellen und moderne Gesellschaft*, edited by Robert Jackall and translated by Wilfried Prantner (Wien/Graz: Nausner and Nausner, 2007), 377-391. Speier's papers, which contain many unpublished essays, short works, stories, notes, and drafts of published materials, are collected at the German and Jewish Intellectual Émigré Collection at the State University of New York at Albany, in Albany, New York. This collection also contains a multitude of correspondence and personal documents.

I consulted many books and articles in the course of researching and writing this dissertation. However, for reasons of brevity, the sections below only include works cited in the text.

Archives

Archives and Special Collections, Love Library, University of Nebraska at Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska
      Alvin Johnson Papers

Briscoe Center for American History, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas
      C. Wright Mills Papers

Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library, Abilene, Kansas
      National Security Council Staff Papers

Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records, 1933-1945, New York Public Library, New York, New York

Frankfurt School Archives, Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek, Frankfurt am Main, Germany
      Max Horkheimer Papers
      Leo Löwenthal Papers

Ford Foundation Archives, New York City, New York

German and Jewish Intellectual Émigré Collection, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York
      Arnold Brecht Papers
      John H.E. Fried Papers
      Erich Hula Papers
      Erich von Kahler Papers
      Emil Lederer Papers
      Karl Otto Paetel Papers
      Hans Speier Papers
      Hans Staudinger Papers

Julius V. Wyler Papers
Storm Publishers

Harvard University Special Collections, Cambridge, Massachusetts
Ruth Fischer Papers
Talcott Parsons Papers
Boris Souvarine Papers

Harry S. Truman Presidential Library, Independence, Missouri
George M. Elsey Papers

Leo Baeck Institute Archives, Center for Jewish History, New York, New York
Hans Morgenthau Papers

Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Ernst Kris Papers

Manuscripts and Archives, Sterling Memorial Library, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut
Alvin Johnson Papers

National Air and Space Museum, Smithsonian Institution Archives, Washington, D.C.
RAND Oral History Project Records

National Archives, College Park, Maryland
Record Group 59 (General Records of the Department of State)
Record Group 208 (Records of the Office of War Information)
Record Group 262 (Records of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service)
Record Group 466 (Records of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany)

New School for Social Research Archives, New School for Social Research, New York, New York

RAND Corporation Archives, RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California

Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois
William Benton Papers
Laura Fermi Papers
Leo Strauss Papers
Louis Wirth Papers
University of Chicago Society for Social Research Records

UCLA Special Collections, Charles E. Young Research Library, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California
Bernard Brodie Papers

Hans Speier's Publications

"Die Geschichtsphilosophie Lassalles I." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 61 (1929): 103-127.

 "Die Geschichtsphilosophie Lassalles II." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 61 (1929): 360-388.

"Zur Soziologie der Bürgerlichen Intelligenz in Deutschland." *Die Gesellschaft* 6 (July 1929): 58-72.

"Die Intellektuellen in der Theorie des Marxismus." *Neue Blätter für den Sozialismus* 1, no. 11 (November 1930): 505-510.

"Die Intellektuellen und ihr Sozialer Beruf." *Neue Blätter für den Sozialismus* 1, no. 12 (December 1930): 549-557.

 "Verbürgerlichung des Proletariats?" *Magazin der Wirtschaft* 13 (March 27, 1931): 591-596.

 "Zum Problem des Reformismus." *Neue Blätter für den Sozialismus* (May 1932): 41-44.

 "Das Proletariat und seine Kritiker." *Die Neue Rundschau* 43 (September 1932): 289-304.

"Bemerkungen zur Erfassung der sozialen Struktur." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaften und Sozialpolitik* 69 (September-October 1933): 705-725.

"Marx als Soziologie." In *Marx, Der Denker und Kämpfer: Gedenksschrift zum 50. Todestag*, 16-23. Berlin: J.H.W. Dietz, 1933.

Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der deutschen Sozialstruktur, 1918-1933. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1977 [1933].

"The Salaried Employee in Modern Society." *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 111-133.

"Germany in Danger: Concerning Oswald Spengler's Latest Book." *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 231-243.

"On Propaganda." *Social Research* 1, no. 3 (August 1934): 376-380.

"Book Review: Homans, George C. and Curtis, Charles P. *An Introduction to Pareto: His Sociology*." *Social Research* 1, no. 4 (November 1934): 524-525.

"Honor and Social Structure." *Social Research* 2, no. 1 (February 1935): 74-97.

"Book Review: Michels, Robert. *Umschichtungen in den herrschenden Klassen nach den Kriege*; Taussig, F.W. and Joslyn, C.S. *American Business Leaders: A Study in Social Origins and Social Stratification*; and Vida, Imre. *Das Problem des Aufstieges*." *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 240-244.

"Book Review: Mayer, Gustav. *Friedrich Engels, Eine Biographie*." *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 389-391.

"Book Review: Lasswell, Harold D. *World Politics and Personal Insecurity*." *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 522-524.

"Social Stratification in the Urban Community." *American Sociological Review* 1, no. 2 (April 1936): 193-202.

"Militarism in the Eighteenth Century." *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 304-336.

"Book Review: Horkheimer, Max, ed. *Studien über Autorität und Familie*." *Social Research* 3, no. 4 (November 1936): 501-504.

"Freedom and Social Planning." *American Journal of Sociology* 42, no. 4 (January 1937): 463-483.

"The Social Conditions of the Intellectual Exile." *Social Research* 4, no. 2 (May 1937): 316-328.

"Book Review: Karl Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia*." *American Journal of Sociology* 43, no. 1 (July 1937): 155-166.

"Book Review: de Francesco, Grete. *Die Macht des Charlatans*." *Social Research* 5, no. 1 (February 1938): 108-112.

"The Social Determination of Ideas." *Social Research* 5, no. 2 (May 1938): 182-205.

"Book Review: Lasker, Bruno and Roman, Ages. *Propaganda from China and Japan*." *Pacific Affairs* 11, no. 3 (September 1938): 407-408.

"Book Review: Brinton, Crane. *The Anatomy of Revolution*." *Social Research* 6, no. 1 (February 1939): 123-126.

"Class Structure and 'Total War.'" *American Sociological Review* 4, no. 3 (June 1939): 370-380.

With Alfred Kähler. "Introduction." In *War in Our Time*, edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler, 11-17. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1939.

"Morale and Propaganda." In *War in Our Time*, edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler, 299-326. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1939.

"Treachery in War." *Social Research* 7, no. 3 (September 1940): 258-279.

"The Social Types of War." *The American Journal of Sociology* 46, no. 4 (January 1941): 445-454.

"Magic Geography." *Social Research* 8, no. 3 (September 1941): 310-330.

"The Effect of War on the Social Order." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 218 (November 1941): 87-96.

"Ludendorff: The German Concept of Total War." In *Makers of Modern Strategy*, edited by Edward Mead Earle et al., 306-322. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943.

"Nazi Propaganda and Its Decline." *Social Research* 10, no. 3 (September 1943): 358-377.

With Ernst Kris. *German Radio Propaganda: Report on Home Broadcasts during the War.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1944.

With Margaret Otis. "German Radio Propaganda to France during the Battle of France." In *Propaganda in War and Crisis: Materials for American Policy*, edited by Daniel Lerner, 209-241. New York: George W. Stewart, 1951 [1944].

"War Aims in Political Warfare." *Social Research* 12, no. 2 (May 1945): 157-180.

"'Reeducation'—The U.S. Policy." In *Social Order and the Risks of War*, 397-414. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1952 [1947].

"The Future of German Nationalism." *Social Research* 14, no. 4 (Winter 1947): 421-445.

"The Future of Psychological Warfare." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1948): 1-18.

"The American Soldier and the Sociology of Military Organization." In *Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of 'The American Soldier,'* edited by Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, 106-132. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1950.

"The Historical Development of Public Opinion." *American Journal of Sociology* 55, no. 4 (January 1950): 376-388.

The RAND Social Science Program. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, D-717-PR, February 2, 1950.

Psychological Warfare Reconsidered. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-196, February 5, 1951.

"International Political Communication: Elite vs. Mass." *World Politics* 4, no. 3 (April 1952): 309-317.

With Jerome Bruner, Wallace Carroll, Harold Lasswell, Paul Lazarsfeld, Edward Shils, and Ithiel de Sola Pool. *Research in International Communication: An Advisory Report of the Planning Committee.* Cambridge: Center for International Studies, June 1953.

Soviet Atomic Blackmail and the North Atlantic Alliance. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, RM-1837, December 10, 1956.

"Introduction: The German Political Scene." In *West German Leadership and Foreign Policy*, edited by Hans Speier and W. Phillips Davison, 1-6. White Plains, NY: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.

"Soviet Atomic Blackmail and the North Atlantic Alliance," *World Politics* 9, no. 3 (April 1957): 307-328.

Disengagement. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-1400, May 18, 1958.

With W. Phillips Davison and Leon Gouré. *The German Crisis: A Field Report, January-February 1959.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-2340, March 20, 1959.

With Herbert Goldhamer. "Some Observations on Political Gaming." *World Politics* 12, no. 1 (October 1959): 71-83.

The Soviet Threat to Berlin. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-1912-1, April 15, 1960.

Divided Berlin: The Anatomy of Soviet Political Blackmail. New York: Praeger, 1961.

An Historical Look at the RAND Research Program. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, B-152, July 5, 1961.

"A Woman Named Courage." In *The Arts in Society*, edited by Robert Neal Wilson, 191-252. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1964.

"Grimmelshausen's Laugher." In *Ancient and Moderns: Essays on the Tradition of Political Philosophy in Honor of Leo Strauss*, edited by Joseph Cropsey, 177-212. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

"Introduction." In Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen. *Courage, The Adventuress, and the False Messiah*. Translated by Hans Speier, 3-79. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Germany, the Continuing Challenge. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, P-3355, April 1966.

"Book Review: His-Huey Liang, *The Berlin Police Force in the Weimar Republic*." *Central European History* 4, no. 1 (March 1971): 86-89.

"Book Review: Oran Reed Young, *The Politics of Force: Bargaining during International Crises*." *Political Science Quarterly* 86, no. 3 (September 1971): 537-538.

"Über den politischen Witz." *Freiburger Universitätsblätter* 11, no. 36 (1972): 13-26.

"Book Review: Samuel Noah Eisenstadt, *Political Sociology: A Reader*." *Policy Sciences* 3, no. 2 (July 1972): 267-269.

"Book Review: Detlev Grieswelle, *Propaganda der Friedlosigkeit. Eine Studie zu Hitler's Rhetorik, 1920-1933*." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36, no. 4 (Winter 1972-1973): 637-638.

Witz und Politik. Essay über die Macht und das Lachen. Zürich/Osnabrück: Edition Interfrom/Fromm, 1975.

"The Chances for Peace." *Social Research* 42, no. 1 (Spring 1975): 35-51.

"Book Review: Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*." *American Political Science Review* 70, no. 4 (December 1976): 1276-1278.

"The Truth in Hell: Maurice Joly on Modern Despotism." *Polity* 10, no. 1 (Autumn 1977): 18-32.

"The Communication of Hidden Meaning." *Social Research* 44, no. 3 (Autumn 1977): 471-501.

"Emil Lederer (1882-1939). Leben und Werk." In *Kapitalismus, Klassenstruktur und Probleme der Demokratie in Deutschland, 1910-1940. Ausgewählte Aufsätze von Emil Lederer*, edited by Jürgen Kocka, 253-273. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.

With Harold Lasswell and Daniel Lerner. *Propaganda and Communication in World History, volume 1: The Symbolic Instrument in Early Times.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1979.

With Harold Lasswell and Daniel Lerner. *Propaganda and Communication in World History, volume 2: Emergence of Public Opinion in the West.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980.

With Harold Lasswell and Daniel Lerner, *Propaganda and Communication in World History, volume 3: A Pluralizing World in Formation*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980.

From the Ashes of Disgrace: A Journal from Germany, 1945-1955. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1981.

"Book Review: Kendall L. Baker, Russell J. Dalton, Kai Hildebrandt, *Germany Transformed: Political Culture and the New Politics*." *German Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (May 1982): 477-478.

"Book Review: Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research*." *Contemporary Sociology* 16, no. 3 (May 1987): 278-279.

"Nicht die Auswanderung, sondern der Triumph Hitlers war die wichtige Erfahrung. Autobiographisches Notizen eines Soziologen." *Exilforschung* 6 (1988): 152-173.

The Truth in Hell and Other Essays on Politics and Culture, 1935-1987. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Published Sources

Acheson, Dean. *Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1969.

Almond, Gabriel. *The American People and Foreign Policy.* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1950.

Aron, Raymond. "L'Ére des tyrannies d'Élie Halévy." *Revue du métaphysique et de morale* 46, no. 2 (April 1939): 283-307.
———. "États démocratiques et états totalitaires. Communication présentée devant la Société francaise de philosophie, le 17 juin 1939." In *Raymond Aron: penser la liberté, penser la démocratie*, edited by Nicolas Baverez (Prais: Gallimard, 2005).

Ascoli, Max. "Realism versus the Constitution." *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 169-184.

———. "Society through Pareto's Mind." *Social Research* 3, no. 1 (February 1935): 78-89.

———. "On Political Parties." *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 206-208.

———. "Education in Fascist Italy." *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 338-347.

Bailey, Thomas A. *The Man in the Street: The Impact of American Public Opinion on Foreign Policy.* New York: Macmillan, 1948.

Barrett, Edward W. *Truth is Our Weapon.* New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1953.

Baruch, Bernard. "Text of Bernard Baruch's Address at Portrait Unveiling." *New York Times*. April 17, 1947, 21.

Beard, Charles A. "The Social Sciences in the United States." *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* IV, no. 1 (1936): 61-64.

Beebe, Robert P. "Military Decision from the Viewpoint of Game Theory." *Naval War College Review* 10, no. 2 (October 1957): 27-76.

Benton, William. *The Struggle for the Minds and Loyalties of Mankind: Proposing a Marshall Plan of Ideas.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, March 22, 1950.

Bentwich, Norman. *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars: The Story of Displaced Scholars and Scientists*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1953.

Berelson, Bernard. "Democratic Theory and Public Opinion." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (Autumn 1952): 313-330.

Bernard, L.L. et al. "Questions for Sociology: An Informal Round Table Symposium […]." *Social Forces* 13, no. 2 (December 1934): 165-223.

Bernaut E. and M. Ruggles. *Collective Leadership and the Political Police in the Soviet Union.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1674, March 15, 1956.

Bernays, Edward L. "Attitude Polls—Servants or Masters?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (Autumn 1945): 264-268.

Borkenau, Franz. *Pareto.* London: Chapman and Hall, 1936.

Borgese, G.A. "The Intellectual Origins of Fascism." *Social Research* 1, no. 4 (November 1934): 458-485.

Brandt, Karl. "Toward a Panic-Proof Industrial Structure." *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 45-60.

———. "Farm Relief in Germany." *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 185-198.

———. "The Employment Capacity of Agriculture." *Social Research* 2, no. 1 (February 1935): 1-19.

———. "Recent Agrarian Policies in Germany, Great Britain, and the United States." *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 167-201.

———. "Farm Tenancy in the United States." *Social Research* 4, no. 2 (May 1937): 133-156.

Brecht, Arnold. "Constitutions and Leadership." *Social Research* 1, no. 3 (August 1934): 265-286.

———. "Federalism and Business Regulation." *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 337-352.

———. "Civil Service." *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 202-221.

———. "The New Russian Constitution." *Social Research* 4, no. 2 (May 1937): 157-190.

Bruner, Jerome S. "Public Opinion and America's Foreign Policy." *American Sociological Review* 9, no. 1 (February 1944): 50-56.

Burnham, James. "Lenin's Heir." *Partisan Review* 12, no. 1 (Winter 1945): 61-72.

———. *The Struggle for the World.* New York: John Day and Company, 1947.

Churchill, Winston. "The Sinews of Peace." In *Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' Speech Fifty Years Later*, edited by James W. Muller, 11-13. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1999.

Cohen, Bernard C. *The Political Process and Foreign Policy: The Making of the Japanese Peace Settlement.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951.

Collbohm, Frank and Warren Weaver. "Opening Plenary." In U.S. Air Force Project RAND, *Conference of Social Scientists, September 14-19, 1947—New York.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, R-106, June 9, 1948.

Colm, Gerhard. "Why the Papen Plan for Industrial Recovery Failed." *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 83-96.

———. "Methods of Financing Unemployment Compensation." *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 148-167.

———. With Fritz Lehmann. "Public Spending and Recovery in the United States." *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 129-165.

———. "Economics Today." *Social Research* 4, no. 2 (May 1937): 195-196.

———. "VI." *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 411-412.

Davie, Maurice. *Refugees In America: Report of the Committee for the Study of Recent Immigration from Europe*. New York: Harpers and Brothers Publishers, 1947.

De Grazia, Alfred. *Elite Analysis: A Manual for Methods for Discovering the Leaders of a Society and their Vulnerability to Propaganda.* Stanford: Institute of Journalistic Studies, 1955.

Dennis, Lawrence. *The Coming American Fascism.* New York: Harper, 1936.

Dewey, John. "Public Opinion." *The New Republic* 30, no. 387 (May 3, 1922): 286-288.
———. "Practical Democracy." *The New Republic* 45, no. 574 (December 2, 1925): 52-54.
———. *The Public and Its Problems.* New York: Holt, 1927.

Dodd, Stuart C. "The Washington Public Opinion Laboratory." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1948): 118-124.

Domarus, Max. *Hitler: Speeches and Proclamations, 1932-1945, and Commentary by a Contemporary, The Chronicle of a Dictatorship: Volume Four, The Years 1941 to 1945.* Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc., 2004.

Duchacek, Ivo D. *Conflict and Cooperation among Nations.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1960.

Dulles, John Foster. "The Evolution of Foreign Policy. Speech Given Before the Council of Foreign Relations, New York, NY." *Department of State Press Release No. 81*, January 12, 1954.

Ehrmann, Henry W. "The French Trade Associations and the Ratification of the Schuman Plan." *World Politics* 6, no. 4 (July 1954): 453-481.

Emeny, Brooks. "A Marshall Plan of Ideas." *ALA Bulletin* 44, no. 7 (July-August 1950): 273-277.

Farago, Ladislas, ed. *German Psychological Warfare.* New York: Putnam, 1941.

Feiler, Arthur. "The Pressure for Monetary Depreciation." *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 61-82.
———. "America in World Trade." *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 248-250.
———. "Will Germany Devaluate?" *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 428-438.

Field, Harry H., Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Claude G. Robinson, and Edward L. Bernays. "The Discussion Goes On." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 9. No. 4 (Winter 1945-1946): 403-410.

Fraenkel, Ernst. *The Dual State.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1941.

Furniss, Edgar S. Jr. and Richard C. Snyder. *Introduction to American Foreign Policy.* New York: Rinehart & Company, 1955.

Gaither, H. Rowan, et al. *Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program.* Detroit: Ford Foundation, 1949.

Gallup, George. "The Absorption Rate of Ideas." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (Autumn 1955): 234-242.

Garthoff, Raymond L. *The New Soviet Leadership.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1086, May 1, 1953.
———. *A Journey through the Cold War: A Memoir of Containment and Coexistence.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001.

George, Alexander L. *Propaganda Analysis: A Study of Inferences Made from Nazi Propaganda in World War II*. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, and Co., 1959.

Gerth, Hans. "The Nazi Party: Its Leadership and Composition." *American Journal of Sociology* 45, no. 4 (January 1940): 517-541.

Goldhamer, Herbert. *The 1951 Korean Armistice Conference: A Personal Memoir.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1994 [1951].

Grover, Wayne C. "Book Review: *A History of Militarism: Romance and Realities*. Alfred Vagts." *Journal of the American Military History Foundation* 2, no. 1 (Spring 1938): 48-50.

Gumbel, Emil Julius. *Freie Wissenschaft: Ein Sammelbuch aus der deutschen Emigration*. Strassburg: Sebastian Brant Verlag, 1938.

Gurian, Waldemar. "The German Question." *World Politics* 1, no. 1 (October 1948): 120-126.

Halévy, Élie. *L'Ére des tyrannies*. Paris: Gallimard, 1938.

Harley, J. Eugene. "The Hochschule für Politik: A Significant German Institution for the Teaching of Political Science." *American Political Science Review* 24, no. 2 (May 1930): 466-469.

Hartshorne, Edward Y. *The German Universities and National Socialism*. Brooklyn: AMS Press, 1981 [1937].

Harvey, Ray F. "Book Review: War in Our Time. Edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 3, no. 3 (July 1939): 516-518.

Haywood, Jr., O.G. "Military Decision and Game Theory." *Operations Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1954): 365-385.

Heimann, Eduard. "Sociological Perceptions of Economic Theory." *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 23-44.
———. "Socialism and Democracy." *Social Research* 1, no. 3 (August 1934): 301-318.
———. "Planning and the Market System." *Social Research* 1, no. 4 (November 1934): 486-504.
———. "Types and Potentialities of Economic Planning." *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 176-194.
———. "I." *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 398-400

Hellwig, Johann C.L. *Versuch eines aufs Schachspiel gebaueten Tacktischen Spiels*. Leipzig: Crusius, 1780.

Herz, John H. "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 2, no. 2 (January 1950): 157-180.
———. *Political Realism and Political Idealism: A Study in Theories and Realities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

High Commissioner for Refugees (Jewish and Other) Coming from Germany, ed., *A Crisis in the University World*. London: H. Mehrtens, 1935.

Hinton, H. *Leaders of Communist China.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1845, December 20, 1956.

Hitler, Adolf. *Mein Kampf: Complete and Unabridged, Fully Annotated.* New York: Reynal & Hitchcock, 1939.

Hoffman, Paul G. *Peace Can Be Won.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1951.

Holborn, Hajo. *American Military Government: Its Organization and Policies*. Washington: Infantry Journal Press, 1947.
———. "The Collapse of the European Political System, 1914-45." *World Politics* 1, no. 4 (July 1949): 442-466.

Hook, Sidney. "The Failure of the Left." *Partisan Review* 10, no. 2 (March/April 1943): 165-177.

Hungerford, J. *The Exploitation of Superstitions for Purposes of Psychological Warfare*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-365, April 15, 1950.

Huntington, Samuel. *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981 [1957].

Jäckh, Ernst, ed. *Politik als Wissenchaft: Zehn Jahre deutsche Hochschule für Politik.* Berlin: Hermann Reckendorf, 1931.

Janis, I.L. *Air War and Emotional Stress.* McGraw Hill, New York, 1951.

Janowitz, Morris. "The Systematic Analysis of Political Biography." *World Politics* 6, no. 3 (April 1954): 405-412.
———. *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1964.

Jaspers, Karl. *Die Schuldfrage: Ein Beitrag zur Deutschen Frage.* Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 1946.

Johnson, Alvin. "The Soul of Capitalism." *The Unpopular Review* 1, no. 2 (April-June 1914): 227-244.
———. *Pioneer's Progress: An Autobiography.* New York: The Viking Press, 1952.

Jünger, Ernst. *Die totale Mobilmachung.* Berlin: Verlag für Zeitkritik, 1931.

Kähler, Alfred. "The Problem of Verifying the Theory of Technological Unemployment." *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 439-460.
———. "Scarcity and Abundance of Capital as Cause of Crisis." *Social Research* 4, no. 1 (February 1937): 74-9

Kecskemeti, Paul. *Strategic Surrender: The Politics of Victory and Defeat.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Kennan, George F. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs* 25 (July 1947): 566-582 [as "Mr. X."].
———. "Planning of Foreign Policy (June 18, 1947)." In *Measures Short of War: The George F. Kennan Lectures at the National War College, 1946-47*, edited by Giles D. Harlow and George C. Maerz, 206-216. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1991.
———. *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Killian, James R. Jr. *The Education of a College President: A Memoir.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985.

King, James E. Jr. "Strategic Surrender: The Senate Debate and the Book." *World Politics* 11, no. 3 (April 1959): 418-429.

Knight, Maxwell E. *The German Executive: 1890-1933.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951.

Knorr, Klaus. "What Manner of Union?" *World Politics* 1, no. 2 (January 1949): 233-242.

Lannes Smith, Bruce. "Bibliography." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 4, no. 3 (September 1940): 562-576.

Larrabee, Harold A. "Book Review: *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction: Studies in Modern Social Structure* by Karl Mannheim." *Journal of Philosophy* 38, no. 4 (February 13, 1941): 103-107.

Lasswell, Harold, Ralph Casey, and Bruce Lannes Smith. *Propaganda and Promotional Activities: An Annotated Bibliography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1935.
———. "Collective Autism as a Consequence of Cultural Contact: Notes on Religious Training and the Peyote Cult at Taos." *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* IV, no. 2 (1936): 232-247.
———. With Daniel Lerner and C. Easton Rothwald. *The Comparative Study of Elites: An Introduction and Bibliography*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1952.

Lavine, Thelma Z. "Sociological Analysis of Cognitive Norms." *Journal of Philosophy* 39, no. 13 (June 18, 1942): 342-256.

Lederer, Emil. *Die Privatangestellten in der Modernen Wirtschaftsentwicklung*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1912.
———. "Zur Soziologie des Weltkrieges." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 39 (1915): 347-384.
———. "Social Control versus Economic Law." *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 3-21.
———. "Freedom and Science." *Social Research* 1, no. 2 (May 1934): 219-230.
———. "The Problem of Development and Growth in the Economic System." *Social Research* 2, no. 1 (February 1935): 20-38.
———. "On Imperfect Competition." *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 222-229.
———. "On Revolutions." *Social Research* 3, no. 1 (February 1936): 1-18.
———. "Comment on Keynes, II." *Social Research* 3, no. 4 (November 1936): 478-487.
———. "The Search for Truth." *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 278-281.
———. *State of the Masses: The Threat of the Classless Society*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1940.

Lehmann, Fritz. "New Literature on Money, Credit, and Banking, 1933-1935." *Social Research* 2, no. 2 (May 1935): 230-238.
———. "The Problem of Financing Small and Intermediate Industries." *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 287-309.
———. "100% Money." *Social Research* 3, no. 1 (February 1936): 37-56.
———. "Rejoinder." *Social Research* 3, no. 2 (May 1936): 241-244.

Leites, Nathan C. "Book Review: *War in Our Time*. Edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler." *American Journal of Sociology* 46, no. 2 (September 1940): 268-269.
———. *The Operational Code of the Politburo*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1951.

———. *A Study of Bolshevism.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1953.

Lenin, V.I. *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism.* London: Penguin, 2011 [1917].

Lerner, Daniel. *Sykewar: Psychological Warfare against Germany, D-Day to VE-Day.* New York: George W. Stewart. Inc., 1949.
———. *The Nazi Elite.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951.

Lippmann, Walter. *Public Opinion.* New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Company, 1922.
———. *The Phantom Public.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1993 [1925].
———. *The Cold War: A Study in U.S. Foreign Policy.* New York: Harper, 1947.
———. *Essays in the Public Philosophy.* New York: Little, Brown, and Company, 1955.

Littauer, Rudolf. "Case Law and Systematic Law: Descriptive Comparison of American and German Legal Thinking." *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 481-502.

Little, William McCarthy. "The Strategic War Game or Chart Maneuver." *US Naval Institute Proceedings XXXVIII* (December 1912): 1213-1233.

Livermore, W.R. *The American Kriegsspiel.* Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1882.

Lockhart, R.B. *Comes the Reckoning.* London: Putnam and Company, 1948.

Löwe, Adolph. "The Task of Democratic Education: Pre-Hitler Germany and England." *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 381-391.

Lukács, George. *Geschichte und Klassenbewußtsein.* Berlin: Hermann Luchterhand, 1968 [1923].

Luxemburg, Rosa. *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals: Ein Beitrag zur ökonomischen Erklärung des Imperialismus.* Berlin: Buchhandlung Vorwärts Paul Singer, 1913.

Macdonald, Dwight. "Book Review: The British Genius: *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius*, by George Orwell." *Partisan Review* 9, no. 2 (March/April 1942): 166-169.
———. "The (American) People's Century." *Partisan Review* 9, no. 4 (July/August 1942): 294-310.
———. "Political Notes." *Partisan Review* 9, no. 6 (November/December 1942): 476-482.

MacDonald, John. "The War of Wits." *Fortune* 43 (March 1951): 99-158.

Mannheim, Karl. *Ideologie und Utopie.* Bonn: Friedrich Cohen, 1930 [1929].

Markel, Lester J. et al. *Public Opinion and Foreign Policy*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Mead, Margaret. *Soviet Attitudes toward Authority*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1951.

Meckel, Jakob. *Studien über das Kriegsspiel*. Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1873.

Merton, Robert K. "Science, Technology, and Society in Seventeenth Century England." *Osiris* 4 (1938): 360-632.

Mills, C. Wright. "Book Review: The Political Gargoyles: *Business as a System of Power*, by Robert A. Brady." *The New Republic* 109, no. 15 (April 12, 1943): 482-483.
———. *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002 [1951].

Morgenthau, Hans. "The Political Science of E.H. Carr." *World Politics* 1, no. 1 (October 1949): 127-134.

Mosca, Gaetano. *The Ruling Class*. Translated by Hannah D. Kahn. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1939.

Neisser, Hans. "Monetary Expansion and the Structure of Production." *Social Research* 1, no. 4 (November 1934): 434-457.
———. "Commentary on Keynes." *Social Research* 3, no. 4 (November 1936): 459-478.

Nelson, Boris Erich. "Book Review: *War in Our Time*. Edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 207 (January 1940): 224-225.

Neumann, Franz. *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Neumann, Sigmund. "Zehn Jahre Deutsche Hochschule für Politik." *Neue Blätter fur den Sozialismus*, 2, no. 1 (1930), unpaginated.
———. "Archiv." In *Politik als Wissenchaft: Zehn Jahre deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, edited by Ernst Jäckh, 279-285. Berlin: Hermann Reckendorf, 1931.
———. *Permanent Revolution: Totalitarianism in the Age of International Civil War*. New York: Harper, 1942.
———. "The International Civil War." *World Politics* 1, no. 3 (April 1949): 333-350.

North, Robert C. *Kuomintang and Chinese Communist Elites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1951.

O, Yu Chin. "Political Re-Orientation Campaigns in North and South Korean." In *A Preliminary Study of the Impact of Communism upon Korea. Psychological Warfare Research, Report no. 1*, edited by John Pelzel, John Riley, and Wilbur Schramm, 312-324. Maxwell Airforce Base, Alabama: Human Resources Research Institute, 1951.

Pächter, Heinz. *Nazi-Deutsch, A Glossary of Contemporary German Usage, with Appendices on Government, Military, and Economic Institutions.* New York: Frederick Ungar, 1944.

Padover, Saul K. "France in Defeat: Causes and Consequences." *World Politics* 2, no. 3 (April 1950): 305-337.

Pareto, Vilfredo. *Theory of Derivations, vol. III of the Mind and Society.* Translated by Andrew Bongiorno and Arthur Livingston. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1939.

Parmalee, Maurice. "Three Communications from Dr. M. Parmalee." *American Journal of Sociology* 37, no. 3 (1931): 468.

Parry, Albert. "Book Review: Trotsky's Stalin: *Stalin: An Appraisal of the Man and His Influence*, by Leon Trotsky." *The New Republic* 114, no. 19 (May 13, 1946): 701-702.

Phillips, William. "The Lion and the Foxes." *Partisan Review* 12, no. 2 (Spring 1945): 190-198.

Pollock, Friedrich. "State Capitalism: Its Possibilities and Limitations." In *The Frankfurt School Reader*, edited by Anderw Arato and Eike Gebhardt, 71-94. New York: Continuum, 1990 [1941]).

Preuss, Lawrence. "The Concepts of Neutrality and Nonbelligerency." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 218 (November 1941): 97-109.

Price, Byron. "Maintaining a Healthy Public Opinion." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (Summer 1945): 140-144.

Rahv, Philip. "Versions of Bolshevism." *Partisan Review* 13, no. 3 (Summer 1946): 365-375.
———. "The Unfuture of Utopia." *Partisan Review* 16, no. 7 (July 1949): 743-749.

RAND Corporation. *A Selected List of Unclassified Publications of the Social Science Department, the RAND Corporation, 1948-1962.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1403-10, October 1962.

———. *A Bibliography of Selected RAND Publications: Game Theory.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1988.

Raney, John C. "Do the Polls Serve Democracy?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 10, no. 3 (Autumn 1946): 349-360.

Raymond, Charles W. *Kriegsspiel.* Hampton, VA: Fortress Monroe, 1881.

Riesman, David Jr. "Book Review: *The Process of Revolution.* G.S. Pettee." *Harvard Law Review* 52, no. 5 (March 1939): 864-865.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund. *Prospect for America: The Rockefeller Panel Reports.* New York: Doubleday, 1961.

Root, Elihu. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs* 9, no. 2 (January 1931): iii-vii.

Rogers, Lindsay. *The Pollsters: Public Opinion, Politics, and Democratic Leadership.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949.

Rosenberg, Harold. "The Communist: His Mentality and His Morals." *Commentary* 8 (July 1949): 1-9.

Salomon, Albert. "Innenpolitische Bildung." In *Politik als Wissenschaft: zehn Jahre Deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, edited by Ernst Jäckh, 94-110. Berlin: Hermann Reckendorf Verlag, 1931.
———. "Tocqueville, Moralist and Sociologist." *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 405-427.
———. "II." *Social Research* 4, no. 3 (September 1937): 332-334.

Sayre, Farrand. *Map Maneuvers and Tactical Rides.* Springfield, MA: Springfield Printing and Binding Company, 1908.

Schleicher, Charles P. *Introduction to International Relations.* New York: Prentice Hall, 1954.

Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr. *A Life in the Twentieth Century: Innocent Beginnings, 1917-1950.* Boston: Mariner Books, 2002.
———. *Journals, 1952-2000.* New York: Penguin, 2007.

Schumpeter, Joseph. "Zur Soziologie der Imperialismen." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 46 (1919): 1-39, 275-310.

Simon, Herbert A. *Models of My Life: The Remarkable Autobiography of the Nobel Prize Winning Social Scientist and the Father of Artificial Intelligence.* New York: Basic Books, 1991.

Simons, Hans. "Lehre und Lehrer." In *Politik als Wissenschaft: Zehn Jahre Deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, edited by Ernst Jäckh, 203-210. Berlin: Hermann Reckendorf Verlag, 1931.

———. "Some European Aspects of International Law." *Social Research* 2, no. 4 (November 1935): 461-480.

———. "Collective Security." *Social Research* 3, no. 4 (November 1936): 383-410.

Speier, Margit. *Die Vernichtung Entkommen: Erinnerung einer Judin.* Bremen: Donat, 1999.

Spiegel, Henry William. "Wehrwirtschaft: Economics of the Military State." *American Economic Review* 30, no. 4 (December 1940): 713-723.

Staudinger, Hans. "Modern Tendencies in Public Utilities." *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 263-286.

———. "Social Rates in Electricity." *Social Research* 3, no. 3 (August 1936): 259-281.

———. "Planning in Electricity." *Social Research* 4, no. 4 (November 1937): 417-439.

Stouffer, Samuel A. "1665 and 1954." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (Autumn 1954): 233-238.

Strauss, Leo. *Natural Right and History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft: Abhandlung des Communismus und des Socialismus als empirischer Culturformen*. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1887.

Totten, Charles A. L. *Strategos: A Series of American Games of War Based upon Military Principles*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1880.

Tucker, Robert. *The Psychological Factor in Soviet Foreign Policy.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, RM-1881, March 7, 1957.

———. "A Stalin Biographer's Memoir." In *Psychology and Historical Interpretation*, edited by William McKinley Runyon, 63-81. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

U.S. Air Force Project RAND. *Preliminary Design of an Experimental World-Circling Spaceship.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, SM-11827, May 2, 1946.

———. *Conference of Social Scientists, September 14-19, 1947—New York*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, R-106, June 9, 1948.

Venturinus, George. *Beschreibung und Regeln eines neuen Krieges-Spiel.* Schleswig, 1798.

Vernois, Julius von Verdy du. *Beitrag zum Kriegsspiel.* Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1876.

———. *A Simplified War Game*. Translated by Eben Swift. Kansas City, MO: Hudson-Kimberly Publishing Company, 1897.

Von Neumann, John and Oskar Morgenstern. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944.

Von Reisswitz, G.L. *Anleitung zur Darstellung militärischer Manöver mit dem Apparate des Kriegsspiels*. Berlin, 1824.

Von Tschischwitz, W. and Thilo von Troth. *Anleitung zur Darstellung von Gefechtsbildern mittelt des Kriegsspielapparatus*. Berlin, 1870.

Wanger, Walter F. "Donald Duck and Diplomacy." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 14, no. 3 (Autumn 1950): 443-452.

Weaver, W.G. "Book Review. *War in Our Time*. Edited by Hans Speier and Alfred Kähler." *American Sociological Review* 4, no. 5 (October 1939): 743-744.

Weber, Max. "Science as a Vocation." In *The Vocation Lectures*, edited by David Owen and Tracy B. Strong, translated by Rodney Livingstone, 1-31. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 2004 [1918-1919].

Weickhmann, Christoph. *Neu erfundenes grosses Königs-Spiel*. Ulm: Bei Balthasar Kühnen, 1664.

Williams, Benjamin H. "Public Opinion in a World of Power Politics." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 11, no. 3 (Autumn 1947): 361-366.

Williams, John D. *The Compleat Strategyst: Being a Primer on the Theory of Games and Strategy*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1954.

Wolfers, Arnold. "Statesmanship and Moral Choice." *World Politics* 1, no. 2 (January 1949): 175-195.

Wunderlich, Frieda. "New Aspects of Unemployment in Germany." *Social Research* 1, no. 1 (February 1934): 97-110.
———. "Women's Work in Germany." *Social Research* 2, no. 3 (August 1935): 310-336.
———. "Some Aspects of Social Work in the German Democratic Republic." *Social Research* 3, no. 1 (February 1936): 19-36.
———. "Health Insurance." *Social Research* 4, no. 4 (November 1937): 509-514.

Secondary Materials

Abbott, Andrew. *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.

Abelson, Donald E. "Think Tanks in the United States." In *Think Tanks across Nations: A Comparative Approach*, edited by Diane Stone, Andrew Denham, and Mark Garnett, 107-126. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998.

———. *A Capitol Idea: Think Tanks and U.S. Foreign Policy.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006.

Acacia, John. *Clark Clifford: The Wise Man of Washington.* Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 2009.

Adams, Gordon. *The Politics of Defense Contracting: The Iron Triangle.* Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1981.

Adcock, Robert and Mark Bevir. "Political Science." In *The History of the Social Sciences since 1945*, edited by Roger E. Backhouse and Philippe Fontaine, 71-101. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Adler, Les K. and Thomas G. Paterson. "Red Fascism: The Merger of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia in the American Image of Totalitarianism, 1930s-1950s." *American Historical Review* 75, no. 4 (April 1970): 1046-1064.

Alpers, Benjamin L. *Dictators, Democracy, and American Public Culture: Envisioning the Totalitarian Enemy, 1920-1950.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002.

Alterman, Eric. *Who Speaks for America?: Why Democracy Matters for Foreign Policy.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Amadae, Sonja M. *Rationalizing Capitalist Democracy: The Cold War Origins of Rational Choice Liberalism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 2006.

Aschheim, Steven E. *Beyond the Border: The German-Jewish Legacy Abroad.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Baird, Jay W. "Goebbels, Horst Wessel, and the Myth of Resurrection and Return." *Journal of Contemporary History* 17, no. 4 (October 1992): 633-650.

Balogh, Brian. "Reorganizing the Organizational Synthesis: Federal-Professional Relations in Modern America." *Studies in American Political Development* 5, no. 1 (1991): 119-172.

———. *Chain Reaction: Expert Debate and Public Participation in American Commercial Nuclear Power, 1945-1975.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Bannister, Robert C. *Sociology and Scientism: The American Quest for Objectivity, 1880-1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Barnouw, Dagmar. *Weimar Intellectuals and the Threat of Modernity*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Baum, Matthew A. "Public Opinion, Presidential Rhetoric, and the *Domestic* Politics of Audience Costs in U.S. Foreign Policy Crises." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48, no. 5 (October 2004): 603-631.

Bayly, C.A., Sven Beckert, Matthew Connelly, Isabel Hofmey, Wendy Kozol, and Patricia Seed. "AHR Conversation on Transnational History." *American Historical Review* 111, no. 5 (December 2006): 1441-1464.

Beisner, Robert L. "The Secretary, the Spy, and the Sage: Dean Acheson, Alger Hiss, and George Kennan." *Diplomatic History* 27, no. 1 (January 2003): 1-14.
———. *Dean Acheson: A Life in the Cold War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Bell, David. *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It.* New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2007.

Bender, Thomas, ed. *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
———. *A Nation among Nations: America's Place in World History.* New York: Hill & Wang, 2006.

Berghahn, Volker. Berghahn, Volker. "Die Harzburger Front und die Kandidatur Hindenburgs für die Präsidentschaftswahlen 1932." *Vierteljahrhefte für Zeitgeschichte* 13, no. 13 (January 1965): 64-82.
———. *America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Bernhard, N.E. "Clearer than Truth: Public Affairs Television and the State Department's Domestic Information Campaigns, 1947-1952." *Diplomatic History* 21, no. 4 (Fall 1997): 545-567.

Bernstein, Mary. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103, no. 3 (November 1997): 531-565.
Bessner, Daniel. "'Rather More than One-Third Had No Jewish Blood': American Progressivism and German-Jewish Cosmopolitanism at the New School for Social Research, 1933-1939." *Religions* 3, no. 1 (March 2012): 99-129.

Bill, James A. *George Ball: Behind the Scenes in U.S. Foreign Policy.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Bird, Kai. *The Color of Truth: McGeorge Bundy and William Bundy: Brothers in Arms.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.

Bischof, Gunter and Saki Dockrill, eds. *Cold War Respite: The Geneva Summit of 1955.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000.

Blackmer, Donald L. M. *The MIT Center for International Studies: The Founding Years, 1951-1969.* Cambridge: MIT Center for International Studies, 2002.

Bleek, Wilhelm. *Geschichte der Politikwissenschaft in Deutschland.* Leinen: C.H. Beck Verlag, 2001.

Botts, Joshua. "'Nothing to Seek and … Nothing to Defend:' George F. Kennan's Core Values and American Foreign Policy, 1938-1993." *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 5 (November 2006): 839-866.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "Intellectual Field and Creative Project." *Social Science Information* 8, no. 2 (April 1969): 89-119.

Brenner, Arthur David. *Emil J. Gumbel: Weimar German Pacifist and Professor.* Boston: Humanities Press, 2001.

Brick, Howard. *Age of Contradiction: American Thought and Culture in the 1960s.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000.

Brodie, Janet Farrell. "Learning Secrecy in the Early Cold War: The RAND Corporation." *Diplomatic History* 35, no. 4 (September 2011): 643-670.

Bu, Liping. "Educational Exchange and Cultural Diplomacy in the Cold War." *Journal of American Studies* 33, no. 3 (December 1999): 393-415.

Buchstein Hubertus and Gerhard Göhler. "After the Revolution: Political Science in East Germany." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 23, no. 4 (December 1990): 668-673.

Buck, Peter. "Adjusting to Military Life: The Social Sciences Go to War, 1941-1950." In *Military Enterprise and Technological Change: Perspectives on the American Experience*, edited by Merritt Roe Smith, 203-252. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1985.

Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* London: Routledge, 1990.

Calavita, Kitty. "The Paradoxes of Race, Class, Identity, and 'Passing': Enforcing the Chinese Exclusion Acts, 1882-1910." *Law and Social Inquiry* 25, no. 1 (Winter 2000): 1-40.

Calhoun, Craig. "Sociology in America: An Introduction." In *Sociology in America: A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, 1-38. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Camic, Charles. "On Edge: Sociology during the Great Depression and the New Deal." In *Sociology in America: A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun, 225-280. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Carpenter, Daniel P. *The Forging of Bureaucratic Autonomy: Reputations, Networks, and Policy Innovation in Executive Agencies, 1862-1928.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
———. *Reputation and Power: Organizational Image and Pharmaceutical Regulation at the FDA.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Carey, James T. *Sociology and Public Affairs: The Chicago School.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1975.

Caspary, William R. "The 'Mood Theory': A Study of Public Opinion and Foreign Policy." *American Political Science Review* 64, no. 2 (June 1970): 536-547.

Caute, David. *The Dancer Defects: The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Chang, Gordon H. *Friends and Enemies: The United States, China, and the Soviet Union, 1948-1972.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.

Chauncey, George. *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World, 1890-1940.* New York: Basic Books, 1995.

Chester, Eric Thomas. *Covert Network: Progressives, the International Rescue Committee, and the CIA.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 1995.

Chomsky, Noam, et al., eds. *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years.* New York: New Press, 1997.

Cloud, John. "Imagining the World in a Barrel: CORONA and the Clandestine Convergence of the Earth Sciences." *Social Studies of Science* 31, no. 2 (April 2001): 231-251.

Collins, Martin J. *Cold War Laboratory: RAND, the Air Force, and the American State.* Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001.

Congdon, Lee. *Exile and Social Thought: Hungarian Intellectuals in Germany and Austria, 1919-1933*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

Corke, Sarah-Jane. *US Covert Operations and Cold War Strategy: Truman, Secret Warfare, and the CIA, 1945-53*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Costigliola, Frank. "The Creation of Memory and Myth: Stalin's 1946 Election Speech and the Soviet Threat." In *Critical Reflections on the Cold War: Linking Rhetoric and History*, edited by Martin J. Medhurst and H.W. Brands, 38-54. College Station, TX: Texas A&M Press, 2000.

Cox, Michael "Whatever Happened to the 'Second' Cold War? Soviet-American Relations: 1980-1988." *Review of International Studies* 16, no. 2 (April 1990): 155-172.

Cravens, Hamilton. "Column Right, March! Nationalism, Scientific Positivism, and the Conservative Turn in the American Social Sciences in the Cold War Era." In *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, edited by Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens, 117-136. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Cull, Nicholas J. *The Cold War and the United States Information Agency: American Propaganda and Cultural Diplomacy, 1945-1989*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Dallek, Robert. *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power*. New York: HarperCollins, 2007.

Daniels, Roger. *Guarding the Golden Door: American Immigration Policy and Immigrants since 1882*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2004.

Davis, Belinda, Wilfried Mausbach, Martin Klimke, and Carla Macdougall, eds. *Changing the World, Changing Oneself: Political Protest and Collective Identities in West Germany and the U.S. in the 1960s and 1970s*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2010.

Dean, Robert D. *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001.

Deconde, Alexander. "Thomas A. Bailey: Teacher, Scholar, Popularizer." *Pacific Historical Review* 56, no. 2 (May 1987): 161-193.

De Grazia, Victoria. *Irresistible Empire: America's Advance through Twentieth-Century Europe*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Del Pero, Mario. "The United States and 'Psychological Warfare' in Italy, 1948-1955." *Journal of American History* 87, no. 4 (March 2001): 1304-1334.

Demm, Eberhard. "Propaganda and Caricature in the First World War." *Journal of Contemporary History* 28, no. 1 (January 1993): 163-192.

Desmond, James. *Nelson Rockefeller, a Political Biography.* New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Dickson, Paul. *Think Tanks.* New York: Atheneum, 1971.

Dijk, Ruud van. "The 1952 Stalin Note Debate: Myth or Missed Opportunity for German Unification?" Working Paper No. 14. Cold War International History Project, May 1996.

Dizard, Wilson P. *Inventing Public Diplomacy: The Story of the U.S. Information Agency.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004.

Eisfeld, Rainer. "Exile and Return: Political Science in the Context of (West) German University Development from Weimar to Bonn." *History of Higher Education Annual* 8 (1988): 9-43.

Eley, Geoff. *Forging Democracy: The History of the Left in Europe, 1850-2000.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Engerman, David C. *Modernization from the Other Shore: American Intellectuals and the Romance of Russian Development.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
———. *Know Your Enemy: The Rise and Fall of America's Soviet Experts.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
———. "The Rise and Fall of Wartime Social Science: Harvard's Refugee Interview Project, 1950-54." In *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, edited by Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens, 25-44. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Entman, Robert M. *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2004.

Freedman, Lawrence. *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Freeman, Joshua B. *In Transit: Transport Workers Union in New York City, 1933-1966*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001.

Friedberg, Aaron L. *In the Shadow of the Garrison State: America's Anti-Statism and Its Cold War Grand Strategy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Friedman, Andrea. *Prurient Interest: Gender, Democracy, and Obscenity in New York City, 1909-1945*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Frisby, David. *The Alienated Mind: The Sociology of Knowledge in Germany, 1918-1933*. London: Heineman Educational Books, 1983.

Fritzsche, Peter. *Germans into Nazis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
———. *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
———. *George F. Kennan: An American Life.* New York: Penguin, 2011.

Galambos, Louis. "The Emerging Organizational Synthesis in Modern American History." *Business History Review* 44, no. 3 (Autumn 1970): 279-290.
———. "Recasting the Organizational Synthesis: Structure and Process in the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries." *Business History Review* 79, no. 1 (Spring 2005): 1-38.
———. *The Creative Society—and the Price Americans Paid for It.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Gardner, Lloyd. *Pay Any Price: Lyndon Johnson and the Wars for Vietnam.* Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1995.

Gary, Brett. *The Nervous Liberals: Propaganda Anxieties from World War I to the Cold War*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Gay, Peter. *Weimar Culture: The Outsider as Insider.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1968.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Gehring, Hansjörg. *Amerikanische Literaturpolitik in Deutschland, 1945-1953: Ein Aspekt des Re-Education-Programms*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags Anstalt, 1976.

Geiger, Robert L. "American Foundations and Academic Social Science, 1945-1960." *Minerva* 26, no. 3 (Autumn 1988): 315-341.

Gentile, Gian P. "Advocacy or Assessment? The United States Strategic Bombing Survey of Germany and Japan." *Pacific Historical Review* 66, no. 1 (February 1997): 53-79.
———. *How Effective is Strategic Bombing?: Lessons Learned from World War II to Kosovo*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.

Gerhardt, Uta. *Talcott Parsons: An Intellectual Biography.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Ghamari-Tabrizi, Sharon. "Simulating the Unthinkable: Gaming Future War in the 1950s and 1960s." *Social Studies of Science* 30, no. 2 (April 2000): 163-223.
———. *The Worlds of Herman Kahn: The Intuitive Science of Thermonuclear War.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005.

Gienow-Hecht, C.E. Jessica. *Transmission Impossible: American Journalism as Cultural Diplomacy in Postwar Germany, 1945-1955.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999.
———. "Shame on US? Academics, Cultural Transfer, and the Cold War—A Critical Review." *Diplomatic History* 24, no. 3 (Summer 2000), 465-494.

Gilman, Nils. *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Gleason, Abbott. "The Truman Doctrine and the Rhetoric of Totalitarianism." In *The Soviet Empire Reconsidered: Essays in Honor of Adam B. Ulam*, edited by Sanford R. Lieberman, David E. Powell, Carol R. Saivetz, and Sarah M. Terry, 11-26. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994.
———. *Totalitarianism: The Inner History of the Cold War.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

González, R.J. *American Counterinsurgency: Human Science and the Human Terrain.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.
———. "'Human Terrain': Past, Present, and Future Applications." In *Ethnographic Fieldwork: An Anthropological Reader*, edited by C.G.M. Robben and Jeffrey A. Sluka, 593-604. Oxford: John Wiley and Sons, 2012.

Graham, S.E. "The (Real)Politics of Culture: U.S. Cultural Diplomacy in UNESCO, 1946-1954." *Diplomatic History* 30, no. 2 (April 2006): 231-251.

Greenberg, Udi. "Cold War Weimar: German Émigrés and the Intellectual Origins of the Cold War." Ph.D Dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2010.

Guglielmo, Jennifer. *Living the Revolution: Italian Women's Resistance and Radicalism in New York City, 1880-1945*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Guilhot, Nicholas. "The Realist Gambit: Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory." *International Political Sociology* 2, no. 4 (December 2008): 281-304.
———. ed. *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

———. "Cyborg Pantocrator: International Relations Theory from Decisionism to Rational Choice." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 47, no. 3 (Summer 2011): 279-301.

Gullace, Nicoletta F. "Sexual Violence and Family Honor: British Propaganda and International Law during the First World War." *American Historical Review* 102, no. 3 (June 1997): 714-747.

Gyory, Andrew. *Closing the Gate: Race, Politics, and the Chinese Exclusion Act*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Hartley, Thomas and Bruce Russett. "Public Opinion and the Common Defense: Who Governs Military Spending in the United States?" *American Political Science Review* 86, no. 4 (December 1992): 905-915.

Haas, Peter. "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46, no. 1 (Winter 1992): 1-35.

Hackemer, Kurt. *The U.S. Navy and the Origins of the Military-Industrial Complex, 1847-1883*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press, 2001.

Hacohen, Malachi. *Jacob and Esau between Nation and Empire: A Jewish European History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming 2013.

Hagen, Joshua. "Parades, Public Space, and Propaganda: The Nazi Culture Parades in Munich." *Geografiska Annaler* 90, no. 4 (2008): 349-367.

Haiger, Ernst. "Politikwissenschaft und Auslandswissenschaft im 'Dritten Reich': Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, 1933-1939 und Auslandswissenschaftliche Fakultät der Berliner Universität, 1940-1945." In *Kontinuitäten und Brüche in der deutscher Politikwissenschaft*, edited by Gerhard Göhler and Bodo Zeuner, 94-136. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1991.

Hall, R.C. *The Origins of U.S. Space Policy: Eisenhower, Open Skies, and Freedom of Space*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 1992.

Halliday, Fred. *The Making of the Second Cold War*. London: Verso Press, 1983.

Halliday, John D. Censorship in Berlin and Vienna during the First World War: A Comparative View." *The Modern Language Review* 83, no. 3 (July 1988): 612-626.

Haney, David Paul. *The Americanization of Social Science: Intellectuals and Public Responsibility in the Postwar United States*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008.

Harsch, Donna. *German Social Democracy and the Rise of Hitler*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993.

Harvey, Lee. *Myths of the Chicago School of Sociology*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1987.

Haste, Cate. "The Machinery of Propaganda." In *Propaganda*, edited by Robert Jackall, 105-136. New York: New York University Press, 1995.

Hauptmann, Emily. "From Opposition to Accommodation: How Rockefeller Foundation Grants Redefined Relations between Political Theory and Social Science in the 1950s." *American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (2006): 643-649.

Heclo, Hugh. "Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment." In *The New American Political System*, edited by Anthony King, 87-124. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1978.

Heidenreich, Frank. *Arbeiterbildung und Kulturpolitik: Kontroversen in der sozialdemokratischen Zeitschrift 'Kulturwille,' 1924-1933*. Berlin: Argument, 1983.

Heilbron, Johan, Nicolas Guilhot, and Laurent Jeanpierre. "Toward a Transnational History of the Social Sciences." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 44, no. 2 (Spring 2008): 146-160.

Herf, Jeffrey. *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda during World War II and the Holocaust.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Herken, Gregg. *Counsels of War.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985.

Heyck, Herbert. *Herbert A. Simon: The Bounds of Reason in Modern America.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.

Hixson, Walter L. Hixson, *George Kennan: Cold War Iconoclast.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
———. *Parting the Curtain: Propaganda, Culture, and the Cold War, 1945-1961.* New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1997.
———. *The Myth of American Diplomacy: National Identity and U.S. Foreign Policy.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Hogan, Michael J. "Eisenhower and Open Skies: A Case Study in 'Psychological Warfare." In *Eisenhower's War of Words: Rhetoric and Leadership*, edited by Martin J. Medhurst, 137-156. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1994.
———. *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945-1954.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Holloway, David. *Stalin and the Bomb: The Soviet Union and Atomic Energy, 1939-1954*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Hollinger, David A. "Communalist and Dispersionist Approaches to American Jewish History in an Increasingly Post-Jewish Era." *American Jewish History* 95, no. 1 (March 2009): 1-32.

Holsti, Ole R. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus." *International Studies Quarterly* 36, no. 4 (December 1992): 439-466.

Hounshell, David A. "The Cold War, RAND, and the Generation of Knowledge." *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences* 27, no. 2 (1997): 237-268.

Hübinger, Gangold. "Wertideen und politische Transformation: Rudolf Hilferding und Gustav Radbruch in der Sozialdemokratischen Partei." In *Kritik und Mandat: Intellektuelle in der Deutschen Politik*, edited by Thomas Hertfelder and Gangolf Hübinger, 181-189. Munich: Verlags-Anstalt, 2000.

Huschke, Wolfgang. *The Candy Bombers: The Berlin Airlift 1948/49, The Technical Conditions and Their Successful Transformation.* Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag.

Isaac, Joel. "The Human Sciences in Cold War America." *The Historical Journal* 50, no. 3 (September 2007): 725-746.

Isaacson, Walter. *Kissinger: A Biography.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005.

Jackall, Robert. "Book Review: *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research* by Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott." *Contemporary Sociology* 16, no. 3 (May 1987): 276-278.
———. With Janice M. Hirota. "America's First Propaganda Ministry: The Committee on Public Information during the Great War." In *Propaganda*, edited by Robert Jackall, 137-173. New York: New York University Press, 1995.

Jacobs, Lawrence R. and Benjamin I. Page. "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 1 (February 2005): 107-123.

Jacobson, David. *Rights Across Borders: Immigration and the Decline of Citizenship*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.

James, Simon. "Influencing Government Policy Making." In *Banking on Knowledge: The Genesis of the Global Development Network*, edited by Diane Stone, 162-179. London: Routledge, 2000.

Jarausch, Konrad and G. Arminger. "The German Teaching Profession and Nazi Party Membership: A Demographic Logit Model." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 20, no. 2 (Autumn 1989): 197-225.

Jardini, David R. "Out of the Blue Yonder: The RAND Corporation's Diversification into Social Welfare Research, 1946-1968." Ph.D Dissertation, Carnegie-Mellon University, 1996.

Jay, Martin. *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute for Social Research, 1923-1950*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973.
———. *Marxism and Totality: The Adventures of a Concept from Lukács to Habermas*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Jones, Larry Eugene. "'The Greatest Stupidity of My Life': Alfred Hugenberg and the Formation of the Hitler Cabinet, January 1933." *Journal of Contemporary History* 27, no.1 (January 1992): 63-87.
———. "Hindenburg and the Conservative Dilemma in the 1932 Presidential Elections." *German Studies Review* 20, no. 2 (May 1997): 235-259.
———. "Nationalists, Nazis, and the Assault Against Weimar: Revisiting the Harzburg Rally of October 1931." *German Studies Review* 29, no 3 (October 2006): 483-494.

Jones, William D. *The Lost Debate: German Socialist Intellectuals and Totalitarianism*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999.

Judis, John B. *The Paradox of American Democracy: Elites, Special Interests, and the Betrayal of Public Trust*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Kalberg, Stephen. "Salomon's Interpretation of Max Weber." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 6, no. 4 (Summer 1993): 585-594.

Kaplan, Fred. *The Wizards of Armageddon*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Kater, Michael. *Hitler Youth*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Katz, Barry M. *Foreign Intelligence: Research and Analysis in the Office of Strategic Services, 1942-1945*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Kettler, David, and Volker Meja. *Karl Mannheim and the Crisis of Liberalism: The Secret of These New Times*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995.
———. "Political Education for a Polity of Dissensus: Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber." *European Journal of Political Theory* 1, no. 1 (July 2002): 31-51.
———. With Colin Loader, *Karl Mannheim's Sociology as Political Education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2002.

———. With Colin Loader and Volker Meja. *Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber: Retrieving a Research Program*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Press, 2008.

Keuren, David K. van. "Cold War Science in Black and White: US Intelligence Gathering and Its Scientific Cover at the Naval Research Laboratory, 1948-62." *Social Studies of Science* 31, no. 1 (April 2001): 207-229

Klimke, Martin. *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Knecht, T. and M.S. Weatherford. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: The Stages of Presidential Decision-Making." *International Studies Quarterly* 50, no. 3 (September 2006): 705-727.

Koebner, Thomas, Gert Sautermeiser, and Sigrid Schneider. *Deutschland nach Hitler: Zukunftspläne im Exil und aus der Besatzungszeit*. Opladen: Verlag für Sozialwisssenschaften, 1987.

Kohn, Richard H. and Joseph P. Harahan, eds. *Strategic Air Warfare: An Interview with Generals Curtis E. LeMay, Leon W. Johnson, David A. Burchinal, and Jack J. Catton.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Air Force History, United States Air Force, 1988.

Koistinen, Paul A.C. *The Military-Industrial Complex: A Historical Perspective*. New York: Praeger, 1980.

Korenblat, Steven D. "A School for the Republic? Cosmopolitans and Their Enemies at the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, 1920-1933." *Central European History* 39, no. 3 (September 2006): 394-430.

Krabbendam, Hans and Giles Scott-Smith, eds. *The Cultural Cold War in Western Europe, 1945-60.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Kraske, Gary E. *Missionaries of the Book: The American Library Profession and the Origins of United States Cultural Diplomacy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985.

Krige, John. "The Ford Foundation, European Physics, and the Cold War." *Historical Studies in the Physical and Biological Sciences* 29, no. 2 (1999): 333-361

Krohn, Claus-Dieter. *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*. Translated by Robert Kimber and Rita Kimber. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993.

———. "Differenz oder Distanz? Hybriditätsdiskurse deutscher refugee scholars im New York der 1930er Jahre." In *Exil, Entwurzelung, Identität*, edited by Claus-Dieter Krohn, Erwin Rothermund, and Lutz Winckler, 20-39. Munich: Edition Text + Kritik, 2009.

Krugler, David F. *The Voice of America and the Domestic Propaganda Battles, 1945-1953.* Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2000.

Kuklick, Bruce. *Blind Oracles: Intellectuals and War from Kennan to Kissinger.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Kutchesfahani, Sara Zahra. "Politics and the Bomb: Exploring the Role of Epistemic Communities in Nuclear Non-Proliferation Outcomes." Ph.D Dissertation, University College London, 2010.

Kuznick, Peter J. *Beyond the Laboratory: Scientists as Political Activists in 1930s America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Lagemann, Ellen Condiffe. *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999.

Lamberti, Marjorie. "The Reception of Refugee Scholars from Nazi Germany: Philanthropy and Social Change in Higher Education." *Jewish Social Studies* 12, no. 3 (Spring-Summer 2006): 157-192.

Lang, Kurt. "The Critical Functions of Empirical Communications Research: Observations on German-American Influences." *Media, Culture, and Society* 1, no. 1 (January 1979): 83-96.

Langewiesche, Dieter. "Review: The Impact of the German Labor Movement on Workers' Culture." *Journal of Modern History* 59, no. 3 (September 1987): 506-523.

Large, David Clay. *Germans to the Front: West German Rearmament in the Adenauer Era.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Layne, Christopher. *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Ledbetter, James. *Unwarranted Influence: Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Military-Industrial Complex.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Lee, Erika. "The Chinese Exclusion Example: Race, Immigration, and American Gatekeeping, 1882-1924." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 21, no. 3 (Spring 2002): 36-62.

Leffler, Melvyn. "The American Conception of National Security and the Beginnings of the Cold War, 1945-1948." *American Historical Review* 89, no. 2 (April 1984): 346-381.

———. *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.

———. "The Cold War: What Do 'We Now Know?'" *American Historical Review* 104, no. 2 (April 1999): 501-524.

Lehner, Detlef. "'Schule der Demokratie' oder 'politische Fachhochschule'? Anspruch und Wirklichkeit einer praxisorientierten Ausbildung der Deutschen Hochschule für Politik, 1929-1933." In *Kontinuitäten und Brüche in der deutscher Politikwissenschaft*, edited by Gerhard Göhler and Bodo Zeuner, 65-93. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1991.

Lengermann, Patricia. "The Founding of the *American Sociological Review*: The Anatomy of a Rebellion." *American Sociological Review* 44, no. 2 (April 1979): 185-198.

Leonard, Robert J. "War as a 'Simple Economic Problem': The Rise of an Economics of Defense." In *Economics and National Security: A History of Their Interaction*, edited by Crauford D. Goodwin, 261-283. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.

———. *Von Neumann, Morgenstern, and the Creation of Game Theory: From Chess to Social Science, 1900-1960.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Leslie, Stuart W. *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Loewenberg, Gerhard. "The Influence of European Émigré Scholars on Comparative Politics, 1925-1965." *American Political Science Review* 100, no. 4 (November 2006): 597-604.

Logevall, Fredrik. "A Critique of Containment." *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 4 (September 2004): 473-499.

Lösche, Peter and Franz Walter. *Die SPD: Klassenpartei-Volkspartei-Quotenpartei: Zur Entwicklung der Sozialdemokratie von Weimar bis zur deutschen Vereinigung.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992.

Lowen, Rebecca S. *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Lucas, Scott. "The Campaigns of Truth: The Psychological Strategy Board and American Ideology, 1951-1953." *International History Review* 18, no. 2 (May 1996): 279-302.

Luckmann, Benita. "Exil oder Emigration: Aspekte der Amerikanisierung an der 'New School for Social Research' in New York." In *Leben im Exil: Probleme der Integration deutscher Flüchtlinge im Ausland, 1933-1945*, edited by Wolfgang Frühwald and Wolfgang Schieder, 227-234. Hamburg: Hoffman und Campe, 1981.

———. "Eine deutsche Universität im Exil: Die 'Graduate Faculty' der New School for Social Research." in *Soziologie in Deutschland und Österreich, 1918-1945: Materialien zur Entwicklung, Emigration, und Wirkungsgeschichte,* edited by M. Rainer Lepsius, 427-441. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1981.

Luskin, Robert C., James S. Fishkin, and Shantyo Iyengar. "Considered Opinions on U.S. Foreign Policy: Evidence from Online and Face-to-Face Deliberative Polling." Center for Deliberative Democracy, Research Papers, Stanford University <http://cdd.stanford.edu/research/papers/2006/foreign-policy.pdf?> [accessed July 26, 2012].

Lyman, Stanford M. "A Haven for Homeless Intellects: The New School and Its Exile Faculties." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 7, no. 3 (Spring 1994): 493-512.

MacIsaac, David. *Strategic Bombing in World War Two: The Story of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1976.

Maddux, Thomas R. "Red Fascism, Brown Bolshevism: The American Image of Totalitarianism in the 1930s." *The Historian* 40 (November 1977): 85-103.

Mahnken, Thomas G. *Technology and the American Way of War since 1945.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2010.

Marquis, Alice. "Words as Weapons: Propaganda in Britain and Germany during the First World War." *Journal of Contemporary History* 13, no. 3 (July 1978): 467-498.

Markowitz, Norman. "A View from the Left: From the Popular Front to Cold War Liberalism." In *The Specter: Original Essays on the Origins of McCarthyism*, edited by Robert Griffith and Athan Theoharis, 90-115. New York: New Divisions, 1974.

Martin, Nicholas. "'Fighting a Philosophy': The Figure of Nietzsche in British Propaganda of the First World War." *Modern Language Review* 98, no. 2 (April 2003): 367-380.

Mastny, Vojtech. *The Cold War and Soviet Insecurity: The Stalin Years.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Matthiesen, Ulf. "'Im Schatten einer endlosen großen Zeit': Etappen der intellektuellen Biographie Albert Salomons." In *Exil, Wissenschaft, Identität: Die Emigration deutscher Wissenschaftler, 1933-1945*, edited by Ilja Srubar, 299-350. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1988.

McFarland, Stephen L. "The Air Force in the Cold War, 1945-60: Birth of a New Defense Paradigm." *Airpower Journal* 10, no. 3 (Fall 1996): 1-15.

McHugh, Francis. *The Fundamentals of War Gaming.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2012.

Medvetz, Thomas. "Think Tanks and the Production of Policy-Knowledge in America." Ph.D Dissertation. University of California at Berkeley, 2007.
———. *Think Tanks in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Mercado, Stephan C. "FBIS Against the Axis, 1941-1945." 2001. <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol45no5/html/v45i5a04p.htm>.

Messinger, Gary S. *British Propaganda and the State in the First World War*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993.

McAuliffe, Mary Sperling. *Crisis on the Left: Cold War Politics and American Liberals, 1947-1954.* Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1978.

McClay, William M. "Historical Research on the Refugee Intellectuals: Problems and Prospects." *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 7, no. 3 (Spring 1994): 513-524.

McClelland, Charles E. *State, Society, and University in Germany, 1700-1914*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

McGann, James M. "Think Tanks and the Transnationalization of U.S. Foreign Policy." *U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda* 7, no. 3 (November 2002): 13-18.
———. *Think Tanks and Policy Advice in the US.* Philadelphia: Foreign Policy Research Institute, August 2005.
———. "The Global 'Go-To' Think Tanks: The Leading Public Policy Research Organizations in the World." Think Tanks and Civil Societies Program, International Relations Program, University of Pennsylvania, 2008.

McGerr, Michael. "The Price of the 'New Transnational History.'" *American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (October 1991): 1056-1067.

McKernan, Luke. "Propaganda, Patriotism, and Profit: Charles Urban and British Official War Films in America during the First World War." *Film History* 13, nos. 3-4 (2002): 369-389.

Miller, Susanne and Heinrich Pothoff. *A History of German Social Democracy from 1848 to the Present.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.

Milne, David. *America's Rasputin: Walt Rostow and the Vietnam War.* New York: Hill and Wang, 2008.

Mirowski, Philip. *Machine Dreams: Economics Becomes a Cyborg Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
———. "How Positivism Made a Pact with the Postwar Social Sciences in the United States." In *The Politics of Method in the Human Sciences: Positivism and Its Epistemological Others*, edited by George Steinmetz, 142-172. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.

Miscamble, Wilson D. *George F. Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy, 1947-1950.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Mommsen, Hans. *The Rise and Fall of Weimar Democracy.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.

Moore, Michaela Hönicke. *Know Your Enemy: The American Debate on Nazism, 1933-1945.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Mosse, George L. *German Jews beyond Judaism.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Müller, Tim B. *Krieger und Gelehrte: Herbert Marcuse und die Denksysteme im Kalten Krieg.* Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2010.

Naimark, Norman. "The Soviets and the Christian Democrats: The Challenge of a 'Bourgeois' Party in Eastern Germany, 1945-1949." *East European Politics and Society* 9, no. 3 (Fall 1995): 369-392.

Needell, Allan A. "'Truth is Our Weapon': Project TROY, Political Warfare, and Government-Academic Relations in the National Security State." *Diplomatic History* 17, no. 3 (July 1993): 399-420.
———. "Project TROY and the Cold War Annexation of the Social Sciences." In *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences during the Cold War*, edited by Christopher Simpson, 3-38. New York: The New Press, 1998.
———. *Science, Cold War, and the American State: Lloyd V. Berkner and the Balance of Professional Ideals.* Amsterdam: Harwood, 2000.

Ngai, Mae M. "The Architecture of Race in American Immigration Law: A Reexamination of the Immigration Act of 1924." *Journal of American History* 86, no. 1 (June 1999): 67-92.

———. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Nicholls, A.J. *Weimar and the Rise of Hitler*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.

Nye, Robert. *The Anti-Democratic Sources of Elite Theory: Pareto, Mosca, Michels*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1977.

Oldenziel, Ruth and Karin Zachman, eds. *Cold War Kitchen: Americanization, Technology, and European Users*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

Opler, Daniel J. *For All White-Collar Workers: The Possibilities of Radicalism in New York City's Department Store Unions, 1934-1953*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2007.

Oren, Ido. *Our Enemies and US: America's Rivalries and the Making of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Osgood, Kenneth. *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2006.

Ostermann, Christian F. "The United States, the East German Uprising of 1953, and the Limits of Rollback." Working Paper no. 11. Cold War International History Project, December 1994.
———. "'Keeping the Pot Simmering': The United States and the East German Uprising of 1953." *German Studies Review* 19, no. 1 (February 1996): 61-89.
———. "'Little Room for Maneuver': Relations between the United States and the GDR." In *The United States and Germany in the Era of the Cold War, 1945-1968*, edited by Detlef Junker, 172-180. Washington, D.C.: German Historical Institute Press, 2004.

Palmier, Jean-Michele. *Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration to Europe and America*. New York: Verso Press, 2006.

Paret, Peter. "Book Review: David A Bell's *The First Total War: Napoleon's Europe and the Birth of Warfare as We Know It*." *American Historical Review* 112, no. 5 (December 2007): 1489-1491.

Parmar, Inderjeet. "American Foundations and the Development of International Knowledge Networks." *Global Networks* 2, no. 1 (January 2002): 13-30.
———. *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations and the Rise of American Power*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Parry-Giles, Shawn J. *The Rhetorical Presidency: Propaganda and the Cold War, 1945-1955.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.

Pells, Richard H. *The Liberal Mind in a Conservative Age: American Intellectuals in the 1940s and 1950s.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1985.
———. *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture since World War II*. New York: Basic Books/HarperCollins, 1997.

Peters, Hans. *Game Theory: A Multi-Leveled Approach.* Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2008.

Petersen, Jens. "Die Entstehung des Totalitarismusbegriffs in Italien." In *Totalitarismus: Ein Studien-Reader zur Herrschaftsanalyse moderner Diktaturen*, edited by Manfred Funke, 105-128. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1978.

Peukert, Detlev J.K. *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity*. New York: The Penguin Press, 1991.

Plessner, Monika. "Die deutsche 'University in Exile' in New York und ihr amerikanischer Gründer." *Frankfurt Hefte* 19 (March 1964): 181-186.

Poiger, Uta G. *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Posnock, Ross. *Color and Culture: Black Writers and the Making of the Modern Intellectual*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

Powlick, Philip J. and Andrew Z. Katz. "Defining the American Public Opinion/Foreign Policy Nexus." *Mershon International Studies Review* 42, no. 1 (May 1998): 29-61.

Prados, John. "Open Skies and Closed Minds: American Disarmament Policy at the Geneva Summit." In *Cold War Respite: The Geneva Summit of 1955* edited by Günter Bischof and Saki Dockrill, 215-233. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2000.

Prevots, Naima. *Dance for Export: Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War.* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1999.

Pyta, Wolfram. *Hindenburg: Zwischen Hohenzollern und Hitler.* Munich: Siedler Verlag, 2007.

Rawnsley, Gary D. ed. *Cold War Propaganda in the 1950s.* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1999.

Reeves, Nicolas. *Official British Film Propaganda during the First World War.* London: Routledge, 1986.

Reichardt, Sve. *Faschistische Kampfbünde: Gewalt und Gemeinschaft im italienischen Squadrismus und in der deutschen SA.* Cologne: Böhlau, 2002.

Ringer, Fritz. "Higher Education in Germany in the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of Contemporary History* 2, no. 3 (July 1967): 123-138.
———. *The Decline of the German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
———. "The Intellectual Field, Intellectual History, and the Sociology of Knowledge." *Theory and Society* 19, no. 3 (June 1990): 269-294.
———. *Max Weber: An Intellectual Biography.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Robertson, Stephan. "Seduction, Sexual Violence, and Marriage in New York City, 1866-1955." *Law and History Review* 24, no. 2 (Summer 2006): 331-373.

Robin, Ron Theodore. *The Making of the Cold War Enemy: Culture and Politics in the Military-Intellectual Complex.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Rodgers, Daniel. *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Rohde, Joy Elizabeth. "From Expert Democracy to Beltway Banditry: How the Antiwar Movement Expanded the Military-Academic-Industrial Complex." In *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, edited by Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens, 137-154. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012.

Roland, Alex. *The Military-Industrial Complex.* Washington, D.C.: American Historical Association, 2002.

Roop, Joseph E. "Foreign Broadcast Information Service." April 1969. < https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/csi-publications/books-and-monographs/foreign-broadcast-information-service/index.html >.

Rosenhaft, Eve. *Beating the Fascists? The German Communists and Political Violence, 1929-1933.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Russell, Richard L. *George F. Kennan's Strategic Through: The Making of an American Political Realist.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 1999.

Rutkoff, Peter M. and William B. Scott. *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research.* New York: The Free Press, 1986.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
———. "Reflections on Exile." In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, 173-186.
　　　Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Sánchez-Korrol, Virginia E. *From Colonia to Community: The History of Puerto Ricans
　　　in New York City*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Sargant, Howland H. "Information and Cultural Representation Overseas." In *The
　　　Representation of the United States Abroad*, edited by Vincent M. Barnett, Jr., 96-
　　　102. New York: The American Assembly, 1956.

Schumann, Dirk. *Political Violence in the Weimar Republic, 1918-1933: Fight for the
　　　Streets and Fears of Civil War.* New York: Berghahn Books, 2009.

Shah, Hemant. *The Production of Modernization: Daniel Lerner, Mass Media, and the
　　　Passing of Traditional Society.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2011.

Shaw, Tony. "The Politics of Cold War Culture." *Journal of Cold War Studies* 3, no. 3
　　　(Fall 2001): 59-76.

Sherry, Michael S. *In the Shadow of War: The United States since the 1930s*. New
　　　Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Shklar, Judith. *Redeeming American Political Thought.* Chicago: University of Chicago
　　　Press, 1998.

Simpson, Christopher. *Blowback: America's Recruitment of Nazis and Its Effects on the
　　　Cold War*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1988.
———. *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare,
　　　1945-1960*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
———. ed. *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences in the
　　　Cold War.* New York: New Press, 1998.

Skotheim, Robert A. *Totalitarianism and American Social Thought.* New York: Holt,
　　　Rheinhart, and Winston, Inc., 1971.

Slezkine, Yuri. *The Jewish Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Smaldone, William. *Confronting Hitler: German Social Democrats in Defense of the
　　　Weimar Republic, 1929-1933*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2009.

Smith, Bruce L.R. *The RAND Corporation: Case Study of a Nonprofit Advisory
　　　Corporation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Smith, Daniel M. "Authoritarianism and American Policy Makers in Two World Wars."
　　　Pacific Historical Review 43, no. 3 (August 1974): 303-323.

Smith, James A. *The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite.* New York: Macmillan/Free Press, 1991.

Smith, Melden E. Jr. "The Strategic Bombing Debate: The Second World War and Vietnam." *Journal of Contemporary History* 12, no. 1 (January 1977): 175-191.

Sobel, Richard. *The Impact of Public Opinion on U.S. Foreign Policy since Vietnam: Constraining the Colossus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Söllner, Alfons. "Sigmund Neumann's *Permanent Revolution:* A Forgotten Classic of Comparative Research into Modern Dictatorships." In *The Totalitarian Paradigm after the End of Communism*, edited by Achim Siegel, 181-204. Atlanta: Rodopi Press, 1998.

Solovey, Mark. "Riding Natural Scientists' Coattails onto the Endless Frontier: The SSRC and the Quest for Scientific Legitimacy." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 40, no. 4 (Fall 2004): 393-422.
———. With Hamilton Cravens, eds. *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
———. "Cold War Social Science: Specter, Reality, or Useful Concept?" In *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature*, edited by Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens, 1-22. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
———. *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America.* New Brunswick, NY: Rutgers University Press, 2013.

Sproule, J. Michael. *Propaganda and Democracy: The American Experience of Media and Mass Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Stachua, P.D. "The Ideology of the Hitler Youth in the *Kampfzeit*." *Journal of Contemporary History* 8, no. 3 (July 1973): 155-167.

Steinmetz, George. "The Historical Sociology of Historical Sociology: Germany and the United States in the Twentieth Century." *Sociologica* 3 (2007): 1-28.

Steinweis, Alan E. "The Trials of Herschel Grynszpan: Anti-Jewish Policy and German Propaganda, 1938-1942." *German Studies Review* 31, no. 3 (October 2008): 471-488.

Stephan, Alexander, ed. *The Americanization of Europe: Culture, Diplomacy, and Anti-Americanism after 1945*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2006.

Stephanson, Anders. "The United States." In *The Origins of the Cold War in Europe: International Perspectives*, edited by David Reynolds, 23-52. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

Stewart, Matthew. *The Management Myth: Why the Experts Keep Getting it Wrong.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2009.

Stone, Diane. "Non-Governmental Policy Transfer: The Strategies of Independent Policy Institutes." *Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration* 13, no. 1 (January 2000): 45-62.

Strote, Noah. "Emigration and the Foundation of West Germany, 1933-1963." Ph.D Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2011.

Stuart, Douglas T. *Creating the National Security State: A History of the Law that Transformed America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Suri, Jeremi. "Henry Kissinger, the American Dream, and the Jewish Immigrant Experience in the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* 32, no. 5 (November 2008): 719-747.
———. *Henry Kissinger and the American Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Swett, Pamela E. *Neighbors and Enemies: The Culture of Radicalism in Berlin, 1929-1933*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Tal, David. "Eisenhower's Disarmament Dilemma: From Change for Peace to Open Skies Proposal." *Diplomacy and Statecraft* 12, no. 2 (January 2001): 175-196.

Taylor, Philip M. "The Foreign Office and British Propaganda during the First World War." *The Historical Journal* 23, no. 4 (December 1980): 875-898.
———. With Michael Sanders. *British Propaganda during the First World War, 1914-1918*. London: Macmillan, 1982.
———. *Munitions of the Mind: A History of Propaganda from the Ancient World to the Present Era*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

Tent, James F. *Mission on the Rhine: 'Reeducation and Denazification in American-Occupied Germany*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Tilly, Charles. *Stories, Identities, and Political Change.* Lanham, MC: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.

Tomasi, Luigi. ed. *The Tradition of the Chicago School of Sociology*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1998.

Trachtenberg, Marc. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Turner, Stephan and Jonathan H. Turner. *The Impossible Science: An Institutional Analysis of American Sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990.

Tyrell, Ian. "American Exceptionalism in an Age of International History." *American Historical Review* 96, no. 4 (October 1991): 1031-1055.
———. *Transnational Nation: United States History in Global Perspective since 1789.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Vaïsse, Justin and Arthur Goldhammer. *Neoconservatism: The Biography of a Movement.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Vidich, Arthur J. "Book Review: Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research.*" *Contemporary Sociology* 16, no. 3 (May 1987): 275.

Vom Bruch, Rüdiger. *Gelehrtenpolitik, Sozialwissenschaften und akademische Diskurse in Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert.* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2006.

Von Hilgers, Philipp. *War Games: A History of War on Paper*. Translated by Ross Benjamin. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2013.

Wagnleitner, Reinhold. *Coco-Colonization and the Cold War: The Culture Mission of the United States in Austria after the Cold War.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.

Wald, Alan M. *The New York Intellectuals*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Walker, Stephen G. "The Evolution of Operational Code Analysis." *Political Psychology* 11, no. 2 (June 1990): 403-418.

Waters, Mary. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Welch, David. *Nazi Propaganda: The Power and the Limitations*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1983.
———. *The Third Reich: Politics and Propaganda*. London: Routledge, 2002.
———. "Nazi Propaganda and the Volksgemeinschaft: Constructing a People's Community." *Journal of Contemporary History* 39, no. 2 (April 2004): 213-238.

Wheatland, Thomas. *The Frankfurt School in Exile*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Wiggerhaus, Rolf. *The Frankfurt School: Its History, Theories, and Political Significance.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1995.

Wilford, Hugh. *The New York Intellectuals: From Vanguard to Institution*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Winkler, Allan M. *The Politics of Propaganda: The Office of War Information, 1942-1945.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978.

Winkler, Heinrich August. "Klassenbewegung oder Volkspartei? Zur Programmdisussion in der Weimarer Sozialdemokratie, 1920-1925." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 8, no. 1 (1982): 9-54.
———. "Choosing the Lesser Evil: The German Social Democrats and the Fall of the Weimar Republic." *Journal of Contemporary History* 25, no. 2/3 (May-June 1990): 205-227.
———. *Weimar in Widerstreit: Deutungen der ersten deutschen Republik im geteilten Deutschland.* Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 2002.

Yergin, Daniel. *Shattered Peace: The Origins of the Cold War and the National Security State.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977.

Zeiler, Thomas W. *Dean Rusk: Defending the American Mission Abroad.* Wilmington: SR Books, 2000.

Zeitlin, Jonathan and Gary Herrigel. *Americanization and Its Limits: Reworking US Technology and Management in Post-war Europe and Japan.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Zolberg, Aristide R. *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Zubkova, Elena. *Russia after the War: Hopes, Illusions, and Disappointments*. Translated by Hugh Ragsdale. New York: M.E. Sharpe, 1998.

Zubok, Vladislav and Constantine Pleshakov. *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War: From Stalin to Khrushchev.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Zuckerman, Alan. "The Concept 'Political Elite': Lessons from Pareto and Mosca." *Journal of Politics* 39, no. 2 (May 1977): 324-244.

Biography

Daniel Bessner was born in Brooklyn, New York on October 16, 1984. He received his BA in History *cum laude* from Columbia University in 2006 and an MA in History with distinction from Duke University in 2010. His publications include "'Rather More than One-Third Had No Jewish Blood': American Progressivism and German-Jewish Cosmopolitanism at the New School for Social Research, 1933-1939," which appeared in *Religions*; "Zarte Hände: Terrorismus, Frauen, und Emanzipation im Werk von Karl Heinzen" ("Tender Hands: Terrorism, Women, and Emancipation in the Work of Karl Heinzen"), which appeared in *Terrorismus und Geschlecht: Politische Gewalt in Europa seit dem 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by Christine Hikel and Sylvia Schraut; "Karl Heinzen and the Intellectual Origins of Modern Terror," written with Michael Stauch and which appeared in *Terrorism and Political Violence*; and "Toward a Theory of Civil-Military Punishment," written with Eric Lorber and which appeared in *Armed Forces & Society*. His research and writing have been funded by numerous organizations, including the Marshall Foundation, the Josephine de Kármán Fellowship Trust, the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations, and the German Historical Institute, and several departments, divisions, and centers at Duke University, including the Kenan Institute for Ethics, the Center for European Studies, the Center for Jewish Studies, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, the History Department, and the Religion Department.