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The end of the Cold War and the manner in which it was “won” by the Allied nations ignited debate over the utility of military power as a source of American leadership in the new unipolar world. A popular theme arose, that a new form of state power, soft power, had the capacity to achieve America’s interests as it prepared to enter the 21st century. The idea that expensive and dangerous technologies could be replaced by investments in peaceful means of influence, wielded by America’s foreign policy professionals to foster a new cooperative spirit in the world, was naturally attractive. The United States could be relieved of much of its global military presence and reduce its military’s intrusions upon foreign people and their cultures.

This dissertation challenges the assumption that the impact of military stationing in the Cold War was limited to hard power. In the case of the U.S. Army in Berlin, the unit and its members practiced civic, social, cultural, and political behaviors that meet the criteria of the post-Cold War branded term, soft power. In their daily interactions with Berliners, they exercised the full spectrum of foreign policy smart power tools, as Cold Warrior defenders of West Berlin and in compliance with U.S. Army, Europe’s directive for all soldiers and their family members to act as Good Neighbors to the Germans in the city. The unit’s command designed institutional structures to enhance its ability to project power, and these networks became the basis for intentional actions to improve its Social Capital in the isolated city. In fact, these networks, controlled by the Army in Berlin, changed the dynamics of the occupied-occupier relationship and provided West Berlin’s civic leadership its first formal step toward balancing the relational power calculations with its lawful occupiers. As a policy history case study, it may be useful to
the U.S. military as a fresh perspective on the spectrum of power behaviors evident in its own historical records. The usefulness of this study is subject to the recognition that the experience in West Berlin, while ultimately successful, occurred in a particular period and cultural context. For U.S. policymakers seeking a broader range of choices in a future scenario requiring a hard power capability on the ground while offering a path to a soft power component possibility, Army Berlin’s critical crisis assessments and long-term practices might be instructive. Policymakers who restrict their choices in the early estimation process based upon the limitations assumed in modern power theory may benefit from a broader understanding that does not exclude the force that necessarily absorbs much of the foreign policy budget. Under certain circumstances and in the proper context, the manpower, social, and cultural strength of the United States military, through its leaders, members, and dependents, has advanced the national interest effectively and without resorting to its hard power capabilities.
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INTRODUCTION

On the evening of November 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall fell as a symbol of permanent oppression and national separation for the German people, who erupted in a massive spontaneous demonstration of peaceful protest, reunion, and joy. The symbolic beginning of the end of the Cold War was not a result of a competent orchestration of policy by the East German (GDR) government. Rather, it was a communication mistake within the GDR itself, struggling with the refugee backlash from the summer’s disintegration of controlled borders in two key Warsaw-Pact states, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Disputes in these two important satellites of the Soviet empire unleashed the East German demand for freedom from the ideological and economic weaknesses of the communist system. The images of massing, jubilant crowds at Berlin’s official crossing points, including the American zone’s single point at Friedrichstrasse (Checkpoint Charlie), beamed around the world on satellite television. For the German Democratic Republic (GDR), the inability of the state to respond with force or to isolate “leaders” of the protests encouraged the crowds to sweep through the gates and engage their fellow Berliners across the wall.¹

Standing among the crowds and observing the developments were soldiers of the United States Army’s Berlin Brigade, the operational arm of United States Army, Berlin, whose duty in the city is chronicled in only two English-language historical works.² On that same evening, the

¹ For a recent examination of the series of events, many of which occurred outside of Berlin, that precipitated the opening of the wall’s crossing points, see Mary E. Sarotte, The Collapse: The Accidental Opening of the Berlin Wall, (New York: Basic Books, 2014). Sarotte provides the important story of the resistance and protest movement in East Germany, focusing on the state of Saxony, as well as the East German state’s difficulties in the final years before the wall’s fall in eliminating opposition, even with its massive security state apparatus.
first flocks of *Mauerspechte* (wall peckers), armed with hammers and chisels, began deconstructing the wall itself. As the historical event unfolded and moved into the initial weeks of interpretation and response, Army Berlin continued to perform many of its long term programs in projecting American *Smart Power*. Within the next year, the collapse of the wall was followed by a nationwide referendum, the first political test for both halves of Germany. This affirmed the German people’s desire for unification which followed in January, 1991, and changed the legal basis for the presence of American forces in Berlin. The final step in Berlin’s relationship with its local American military cohort occurred well after the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union, with the withdrawal of Soviet military forces in 1994 from the city. This final development made possible the exit of the military forces of the United Kingdom, France, and the Berlin Brigade, the remaining American force in Berlin.

There were many “fathers” of victory, each claiming their role in the American-led Allied triumph as they extolled the vindicated wisdom of “peace through strength” which, as a catastrophic potential outcome, included the specter of global nuclear Armageddon. In a rush of intellectual euphoria nearly as unrealistic as the deterministic worldview of Marx, the possibility that western ideals of liberal democracy had now officially and permanently triumphed over the opposition gained currency in some circles of the history of international relations. In this environment, as the world watched the collapse of one superpower and the elevation of the other as the assumed lone super-state, historians, political scientists, and those engaged in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States began their task of “explaining” how it had occurred.

---

3 The term *Smart Power* referred to in text is, in the general sense, in the context credited to United States political scientist Joseph S. Nye, Jr. in the evolution of his work on power types. Chapter 2, “The Framework: Theory and Policy,” includes a detailed evaluation of power concepts as they are applied in this work, including the problematic use of Nye’s frameworks in analysis of military foreign policy contributions. See Joseph S. Nye, Jr. *The Future of Power* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2004).

It is the contention of this dissertation that the emphasis on national policy level decision-making in response to the construction of the Berlin Wall, while vital to an understanding of the role of America in the crisis period and beyond, omits an important part of the story. The successful series of foreign policy decisions made by the Kennedy administration in the period 1961 to 1963 are the subject of an exhaustive number of contending and illuminative historical and political analyses. This extensive literature, however, is beyond the scope of this study, which focuses on the local implementation of national-level policy decisions.\textsuperscript{5} President Kennedy’s emergency reinforcement of the existing Berlin Command by a battle group from the 8\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Division appeared to signal the primacy of a military solution, and analyzed on its own, lacked any foundation in a realistic possibility of success.\textsuperscript{6}

While it appeared consistent with his administration’s early Cold War foreign policy decisions which included a massive increase in conventional military spending to support Kennedy’s version of “Flexible Response,” it was, in fact, a finely calibrated act. However, the long term success of American policy in Berlin through subsequent Cold War administrations depended upon a broader population of American foreign policy servants who operated at a much lower level in the institutional domain of the Department of Defense.

It is clear that President Kennedy did achieve the long-term national interests, but the impetus for the policy success was the renewal and reform of the local primary American foreign policy instrument, the U.S. Army command in Berlin. The vigorous policy debates inside the administration, particularly in regard to the role of the U.S. military in Berlin, challenged the

\textsuperscript{5} There are numerous examples of crisis decision-making policy analysis of the Kennedy Administration’s actions in regard to Berlin and its linkage to broader Cold War issues. These will be briefly discussed in chapter 1, “Historians and U.S. Army, Berlin, 1961-1994.”

command to expand its functional understanding of power. The institutionalization of *Soft Power* behaviors which are commonly understood to be excluded from traditional military activity allowed the military force in Berlin to project a significantly more effective spectrum of power in the city, the prerequisite for smart power policy.\(^7\)

The unique structure and mission of Army Berlin as it was organized on that November evening in 1989 was the result of the wall itself, a combined military-diplomatic response by the Kennedy administration in 1961 which realigned the force in Berlin, as well as the way in which it accomplished its mission.\(^8\) In less than four full months, President Kennedy authorized the reorganization of the United States diplomatic and military structure of Army Berlin and Mission Berlin. The military component of American foreign policy in Berlin, Army Berlin, was re-designated a direct major command of United States Army, Europe (USAREUR), under USAREUR General Order Number 395, effective December 6, 1961.\(^9\) Additionally, the position of United States Commander, Berlin, (USCOB), was authorized as Commanding General, United States Army, Berlin, and became the ranking diplomatic representative to Berlin for the United States Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, stationed in Bonn.\(^{10}\)

---


\(^8\) The army command structure in Berlin was commonly known as “Berlin Command” in the pre-wall period; the reorganized unit in December, 1961 operated as “United States Army, Berlin.” For the purpose of consistency and brevity, the command-level element is referred to as “Army Berlin” in this work. Additionally, similar treatment occurs regarding the operational infantry unit; the Berlin Brigade is referred to throughout the work distinctly as “Berlin Brigade.” One additional significant American foreign policy structure in Berlin which is part of this study is the Department of State’s Berlin Mission, which is referred to as “Mission Berlin” for the same purpose of clarity and consistency.

\(^9\) “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” Box 2, 6, Berlin Brigade Collection, United States Army History Institute, Carlisle, PA (hereafter USAMHI). Please note: All subsequent references to The Berlin Brigade Collection held at USAMHI are from this unprocessed and non-public collection, accessed through special handling agreements with supervisory archivists. As the collection is unprocessed and retained in its original, delivered order, document titles, box and folder numbers are subject to change in the event the collection is processed. All reference locations are as they appeared in the period April 8, 2011 to June 23, 2013, researcher period of access.

\(^{10}\) Ibid., 7.
It is the assessment of this examination that in this consolidation of military and diplomatic power in the office of one individual, President Kennedy selected the optimum operational solution available to the nation in pursuit of both its immediate and long term national foreign policy interests in Berlin. This fusion of two distinctly different American foreign policy structures into one central office in Berlin was an innovative method to address common bureaucratic challenges to the effective projection of vastly different versions of power wielded by the Departments of State and Defense. While Mission Berlin retained primary responsibility for its assigned programs, the United States was represented by one ultimate voice in Berlin, an important message to Berliners, the East German government, and the Soviets.

Additionally, the available records reviewed for this study suggests that Army Berlin, as the street-level policy implementers of American foreign policy assigned to extend American power, was a singular military unit in its operational structure and behaviors, deeply engaged in advancing smart power. While it practiced traditional forms of military preparedness, training, and doctrinal activities as originally codified in its 1961 reorganization, the requirements of the environment it was deployed in forced significant alterations from the normal military procedures many of its contemporary soldiers in the broader U.S. Army experienced. Although there were other mission-specific composite units in the U.S. Army force structure in the Cold War, Army Berlin was, for numerous military, political, and cultural factors, unlike any other in its role in American foreign policy.11 In its often paradoxical roles of “Cold Warriors” and “Good Neighbors,” the outlines of which were already assumed as a feature of pre-wall Army

---

11 An example of another U.S. Army composite unit serving in the Cold War in a specific location deemed to be in the vital interest is the 193rd Infantry Brigade in the Panama Canal Zone, activated to duty on August 8, 1962.
Berlin, the unit faced considerable challenges in meeting its success in implementation of national policy.\footnote{12}

This dissertation asserts that, for the remainder of the Cold War period, these two roles resulted in exceptional efforts by the entire American military community in Berlin. While the roles were distinctly different in their emphasis and reliance upon varied tools of foreign policy power projection, they could not be separated entirely from each other. Army Berlin’s complement of soldiers, spouses and even children in Berlin were continually cognizant of this fact. Contrary to assumptions in the theoretical discussions on state power, in the case of Army Berlin, it became an effective instrument in not only maintaining its usefulness as a \textit{Hard Power} resource, but it also successfully exercised soft power in its methodological approach to Berlin.\footnote{13}

This study further maintains that, through a broad series of public relations and community-centered programs which emphasized a sophisticated cultural and political awareness of Berlin’s environment, Army Berlin practiced smart power in its intentional, and in

\footnote{12} The term “Cold Warriors” in this dissertation applies to all assigned officers and enlisted who served in Berlin for the period covered, from 1961 to 1994 (ending with The Berlin Brigade’s color casing ceremony in 1994, beyond the “end” date of the Cold War as interpreted alternatively by scholars). Army Berlin’s original mission statement in 1961 did not specifically list a mission requirement for “Good Neighbor” behavior, the war doctrine priorities were the stated purpose. However, it is the contention in this work that the integration of CINCUSAREUR Bruce Clarke’s doctrinal requirement that all United States soldiers behave as Good Neighbors to their German neighbors influenced command and individual behaviors in Army Berlin in the same way that USAREUR elements across Europe instituted programs to project civic, cultural, and political soft power in their communities. See Bruce C. Clarke, “Soldier: This is Why You’re In Germany,” ca. 1960, \textit{Report of Stewardship: October 1960- April 1962}, \textit{USAREUR}, Bruce Cooper Clarke Papers, USAMHI. Additionally, consistent statements by subsequent commanders in Army Berlin throughout the Cold War Period explicitly refer to this soft power role of Good Neighbors as the second mission to their warrior tasks; these themes are expanded throughout this survey, and particularly in Chapter 6, “Soft Power: America’s Good Neighbors in Berlin.”

\footnote{13} The term \textit{Hard Power} is another of Joseph Nye’s power terminologies, the natural antithesis to his 1990 promotion of soft power. The first significant use of the hard power term appeared in Joseph S. Nye, Jr. \textit{The Paradox of American Power: Why the World’s Superpower Can’t Go It Alone}, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002). For background on the use of the term in this study, see chapter 2, “The Framework: Theory and Policy.”
some instances, spontaneous efforts to project American ideals and behaviors. These acts were selected and implemented in the broader Army Berlin community based not only upon their local perceptions of their Berliner neighbors, but were also, in fact, deeply influenced by their own contemporary views of American ideals, history, and social practice in the public and private spheres.

In its role as Cold Warriors, Army Berlin differed from other U.S. military forces in Europe tasked with mission goals of effective deterrence or ultimate defeat of Soviet forces in a primarily defensive posture with its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies. Army Berlin’s wartime mission was essentially one of managed defeat, a process of tactical delay for a strategic outcome. In Army Berlin’s 1961 historical report, the expectations of the unit aligned with its fellow allies in Berlin from France and the United Kingdom, and included no illusory morale-inducing promise of allied rescue:

The wartime mission for the U.S. Army, Berlin, as agreed upon by the Allied Commanders in Chief in Germany, remained as follows: To defend West Berlin, sustaining the maximum enemy forces as long as possible, and doing such damage to means of communication through, and installations of military significance in, West Berlin as is compatible with such defense.14

For generations of American service members who served in the newly reconstituted Army Berlin, either as permanent members of the unit or the various emergency reinforcing units, their military functionality was influenced by the extreme limitations of their deployed area of operations. Strategically and operationally disconnected from the hope of realistic and timely relief from U.S. and NATO ground forces in Europe, their ability to influence Soviet military behavior was severely limited beyond the role of symbolic hostages. Their first mission priority in defending their territory against an external Soviet threat, surrounded by massive force imbalances, required a creative emphasis upon their part.

14 “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” Box 2, 3, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
Army Berlin became the U.S. Army’s most experienced trained soldiers in the doctrine of fighting in urban areas, a specialty that retained valuable institutional knowledge and helped form modern U.S. military training practices in one of the most complicated battle space scenarios any military force may face. Additional restrictions, imposed as part of the Post-World War II diplomatic agreements in the division of Germany, negatively impacted crucial individual and unit training rotations. These deficiencies were exacerbated by Army Berlin’s voluntary adherence to many of the West Berliner’s expectations of their American defenders and neighbors, as the soldiers prepared for the anticipated external military threat. These expectations were negotiated through formal, associative networks designed to mitigate tensions between Army Berlin and its West Berliner neighbors.

Army Berlin’s most realistic military responsibility emphasized preparations for potential internal civil disturbances in West Berlin, providing the municipal government with a force that reinforced West Berlin Polizei capabilities. In this role, Army Berlin adapted advances in technology throughout the decades that were suited for their very unique need to quell civil disturbances, while at the same time, allowed for interoperability in both anti-tank and anti-personnel conditions. Although in general compatibility with the capabilities of a military force, these two unusual mission requirements did not necessarily constitute the most substantial impacts Army Berlin achieved in the Cold War. For the commanders of the reorganized Army Berlin, a second major mission was consistently given priority in public statements. Although not necessarily embedded in its traditional mission plans, this soft power behavior may have

---

15 The terminology for warfare in cities during the period in study went through several doctrinal alterations. The term used in the pre-Berlin wall period, and for some time in the pre-TRADOC U.S. Army, was “Combat in Cities,” often abbreviated by Army Berlin as “CIC.” After Army-wide standardization of training and doctrinal texts for field manuals during the early TRADOC years, The U.S. Army referred to urban warfare as “Military Operations in Urban Terrain” (MOUT). As of 2015, current Army nomenclature for this challenging battle environment is “Urban Operations,” (UO). Further detail on Army Berlin’s experiences will appear in Chapter 3, “Implementing National Smart Power Policy in Berlin, 1961-1963,” as well as Chapter 4, “America’s Cold Warriors for Berlin.”
been its most important contribution to the long term foreign policy interests of the United States.

In contrast to the unit’s mission as Cold Warriors, the role of Good Neighbors required an exceptional amount of command and community attention, the allocation of significant resources of time and effort, and a commitment to cultural integration that acknowledged the singular importance of Berlin in the Cold War. Army Berlin sought to apply every available means of influence to secure the unit’s success in projecting an American smart power version of a capitalist, liberal democracy. The unit engaged in an alternative form of power projection that was subtle, consistent, and focused on Contesting an ideological “battle space” that has come to be known in the post-Cold War military as the struggle for “hearts and minds.” Every level of Army Berlin’s command structure, down to the individual company level, invested repeatedly in personal relationships with the Berlin community and looked for opportunities to showcase the differences between the two ideological systems which coexisted in Greater Berlin.

These relationships were congruent with the standing orders and necessary in a city that was the window through which East Berliners might glimpse a liberal democracy, in stark contrast to their own society. These behaviors, practiced by a population of Americans who were considerably less elite than the professional diplomats of Mission Berlin, formed the frame of an unwanted mirror to the Soviet system for varied audiences inside both halves of Berlin. Mission Berlin itself, the traditional foreign policy resource in American diplomatic behaviors, contributed greatly to the support of Army Berlin. Its substantial expertise in cultural and political programs and the wise use of its own independent resources which included outreach through programs including Amerika Haus and the United States Information Agency (USIA) integrated well with Army Berlin’s efforts to meet their goals.
Beyond the personal actions of commanders, a much larger force of individuals were tied to the national interest, and given the responsibility to project this national power, a “softer” version of their primary military mission. The entire force, which included its dependent spouses and children, was expected to contribute to the inculcation of American culture and behaviors within the city of Berlin. These cultural interactions required regular educational and doctrinal support, in the hope of transmitting a positive and lasting impression of the Americans in Berlin, and by extension, of America itself. In reality, the U.S. Army had planted a cultural “Peace Corps” in the heart of Soviet ideology disguised as a military unit tasked as an allied guarantor of a free city. While Army Berlin’s area of operations and threat profile differed from other USAREUR military communities, their broader responsibilities toward their German neighbors mirrored similar expectations of Army units in West Germany and Western Europe.

Chapter one, “Historians and U.S. Army, Berlin,” reviews the limited available literature written on Army Berlin and discusses the broader national policy history of the issues of the period surrounding Berlin, connecting linkages from policymakers to implementers. A series of studies of similar United States military units, stationed in overseas communities, and particularly those in the Federal Republic of Germany, are integrated for conceptual framework comparisons. These include historical assessments of traditional military behaviors, as well as the growing body of literature engaged in examining cultural, political, and social contexts.

Chapter two, “The Framework: Theory and Policy,” reviews the methodological and theoretical frameworks that are gathered and constructed to interpret the unit’s actions. The central concepts of power types which a state, and in this case, the United States government, can exercise in its foreign policy behaviors are reviewed. Army Berlin’s policy selection and implementation practices are analyzed primarily in the context of theoretical constructs promoted
by Joseph S. Nye, Jr., an influential Post-Cold War American political scientist. As Nye’s power types have been advanced and altered over the past two decades following the end of the Cold War, his theories have attracted both a loyal following of adherents as well as the attention of critics in the foreign relations community. The realities of international relations over the course of history between modern nation-states are complex and often resistant to absolute formulas, and the case of Army Berlin is no exception to that rule.

A review of Nye’s major works is included, to define the relevant concepts for this study, as well as to acknowledge the theoretical inconsistencies and difficulties in applying his power types. This is particularly problematic in behaviors not normally associated with the military’s role in foreign relations, most specifically in the intentional use of soft power. Regardless of Nye’s institutional boundaries which consistently exclude the possibility of the U.S. military’s ability to project soft power beyond humanitarian responses borne by the capacities which exist as a result of preparations and resources for war, his soft power type does appear in Army Berlin.

Moving beyond Nye, Garry Brewer and Peter deLeon’s descriptions of the policymaker processes of estimation, selection, and, most relevant to Army Berlin, implementation, are critical additions to refine the methodological framework. Where Nye seldom ventures beyond the policymaker realm, Brewer and deLeon connect theory to action, including reactive feedback and adjustments. Additionally, Michael Lipsky’s central concept of policy projection at a “micro-history” level is integrated into the framework. The identification of the varied “micro-implementers” as key actors in Army Berlin rests on Lipsky’s contention that success or failure of policy may be dependent upon “‘micro-implementation’… those that actually carry out

---

the policy, the street-level bureaucrats, the schoolroom teachers, and the cop on the beat.”

Army Berlin’s “micro-implementers,” in their primary roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors engaged in achieving national interests, clearly meet Lipsky’s criteria for “street-level” bureaucrats as the face of American national policy.

Incorporating concepts of varied recent works on non-Berlin U.S. Army units stationed in Germany that have focused primarily on social, political, and cultural issues, an analysis of new information from Army Berlin’s final duty closing records is presented. In the realms of traditionally non-military behaviors which Nye squarely locates in the bailiwick of the Department of State, Robert Putnam’s interpretation of American society through the application of modern “social capital theory” is adapted to support the framework. Army Berlin’s exhaustive efforts to implement associative programs built upon moral, religious, civic, and cultural foundations in order to transplant a truly American social engagement model into their official and unofficial modes of community formation in Berlin are highlighted.

Chapter three, “Enforcing Consensual, Implied, and Invented Rights in Berlin,” examines the origins of the western Allied requirements in Berlin. It describes the processes in which the rights or alternatively labeled guarantees developed, beginning with the early occupation of Berlin and how they were altered through written agreements, practice, and historical precedents. The drift of behaviors over the period leading up to the third crisis in 1961, where subtle accommodations between the Allies had avoided potential conflicts, was interrupted by Soviet acquiescence to East German demands to stop the refugee flow, resulting ultimately in the erection of the wall. This sudden change offered President Kennedy the opportunity to redefine

---

American goals, and these adaptations, while sending important signals to allies and foe alike, met different reactions in Army Berlin on the ground. Local experience in dealing with Soviet administrative and policy disruptions in the city, not limited to the catastrophic isolation of blockades, prevented Army Berlin from embracing all of Kennedy’s intent. The appearance of a new right, Viability, is central to Army Berlin’s estimation, selection, and implementation procedures in Berlin. The unit’s interpretation of the meaning of this new term expanded its practices beyond the limited and clear meaning president Kennedy intoned in his first public use of the word.

Chapter four, “Implementing National Smart Power in Berlin, 1961-1963,” focuses on the crisis period following the appearance of the wall. The local influence of Army Berlin upon national policies through its own policy planning processes, which culminated in a series of implementation behaviors that both affirmed President Kennedy’s policy decisions and challenged his assumptions, is examined. These behaviors, exhibited in Army Berlin’s crisis decision-making strategic and tactical responses, are primarily in alignment with Kennedy’s traditional military prescriptions designed for public effects as “Cold Warriors.” However, it is apparent in the analysis of Army Berlin’s available records from this period that, even as they made every effort to increase their traditional military hard power capabilities, they were cognizant of the importance of soft power influence well before the term appeared in the salons of international relations. The command of Army Berlin, retaining institutional knowledge of the unit’s successes and failures in the first sixteen years as an occupying force in the city, reinvigorated its efforts to promote themselves as Good Neighbors at every opportunity.

Chapter five, “Hard Power: America’s Cold Warriors for Berlin,” focuses on the special challenges and emphasis of Army Berlin as Cold Warriors. In this section, the unit’s unique
operational environment and adaptations, revised substantially in the wake of the wall crisis period of 1961 to 1963, are considered. Army Berlin’s relationship to American and allied command structures in Europe, as well as its specific mission capabilities in the city are reviewed, and the impact of Army-wide transformational efforts throughout the Cold War is examined as they affected the unit.

In addition, the training challenges and small unit stressors that occurred inside the context of the unit’s difficult area of operations, which included temporal and spacial limitations, is evident in the records. Changing social issues in Berlin, mirrored in West Germany across the decades, presented additional political and cultural challenges to military effectiveness. Army Berlin attempted to manage Berliner acceptance of the regular disruptions to civil society which occur due to safety, noise, and maneuver damage that accompanies the exercise of modern war technologies. The policy estimate and implementation processes of Army Berlin’s leaders were increasingly subjected to public scrutiny and individual responses on a wide range of issues championed by public forums and individual complaints. Lipksy’s work on the role of community relations boards and procedures offers a critical perspective to the assessment of Army Berlin’s effort, intent, and effectiveness in maximizing its professional skills training while minimizing community disruption.19

An additional line of inquiry of Army Berlin’s role as Cold Warriors considers changes in the force structure available to the unit, as a result of social unrest in America, the Vietnam War, 

---

19 Lipsky assesses the role of community relations processes (boards, outreach) critically, asserting that they often are only marginally effective at providing the population impact on policy behaviors, and often provide cover for bureaucratic inertia and continued street-level abuses. His work on American public administration in the early 1970’s, in the context of racial and class tensions in communities served by the face of government (police, nurses, etc.) is applicable to Army Berlin’s understanding of civil society, contemporary to this dissertation. See Michael Lipsky, “Street-Level Bureaucracy and the Analysis of Urban Reform,” Urban Affairs Quarterly, (June 1971), 399-400.
and the post-Vietnam volunteer military. The U.S. Army of the late 1960s and 1970s was threatened by factors that included fiscal and manpower deficiencies as well as the psychologically debilitating plagues of crime, drug usage, and low morale. Army Berlin, while insulated to some extent by its unique assignment status, was not entirely immune. Discipline problems, criminal behavior and substance abuse issues in the unit concerned both Army Berlin command and the leadership of West Berlin’s municipal government, and once again, new policies appeared. New forms of associative formal networking practices were required to address and protect Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors image which had been institutionalized, cultivated and projected as an effective American soft power type across Western Europe.

Chapter six, “Soft Power: America’s Good Neighbors in Berlin,” considers the broad roles of the American Berlin military community in projecting soft power as the necessary complement to traditional military behaviors, or Nye’s most easily understood hard power. Procedures and guidance inside the normal military command structure are assessed, where junior officers, non-commissioned officers, and even the enlisted ranks became directly engaged in community service. The efforts were broad, repetitive, and local in emphasis, and included joint association-building with the German public in both officially promoted events and spontaneous acts of service and charity. Additionally, numerous joint programs which were developed in partnership with Berlin’s civic and municipal leadership are assessed. Unintended and unexpected outcomes, both positive and negative, resulted from these efforts, and the records indicate the complexity of each community’s expectations and responses as recorded in the organized feedback mechanisms of the associations.

The command support of military spouses and children in playing their part as Good Neighbors is considered, and their importance as effective and engaged members of national
smart power policy is reviewed in the context of Nye, and particularly through the lens of Putnam’s version of social capital theory. The civic, social and cultural impact of a military force accompanied by the moderating influence of the image of the nuclear American family, transplanted into West Berlin’s urban and modern environment, provided Berliners with the opportunity to engage and observe American cultural behaviors. The Americans, for their part, organized their efforts at social connectivity through officially sanctioned programs, officially authorized associations, and even forms of private association not officially approved. In these cases, well beyond the army’s normal discipline regimes, the behavior of private Americans participating in voluntary association with their Berliner neighbors exhibited soft power in a manner that Nye would recognize in his theory. The problematic application of Nye in this case is the primary role of Department of Defense authority in projecting American smart power policy through what are clearly non-military behaviors.

The final chapter, “Assessing Smart Power: Army Berlin and its Legacy,” focuses on the closing period for Army Berlin, beginning with the unplanned events at the wall of November 9, 1989 and moving through the unit’s redefinition and mission adaptations from that date until the Berlin Brigade’s official retirement in 1994. This period required Army Berlin to adapt its roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors in the changing relationship with the new unified Berlin and its leadership. Beyond the city, the command sought to redefine itself as a deployable command and integrate back into “Big Army,” hoping to withstand the winnowing scythe of Army “Peace Dividend” reductions.

The complex details of drawdown and community loss expressed by both Americans and Berliners is examined based upon the archival holdings of the unit, and the evidence supports the argument of the ultimate historical impact of Army Berlin’s local exercise of smart power.
The section concludes with a final assessment of Army Berlin’s role in the outcome of the Cold War in Berlin. As explored in the preceding chapters, the results of decades of consistent behaviors, made possible by President Kennedy’s initial decision to retain the military option, allowed Army Berlin to take the lead in an effort that, in historical terms, challenges modern power theses excluding military lead responsibility for smart power.

In a letter sent to Army Berlin in January of 1994, Herr Heinz Böhlke, a longtime resident of West Berlin, shared his personal thoughts on the impending removal of the remaining U.S. Army unit, the Berlin Brigade, scheduled for the summer of 1994. Addressing his “Dear American Friends,” Herr Böhlke wrote of his memories as a small boy in 1948, when he experienced the Airlift, hunger, and American soldiers with chocolate bars. He recounted his days as a student at the Free University in Dahlem, where he “was always very gladdened of your presence.” These recollections, a common meme among Herr Böhlke’s generation of Berliners, were repeated in numerous forms of correspondence to Army Berlin as the removal of the troops approached. Like many of the letters, however, a deeper sense of loss, along with a particularly strong sense of cultural and political kinship, was evident:

The United States preserved freedom for us for almost 50 years. My wife and I thank you that we were able to live in our hometown of Berlin with dignity and in freedom. When my wife died three years ago, shortly after the opening of the wall, she told me on her deathbed to never forget that we have very much to be grateful to American soldiers for. In all these many years, I have never doubted the American determination to preserve our freedom.

In the close of his letter to his American Good Neighbors, the grateful Berliner shared a prayer for the nation. “May God protect the United States of America- and that you keep your power, strength, and determination to stand up for freedom.”

---

20 “Letter from Heinz Böhlke, January 21, 1994,” original and translated versions, PAO files, Box 11, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
specific petition, summarized the foreign policy impact of Army Berlin as he experienced the entire span of its service. It is apparent from the letter that Herr Böhlke appreciated both the soft and hard power of the United States. He acknowledged the consistent actions of Army Berlin as both Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors, and referred to his trust in America. This, by definition, might constitute proof of the smart power legacy of Army Berlin’s service, assessed in the light of both hindsight and personal perception.

The realities of both individual and state relations are governed by complex political, social and cultural factors which can be difficult to assess and regulate. Herr Böhlke identifies Army Berlin as the American foreign policy force in Berlin which projected a moral foreign policy that provided security, freedom, and dignity in his city for the length of its service. Army Berlin, reformed in 1961 in response to the East German construction of the wall, provided that smart power policy to Berliners through a patient and purposeful series of programs and initiatives, cognizant of the relational complexities and limits of coercive, or hard power.
CHAPTER 1. HISTORIANS AND U.S. ARMY, BERLIN IN THE COLD WAR

The body of literature focused on U.S. Army, Berlin as organized December 1, 1961 and operationally active during the remainder of the Cold War is both comparatively small and relatively distant from the approach offered in the chapters that follow. There may be several explanations for this lack of historiography, including the fact that, during its tour of duty, the unit was never engaged in a traditional combat operation. It also has never been substantially linked to controversial issues in the Cold War United States military that plagued the armed forces during the Vietnam War and in the post-Vietnam army struggling with morale and discipline issues, illegal drugs and crime.1 Serving behind the “Iron Curtain,” it was a very public unit in the fishbowl of political and military pressure focused upon Berlin, yet it has remained relatively untouched by post-Cold War autopsy and policy treatment. This gap may also be a result of the limited access made available to date for researchers wishing to examine traditional official archival sources on Army Berlin.2

This dissertation asserts that the reformation and mission renewal of Army Berlin as reorganized in December, 1961 was the most efficient policy option available to the Kennedy administration in its initial response to the Berlin Wall. The exercise of smart power as policy was constricted by the reality on the ground in the city, as well as the complex geopolitical context of Cold War alliances. Further, Army Berlin considered Kennedy’s three stated rights of

---

2As noted in the introductory chapter, Army Berlin’s closing records from 1994 (under the title Berlin Brigade Collection, the unit in Berlin at the time of the casing of its colors) are unprocessed in the possession of U.S. Army Military History Institute, Carlisle, PA. Additionally, public records available for the unit held at National Archives and Records in College Park, MD (NARAI) are limited for the period in question; access through command records of Seventh Army and United States Army, Europe, offered additional but limited information in the scope of this survey.
American presence, access, and viability from a different perspective, and their implementation practices resulted in significantly unique operational behaviors, particularly in their exercise of access and interpretation of viability.³ Finally, these crisis-era implementations at the micro-level solidified Army Berlin’s methodologies and practices to achieve their goals in pursuit of national interests, and informed their behaviors in their roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors.

The scope of this examination is limited to assessing the actions of Army Berlin itself, rather than a comprehensive national policy level decision-making process during either the crisis period of 1961 to 1963 under President Kennedy’s administration or in the less contentious but still crucial decisions made by subsequent administrations.⁴ Connections to President Kennedy are limited to the broad proclamations and pertinent communications that are linked to the historical record of Army Berlin, used only as interpretive guidelines to frame the issues facing the unit. This micro-level emphasis does not incorporate significant holdings available in either the John F. Kennedy library nor in Department of State archival records, and is based instead primarily upon records held at the United States Army Military History Institute, as well as at the National Archives and Records Annex II in College Park, Maryland.


⁴ The field of policy studies and historical assessments of the Kennedy administration’s crisis decision-making in the period of 1961 to 1963 is voluminous: As examples of theoretical analyses, Honoré M. Catudal’s Kennedy and the Berlin Wall Crisis: A Case Study in U.S. Decision Making, (Berlin: Berlin Verlag, 1980) approaches the subject from the “rational-actor” mode of decision-making and places Kennedy and his closest advisors at the center of the story; In the broader sense of the link between the Cuban Missile Crisis and Berlin, For discussions on the Cuban Missile Crisis, see Graham Allison and Phillip Zelikow, Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis, 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 1999), as well as Richard Neustadt and Ernest May, Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision-makers, (New York: Free Press, 1986), both of which apply “bureaucratic-actor” models to assess the crisis period.
In Army Berlin’s role on the ground as street-level implementers of American foreign policy, the unit maximized the influence of American power and worked in cooperation with Mission Berlin, which positively altered the outcome in the first two years of the 1961 crisis. For the remainder of the Cold War following the crisis which ended with the 1994 retirement of Army Berlin’s final remaining command structure in Berlin, The Berlin Brigade, the leadership made policy estimates and selected internal command procedures to achieve the unit’s missions. It implemented a much broader range of practices that extended well beyond traditional military behaviors. Army Berlin and its subordinate commands exercised diplomatic, political, and cultural programs that accessed deeply-held American societal beliefs in order to extend their role as Good Neighbors to the West Berlin civilian population. These behaviors clearly meet Joseph S. Nye’s most evolved definitions of soft power.  

This chapter first reviews the two specific English-language works that are focused on Army Berlin. One is an official Cold War historical summary designed to close the conflict with a military-oriented narrative, while the second is offered by an international journalist with experience in Berlin that incorporated a broader perspective which included the Berliner voice. Building upon these two traditional treatments, additional works that offer material relevant to the scope of this analysis, including time period, cultural geography, and operational behaviors, but which lack specific reference to Army Berlin, are reviewed. In this section, the analysis is divided into the two major themes of this study.

In the case of Army Berlin’s Cold Warriors role, the secondary literature on this special unit is nearly non-existent. A background reference to policy and practices in the broader U.S.  

---

5 For the definition of soft power in Joseph S. Nye, Jr.’s most current formulation, see his work The Future of Power, (New York: PublicAffairs, 2011). The context and use of Nye’s different types of power is described in this examination’s Chapter 2, “The Framework: Theory and Policy.”
military stationed in Europe is helpful in providing context. Even though Army Berlin’s missions and area of operations were significantly different than other U.S. forces in Europe, they were bound by the same doctrines and similar operational issues as their counterparts in USAREUR. It was essential that Army Berlin remained technically and tactically proficient, and it integrated updated standardized weapons and training requirements into its unique situational deployment, which required significant operational and diplomatic accommodations. The unit also adapted to manpower and organizational challenges that impacted the broader U.S. Army, while leadership and morale issues presented additional tests of the command’s ability to project American foreign policy in the city.

The two specific English-language works on Army Berlin which attempt to localize the narrative in a traditional form of historiography are limited in their application as foreign policy analysis, yet they are instructive as foundational material. In 1994, The U.S. Department of Defense published American Forces in Berlin: Cold War Outpost, 1945-1994, a title in its “Cold War Project” series. Authors Robert P. Grathwol and Donita M. Moorhus wrote the official U.S. Department of Defense history on U.S. Army forces in Berlin from the end of World War II to the end of the Cold War. The work is organized chronologically and covers the broad history of the American forces in Berlin from the post-World War II occupation through its compliance with the various consensual texts comprising the Quadripartite Agreements (QA) for Berlin.

The emphasis of American Forces in Berlin is a Cold War narrative of the American “victory” in Berlin, complete with personal interviews from American and German members of the community which support the “peace through strength” meme. Grathwohl and Moorhus

---

avoid any significant policy perspective and they did not attempt to compare or contrast competing policy processes or assess the history of Army Berlin in the context of these choices; national policy was made, and the unit carried it out. No indications of “micro-implanter” misgivings or adaptive behaviors are offered, and in the model of military “command-obey” execution, Grathwol and Moorhus portrayed the unit as a dutiful participant in the Cold War.

This Department of Defense work differs from the examination offered here, which argues that the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961 forced an important structural change in Army Berlin that enhanced the role of the military in achieving American interests. Grathwol and Moorhus noted changes to Army Berlin which included command structure, authority designations, and operational upgrades to traditional military technology during the crisis period which were precipitated by the East German decision to seal off East Berlin. However, *American Forces in Berlin* does not evaluate the significance of reforms in Army Berlin’s civic, political, and social behaviors. The scope of this official history differs from the analysis that follows in both its necessarily broad timeline and its analytical goals.

Grathwol and Moorhus provide a treatment covering the entire period of American military occupation in the city, from the post-World War II occupation until the casing of the Berlin Brigade’s colors in July, 1994. Their broad approach also does not attempt to incorporate a framework which might be applied for policy analysis. *American Forces in Berlin’s emphasis on traditional military behaviors and metrics limits the treatment of Army Berlin’s critical role in Berlin’s political, social and cultural spheres, where much of its impact was felt. While acknowledging the significance of the positive interactions of the military with the Berliner population, the official history provides inadequate recognition of the extensive efforts by the command of Army Berlin to control the public message. In fact, although Army Berlin’s local
institutional processes focused on achieving the national long term goal of the defeat of the Soviet communist system through cultural, social, and civic involvements in the ideological battle space of Berlin, these soft power efforts are treated minimally and appear as a series of interesting anecdotal personal interviews without substantial policy connection.

While it is likely that the authors, commissioned under Department of Defense authorization, had access to the same material on the unit that was reviewed for this work, there were few references to the political and social schema developed. The sophisticated manner in which non-traditional military procedures were instituted and revised across the time period as developments occurred in the political, social, and cultural landscape of Berlin is almost entirely omitted. As an example, the singular cultural-exchange event, the annual German-American Volksfest, is reduced to several references to beer drinking, sausage eating, and singing. This omission obscures the policy selection process behind this event, as well as the deeper contexts and the broader year-round and long-term efforts Army Berlin implemented to project American soft power.  

Additionally, the active and supportive role of the family members in the Berlin military community does not benefit from any substantial discussion by the authors. This is not surprising, as a history commissioned by an institution seeking to portray the end of the Cold War as a fait accompli and the result of a more traditional military-diplomatic success is the end result. The work does provide the reader a starting point from the U.S. military’s perspective in order to expand into potentially more interesting and productive analyses of the complexity of institutional behavior, individual responses, and the relationship between populations living in close proximity under unique circumstances. Commissioned as the “official” history of the

United States Army in Berlin, *American Forces in Berlin*, in the final analysis, does not reflect accurately the full measure of street-level implementation behaviors. Lacking a link between policy and practice beyond publicly available information, a great deal of the story of Army Berlin remained unexamined.

The second of the two English-language books focused on the U.S. Army in Berlin was written by Henrik Bering, a foreign correspondent for U.S. press outlets in the period. Published in 1995, *Outpost Berlin: The History of the American Military Forces in Berlin, 1945-1994*, provides a different perspective than the similarly-titled official treatment listed previously.³ Bering also incorporates personal interviews of key commanders as well as lower ranking members of the military, similar to *American Forces in Berlin*. However, unlike Grathwol and Moorhus, Bering did not have access to the command’s existing and classified archival records, and instead *Outpost Berlin* combines secondary sources, public sources (news, radio, television) and selected interviews.

The format of the book is chronological, and in respect to the inclusion of Berliner perspectives, it is an improvement over the official version by Grathwol and Moorhus in providing Berliner interpretations of the Americans in their city. Bering includes a reflective series of interviews of U.S. soldiers, airmen, and civilian employees, as well as German (Berliner) citizens who described their perceptions of the “other” in the circumstances of the long occupation.

As an example, Bering personalizes the standard narrative of the impracticality of the early United States military occupation policy of “non-fraternization” with German nationals

---

which was implemented in the fall of 1944, but rescinded in October of 1945. Bering provides anecdotal evidence that supports the contention that the reversal of the early policy was recognition that the policy was already seriously undermined by normal human relations in the broader military population of “micro-implementers.” In addition to requiring significant command resources focused on disciplinary measures, the non-fraternization policy had interrupted the development of a more typical “occupier-occupied” environment in which individuals select relationships based upon human behaviors beyond the control of the state.

The interaction between American soldiers and both male and female Berliners provided important connections that enhanced Army Berlin’s ability to perform its broader, non-traditional mission as Good Neighbors. Outpost Berlin provides a city-specific set of narratives, yet it does not reflect the background story of the policy estimation, selection, and implementation practices in Army Berlin for the period beyond these interviews and anecdotes.

In contrast to this examination’s scope, Bering’s chapters dealing with Army Berlin in the period of 1961 to 1994 make no clear effort to link either strategic or national interest directly to the events on the ground for Army Berlin’s “micro-implementers.” Bering does provide evidence of the policy benefits of the strength of the American model of a liberal, capitalist democracy in Berlin, which is consistent with the internal records examined for this analysis:

“Once the center of evil, Berlin became a symbol of freedom. The mere existence of West Berlin as a showcase of the Free World was a thorn in the side of the Soviet leadership; the inevitable comparisons between the two halves of the city pointed up the failures of the communist system. For Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev, Berlin was ‘a bone in the throat of communism.’ Alternatively, he threatened that ‘West Berlin will fall into our hands like a rotten apple.’

---

9 For a solid description of the origins and outcomes of the early “non-fraternization” policy, see Petra Goedde, *GIs and Germans: Culture, Gender, and Foreign Relations, 1945-1949*, (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 2003), particularly in Goedde’s second chapter, “Crossing the Border.” What Bering uncovers on this issue is consistent with Goedde’s broader look at the Germany-wide issue of U.S. troop behavior in the social and cultural spheres, where official policy and human nature collide in contact.
Whatever the metaphorical flavor of the day, the fact that half of Berlin was beyond their control, an outpost of the West, was a constant problem for the Soviets."\textsuperscript{10} 

The lack of an investigative use of primary sources leaves the text incomplete for the purposes of this work, which benefits from the new sources made available and incorporates a framework designed to consider the intentional street-level efforts of Army Berlin. The result of the limitations of both \textit{American Forces in Berlin} and \textit{Outpost Berlin} render them each incapable of connecting the important policy processes of estimation, selection, and implementation in assessing Army Berlin’s actions.

As an institution, the Cold War U.S. Army was familiar with the challenge of meeting national strategic needs and reorganizing itself to remain relevant to policymakers. At a great distance from the problems of political intrigue in Washington, Army Berlin stood post 110 miles inside the Soviet zone of East Germany, and the gulf between the ends of American policy decisions and action was similarly wide. Simultaneously, while it was at the center of the Cold War, it was at the end of an increasingly thin line of a military incapable of projecting force without likely resort to nuclear means.

With its reorganization in 1961, Army Berlin found its relevance to national strategy linked to the ability of the Cold War U.S. Army to adapt to recurrent waves of political and doctrinal change. In the face of these serious challenges, the strategic and tactical implications facing the U.S. Army in Europe were seemingly distant from Berlin, even as the city remained the focus of American intentions. In order to assess the ability of Army Berlin beginning in 1961 as Cold Warriors, it is critical to contextualize their relationship to political and military thinking in the period leading up to the authorization of the structure in December of 1961. There are several works that offer relevant and necessary analysis of American strategic and operational

\textsuperscript{10} Bering, \textit{Outpost Berlin}, x.
thought, as well as glimpses into the preparatory processes that must precede any complex military scenarios upon which hard power rests.

In Ingo Trauschweizer’s work *The Cold War U.S. Army: Building Deterrence for Limited War*, it is the U.S. Army that is under siege and must respond to multiple threats to its relevance and capability to project power for the use of policy makers. According to Trauschweizer, “After World War II, the general public regarded ground forces as unfashionable.”¹¹ The replacement of the U.S. Army as the national expression of commitment to general warfare by the new separate branch, the U.S. Air Force, matched the Eisenhower “New Look” and reliance upon “Massive Retaliation.”

In this environment, the Army that Trauschweizer analyzed found itself defending its role against the tide of public opinion and fiscal reality, and perhaps more importantly, the ex-Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe. Eisenhower’s inward emphasis on the American economy and the reliance upon the threat of the asymmetrical use of nuclear weapons against the Soviets in any future European war left the 1950s U.S. Army in a dilemma of identity. Without a primary role in deterring threat, how might it survive as a credible asset to the nation?

Trauschweizer highlights the efforts of General Maxwell Taylor in recognizing the threat to the institution, as well as his objection to the strategic reliance upon “Massive Retaliation” as the sole policy solution to Soviet aggression. In the effort, Taylor championed an organizational structure that met two important needs of the army:

The pentomic division, introduced in 1956 and so called because it consisted of a pentagonal unit with five battle groups armed with conventional and atomic weapons, had been designed to address bureaucratic pressure for reform and provide dual capability for conventional and nuclear

war. It provided a rationale for the army’s own nuclear weapons. Although it was impractical from an operational perspective, it marked a sharp break from the traditional combat division, thus opening the way for future change.\textsuperscript{12}

This organizational experiment, which bought time for the Army to search for its future and a return to emphasize conventional capabilities, had no significant direct impact upon the forces of Army Berlin in the 1950s beyond its structural framework of battle groups as the basic independent maneuver element. However, it did provide a brief respite for the U.S. Army and supposed a credible defense of Western Europe through a mixed conventional and nuclear strategy. This, at least, theoretically increased the risk for the Soviets in any attempt to squeeze the Allies, especially the United States, out of West Berlin.\textsuperscript{13}

While Maxwell Taylor worked to save the U.S. Army from irrelevance and developed his own version of “flexible response,” the military and intellectual community struggled to label future warfare consistently. Confusion over the meaning of the term “flexible response” as appropriated by candidate Kennedy in his critique of Eisenhower’s “New Look” mirrored the varied understandings of categorical terms meant to describe hybrid forms of warfare. The 1950s U.S. Army had survived the most drastic structural damage intended them by opponents of the role of conventional warfare and continued its search for organizational and operational efficiency.

Now focused upon its own understanding of the priority of preparing for land warfare in Europe, the U.S. Army in Europe recognized the tactical advantages of the operational \textit{Bundeswehr} structure which had won the role as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO) preferred combat division formula.\textsuperscript{14} Beyond structure, the U.S. Army needed

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid., 3.
\textsuperscript{14} Trauschweizer, \textit{The Cold War U.S. Army}, 81.
significant upgrades to its conventional warfare technologies for the modern battlefield in Europe.

Combined with the adoption of its new Main Battle Tank (M-60), Armored Personnel Carrier (M-113), and the replacement of towed howitzers by new Self-Propelled Guns (M-108), the U.S. Army theoretically envisioned land warfare without resort to strategic nuclear engagement. These changes appeared to offer President Kennedy a policy option (limited war that may or may not include the use of atomic weapons) in the Berlin Crisis of 1961 which was unavailable in 1958, both in capability and strategic thought.

However, this perception of operational capability was premature, if not unwarranted in the final analysis. Over the course of the next two years, from 1961 to 1963, the U.S. Army was modernized in both equipment and structure. The adoption of the German-inspired Reorganization Objective Army Division (ROAD) which was planned for implementation just as the new crisis occurred in 1961 was delayed, but with an implementation benefit. As Trauschweizer commented on the impact of the wall crisis, “In the event, the Berlin Crisis delayed the reorganization of army divisions. The Army Staff decided to use the additional time to test the concept more thoroughly.”15

For Army Berlin, the impact was felt in its rapid adoption of modernized equipment in the fall of 1961 which mirrored the larger maneuver elements even as its unique tactical situation required significantly different mission objectives. The isolation of Army Berlin from “Big Army” (U.S. Seventh Army and its two operational Corps, V and VII) had not changed, nor had its own extreme negative correlation of forces improved as it faced Soviet and East German forces. However, the perceptual impact of the improved capacity of NATO to offer resistance in

---

15 Ibid., 117.
a form of warfare (by any name or understanding) which might not absolutely require the use of atomic weapons was an improvement in the balance of the threat over the issue of Berlin.

Trauschweizer’s work on “Big Army” strategic and operational development spans across the significant period of the reformed force in Berlin and provides important context to the radically different operational environment Army Berlin inhabited in metropolitan Berlin. At the highest levels debates over doctrine raged across the U.S. Army as Kennedy’s version of “Flexible Response” challenged the Euro-centric planning of Army leaders. Additionally and fundamentally, the definitions of categories of war (general, limited, and sub-limited) were often understood differently by political and military planners.16

The issue of adapting intellectually flexible institutional behaviors, where habits learned in formative experiences impede transitional behavior, is central to the study Trauschweizer provides. The leaders of the Army of the 1950s were formed in their experience of World War II, which impacted their understanding of the risks of failure. What may appear to the non-military observer as an endless exercise in the details of the size of a battalion, the role of technology, or the language of the profession, were in fact critical questions that would determine the utility of the force to meet the goals of the political leadership in Washington.

In his historical study of the doctrinal changes of the period for the first paper of the U.S. Army’s Combat Studies Institute at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College (The Leavenworth Papers), Robert Doughty notes the significance of human behavior in the process of institutional and intellectual reforms:

In short, intellectual changes can sometimes be more difficult to achieve than materiel changes. One of the purposes of doctrine is to ensure common thinking, but, when changes are necessary, that common thinking can become an obstacle for needed modifications or improvements. When the major components of a doctrine are established, military leaders must recognize that attempts

16 Ibid., 162-163.
to operate in a different manner, even on an emergency basis, can only be accomplished with great difficulty.\textsuperscript{17}

One of the central issues for USAREUR in making a limited war possible was the importance in selecting the correct defensive strategy in planning for war in Europe in coordination with its allies. This was particularly true in the case of the U.S. Army’s relationship with the West German \textit{Bundeswehr}, upon which a greater share of the military burden necessarily fell. From the moment of its inception, NATO was structured as a defensive organization, and the issues of debate centered upon “where” to draw the line for defense and how it might be most effectively achieved. In practical terms, until the West German \textit{Bundeswehr} could provide forces to defend a larger territory, NATO set its defensive line at the Rhine River. It was not until 1963, when the \textit{Bundeswehr} provided adequate forces, that NATO expanded its defensive territory to the edge of the Iron Curtain.\textsuperscript{18}

Even at this stage, the debate over the supremacy of the offensive as the determinant factor in combat was in contest in the U.S. Army, and the adaptations of the environment required that leadership engaged in doctrinal development acknowledge the necessary value of the defensive. Bound by its national obligations to support its allies in defense, the U.S. Army had no practical plan at any time to relieve Army Berlin or the allied contingents in the city. Only a long delayed counterattack which required significant coordination between the three NATO groups facing east offered any theoretical relief of the U.S. Armed forces, their family

\textsuperscript{17} Robert Doughty, \textit{The Evolution of U.S. Army Tactical Doctrine, 1946-1976}, (Fort Leavenworth KS: Combat Studies Institute, 1979), 47.

members, and assorted other Americans who could be trapped in the city during a potential conflict.  

At no point during the Cold War did the U.S. Army or the NATO allies contemplate an offensive in relief of West Berlin. This included the final phase of the synchronicity of doctrine, organizational structure, and operationally-capable maneuver divisions armed with the latest technologies, exemplified in the 1980s U.S. Army doctrine known as AirLand Battle. This is an important point in the assessment of Army Berlin’s behaviors in the city. Its official mission statements reflected this reality, but the concept of a small and independent force being abandoned as a practical matter did not match the American public’s attitude toward Berlin and its defenders.

As evidence of the American public’s attitudes toward Berlin in the early period of the wall crisis, a poll conducted by Public Opinion Surveys (Gallup) conducted beginning 12 JUL 1961 to 19 JUL 1961 found the American public to be quite strongly in favor of military action in defense of Berlin. 85% of the public (83% Democratic, 87% Republican, 87% Independent) answered “Keep troops there” when posed the question “Do you think we should pull out our troops and leave West Berlin exposed to a take-over by Russia—or keep our troops in West Berlin even if it means risking war?”

When asked a more specific question relating to an allied offensive or pre-emptive military action, the numbers remained significantly in favor of action. “If Communist East Germany closes all roads to Berlin and does not permit planes to land in Berlin, do you think the

---

19 In regard to Army Berlin’s existing operational plans during the period in study (1961-1994), there are few records available. In the Berlin Brigade collection at USAMHI, the records are intermittent. At NARAR II in College Park, publicly accessible records in Record Group 549, Boxes 14 and 15, currently list operational plans by title but remain classified, withdrawn as restricted under National Archives authority; these include references to Emergency and Evacuation Operational Plans.

Allies should or should not try to fight their way into Berlin?” 67% of the respondents replied that the U.S. “should fight.”21 The American public appeared blissfully unaware of the strategic consequences of such a decision and the tactical limitations of its own Army, yet it was unified on the issue of Berlin as a strategic and national asset.

For the members of Army Berlin, their area of operations and tactical situation remained unlike any other unit in the period. As Cold Warriors often depicted by their 6th infantry battle group nicknames as “Defenders” or “Guardians” of a civilian population, their operational activities were altered considerably in comparison to their contemporary peers. In Berlin prior to the wall, the behaviors of the previous generation of soldiers had solidified into standard practices, constricted in the space of limited options.

With the new restrictions of East German travel imposed by the wall and enforced by an aggressive state security apparatus that regularly engaged lethal force to stop escapees, the leadership challenge in Army Berlin to resist adverse “common thinking” that permeated the combat elements of the force was substantial. Additionally, for the next five years, new units of non-Berlin U.S. Army troops rotated into the city for short periods of three month duty status as lodger units (temporarily assigned forces). These troops experienced their own effects of the organizational shift to ROAD divisions and required orientation in a tactical problem that was foreign to the majority of the U.S. Army, the defense of a modern city. Just as the U.S. Army implemented and tested strategic reforms throughout the period, the unit operated from the same basic doctrinal training and field manuals as those in “Big Army.” However, in the anticipated battle space of Berlin, the threats were vastly different, as well as the acceptable methods of response.

21 Ibid., 7.
Decades before the invention of new terms designed by political scientists and international relations scholars to describe the projection of power, military or otherwise, the U. S. Army refined a hybrid practice inside Berlin. While other contemporary American military units projected soft power through a common American understanding and accessed deep cultural narratives and mythology in American history to create community, Army Berlin experienced it in a difficult and unique environment. The title of “unofficial ambassador,” found nowhere in the common task skill sets for soldiers in doctrinal and training manuals, was given a different name, meant to democratize the practice and extend American power.

The role of the individual soldier and their military family members as Good Neighbors in Cold War Berlin did not include any official title or extensive international relations training beyond normal military and cultural orientation. There were no detailed training manuals or requirements for advanced university degrees to qualify for the posting, yet military personnel were expected to project values that reflected American ideals. Soldiers, particularly those in the combat operational sub-unit, the Berlin Brigade, were trained specialists in the use of violence for the purpose of national interest within the boundaries of lawful lethal application as Cold Warriors.

In recognition of the dissonance in the duality of the roles, General Bruce C. Clarke, in his duties as Commander in Chief, USAREUR, defined the national interests into a USAREUR-wide poster and flyer campaign. Following the statement “Soldier, This is Why You’re in Germany,” Clarke approved a campaign which listed four distinct roles for soldiers in his command, and included the call “To be a good neighbor to our German neighbors.”

---

22 Bruce C. Clarke, Report of Stewardship: October 1960- April 1962, USAREUR. “Soldier: This is Why You’re In Germany,” ca. 1960, Bruce Cooper Clarke Papers, USAMHI.
Substituting the role of Good Neighbor for the diplomatic specialty of Ambassador allowed the command to access cultural understandings more common in the rank and file of their force. If national interest needed to be translated through doctrine to the broader population, it was crucial that the communication be of a format and language that could be understood. Although the term Ambassador may have transmitted a positive meaning to the troops in their role in the population, it lacked a personal, connected meaning that the term Good Neighbor, in the generalized American sense, delivered. It was efficient and effective in a military environment to adopt the terminology, and it was in this social context that national policy was delivered. This Good Neighbors policy was subordinated in matters of military conflict, but in the daily, local interaction across the life of the unit, the image of the American Cold Warriors was balanced in relation to values of power projection by the Good Neighbors role.

In the expanded emphasis historians have placed on the localization of social and cultural contexts, Army Berlin remains considerably unexamined. The concept of “cultural internationalism,” as described by Akira Iriye, extends beyond traditional understandings of international relations. However, in the context of intentional efforts to convert culture into power, Iriye offers a definition that is helpful in considering the efforts of Army Berlin as well as in reflection upon a number of other examinations of American military communities that are available. Iriye posits that “Cultural internationalism entails a variety of activities undertaken to link countries and peoples through the exchange of ideas and persons, through scholarly cooperation, or through efforts at facilitating cross-national understanding.”

---

Thus, by conceiving of Army Berlin as a form of exchange more than simply as a military occupation, its legal basis for operations in the city, a new interpretive schema in assessment is available. Combining Iriye’s definition of an exchange with Nye’s prescriptions for national power projection acknowledges the reality of human interactions which occurred in Berlin during the Cold War. Nye describes a nation’s soft power as “its culture (in places where it is attractive to others), its political values (where it lives up to them at home or abroad), and its foreign policies (when others seem them as legitimate and having moral authority.)” Nye’s consistent exclusion of a nation’s military resources as a means of effectively projecting soft power beyond the marshalling of logistical and humanitarian support in catastrophic events does not match the growing body of historical work reviewed in the following sections.

In contrast, the cultural internationalism that Iriye describes as a force is primarily beyond state control. In either of these interpretations, the effectiveness of Army Berlin to successfully accomplish its secondary mission to extend American cultural and political influence through a foreign policy carried by Good Neighbors is in question. This line of inquiry specific to Army Berlin has yet to be developed, but there are similar works that approach the idea of an American attempt at hegemonic extension through the Cold War U.S. military.

The majority of the works focused on the role of the U.S. military in its intentional attempts to assist in extending American cultural, political, or social hegemony have appeared in the post-Cold War era. This is a beneficial result of the contribution of a broader community of military historians writing on social and cultural themes, as well as social historians venturing into the field of military history. In most cases, the long history of cultural internationalism, as described by Iriye, is acknowledged, ascribing to his assertion that “one could argue that cultural

---

24 Nye, The Future of Power, 84.
internationalist activities were pursued despite-or in some instances, even because of- the U.S.-Soviet geopolitical confrontation.” If the Cold War was, in a large part, a struggle of ideas and ideals, it is unlikely that the U.S. military did not engage on this battlefield.

To the extent that liberal internationalist ideals, as promoted by the United States, shaped the global community’s structure and practices, American military policies and behaviors were necessarily significant in their democratization and dispersal of soft power. The advancing scholarship provides for a much more inclusive definition of American foreign policy in the Cold War, and places into some question Nye’s conceptual exclusion of the American military’s historic role in forms of systematic and intentional power, expressed in other than traditional forms of military behaviors.

In terms of its Good Neighbors identity, the English-language literature available for review on the specific impact of Army Berlin upon the city and its citizens is less than comprehensive. One particularly recent work by Benjamin P. Greene approaches this role in a limited scope, analyzing Army Berlin’s efforts in connecting American history and mythologies of the American frontier with their mission in the city. Focused upon the annual German-American Volksfest from 1965 to 1981, Greene adds valuable insight into Army Berlin’s intentional activity in the area of public diplomacy on the ground in partnership with the programmed efforts of Mission Berlin. The use of American military members and their families in creating and sustaining this street-level foreign policy is noted, and especially important to Greene’s analysis is the role of the German public’s assumptions regarding Americans in the context of the frontier. In the period covered, there are notations of some of the

tensions which arise between the changing Berlin public in the context of the Vietnam War and broader social protest.

Greene highlights Army Berlin’s use of historical American frontier events, as in the case of the 1966 *Volksfest*, where the theme was the 1836 battle at the Alamo. Fully enveloped by a superior force, a small band of Americans refused to surrender or evacuate the mission on the outskirts of San Antonio, ultimately suffering a defeat that included no surviving military prisoners. This mythical narrative was presented to the West Berliners as an example of American determination in the face of the daunting Soviet threat, which loosely mirrored the situational environment for Army Berlin.\(^{27}\) Beyond the *Volksfest*, Greene acknowledges briefly some of the non-*Volksfest* efforts, including sport programs and the “*Kontakt* club dedicated to arranging events and exchanges with young adults.”\(^{28}\) However, these references are minimally assessed, leaving much more investigative space for discussion.

Relying upon the assessment of both the American public relations community and individual statements of leading Berliners, Greene posits that “for the leadership of the U.S. Army in Berlin the annual volksfest was their most effective means of strong German-American ties within the divided city.”\(^{29}\) This conclusion, however, is perhaps too broad a statement on the role of the *Volksfest* for Army Berlin. It may be more correct to argue that the *Volksfest* was the leading annual Army Berlin cultural event which broadcast American themes into the larger Berlin community. It was not, as Greene asserts, Army Berlin’s primary method of promoting bonding and bridging associations into the West Berlin community, the sinew of German-American relations.

\(^{27}\) Ibid.  
\(^{28}\) Ibid.  
\(^{29}\) Ibid.
One example of the limited role the Volksfest fulfilled in Army Berlin’s broad spectrum of public relations efforts in the city is found in the official Army Berlin minutes of the February, 1976 meeting of the German-American Committee. Mayor Wolfgang Rothkegel, Zehlendorf’s district mayor, “remarked that the Volksfest is one of the most important events to further German-American relations in Berlin.” The context for this statement, recorded in the minutes written by Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Office, requires an important qualifier. Mayor Rothkegel’s acknowledgement, made in the action of receiving the annual Volksfest fund contributions to the districts and specified local charities, recognized the festival as an “event” of significance, rather than as a program of the German-American Committee itself. With the exception of the communication of important relational power preference selections, which included the selection of the location in the American sector for the festival, West Berlin’s appointed members of the German-American Committee had no authority over Volksfest.

As this examination contends, Army Berlin exercised a much more complex and sophisticated framework to integrate itself into the community beyond simply hosting a two-week festival each year. During the period in study beginning with the erection of the wall, the unit’s commanders made estimations of Berliner public opinion through observation of the press and in its regular involvement with the city’s elite. They set expectations of their military community members in their behaviors, and repeatedly selected programs for American and German interaction. Their implementation strategies were similar to other U.S. Army units in Europe in the period and will benefit from a more thorough examination.

Fortunately, there is a recent and growing body of political, social, and cultural works that are focused on American military policy and behavior in post-World War II Germany. In

30 “Minutes of the German-American Committee Meeting, 21 February, 1975,” Office of the U.S. Commander, Berlin Public Affairs Office, Box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
these works, important conceptual and comparative frameworks are applied, and these are instructive in the following chapters relating to cultural, social, and civic engagement between Americans assigned or related to Army Berlin.

In some of these works, partial treatments of Berlin are included in their own social, cultural, political, or military emphasis of different time periods or separate contemporaneous examinations of other geographic areas in West Germany, where the United States Army had a larger impact. In addition, these works offer expanded thematic goals that are informative in assessing Army Berlin’s influence as Good Neighbors, their secondary role to the traditional responsibilities of military forces.

Donna Alvah’s *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War, 1946-1965* is an example of a work localizing the efforts of the U.S. military in its attempts to extend American interests through cultural, political, and social means in the early Cold War. Alvah examines the policy of military family members in Europe as well as Okinawa (where her experience as a military dependent in the 1970s is the genesis for her dissertation that evolved into the work) with an excellent background on the development of post-World War II U.S. military policy for equality in military family stationing plans.

The reality of a long-term global power projection which required the United States provide occupation forces brought issues of “morale, retention, discipline, and fraternization with local women.”31 From this force-focused set of policy interests, the utility of the use of military family members as “Unofficial Ambassadors” quickly adapted as a matter of practicality as well as a resource in ideological warfare against the developing communist threat. Alvah

---

acknowledges the primary military role of stationing, but concentrates on the military family member’s efforts and interactions, as well as the forms of official and unofficial support and policy meant to “soften” American power through dependent wives and husbands, as well as the children of service-members.

Alvah’s primary perspective is a gendered postwar context, although it also significantly considers American youth activities. *Unofficial Ambassadors* includes additional reference to the role of race and class in the behavior of the Americans stationed in foreign nations, and reviews institutional programs developed by the local American street-level authorities. However, these sub-themes are not the focus of *Unofficial Ambassadors* and are often inserted as additional indicators, not subjected to particularly deep analysis. In regard to Berlin-specific content, Alvah includes several examples similar to the focus of this analysis, however they are primarily limited to non-Berlin military communities. The Berlin examples included are referenced to the pre-1961 Army Berlin period, providing a “baseline” for consideration. Alvah’s framework also incorporates Nye’s basic power types that were available at the time of her work, hard power and soft power (as developed up to Nye Version 5.0), in a number of examples, including the roles of military family members in the soft power category.32

Maria Höhn’s *GI’s and Fräuleins: The German-American Encounter in 1950s West Germany* provides analysis of the early Cold War experiences of a vastly different population of Germans when compared to Berliners.33 Höhn investigates the impact on German political and
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32 Ibid., 82-83. In the contemporary sense of Nye at time of Alvah’s publication, the term soft power had been subsumed into the new category of power type, smart power, but only in the sense that soft power was still not a type of power exercised by military forces. Consequently, the role of military families and where they may fit into his power types are not mentioned by Nye, regardless of the available historical evidence of the intentional implementation and support of military family members as “unofficial ambassadors” which had begun to appear in the social, political, and cultural histories appearing during the first decade of his power type evolution.

cultural life due to the American occupation in the Rhineland-Palatinate region of West Germany. The work is focused upon two important U.S. military communities, one in Baumholder and the other in Kaiserslautern, both established to support the operational capabilities of U.S. Seventh Army in its mission to defend Western Europe on the plains of Germany.

An important comparative qualification in the use of Höhn is based upon the different geographic location, in terms of military maneuver and threat, as well as the significant dissimilarity in population impact. Army Berlin, including its family members across the period in scope, rarely numbered above 10,000 people in a city of more than 2.5 million West Berliners. In contrast, the primarily rural Rhineland-Palatinate area experienced a population of American troops and family members well over 100,000, with a much lower German population density.

The monograph covers the period of the 1950s, when the U.S. military increased its presence in Europe as part of the “Korea Boom,” and is targeted on the effects upon the Germans themselves.34 Höhn, who experienced life among American soldiers in the 1960s and 1970s as a young German in the Rhineland-Palatinate, delivers a strong gendered analysis of the “Americanization” of German society that also includes historically comparative themes.35 The role of the French in Germany as occupiers after World War I, as well as the establishment of the German military’s largest training site in 1937 in the same area, are both considered as comparatives to U.S. force impact.36

Although Höhn’s work provides additional thematic depth in the context of the American force’s impact on race and sexual relations in the German population, additional parts of the

34 Ibid., 7.
36 Ibid., 19.
narrative are important in the investigation of Army Berlin. Höhn exposes the local and significantly forgotten history of the role of the American buildup in sharpening the lines of political discourse around the issues of modernity, morality, and religious beliefs in postwar Germany. These cultural issues also appear in the records of Army Berlin’s efforts to connect their Good Neighbors to the Berliner population, and commanders in the unit refer to these same values and beliefs in their official and unofficial promotion of behaviors. The source material that is the basis for *GIs and Fräuleins* strongly supports the title and provides a relevant glimpse into the impact of “Americanization” upon the early political, social, and cultural exchange in West Germany. These observations can be transferred as a helpful guide in approaching the Army Berlin experience in the wall period.

Petra Goedde’s *GIs and Germans: Culture, Gender, and Foreign Relations, 1945-1949*, published in 2003, investigates American policy in the first years of the occupation from a series of new perspectives that are additionally helpful in framing this dissertation. While Goedde’s work is focused on a different temporal and geographical space, the issues Goedde reviews in the context of German-American relations surrounding the U.S. military are relevant. In describing her ultimate goal, Goedde writes that her study “tries to link the history of the cultural and social interactions between American soldiers and German civilians to the occupation.” An important concept in Goedde that will apply to this dissertation is the role of the deep cultural and historical connections that America shared with Germany before the war, at least for white Americans, who viewed the German people significantly more deserving of leniency than their Japanese allies. Goedde notes the distinctions made by American between the Japanese, who
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were depicted repeatedly in wartime propaganda as “rats, roaches, or apes, reflected the endemic current of racism in the United States toward a non-white people.”39 Additionally, Goedde credits the cultural similarities between Germany and the United States, as well as the large population of Americans of German descent, for moderating the level of vitriol toward the German people in distinction from the Nazi regime.40 These observations are relevant to Army Berlin’s experience as well.

In the early years of Army Berlin after the reorganization in 1961, the links between the Americans and the Germans, and in particular Berliners, exhibit similar cultural assumptions. In Iriye’s opinion, traditional European belief systems, interrupted by the rise of fascism and Nazism in the 1930s, were already linked to American beliefs from its colonial founding. The end of World War II, followed by the Cold War, did not essentially represent a new phenomenon of “Americanization” of Europe, but instead a return of European values, as they had been adapted in America, back into post-war Europe.41 Goedde’s work points to the continuity of the process, even as there are difficult issues of human interaction between Americans and Germans. This is a central part of this examination, particularly in chapter 6, where Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors role encounters both success and failure, leading to often difficult discussions between the Americans and the Berliner community.

Particular themes for Goedde emphasize the distinctions Americans made between women and men in occupied Germany during the early occupation period, and the roles the Americans played for each gender. Goedde advances the concept of “the cultural feminization of Germany” and provides a series of examples that, like Donna Alvah’s *Unofficial Ambassadors*,
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41 Iriye, *Cultural Internationalism and World Order*, 157-158.
support the contention that the original “non-fraternization” policy of the early occupation was not only impractical, but that it undermined national goals. Additionally, while she does not use the term “micro-implementers,” (a key concept in this work), Goedde’s observation of the impact upon United States national policy through private, unofficial acts between American soldiers and Germans, particularly women, is helpful:

Despite soldier’s assumptions, their relationships with German women had ramifications beyond the merely sexual. They ultimately undermined the original, punitive occupation policy not just through their early defiance of the non-fraternization directive but through the increasing compassion they showed toward the civilian population.42

Additionally, these metrics of behavior, viewed in the context of the early occupation policies, were often misunderstood due to the differing roles that German men and women held in society and in the construction of new administrative and bureaucratic organizations in early postwar Germany. Interaction between men often occurred in the technically public sphere of governmental or official duties, where it was accepted and gained little public attention. It was in the “private” sphere where the sexualized relationships occurred that gained the disapproving attention of the American and German press, policymakers, and the public.43

This transition of the German public “from villains to victims” occurred rapidly in the early years of the occupation, as “American GI’s became providers and protectors, first literally for the women they dated, and later figuratively for what they perceived to be an emasculated, starving population.”44 These relationships, based upon the devastating inequalities of wealth between the Americans and the “feminized” Germans, had a major impact on the views Germans held of American soldiers, their spouses, and children.

42 Goedde, GIs and Germans, 81-82.
43 Ibid., 81.
44 Ibid., 81.
Goedde’s emphasis on gender, magnified by the actual population distortions of war which resulted in a dearth of male Germans, as well as the emotional and psychological impact of the loss of the war and the post-war examination of German war crimes, are relevant to Army Berlin. However, in the period preceding the reorganized Army Berlin of 1961, West Germany, and West Berlin itself, had undergone an economic miracle. The celebrated *Wirtschaftswunder*, an explosive period of economic growth in the 1950s, had resulted in a West Berlin population that was significantly more prosperous, and by extension, more secure, than the city in Goedde’s study.

The comparative wealth in 1961 between the two halves of the city, East and West, was an important symbol for both Army Berlin and West Berlin’s leaders. The records of the unit across the period of 1961 to 1994 point to subtle but clear changes in regard to American and Berliner attitudes toward civic duty, particularly in the populations that were impacted by American values as they extended Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors practices. Even as Goedde notes that Americans and Europeans share similar values systems, this general commonality did not guarantee that interactions did not result in contentious outcomes in specific cases.

Over the longer period examined specifically focused upon Army Berlin, the changing expectations of Berliners, who exhibited the social and political evolutions, and in some cases, revolutions which occurred in the city, modified the impact of “feminization” which Goedde notes. As Berliners utilized their increasing political agency in associative behaviors encouraged, ironically, by the processes of democratic behaviors championed by Army Berlin and Mission Berlin, they reclaimed their masculine identities. However, American influence on the youth of Berlin is another story.
The role of American soldiers in regard to the youth of Germany is an important line of inquiry for Goedde, and again, while not in the time period and scope of Army Berlin that is the subject of this work, Goedde’s emphasis is helpful in providing a baseline for this survey. Goedde quotes official sources in May of 1946 that “Youngsters have become at the same time the hope and the problem of the German people.”45 The early seeds of organized, national policy efforts toward the young in Germany are well examined by Goedde, who notes that a combination of economic factors, Allied disagreements, and the specter of Soviet-aligned underground political parties and labor organizations in the west drove U.S. decisions in 1946.

Goedde notes that the formal organization of the German Youth Activities (GYA) Program occurred at the same time that the non-fraternization policy was collapsing, and enhanced the opportunity for “soldiers to become more involved in Germany’s social, cultural, and political reconstruction.”46 This was an official response to a national problem that both Germans and Americans were acutely aware of due to the high numbers of youth who lacked either one or both parents. This policy was instituted after many U.S. Army units based across Germany had already established their own local youth programs to solve needs they encountered. Acting within their discretionary orders, these local street-level policymakers were implementing national policies that clearly qualified as soft power, well before any bureaucratic infrastructure was available to meet these needs.

These cultural understandings of social and civil challenges in Germany, mirrored in Berlin for the members of Army Berlin from 1961 and beyond, also connected with American society’s contemporary views on the problems of the future Berliners. The important connection Americans assumed in their own society between juvenile delinquency and crime, a politically

45 Ibid., 127.
46 Ibid., 132.
contentious subject in America in the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s, traveled to Berlin in
the beliefs and values of the military and family members of Army Berlin.47

Army Berlin’s military community’s efforts in providing German youth acceptable
activity and associative structures emulated their pre-wall crisis predecessors, and included
attempts to modify or even disregard national policy limits to achieve goals recognized at the
local level. At this point Berlin had been occupied for 15 years and the transition of German
perceptions of Army Berlin’s transformation from occupier to defender had already been
achieved, in no small part due to the success of the Airlift from 1948 to 1949. Yet, threats to the
sustainment of this image caused no small amount of anxiety on the part of the command of
Army Berlin, and the projection of smart power through soft power programs remained central to
its image as Good Neighbors.

Goedde contends that the political life of postwar Germany could not be separated from
issues of culture and society. This fact, which complicates linear explanations designed to
ascribe causal and relational explanations to form public policy, offers a much more complete
view of historical events in broader context. Similarly seeking a neat and orderly series of
explanations, Nye’s power typologies, with his hesitance to contemplate the role of the U.S.
military in exercising soft power behaviors, potentially restricts policy choices for future
decision-makers. In a scenario in which the appropriate policy solution requires a department of
defense lead in projecting American foreign smart power policy due to internal instability or
external threat to the mission, Alvah, Höhn, and Goedde offer valuable historical context
specifically engaging Iriye’s cultural internationalism possibilities.

47 For background on the impact on public opinions regarding juvenile delinquency and its purported link to
increased criminality in post-World War II American society, see William Howard Moore, The Kefauver Committee
Army Berlin’s determination to engage continually in the local communities of the city, both in official and unofficial efforts, advanced American national interests while at the same time it validated its members own sense of liberal, democratic values as they worked and lived in the enclave. This was by design, and it may be helpful to review another work that emphasizes the administrative, purposeful efforts of command elements in developing the associational and beneficial networks required to promote American policy.

Theodor Scharnholz provides a glimpse into the administrative challenges the United States faced in the early occupation of local communities through his study of the American diplomatic and military efforts in Heidelberg, Germany, from 1948 to 1955. His chapter, “German-American Relations at the Local Level,” investigates the U.S. Army’s attempts to form structures, or formal networks, in Heidelberg, West Germany. This city was significantly different from Berlin in both its legal status, particularly in the post-occupation period in West Germany, as well as in its role in U.S. Army operational planning in the Cold War.

Heidelberg, where USAREUR was headquartered during the period Scharnholz assesses, was an important American command location which made it one of the four most important military cities in West Germany for Americans (along with Berlin, Stuttgart and Frankfurt-am-Main). Scharnholz reviews several key issues that commanders of any U.S. military community (MILCOM) in that period in Germany would recognize as challenges in their relations with local officials and the general German public. Scharnholz addresses the competing visions of the Office of Military Government of the United States (OMGUS) and the command element of USAREUR in their varied approaches to the Germans. Compounding these differences for the
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American mission, when OMGUS was replaced by the High Commission for Occupied Germany (HICOG) in 1949, additional disruption occurred on the American side as it changed its structure to acknowledge the establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany that same year.

Scharnholz traces the development of the structure of American efforts to increase friendship in their German communities, specifically in Heidelberg, and it is a useful guide to some similar behaviors in the Berlin American sector. A particularly important analysis of the bureaucratic disagreements that occurred between the military commanders in Germany tasked with enforcing the occupation and the civilian staff of OMGUS is included. This is preceded by commentary on the impact of a familiar name in Berlin and Germany’s postwar history:

A consistent policy on German-American relations existed in the immediate postwar years thanks to the union of responsibility for both military government and troop command in the hands of General Lucius D. Clay. But by 1948-1949 differences in the views of the U.S. military staff in command of the occupation forces and the civilian staff of OMGUS had become apparent, and these differences hardened in the HICOG era.49

Tracking this issue, Scharnholz points to a renewed effort in 1950 to “improve relations between the occupation troops and the German population… triggered by U.S. High Commissioner John J. McCloy.”50 If Scharnholz is correct, the doctrinal origins for USAREUR’s Good Neighbors policy, which General Bruce C. Clarke implemented command-wide through his promotion of the term later during his tenure as Commander-in-Chief, USAREUR, may begin here.51 In his communication to General Thomas T. Handy, Commander in Chief of European Command (EUCOM), McCloy “had repeatedly urged [Handy]…to enlist

---


50 Ibid.

his personnel and their dependents as a ‘missionary force’ for his reorientation aims.”52 This
exhortation, which included terminology normally reserved for the zeal of the pulpit, was met
with Handy’s agreement to implement a program to extend American soft power by enlisting
Americans to go forth and commingle.53

Many of the local Heidelberg issues Scharnholz highlights and critiques (housing, youth
and elderly care, crime) are identical to the efforts by Army Berlin in coordination with its own
German-American Committee, which was not established until 1962.54 However, there were
significant differences in the legal and operational structures that governed Heidelberg in this
period, when compared to Berlin. The governing Quadripartite Agreements in Berlin and the
absence of a relationship with the evolving Federal system to the west meant that the U.S. forces
there approached community involvement in a different manner, under different authority and
experiences with the public.55

Scharnholz offers an analysis of Heidelberg’s varied levels of communication and
interaction, where the business of managing both the private and public spheres of occupation
relations occurred. As an example, the U.S. Army in Heidelberg established a German-
American Advisory board where official meetings between Heidelberg’s elected and civic
leadership and the American command staff and diplomatic specialists occurred in an effort to
communicate and adapt formal policy.

52 Scharnholz, “German-American Relations at the Local Level,” 144.
53 Ibid., 144-145.
54 “German-American Committee Report,” July 13, 1962, Berlin Brigade Collection, Box 29, USAMHI. This was
the first recorded meeting of the new Berlin German-American Committee, called by Army Berlin.
55 The U.S. Army Command in Berlin prior to the reorganization in December of 1961 had not formally organized
its own German-American committee. The available records do not reflect the reasoning behind this omission,
although in its special relationship inside West Berlin with the American sector’s district mayors, the command had
regular access to officials to deal with issues. Officially under authority as an occupying power, the Berlin
Command exercised its “Relational Powers: Commanding Change, Controlling Agendas, and Establishing
Preferences” as described by Joseph S. Nye, Jr. in his work The Future of Power, (New York: PublicAffairs, 2011),
10-11.
Another broader attempt to cast U.S. policy into the elite of the Heidelberg area was through the officially-sanctioned and organized German-American Club, the Heidelberger Gesellschaft. This association only survived two years and became inactive in 1949, primarily due to a lack of the consistent voluntary participation by the Americans even when encouraged by their commander in 1947, General Lucius D. Clay. Again, this early experience in Clay’s efforts to connect American command to local political leadership influenced his policy advice to Army Berlin later in the early Berlin Wall period, when he returned to the city as President Kennedy’s special representative.

Scharnholz provides details on a wide range of other private associations that were fostered by the Americans in Heidelberg during his period of study. This behavior was similar to Army Berlin as well, in both the period of his study and the post 1961 force. Additionally, the legalization of organized German “interest groups” in 1949 allowed Heidelbergers to gather together legally in private, authorized associations that often were a means of gathering social capital for the purpose of adapting to, or even resisting the influence of American occupation policies and limit undesirable social impact. This broadened approach to construct a functional democratic society which accepted American values, or at the least Americans as neighbors in their community, reflected the military’s acknowledgement of the potential value of soft power before the term existed. Scharnholz’s depiction of the U.S. Army in Heidelberg clearly resembles an effort to project a foreign policy that could be “seen as legitimate and having moral authority.”
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56 Scharnholz, “German-American Relations at the Local Level,” 152.
58 Nye, The Future of Power, 84.
Additionally, Scharnholz provides background on the role of the early West German press in relationship to community efforts to promote Americans as friends. It is crucial to note that in the period of his study, the German press was heavily regulated in its freedom to print the news. Operating first under the control of OMGUS in the American zone, and then under the regulations of West German law, this was an important issue in the Berlin community as well. Similarly, Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Office (PAO) engaged in promoting the positive benefits of the Americans in the city, important not only in maintaining the role of Good Neighbors, but to also increase the effectiveness of West Berlin’s vibrant, free press as partners in that goal. Additionally, the PAO provided press translations of available Berlin newspapers, both in the western Allied sectors as well as the state-run Eastern papers, to assist the command in monitoring any public perceptions or incidents that might impact the mission.

Finally, a particularly important observation Scharnholz makes is in regard to the bureaucratic dilemmas in exercising foreign policy at the street-level. This point bears significantly on the restructured hierarchy in Berlin in 1961, both in the military sense as well as the diplomatic repositioning of the United States Commander, Berlin, as the American representative of the U.S. Ambassador to West Germany in isolated Berlin. In the transition period in West Germany from OMGUS to HICOG, the post of “Resident Officer” under the control of OMGUS, assigned to Liaison and Security Offices (LSO), suffered from a loss of influence due to rotation of personnel:

About half of the LSO personnel, mainly former military officers, were replaced by junior State Department officials. These young diplomats were probably much better suited than their predecessors for implementing the policy of reorientation. At the same time, however, they were much less suited to fill the liaison role that was so important in the garrison cities. Most critically, they lacked access to the military. HICOG would later complain vehemently about the widespread tension and quarreling between the civil and military arms of the U.S. occupation regime.59

---

59 Scharnholz, “German-American Relations at the Local Level,” 146.
In this example, the replacement of one cadre of LSO personnel based upon assumptions made in the halls of the Department of State, where junior diplomats replaced experienced military officers serving in the role, illustrates a flaw in Nye’s inflexible separation of the military from soft power.

Regardless of the probability that Scharnholz’s assertion that trained diplomats may be better suited for relations with German nationals is valid, the wholesale removal of the military from the process hampered the purpose of the LSO. Scharnholz makes no attempt to assign comparative fault between HICOG and the U.S. Army in West Germany, but situates the dispute clearly on the military side of the relationship. This particular dilemma which occurred in the early changes in the American zone in the territory which became the Federal Republic of Germany was not replicated in Berlin, once again a result of its unique legal status in occupation.

An application of smart power in this instance certainly may have called for an appreciation of the differing missions of the military and civilian institutions, and perhaps a less drastic bureaucratic removal process. This may have, at least temporarily, assisted in the transition through the retention of a larger share of the military members, replaced over a longer period and as local responses warranted. This policy process, implemented at the beginning of HICOG’s establishment, was corrected only with the end of HICOG’s role in West Germany in 1952, when the Federal Republic and the western powers ratified the Bonn agreement. The responsibility for relations between the U.S. Army in West Germany returned to the Army itself, which created the new position of Civil Affairs Officer to interact in liaison with Germans.60

The success of Army Berlin in the Cold War is a broader, more complicated story that involved a wider range of behaviors well beyond traditional military activities. The different

60 Ibid., 147.
American force structures which existed in the city from the end of World War II, adapted by the geopolitical conflict between two adversarial economic and political systems, served American national interests in very similar manners. However, Army Berlin as reorganized on December 1, 1961, in response to the Berlin Wall, experienced a series of operational and command reforms that solidified its singular role in presenting American determination to retain West Berlin as an outpost of freedom in an authoritarian wilderness. As a representative of national hard power, Army Berlin exercised its limited capabilities, recognized by policymakers and military leadership as a symbolic presentation meant to increase the risks of war to the Soviets, while it provided support for the morale of West Berliners and West Germans in their important role in western defense.

As the preceding pages illustrate, the relationships of American soldiers and their family members with their German communities were complex human interactions, governed not only by the force of military policies, but more importantly, deep cultural and social experiences. The growing, rich body of social and cultural histories on American military posts in foreign nations during the Cold War provides policymakers and the public important new insight into the impact of American foreign policy decisions, particularly in regard to the military’s role in projecting American smart power policies in Germany’s political, social, and cultural spheres.

Army Berlin from 1961 to 1994 was no exception, yet its own story has not received any significant analysis incorporating a broader historical treatment assessing its full range of efforts in accomplishing its missions. This omission remains, potentially a result of the various factors described earlier in this chapter. The lack of access to Army Berlin’s official documents, along with its finalized status as perhaps the most important independent American Cold War unit to have never experienced combat during the conflict, are two possible explanations.
As the introductory chapter notes, this examination asserts that the reformed unit, a response by the Kennedy administration to the third Berlin crisis precipitated by the erection of the Berlin Wall, served America’s short term interests in the crisis period, and more importantly, provided the basis for long term success. The consolidation of the diplomatic and military hierarchy through the United States Commander of Berlin, as well as the U.S. Army’s decision to streamline its operational lines to Berlin, were both optimal bureaucratic solutions. As Cold Warriors, Army Berlin’s unique operational area in the city of Berlin challenged its training and readiness and forced it to adopt small unit tactical exercises and operational plans which made them singular experts in the dangerous and complicated urban warfare environment, its particular hard power.

Beyond the traditional military issues of command and control, operational planning, and tactical readiness, Army Berlin fully engaged in its other national mission, the soft power role of Good Neighbors. The behaviors of the command, as well as its full complement of assigned soldiers and resident military spouses and children, appeared as both intentional and spontaneous activities meant to project the American version of Irye’s cultural internationalism into Berlin. These political, social, and cultural efforts, often grounded in common American mythic narratives and religious belief systems, represented American policy as they were implemented at the street-level in Berlin.

Army Berlin’s interactions, often through formal networks governed by military community regulations, represented efforts at increasing its social capital in the Berlin community through both formal and informal positive networks which develop two forms of trust described by Robert Putnam. According to Putnam, *Thick Trust* is “trust embedded in
personal relations that are strong, frequent, and nested in wider networks.”61 Putnam’s other form of trust, Thin Trust, is developed in a different manner, but critical in Army Berlin’s efforts as it “is even more useful than thick trust, because it extends the radius of trust beyond the roster of people we can know personally.”62

These concepts, bound in the understanding that human relations are impacted by deep psychological forces that are as important in projecting soft power as the presentation of an attractive cultural and political image for the purpose of foreign relations, are significantly represented in Army Berlin’s record. In the emphasis on soft power as a formidable asset in the United States foreign policy arsenal, cultural artifacts and practices are routinely presented as representative of the attractive elements of American economic and political practices. The crucial role of interpersonal relationships often appears secondary to the story. This examination seeks to broaden the discussion on Army Berlin’s history, to add to the field of work uncovering the full record on the Cold War, and finally, to advance the understanding of the capacities of a larger range of actors in full-spectrum power projection in American foreign relations.

62 Ibid. For a full definition of Putnam’s version of social capital, networks, and his two trust forms as they are applicable to this study, see chapter 2, “The Framework: Theory and Policy.”
CHAPTER 2. THE FRAMEWORK: THEORY AND POLICY

The Kennedy administration’s policy choices in response to the East German decision to construct a barrier around Berlin in August of 1961 to restrict its own population’s freedom of movement required careful analysis and calibrated plans for implementation. Like the Eisenhower administration before it, the emphasis upon avoiding catastrophic outcomes was the primary concern. The need to preserve the vital interests of access to Berlin, presence in the city, and the viability of American foreign policy institutions were additional requirements in projecting power by maintaining credibility with allies and demonstrating resolve in the face of Soviet threats. A nuanced approach is required to assess the methods of projecting American power, as well as a broader understanding of the issues affecting the street-level bureaucrats working in the city to achieve these goals.¹

In his first year as president, John F. Kennedy faced not only the Soviet and East German regimes as opponents, but the dilemma of appeasing allied leaders entrusted with their own nation’s interests, which occasionally conflicted with American objectives. These issues for the allied nations, primarily political, military, and economic, did not always align with the preferred outcomes of the United States. In addition, American domestic political expectations of their elected leaders required a consistent national security posture opposing communist aggression, particularly in regard to Cold War commitments to Europe. The preparation and use of the U.S. military in projecting strength against Soviet communist aggression was a test of the *bona fides* for both of America’s major political parties, measured in Air Force throw weight, Navy carrier groups, and Army divisions. These classical forms of international behaviors in the value of

¹ In alignment with this work’s introduction, discussion of President Kennedy’s role in this issue is limited to the distant connection of executive policymaking to Army Berlin in its “street-level” implementation of smart power in Berlin.
military capabilities, updated to the reality of the 20th century through both conventional and atomic technology, offered no real strength as policy options to the issues surrounding Berlin and its role in American influence in Europe. In any case, strategic planning exemplified by Kennedy’s “Flexible Response,” offered as a contrast to Eisenhower’s “New Look” doctrine which relied upon the threat of “Massive Retaliation,” had not yet been integrated into the military’s doctrine, training, and technical capabilities.

An alternative form of power, cooperative in its nature and exercised through patient and purposeful means, offered the United States a different possibility to increase its influence in Berlin. As a re-emphasis of prior policies in the city implemented by the Mission of the U.S. Department of State and the Berlin Command, this power type was successfully wielded by Army Berlin to build relationships and provide a contrasting narrative to the Soviet east. Contrary to the confining limits of traditional military practices, focused on projecting strength as deterrence or ultimately fighting and winning wars, Army Berlin accepted increased responsibilities for the exercise of American cultural, political, and economic influence in the city.

These “aspects” of relational power were exhibited by Army Berlin across the period of 1961 to 1994 in numerous examples, and these interactions met every form of the type of power which later became known as soft power as it was reformulated to its current definition. In order to assess Army Berlin’s activities during this period, an understanding of the progression and definition of power terminology (soft, hard, and smart) is crucial. The role of the unit in practicing foreign policy at the street level, engaged in both military and cultural behaviors, was directly connected to U.S. national policy. The methods and philosophical basis for unit and individual actions were connected to deeply-held American beliefs, even as these were modified
by generational changes in American society across the period. Army Berlin provided a steady and mission-centered institutional platform to implement American foreign policy in Berlin.

In the minutes of the October 24, 1964 meeting of the German-American committee of West Berlin, U.S. Army Brigadier General John H. Hay, new commander of the Berlin Brigade, thanked the mayors for electing him as “honorary chairman,” and then proceeded to express his first thoughts on the role of the U.S. Army in Berlin:

General Hay also stated that he considered our primary duty, as soldiers, is to be prepared to fight in defense of Berlin and assured the committee that the Berlin Brigade is prepared to do so. He added that the secondary mission is to continue the warm and cordial relationships which exist between Berliners and Americans. General Hay stated that the heart of these relationships was this committee, and the bulwark of the committee was the mayors, and that he thanked everyone involved for doing such an outstanding job in this area.²

General Hay, as the traditionally elected “honorary chairman” to the committee Army Berlin instituted in 1962 to reinforce relationships between Berliners and American forces, made only one additional noted contribution to the meeting held at Schöneberg Rathaus. Mr. Lyons, the newly assigned Chief of the U.S. Cultural Section of the U.S. Mission, Berlin, requested that Berlin’s district mayors in the American zone reinvigorate a program of exchange between Berliners and Americans in the city. The program relied upon the willingness of Berliners to invite Americans into their homes to live, creating space for exchange students, as well as to alleviate housing shortages for troops who wished to live away from barracks quarters.

The recorded attitude of the Berliner’s elected representatives was “that, on occasion, American students and soldiers had not acted with a dignity or decorum which would be conducive to Berliners asking for more visits of this nature.”³ Hay, tasked with the mission requirements of preparing the Berlin Brigade, the operational arm of Army Berlin, for military

² “Minutes of German-American Committee Meeting, 24 September 1964,” Berlin Brigade Collection, Box 29, 2, U.S. Army Military History Institute, Carlisle, PA (hereafter USAMHI).
³ Ibid., 4.
action, recognized the significance of the issue to national interests and the broader Berlin command mission requirements:

Brigadier General Hay stated that he hoped the committee realized that this type of young American was certainly not commensurate with most young people and this type incident is regrettable. He further stated that this program is important for our youth in learning the German language and customs and that it should certainly continue if possible.⁴

This exchange is an example of prioritization and strategic interest at the highest levels of command responsibility. General Hay was second in command to Major General John F. Franklin, Jr., the U.S. Commander of Berlin.⁵ Hay’s limited but focused input illustrates how attuned leadership inside the Army was to the practical realities of duty in Berlin, as well as the broader ideological context. Mission Berlin and Army Berlin, the primary American foreign policy institutions in the city, were necessary not only to provide security to West Berliners, but also to secure the broadest spectrum of freedoms for them, not in the abstract, but in the real sense.

In this case, General Hay engaged immediately in addressing the spectrum of policies and efforts to maximize American power in the city of Berlin from the perspective of the two major goals in his declaration at the beginning of the meeting. In his role as the second highest-ranking U.S. Army Good Neighbor in Berlin, and Hay acutely aware of the importance of his role to influence these key Berliners on this specific American issue, when addressed later by Mr. Lyons, Berlin Mission Cultural Affairs Chief in the “New Business” portion of the meeting. Aware of the delicacy of the issue, and in anticipation of the likely negative response from the

⁴ Ibid., 4.
⁵ The U.S. Commander of Berlin in the reorganized command structure of December 1, 1961 was the highest ranking American official in the city. He was the commander of all Army forces as well as the lead American diplomat, answering to the U.S. Ambassador to Germany located in Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany. The Department of State’s Mission in Berlin was staffed with professional diplomats who answered to the commander but were supervised by a State Department officer assigned as the Deputy to the commander. The formal title is often shortened to the acronym USCOB in diplomatic and military documents, and will appear in referenced texts in this manner.
district mayors and vice-mayors in attendance, General Hay reinforced the position of Mission Berlin on this seemingly minor request as a separate unofficial Ambassador.

In this formal diplomatic practice structured in the manner of an American associative practice, complete with Roberts Rules of Order, a subtler form of American diplomatic leverage was on display. This particular cultural exchange program, manifestly a priority of the local American Foreign Service officers assigned to Mission Berlin, had withered into a state of perceived ineffectiveness. In this case, the anticipated national benefit of projecting the interests of the United States through cooperative and peaceful relations between neighbors who shared a common recent experience of a traumatic disruption of the city had not materialized into a mature and sustained program.

It is evident from the record that the population’s enthusiasm for the program had waned in the western portion of Berlin, which reduced their elected representatives’ support. According to the official minutes, after Mr. Lyon’s presentation the proposal received no complimentary or affirmative testimony from any member of the German side of the body, even as a matter of diplomatic decorum. This prompted General Hay’s soft “command” that the program be reconsidered by the German side in any possible configuration. The result of Hay’s statement was a recommendation by Lieutenant Colonel Roy F. Jackson, committee chair, to form an ad hoc committee headed by Herr Steitzer, the West Berlin government’s Information Center representative. This committee was tasked to investigate the program and respond with recommendations to improve its effectiveness and encourage Berliners to voluntarily participate.6

6 Minutes of German-American Committee Meeting, 24 September 1964,” Berlin Brigade Collection, Box 29, 4, USAMHI. The records in full committee and recreation subcommittee (which took on the task) appear in several more 1964-1965 minutes; the program emphasizing “student exchanges” went forward; first with a broad publicity
For the remainder of the meeting, General Hay refrained from making any recorded statement on other issues, including discussions of other more prominent military and diplomatic practices that were listed on the agenda or introduced. These included notices of scheduled training exercises in the city, as well as the long range planning for the 1965 Volksfest, the fifth annual festival hosted by the U.S. Army for the local population. Over the course of its first four years, the event had expanded significantly beyond its original goals and was a premier means of transmitting American cultural and historic narratives to the Berliners. Similarly, Hay’s opening statement had reinforced Army Berlin’s second mission as Good Neighbors most clearly. He leveraged his military position and command of Army Berlin’s resources in support of a fundamentally non-military issue, the transmission of cultural values between Berliners and Americans.

Lyons made a diplomatic plea to West Berlin’s political and municipal leadership for cooperative behavior in identifying host families. However, unlike Hay, who commanded the infantry brigade which defended West Berlin from Soviet threat and played a significant role in civil stability for these leaders, Lyons possessed no additional leverage of his own in relation to the problem. Lacking a cooperative reply from the Germans, his success relied upon influential representatives of Army Berlin, who also acted as “associative” Americans with their German counterparts, in order to provide the momentum for the continued efforts to achieve his goal. Army Berlin’s repetitive and command-directed efforts to develop and sustain a particular form of trust in the context of social engagement made it an effective street-level implementer of the campaign driven by the Army Berlin Public Affairs Office and district Mayoral administrations, then as an effort to use other formal associative networks (churches, synagogues, youth groups, etc.) to gather 150-200 families who would agree to be on the list. These exchanges were often structured as short term agreements of six months or less, or even as brief as a few weeks. This form of behavior in the context of the German-American Committee will appear repeatedly in the remainder of the examination.
national policy. In these patient and iterative formal contacts, it exerted influence in a manner which meets a broad definition of power projections often disregarded as a benefit of military strength and deployment.

This single exchange illustrates a central theme in this work: how Army Berlin served as the primary local means of achieving American national interests. The U.S. Army, the western alliance’s prime projector of land warfare capabilities in Europe, had broader duties than preparing for war, and this was particularly true in Berlin. Exercising influential power at the street level, where national goals took the form of human relationships, the members of Army Berlin assumed their dual roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors. The cultural worldviews of the American military members and their dependents were applied in their own communal expectations of the meaning of the term Good Neighbors and informed their actions in the foreign environment as they interacted with Berliners. They exercised their associative and individual efforts within the framework of military and national policy, as it was understood in their doctrinal texts and organizational structures.

In Berlin, Cold War policies of containment and deterrence lacked realistic expectations of the standard metrics of military success. Army Berlin was engaged in its own form of conflict, one in which a set of programs and policies emphasized military professionalism and commitment, as well as broad efforts at maintaining cultural relations with West Berliners. This smart power approach at the local level in Berlin was the basis for American influence in the city.7

The importance of Berlin as a strategic interest of the western allies, and particularly the Americans, aligns with George Kennan’s ethereal and cryptic admonition to deal with the long

---

7 For an operative definition of smart power and its use in this study, refer to pages 19-23 in this chapter.
term Soviet threat through “adroit and vigilant application of counter-force at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points.”

However, Berlin was geographically and militarily an untenable space to apply Kennan’s counter-force in any traditional military sense to extend American interests, and the concept of power required redefinition.

Since the end of the Cold War, characterizations of power have been subjected to a series of redefinitions that are helpful in considering this examination of the work of Army Berlin during the period beginning of August 13, 1961 and ending July 12, 1994 with the casing of colors of the reduced unit, the Berlin Brigade. Political scientist Joseph S. Nye, Jr., an influential contemporary modern American theorist, provided an early alteration to the historical meaning of the word “power” as the global order began to change in the late 1980s. For Army Berlin, Nye’s theory was not contemporaneously influential, as his first version of the theory was not available before the end of the unit’s Cold War mission, the fall of the Berlin Wall, and the end to a divided Germany by popular vote. Nevertheless, his concepts of power are instructive as a framework of analysis to consider Army Berlin’s role as an effective tool of American foreign policy.

The Evolutions of Nye’s Power Theories

Understanding the evolutions of Nye’s conceptualizations on power and the context in which he altered his views is an important starting point to consider the unique and significant roles of Army Berlin, beginning with his first work mentioning his term soft power in 1990. In

---

8 George Kennan, “The Sources of Soviet Conduct,” (The X Article) Foreign Affairs 25 (July 1947), 576. It is recognized that Kennan’s early work is interpreted primarily as justification for military strength in specific geographic and cultural spaces, including Central Europe in this case. Subsequent statements, writings, and speeches made by Kennan expanding his goals for American power in means other than military or intelligence policies are justifiably contested. However, in the scope of this work, focused from 1961 to the end of the occupation authority for American troops in Berlin as altered by the reunification vote of Germany, Kennan’s ambiguity and repeated statements emphasizing other than military means, made well before the wall crisis, are considered in the context of broader American cultural, economic, and political advantages which Kennan championed in the contest against Soviet communist expansion.
subsequent revisions over the course of two decades, Nye addressed these issues by changing the context and the parameters of his original soft power label, as well as the reactive development of the terms hard power and smart power. These changes as applied to Army Berlin are significant as they practiced both their military functions and statecraft in Berlin. Behaviors that the unit undertook, officially and unofficially, qualified as soft power under numerous versions of Nye, but not all iterations.

The recurrent distinction between “who” is projecting power on behalf of the American government is a limiting factor for Nye, where he primarily excludes the military in any consideration of power variability on the spectrum beyond its traditional behaviors. This is a weakness at different points in Nye’s progressions, and in the most current formulation, is dismissive of the possibility of any form of soft power being advanced through the United States military, beyond major humanitarian relief operations.

Contrary to this theoretical omission, Army Berlin approached its assigned mission priorities as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors in manners which fit Nye’s development of the term smart power, or more correctly, smart power as policy. How Nye manipulated his master theses on American power is an important background to perform an assessment of the Berlin story using any of his constructs. Each version is written in the geopolitical context of its time, either as a post-Cold War narrative or a critique of American behavior in the “Global War on Terror.” However, by identifying the consistent threads in Nye across the period, as well as applying clear links to those strands, Nye can be relevant for this work.

In Nye’s first effort to make sense of the rapidly changing global order, he provided a brief review of varied meanings and outcomes in the modern nation-state system in his 1990
work *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. Written in the confusion which occurred in the international order as the early cracks in communist economies and state structures appeared in both Eastern Europe and China, Nye offered a predictive theoretical framework that could navigate between two major ideological camps that had developed to explain the seemingly sudden collapse of the Soviet system. From one perspective, there was an emerging “America as Triumphant” narrative, in which America “won” the Cold War through containment, strength, and virtue. At the other extreme, the collapse of the Soviet system was evidence of a dangerous new global order in which America, the lone superpower, now unchecked by traditional *realpolitik* balance of power principles, might be tempted to exert its power illegitimately.

Nye provided a different analysis of the definition, use, and limits of American power in *Bound to Lead*, his first attempt to restrain American reliance upon military power. Where Kennedy saw economic ruin approaching America due to an over-reliance on military force projection and Fukuyama wrote of a broad historical and philosophical dialectic awake in the world, political scientist Nye offered his own redefinition of the realities of international

---

9 Joseph S. Nye, Jr. *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power*. (New York: Basic Books, 1990). For the purpose of clarification in the following chapters as they are conceptually applied to Army Berlin, references to Nye’s significant adaptations are assigned version indicators: Version 1.0 (*Bound to Lead*, 1990) through version 6.0 (*The Future of Power*, 2011) will appear in footnote text to differentiate and assign. This approach is meant to acknowledge the difficulty in applying one version of Nye’s theses across all behaviors exhibited by Army Berlin, not as a critique of Nye’s inapplicability to a particular case, but instead to demonstrate the breadth and variances in the unit’s efforts in the city over the course of more than three decades.

10 The case for America as “Triumphant” in the Cold War is represented by numerous works, one example of which may be John Lewis Gaddis’ *The Cold War: A New History*, (New York: Penguin Press, 2005); contemporary to Nye’s 1990 work, Francis Fukuyama’s *The End of History and the Last Man*, (New York: Free Press, 1992) is an example of a case made for the triumph of the liberal, democratic, capitalist system in the context of a final victory over other forms of political, economic, and social structures. On the other end of the spectrum, an economic critique of empires based upon military power and expansion is offered by Paul M. Kennedy in *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, (New York: Random House, 1987). Kennedy coined his own signature term “imperial overstretch” in a related article “The Relative Decline of America,” *Atlantic*, 260, 2 (August 1987). These interpretations of the outcome of the Cold War provided both historical analysis and prescriptive policy advice, which Nye also addressed with his power terms, beginning in 1990.
relations in terms of power. Nye argued that to negotiate the future, America needed to comprehend that it faced substantial risks should it adopt an isolationist response to the world:

Policies of retrenchment are premature, and, ironically, they could produce the very weakening of American power they are supposed to avert. Withdrawal from international commitments might reduce American influence overseas without necessarily strengthening the domestic economy. Further, the nations of the world have become so inextricably intertwined that efforts to draw back would be difficult at best.11

Nye presented his own historical analysis, and found the solution in a new form of a more legitimate “power” that could be exercised by the United States in its global commitments. Nye saw the engagement of U.S. foreign policy influence in a context of reduced reliance upon the use of coercive force.

A new alternative, no longer a secondary mode to force, could rebalance the international system, under the guidance of American leadership. Nye’s first mention of his signature idea appears in his assertion that “Co-optive behavioral power- getting others to want what you want- and soft power resources- cultural attraction, ideology, and international institutions- are not new.”12 The unique term that survived from this definition, soft power, became a formidable means of transmitting the idea of a type of power that is not based upon coercion.13

As a first attempt to distinguish an old form of power with a new name, Nye’s original definition of soft power included regimes (or perhaps institutions) that were actually significant levers of coercive power in the international order, depending upon the viewpoint of the observer. Nye included both the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the General Agreement

---

12 Ibid., 188.
13 The term “soft power” as developed by Nye throughout his publications after 1990 is alternatively written in several different forms by Nye and those who attempted to expand or critique it; “soft power”; “Soft Power”; “Soft” power; or *Soft Power* are the main versions. In a similar sense, Nye was equally unstructured on the terms “hard power” and “smart power”, which are treated in the same manner.
on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) as co-optive institutions under the soft power banner.\textsuperscript{14} From a liberal internationalist perspective, these institutions, which possess no military capabilities, represent a form of non-coercive power that can be included in a soft power paradigm. However, as regimes that exercise significant economic penalties for non-compliant states, they are not exclusively soft in action. Nye’s lack of precision in this first formulation required significant revision and defense as it moved into the lexicon of policymakers and before it could be practical advice for the “street-level” implementers of American policy abroad.

In the 1997 work, \textit{Understanding International Conflicts}, Nye referred to his unique power terminology in a more limited sense, omitting significant reference to these problematic institutions. In this update, Nye replaced co-optive power with soft power as his terminology preference and described it as “getting others to want what you want- might be called cooptic, or soft power behavior.”\textsuperscript{15} At this point in the progression of the term, the inclusion of ideology as an example of a co-optive power remained a difficult variable, at least in Nye’s only significant reference in an early work that specifically engaged soft power by name.

As he attempted to explain the recent collapse of the Soviet system, Nye assigned Paul Kennedy’s “imperial overstretch” as one factor in the surprising fall. He credited the Soviet system that emerged from World War II with the ideological advantage that “Many communists had led the resistance against fascism in Europe, and many people believed that communism was the wave of the future. The Soviet Union had gained a great deal of soft power from their communist ideology.”\textsuperscript{16} To the extent that the influence of communist ideology attracted adherents in non-communist countries, the idea of its ideology as a soft power may be correct.

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 191.
\textsuperscript{15}Joseph S. Nye, Jr., \textit{Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History}, (New York: Longman, 1997), 53. This iteration marks “Nye Version 2.0” for the purpose of future discussion.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 118.
Yet, in Nye’s analysis immediately following this statement, he tied the loss of this power to the revelations of Stalin’s excesses in brutality acknowledged during the de-Stalinization program led by Khrushchev in 1956, as well as the military and political crackdowns in Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.\(^{17}\)

For Nye, the turning point in the loss of communist soft power was the clearly coercive nature of these public events. What Nye lacked in his analysis of communist ideological soft power in this second version of his theory was a comprehensive treatment of the actual range of communism’s power projection onto those who were under its control.\(^{18}\) This simplification of Soviet success did little to address the delicate and confusing lines between soft power and coercive capabilities, as they may be experienced inside the Soviet model. It also did not clarify the problems policymakers face in attempting to select the correct form of power to achieve the preferred outcomes without sacrificing the benefits of alternative policies, a consideration Army Berlin applied regularly in its mission.

Nye’s explanation for perceived soft power loss by the Soviets is applicable to this examination of Army Berlin, as the behaviors of the Soviets in the oppression of dissent in satellite nations and the impact these actions had on public opinion weighed on the unit in its preparations for duty in the city. Army Berlin possessed the capability to exercise Nye’s soft power, yet in its planning and training, it prepared to exercise a broader range of power if required to achieve the policy goals of the United States.

From these early attempts by Nye to define soft power as a working concept, it was still necessary for him to provide practical means by which a state might not only recognize and

---

\(^{17}\) Ibid.

\(^{18}\) For background on the Soviet system as it was applied to satellite states, see Leszek Kolakowski’s three volume treatise *Main Currents of Marxism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978). Kolakowski, a committed Polish socialist, critiqued the methods of totalitarian communism based upon his own experience in Poland.
enhance its own soft power resources, but to act intentionally to exercise this form of power globally. Nye, who had established the brand name soft power, framed these responses in a series of publications from 2002 through 2004. One of the first conceptual redefinitions which occurred in this series was the logical formation of a simpler descriptor for the antithesis to soft power projection. “Military power and economic power are both examples of hard command power that can be used to induce others to change their position. Hard power can rest on inducements (carrots) or threats (sticks).” Nye’s description of the classic form of power, coercion, into its own unified term, hard power, was the logical result.

In fact, Nye had simply begun rebranding two conceptual realities of foreign relations that were acknowledged in nearly every form of political theorization from the beginning of the study of international politics. His 1990 definition of co-optive power into soft power resulted in no actual paradigm shift from the standard understanding of cooperation as one mode of interaction between states. At the other end of the spectrum, forms of coercion eventually became known as hard power.

The simplification of state behavior into these two primary modes carried with it both benefits and costs. On the positive side, emphasizing two modes of interaction as the principal mechanisms of state-to-state behavior, using common terms that broadened the understanding for the public, provided an opportunity to expand the discussion, a democratization of foreign policy terminology. Alternatively, one possible negative in the narrowed discussion is the reduction of
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19 For examples of Nye’s published monographs of this period on the definition of “soft” and “hard” power and their roles in American and International Relations practices, see The Paradox of American Power: Why the World’s Superpower Can’t Go It Alone, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Power in the Global Information Age: From Realism to Globalization, (London: Routledge, 2004); Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics, (New York: PublicAffairs, 2004). This series of publications during the period constitutes “Nye version 3.0” for the purpose of this work.

increased awareness of more nuanced modes that also impact why one state may act in alignment with another state’s wishes, including “coordination” and “coincidence of interest,” modes which Nye’s soft power only incidentally impacts. In this period of refinement, Nye appeared to recognize the limits of his own conceptual framework, if only in reactionary response to its application, as well as the political environment in which his concepts were operating.

A difficult and less apparent realization, that the institutional separations between the primary implementers of coercive and cooperative branches of U.S. foreign policy goals were often indistinguishable at the street level, had not clearly materialized in this third version of Nye’s attempt to standardize his concepts. His refinement appeared to avoid grappling with this reality, bearing little resemblance to actual foreign policy practices readily apparent in the historical records of the uniformed foreign policy institutions of the United States.

On November 14, 1980, the Public Affairs Office of the United States Commander of Berlin provided Major General Calvert P. Benedict and his Chief of Staff a series of translated West Berlin newspaper stories criticizing American land use plans. Army Berlin’s designated property leasing office, the Division of Engineering and Housing (DEH) had initial discussions from the beginning of 1980 to make troop and dependent morale improvements to a newly constructed military housing area. Representative of similar stories in Der Taggespiegel and Berliner Morgenpost in their November 13th and 14th editions, the translated headline in Bild Zeitung read “FDP: Not any more American Sports Fields in Zehlendorf.”

Located in district Zehlendorf, a 250-unit dependent housing complex known as “Dueppel IX” had been built under lease agreement and contract with German firms in

---

accordance with all local and Quadrapartite Agreement regulations. This cooperative practice between U.S. and Berlin officials exemplified the long-standing institutional and political processes that served American force support in Berlin, as well as providing the local elected leaders access to military decision-making. Yet, inside the district’s elected leadership, the value of publicizing the discussions through the free press to elicit opposition in the population was a potent form of political power. In its transmittal to the Secretary of State regarding the issue, Mission Berlin provided the translated West Berlin newspaper story to illustrate the dilemma of a public forum process which invited local comment and creative interpretation:

The Zehlendorf FDP will try everything to have the American authorities drop the construction of the Sports area in Dueppel Nord. The District Assembly said: The party rejects the American intention to construct sports areas on another area between Benschallee and Krummes Fenn. The FDP is asking the Americans to drop these plans. The ecologically valuable area should be preserved for the population and kept as the Museum village’s surrounding area. The Voters Union of Independent Citizens (WUB) also are against the project of the Americans. The Zehlendorf District Office is also against the American construction plans: The area was included into the regional landscape plans for its ecological importance.23

This American request to lease the large, flat open field adjacent to Dueppel IX arose as an unexpected controversy for Army Berlin. In an effort to make improvements in soldier and family quality of life in the first decade of the post-Vietnam all volunteer military, the field would be utilized for sports including soccer and football, and required the approval of the Zehlendorf district assembly and a written agreement.

The sudden unplanned press leak by Jürgen Klemann, (CDU) Deputy City Councillor for Building in Rathaus Zehlendorf, forced both Army Berlin and Mission Berlin to review the process of the discussions. The resulting investigation produced a direct telegram from Mission Berlin to the Secretary of State in Washington D.C., to prepare diplomatic representatives on any potential discussion issues for a scheduled December 11, 1980 meeting between West German

23 Ibid.
and American diplomats. The telegram noted the standard practice of Army Berlin to make requests of their West Berlin counterparts, and included an offer to relocate a current land user, Free University professor Schubenz, to other U.S. leased property, conditional upon his acceptance.

At the time of the inconvenient press leak, the final agreement had not been made public or ratified by Rathaus Zehlendorf, but the telegram reflects continued optimism that the unexpected controversy would be successfully resolved. This assumption was based upon the hope that the arrangement was accepted by Dr. Schubenz and positively influenced through additional contacts by Brigadier General John E. Rogers, commanding general of the Berlin Brigade, as well as Mission Berlin Minister Anderson. Mission Berlin described the efforts of both its representative and Army Berlin’s General Rogers in a follow-up cable to Washington:

…the Berlin Brigade Commander, Brigadier General Rogers, called on Zehlendorf Mayor Rothkegel to discuss the matter. Mayor Rothkegel was somewhat apologetic about the press report allegedly made in his name. He assured Gen. Rogers that something would be worked out, and that it would take several months. Gen. Rogers left the meeting reassured that the Zehlendorf leadership did not believe that the US was trying to force its will on the local community. Subsequently, Mayor Rothkegel requested a meeting to discuss several matters with Minister Anderson. One matter concerned this field. Rothkegel told the minister that he had asked General Rogers for a letter which would include details of the proposed sports facility, including a plan of the work to be done, and assurances that German nationals would also be allowed to use the facility. Under those conditions, he said, he would see to it that area would be made available to USAB with a minimum of fuss. Minister Anderson repeated Gen. Rogers’ assurances that the US had no intention of taking the area in question through the use of its occupation rights.

In its final comment, Mission Berlin’s cable report to Washington reaffirmed the cooperative approach Army Berlin and Mission Berlin were committed to in their attempt to secure this valuable space at Dueppel IX:

24 “US Mission Berlin Telegram to Secretary of State, Washington, DC.” 12/8/80, USBERLIN Unclassified #2581, reply to STATE reference 294804, Berlin Brigade Collection, Box 5, folder titled “Correspondence Concerning Construction Projects,” USAMHI. Note: USAB is a common diplomatic and military channel acronym for United States Army, Berlin.

25 Ibid. Emphasis in italics added.
This issue is irrelevant to the case to be argued on 11 December. Our best estimate is that it arose because of local political maneuvering in the Zehlendorf district. USAB plans to pursue the idea of a sports field, and will continue consultations with Rothkegel and other Zehlendorf officials. *There is no intention to use occupation authority to override the district’s wishes.*

In order to apply Nye’s first decade of theoretical assumptions to the example of the land use request, it requires flexibility in accepting the premise that co-optive and coercive power is not only a policy selection, but also a political calculation. In the case of the goals of Army Berlin, to achieve a contiguous space available for recreational use for military families that allowed for maximum morale improvement, the command restricted its policy options to cooperative methods only.

Working with Zehlendorf Mayor Wolfgang Rothkegel, General Rogers, the newly rotated commander of the Berlin Brigade as of August 1, 1980, made a policy choice that left the outcome of this issue in the hands of Zehlendorf’s elected leaders. Rogers deferred use of the available U.S. rights in occupation even as dissident political forces used the press in an attempt to portray the request as a U.S. demand. On the Berliner side, Rothkegel recognized the opportunity to cooperate and achieve a written agreement that the space would remain available to Berliners. This allowed him to claim a victory in the process that could be used to negate the opposition’s attempt to stir public dissatisfaction through its own use of strategic press leaks to activate existing Berliner sentiments toward American land possession and use.

This interaction might be recognized in Nye’s early versions of his co-optive or soft power, based upon the behavior of representatives of Army Berlin and Mission Berlin. The difficulty in the methodology in assessment arises based upon “who” is practicing this form of power. Army Berlin is a military unit, which classically represents the coercive power of the United States. Applying Nye’s first three power definition versions, military units are ineligible.

---

26 Ibid. Emphasis in italics added.
to exercise soft power, as they are considered representative of “hard command power.” The continuation of long-standing practices in the city, exhibited by Army Berlin’s refusal to countenance exercising its occupation authority, even for an important complex that was meant to enhance the force, is clearly co-operative behavior. This discretionary policy choice which exhibited a nuanced awareness on the part of the street-level foreign policy force, Army Berlin, perhaps would have appeared unrecognizable to the disciples of Nye formulating foreign policy theories over a decade later.

Reminiscent of the process in which the new term soft power arose to characterize the use of non-coercive power by a state to achieve goals in international relations, smart power had a similar accidental origin. In his 2004 work *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*, Nye once again attached a common word to the singular “power” to make a point on its use by states in foreign relations. “Like the challenge of the Cold War, this one cannot be met by military power alone. That is why it is so essential that Americans- and others- better understand and apply soft power. Smart power is neither hard nor soft. It is both.”

This work was meant as both a refinement of the soft power concept as well as a pointed critique of the international behavior of the administration of George W. Bush in the early days of the Iraq War. This uncovered one of the central dilemmas in Nye’s promotion of soft power as a principal competitor to the classical understanding of international political behaviors, in which power selections included the full spectrum of modes of interaction. It was his original thesis in 1990 that the answer to reversing the specter of American decline in the post-Cold war era rested in the promotion of soft power in place of hard power in more instances of foreign relations.

---

In this new iteration, Nye came to the realization that the key to successful diplomacy was a new form of power, smart power, exercised by policymakers. Unfortunately, consistent with the imprecision of his 1990 work, Nye failed to recognize that by offering a new term without adequate development it was subject to varied interpretation until much later, when he attempted to impose a clearer picture of his views of smart power.

The next development in Nye’s theorem was his opportunity to serve as co-chair of a foreign policy commission of an influential American think-tank in 2007. The Center for Strategic & International Studies report entitled “CSIS Commission on Smart Power: A smarter, more secure America” offered policy diagnosis and prescriptions “to develop a vision to guide America’s global engagement.” Self-described as a bipartisan effort, the commission adapted Nye’s power constructs, and in its executive summary, offered its own definition of the new desired mode of American foreign policy, smart power, as the following:

Smart power is neither hard nor soft- it is the skillful combination of both. Smart power means developing an integrated strategy, resource base, and tool kit to achieve American objectives, drawing on both hard and soft power. It is an approach that underscores the necessity of a strong military, but also invests heavily in alliances, partnerships, and institutions at all levels to expand American influence and establish the legitimacy of American action. Providing for the global good is central to this effort because it helps American reconcile its overwhelming power with the rest of the world’s interests and values.

The commission located the dilemma of modern American foreign policy in three areas, identifying the first as an over-reliance upon the military resources at hand. “The Pentagon is the best trained and best resourced arm of the federal government. As a result, it tends to fill every void, even those that civilian instruments should fill.” The report included just a few of the most recent examples of the significant gaps the U.S. military filled in soft power projection
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28 Center for Strategic & International Studies, CSIS Commission on Smart Power: A smarter, more secure America, Richard L. Armitage and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., co-chairs, 2007, 1. This publication represents “Nye Version 5.0” in development for future discussion.
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around the globe. These included the 2004 tsunami relief in Southeast Asia, as well as earthquake relief to Pakistan in 2005.

Another example of the long history of the use of the U.S. military, which is not highlighted in the commission’s report, is directly related to America’s commitment to Berlin. In 1948, in response to the Soviet ground blockade of Berlin, the Allied western forces established a massive air supply system, the Berlin Airlift, to support the citizens of West Berlin with every form of subsistence material necessary to remain in the city. This also would certainly qualify as a form of soft power or a humanitarian effort. At the least, this was most certainly a form of foreign assistance which was delivered by a U.S. government foreign policy institution.

Additional issues identified by the commission included the observation that “U.S. foreign policy is still struggling to develop soft power instruments…Diplomacy and foreign assistance are often underfunded and underused.”\(^\text{31}\) A final critical area addressed is the difficulty of the fractured nature and compartmentalization of national security and foreign affairs bureaucratic structures. The commission attributed interagency coordination difficulties as well as the phenomenon of bureaucratic “stovepiping,” where action and information are channeled into the lead agency on an issue only to be walled off from other foreign relations assets that might offer valuable assistance or support.\(^\text{32}\)

These particular critical problems are a useful set of comparatives for analysis of the limits and use of different types of power available to Army Berlin from 1961 to 1994. The use of the military in accomplishing soft power goals in Berlin had longstanding precedents before the unit’s command reorganization and upgrades in 1961 in response to the emergency, and set

\(^{31}\) Ibid., 8-9.
\(^{32}\) Ibid., 9.
the tone for the remainder of the Cold War period. The command structure implemented in Berlin was a critical step in smoothing out the coordination and institutional conflicts that are highlighted in the 2007 CSIS report, exemplified by its contemporary terminology including “stovepiped institutional cultures.” In fact, the cooperative nature of Army Berlin and Mission Berlin throughout the early crisis period and after in the city offers another historical reply to Nye’s inability to recognize precedents in joint institutional operations for national purposes, wielding smart power policy.

In 2011, Nye offered The Future of Power as his final update to his definitions and promoted the term smart power in differentiation to others who had incorporated his soft power and hard power concepts into their own smart theories. In this most current version Nye made his most complete synthesis on the forms of power that a state must utilize in order to secure its own interests and assume leadership in the global community. For the first time, Nye fully examines the functionality of three separate types of power (Military, Economic, and Soft) and provided analysis in each category, differentiating between their limits and advantages. He acknowledged the fact that his newly free-standing type of power (economic) is dependent upon a coercive foundation, and rather ironically, emphasized the critical value of military force:

…markets and economic power rest upon political frameworks. In chaotic conditions of great uncertainty, markets fail. Political frameworks rest upon norms and institutions, but also upon the management of coercive power. A well-ordered modern state is defined in terms of a monopoly on the legitimate use of force, and that allows domestic markets to operate. Internationally, where order is more tenuous, residual concerns about the coercive use of force, even if a low probability, can have important effects. Military force provides the framework (along with norms, institutions, and relationships) that helps to provide a minimal degree of order. Metaphorically, military power provides a degree of security that is to order as oxygen is to breathing: little noticed until it begins to become scarce.

---
33 Ibid.
34 Joseph S. Nye, Jr., The Future of Power (New York: PublicAffairs, 2011). This final work represents the final, or perhaps more correctly, the latest iteration, “Nye Version 6.0.” For a different viewpoint on smart power that was authored in 2004 at the time of Nye’s incomplete use of the term, see Suzanne Nossel, “Smart Power.” Foreign Affairs, 83, 4 (March 2004), 131-142.
Similarly, Nye’s two decades old term of soft power was significantly refined as a stand-alone co-optive value in this restructure. Mechanisms like the IMF and GATT regimes, which may be coercive, were no longer included in the soft type. Instead, they reside in Nye’s new separate economic type, supported by the coercive foundation, and the emphasis is well-defined.

In this last version, Nye Version 6.0, his criteria for his original idea of simplified power typologies is refined into its clearest form. “The soft power of a country rests heavily on three basic resources: its culture (in places where it is attractive to others), its political values (where it lives up to them at home or abroad), and its foreign policies (when others see them as legitimate and having moral authority).”36

Another key advancement is Nye’s integration of other scholar’s conceptual works into his own formulation of the exercise of power; Nye’s “Three Aspects of Relational Power” include “commanding change, controlling agendas, and establishing preferences.”37 These “faces” of power as adapted by Nye add critical nuance to the understanding of the methods available to policymakers as they select from his three power types.38 These might be considered both strategic and tactical political behaviors based upon the existing balance of power, real or perceived, which exist between two or more actors or groups. These aspects of relational power were particularly displayed by both Army Berlin and West Berlin’s own civic leadership in the period under study, and as modes of implementation, were indispensable in achieving policy outcomes that appear “smart” in historical analysis.

36 Ibid., 84.
37 Ibid., 10-11.
In this last iteration, Nye offered a workable structure that addressed the missing component of distinction and vague references to soft power as its own source of influence, accessible for policymakers command. Although Nye had never made the argument that soft power, under any definition, provided a state with an equal amount of influence to entirely supplant hard power, its allure tempted policymakers to overemphasize where it might be used. Nye’s addition and clarification of smart power as policy behavior, rather than a type of power itself, is a critical development. Yet, an assessment of front-end estimates at national policymaker level in the case of Army Berlin is incomplete for this task. To understand John F. Kennedy’s smart power choice of the military as the prime institution to project American power, both hard and soft through the reorganized unit of Army Berlin, a different level of analysis must be employed.

Connecting Nye to Street-level Implementation by Army Berlin

In Nye’s power theses as advanced to their current configuration, the emphasis is directed at the state policymaker level. Nye is primarily concerned with processes that may be described as “estimation” and “selection,” and offers less advice on the next stage of any action, the “implementation” process. This, in fact, is a critical stage in which the theoretical smart power confronts the reality of contact and requires observation, adjustment, and possibly even radical revisions. Combining Nye’s smart power with a more complete schema of how policy becomes functioning and practical in complex, multi-iteration models which acknowledge this reality can provide the sophistication necessary to assess how smart power actually occurred in the city occupied by Army Berlin and its allies.

The activities of members of the military community in Berlin in relation to the mission and the city were designed well outside the assumed behaviors of a normally coercive institution.
In the January 8, 1960 edition of the *Berlin Observer*, Army Berlin’s official community newspaper, the role of dependents in projecting soft power is highlighted:

Ladies of the 6th Infantry Officers Wives Club brought Christmas cheer to 114 adults and children of the Britz refugee camp recently— the third consecutive year that the organization has brightened the holiday season of refugee centers in West Berlin. For several weeks the club…collected clothing for the needy people. Then, when the day of the presentation arrived, each member brought a toy for a child. The children received their gifts at the Christmas party from a “Weihnachsmann.” For many of the refugees from Communism, it was their first contact with Americans.\(^{39}\)

This response, driven by the officially organized voluntary association of the spouses of male officers of the Berlin Brigade’s line infantry regiment, the 6th U.S. Infantry, clearly meets the most advanced criteria of Nye’s idea of soft power, Version 6.0.

The event is cultural in context, yet it is also purposefully designed in line with Army Berlin guidelines and support, although the unit provided no direct financial assistance toward the cost of the gifts, clothing, or celebration. The recipients of the 1959 holiday outreach were East German refugees in West Berlin who were attempting to obtain permanent residence in West Berlin or access to West Germany. Their status varied, and while some had not yet been cleared through West Berlin security procedures, many had no relatives with available living space, leaving them in the camp.

For the American officer’s wives, the interactions were personal and affirming of their Christian values, yet the foreign policy benefits to the United States met national goals of projecting political legitimacy and moral behavior, ultimately demonstrating presence and viability in Berlin. These women connected U.S. national policy goals through their own process of estimation and selection, and carried out the program with their own implementation behaviors.

In *The Foundations of Policy Analysis*, Garry D. Brewer and Peter deLeon provide a connective remedy to the distance between Nye’s executive-level smart power and the actions of the U.S. Army on the ground in Berlin under investigation in this work. The critical difference is the inclusion of the processes “Implementation, Evaluation, and Termination.”40 Where Nye located control of outcomes at the top of the command chain and offered little advice for observation of outcomes of smart power policy at the street level, Brewer and deLeon focused on the bureaucratic-political work of local public administrators in America:

> Implementation is an important but frequently overlooked step in the general policy process model. Lacking proper implementation, policy innovation and selection may end up being little more than intellectual exercises; indeed, faulty policy implementation can invalidate the earlier, carefully considered steps in the policy process and thereby intensify the original problem.41

This “street-level” bureaucrat viewpoint of the functional requirements of making power by any name (soft, hard, smart) work to achieve strategic goals leads to the recognition that human inputs - constrained or informed by factors including social, political, and psychological conditions - matter.42 In a bureaucratic structure that translates strategic goals into policies and practices that can be implemented by the majority of its necessary local leadership and workforce in their routine behaviors, the expectations of successful implementation are enhanced.

In the context of this work, the existence of more than one strategic goal in United States policy in response to the 1961 Berlin crisis required Army Berlin to modify the implementation of local policies to accomplish these strategic objectives. Brewer and deLeon differentiate between goals (intent) and behavior (policy), which separate policymakers from implementers:

> Intent refers to desired outcomes of perceived problems, while policy encompasses the programs designed to effect those outcomes. High-level policymakers usually have to be rather general and
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abstract in their statements of intent, for it may be difficult or impossible for them to foresee all
the contexts in which a policy will be carried out and to formulate specific guidelines for each
one.43

While the executive defines both intent and policy, the execution of the policy in pursuit
of these goals is dependent upon gaining broad bureaucratic action in furtherance of the policy,
in the local context of action. For Brewer and deLeon, “A sensitive appreciation of specific,
realistic contexts in which decisions are made and results are sought is a necessary prerequisite
to understanding and action.”44 In the case of policy and its implementation in Berlin, U.S.
national intent was dependent upon the institutional regimes of Army Berlin as action agent to
provide the most complete spectrum of Nye’s available power types, to select the appropriate
aspect of relational power as a tactical political matter, and to execute action.

It is critical to note that the distance from policymaker to the action agent is more than a
spatial or temporal issue. Contrary to Nye’s structure, where the executive selects policy and
moves on to the next national challenge, policy on the ground can be fraught with anarchic
conditions. The addition of Brewer and deLeon to the methodology advances the structural
component of the analysis; yet one more level of investigation, a step further into the street, is
offered.

Michael Lipsky’s contribution to the framework is based upon his work observing and
interviewing “street-level bureaucrats” beginning in the early 1970s.45 Lipsky investigated the
environment and attitudes of three particular occupations in delivering government services to
the public, in the context of the racial and financial challenges to the contemporary systems
constructed by smart policy to serve citizens in the urban environment:

44 Ibid., 260.
45Michael Lipsky, “Street-Level Bureaucracy and the Analysis of Urban Reform,” Urban Affairs Quarterly, (June
In American cities today, policemen, teachers, and welfare workers are under siege. Their critics variously charge them with being insensitive, unprepared to work with ghetto residents, incompetent, resistant to change, and racist. These accusations, directed toward individuals, are transferred to the bureaucracies in which they work.46

In this early work, Lipsky argued that these individuals acted “as ambassadors of government to the American people, and as ambassadors with significant impacts upon the lives of the poor and of relatively powerless minorities.”47 In their delivery of the necessary public goods and services to populations that are essentially captives of urban America, they “represent American government to its citizens.”48

In addition, the role of workplace bureaucratic stressors in the population of “street-level bureaucrats” was highlighted by Lipsky, who attributed low morale and stress adaptations to several factors:

(1) Inadequate resources. Street-level bureaucracies are widely thought to lack sufficient organizational resources to accomplish their jobs...(2) Threat and challenge to authority. The conditions under which street-level bureaucrats work often include distinct physical and psychological threats...(3) Contradictory or ambiguous job expectations. Confronted with resource inadequacies and threats which increase the salience of work-related results, street-level bureaucrats often find their duties exacerbated by uncertainties concerning expectations or performance.49

Each of these street-level stressors can be observed in the work of members of Army Berlin in their normal duties in the city. While Lipsky provided additional depth in these areas that is useful in the following chapters, one last point from his work may be insightful. In the normal practice of bureaucratic interactions with the public, frictions and misunderstandings are inevitable. Lipsky contended that institutional responses, which may appear to promote communication and transparency in service to the “client” public, serve dual and sometimes contradictory purposes:
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…we may see the development of human relations councils, citizen review boards, special equal opportunity units, and other “community relations” bureaus for what they are. They may provide citizens with increased marginal access to the system, but, equally important, they inhibit institutional change by permitting street-level bureaucrats to persist in behavioral patterns because special units to handle “human relations problems” have been created. These institutional developments do not fundamentally affect general bureaucratic performance. Instead, they insulate bureaucracies from having to confront behavioral factors affecting what appears to be racist work performance. These observations particularly obtain when, as is often the case, these units lack the power to impose on the bureaucracy decisions favorable to aggrieved citizens.50

The context of this observation by Lipsky is important, even if not a parallel to this work in emphasis. Studying the role of government in urban America during the turbulent 1970s, Lipksy argued that issues of race and poverty forced local governments to adapt new forms of public communications, directed at the most vocal leaders of affected communities.

This is a bureaucratic phenomenon that appears inside Army Berlin, as well as in its renewed efforts to connect with the Berliner public, particularly as Germans experienced their own forms of social revolutions and generational shifts. As Nye cautioned at the policymaker level, for power to be truly smart it must be adaptable and revisable in different contexts, cultures, and times. Moving beyond Nye, it must also result in a positive, local impact. In their efforts to be both Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors, Americans in Berlin practiced a form of associative community structure through the formation of networks, clubs, and interest organizations. The members of the broader American foreign policy efforts in Berlin transplanted democratic, local, and effective behaviors from their own cultural experiences and history which they deemed highly valuable in their interactions with their Berliner neighbors.

Smart Power Implementation: Culture, Networks and Trust as Power

The reliance upon soft power as smart policy, selected and implemented, appears differently at the street-level for both the American tasked with projecting it as well as the

50 Ibid., 399-400.
Berliner experiencing it. For Americans, the efforts required in support of a democratic society are individual, embedded, and primarily voluntary. In Alexis de Tocqueville’s report on mid-19th century American society, his concentration on the local level provided him with distinct observations of conditions, even as his analysis led to many broad generalizations about the nation:

Their diverse municipal laws struck me as so many barriers designed to confine the restless ambitions of citizens within a narrow sphere and to turn the very democratic passions that might overthrow the state to the benefit of the towns. It seemed to me that American lawmakers had contrived, not without success, to counter the constant flux of the political world with the stability of religious morality; to counter the people’s theoretical ignorance with their experience; and to counter the heat of popular desires with the people’s habitual involvement in public affairs.\(^5\)

This understanding of one form of American exceptionalism, passed down in the mythic narratives of American representative government where power is based at the local level, was a staple of civic education in the United States in the first half of the 20th century. In the context of the Cold War, among the many distinctions between the two competing economic and political systems, this organizing principle possessed significant power.

de Tocqueville’s comment upon American municipal activity, and more specifically the habits of Americans to engage in the public space for the purpose of impacting their communities, is updated and expanded in Robert D. Putnam’s *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*.\(^5\) Putnam’s conceptual insights from his investigation into the changing landscape of the individual and communal behaviors of Americans in the second half of the 20th century provide a cultural component to this examination.

The time period that much of Putnam’s study is drawn from is contemporaneous with the service of Army Berlin for the period of the Berlin Wall. The mores and cultural cues of their
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own functioning democracy were a fundamental part of the Americans serving in Berlin, and they transmitted these behaviors into Berlin through their official and unofficial behaviors. Their understanding of civic virtue and good government in their own communities in America altered their interaction with Berliners, both in the private and public spheres, and in their official and unofficial duties. Acting in alignment with their understanding of national interests as communicated in official mission statements and supporting directives, soft power was an integral part of the Army’s efforts in Berlin.

As Good Neighbors, members of the American military in Berlin invested significant social capital into their mission accomplishment. The goals of social capital, like power, can vary, and Putnam answers a question in his study that this examination will consider in context:

Social capital, in short, can be directed toward malevolent, anti-social purposes, just like any other form of capital…Therefore it is important to ask how the positive consequences of social capital-mutual support, cooperation, trust, institutional effectiveness-can be maximized and the negative manifestations-sectarianism, ethnocentrism, corruption-minimized.53

Putnam’s version of social capital theory posits that “the core idea of social capital theory is that social networks have value…social contacts affect the productivity of individuals and groups.”54 Putnam asserts that these networks are structured in two forms, informal and formal, and both are applicable to the practices of the U.S. Army in Berlin. Informal networks occur in both repeated and episodic form, and an example of a repeated form Putnam offers is a regularly scheduled “pickup basketball game” in which there are no formal policies or governing rules.55 An episodic, informal form may be the “faintly familiar face you see several times a month in the supermarket checkout line.”56 Formal networks, according to Putnam, are characterized by
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organizational structures that include “incorporation papers, regular meetings, a written constitution, and connection to a national federation.”57

Both of these forms of networking are practiced by Army Berlin, based upon existing networks that preceded the reorganization in 1961, and in new forms of behaviors that were adapted at the street-level by the command. Putnam’s assertion that social capital is a mechanism to improve trust is developed further in his distinction in the use of networks, formal or informal, to either “bridge” or “bond” among individuals:

Of all the dimensions along which forms of social capital vary, perhaps the most important is the distinction between bridging (or inclusive) and bonding (or exclusive)... Bonding social capital is good for undergirding specific reciprocity and mobilizing solidarity... Bridging networks, by contrast, are better for linkage to external assets and form information diffusion.58

The prior example of the 1959 Christmas program for refugees at the Britz refugee camp, a need-based response by a formal organization, the 6th Infantry’s Officer Wives Club (OWC), meets this criteria clearly.

The OWC operated in a formal structure of hierarchical positions, constitutional and incorporative papers, and in regular meetings governed by “Roberts Rules of Order.” It provided a definite bonding function among its members, linking the spouses of senior command officers in the regiment with the wives of newly assigned and junior officers, in mutual support environment, a critical military morale network.

Additionally, in its outreach into the Berlin civil population, it presented opportunities for bridging between the American and German cultural communities. As a recurrent program that began in 1957, the outreach to refugees had adapted and was revised to increase the efficiency of the effort, matching the needs of the transient population to the capacity of the association.

---
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The efforts of these Good Neighbor American military housewives, primarily viewed as charitable in nature, also contained a deep cultural exchange between Americans and Berliners, in the context of their shared Christian belief systems. The Christmas holiday season was a regular opportunity to showcase many forms of American presence and viability, exemplified through acts of civic virtue, and this program demonstrated that it went well beyond the soldiers themselves. In his 2004 work, Nye alluded to the value of cultural interactions as a form of soft power in his inclusion of a short quote attributed to George Kennan on the importance of the transfer of “high culture” through artistic expression. In his address to the Museum of Modern Art in New York, Kennan stated that “I for my part, would willingly trade the entire remaining inventory of political propaganda for the results that could be achieved by such means alone.”

Although Kennan emphasized elite cultural connections in this speech, in Berlin important cultural transfers were often at a much more common level, in a broader population. In the case of the 6th Infantry Officer’s Wives Club, this behavior by American women co-deployed with their spouses linked a formal network into an informal process that identified refugees from East Germany and the eastern portion of Berlin, stranded in the city after crossing the border to escape the Soviet zone. The activities of these women added social capital to the American occupation and enhanced trust between themselves and the specific recipients. More importantly in Putnam’s theory, these women provided the conditions for the increase in social capital, as he explains the benefits to a functioning society. Putnam specified the duality in his statement that “Social capital can thus be simultaneously a ‘private good’ and a ‘public good.’

---

Some of the investment in social capital goes to bystanders, while some of the benefit redounds to the immediate interest of the person making the investment.\(^\text{60}\)

The centrality of trust between members of networks, either formal or informal, is a significant part of Putnam’s deeper analysis of the concept of social capital as exercised in post-World War II America, where he elaborated on the value of specific forms of trust:

“The touchstone of social capital is the principal of generalized reciprocity–I’ll do this for you now without expecting anything immediately in return and perhaps without even knowing you, confident that down the road you or someone else will return the favor… A society that relies on generalized reciprocity is more efficient than a distrustful society, for the same reason that money is more efficient than barter. Honesty and trust lubricate the inevitable frictions of social life…Social trust is a valuable community asset if- but only if- it is warranted. You and I will both be better off if we are honest toward one another than if-each fearing betrayal- we decline to cooperate.”\(^\text{61}\)

Putnam’s theory distinguished between societies that operate with low levels of trust and those that build rich functioning networks that make cooperative behavior possible. He made a critical point that a specific form of trust, *Generalized Reciprocal Thin Trust*, is the key to maximizing societal effectiveness. As a final dimension of trust, Putnam incorporated its relationship with honesty as a basis for the extension of trust to others.\(^\text{62}\)

The connection between honesty and trust, exercised in informal and formal networks for the purpose of increasing cooperation between individuals and groups, is the basis for generalized reciprocity. The possibility of Nye’s co-optive soft power as a necessary balance to hard power in the exercise of smart power, or perhaps more correctly, smart policy, is dependent upon trust. The final analytical distinctions from Putnam’s framework that impact this study are the differences between *Thick Trust* and *Thin Trust*. Thick trust is “trust embedded in personal

---

\(^{60}\) Putnam, *Bowling Alone*, 20.

\(^{61}\) Ibid., 134-136.

\(^{62}\) Ibid., 135-136.
relations that are strong, frequent, and nested in wider networks." This trust is the type that members of formal networks routinely develop, and that are most directly related to organized efforts to influence social capital possibilities. Alternatively, Putnam described thin trust:

On the other hand, a thinner trust in “the generalized other,” like your new acquaintance from the coffee shop, also rests implicitly on some background of shared social networks and expectations of reciprocity. Thin trust is even more useful than thick trust, because it extends the radius of trust beyond the roster of people whom we can know personally.

By distinguishing the two types of trust from each other, interactions preserved in the records of Army Berlin offer interesting glimpses in the power structure and personal behaviors on both sides of the street-level diplomatic table.

As an example of the application of Putnam to this study, General Hay’s comment in 1964 at his first German-American committee meeting on the program to have Americans live in Berliner homes can be illustrated in the context of Putnam’s version of social capital. Engaged in a formal network that has both bonding and bridging impacts, Hay reminded West Berlin’s district mayors of the role of the U.S. Army in their city, the basis for a generalized reciprocal thin trust that should inform the public’s views. Army Berlin projected hard power in a traditional military sense, and in its duty as a force of soft power, the general asked the mayors to expend their own political capital to achieve a goal of the U.S. State Department. He made this request in the belief that past interactions in the public by Americans, whether repeated or episodic, had generated enough accumulated thin trust in the city’s general population that the program could succeed.

As a new member of the committee, General Hay may not yet have had the opportunity to build his own thick trust with the German members of the network. It is clear that he

---
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depended upon the generalized reciprocal thick trust earned by his predecessors to aid him while he established his own social capital in the group. Adding influence to his request, however, was his primary role as the representative of U.S. national hard power as the second in command of the Berlin Brigade to Army Berlin commander Franklin in the event of war. This combination of two of Nye’s 2011 version power types, military and soft, is the definition of smart power as policy.

The mission requirements of Army Berlin during the period of the existence of the Berlin Wall consistently required all members of the unit, as well as their dependents, to exercise a set of policy behaviors which Nye began to define as smart power in 2004 and ultimately refined to its most developed version in 2011. The exclusion by Nye of military efforts to advance cultural and political diplomacy in these frameworks misses the reality of the historical record of Army Berlin.

Although there are elements in Army Berlin of the basic Nye versions offered beginning in his 1990, characterized here as Nye Versions 1.0 through 3.0, it is most fitting to apply Nye’s eventual developmental schema, Nye Versions 4.0 through 6.0, to the entire period under examination. Army Berlin understood its actions in the context of an assumed “smart” outcome, and exercised policy selection and implementation practices accordingly. It was not restricted from the exercise of soft power by the theoretical limitations of political scientists and adapted its public relations and community efforts in furtherance of smart power policy.

Framed in the paradoxes of hard power and soft power and additionally viewed in their roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors, these Americans’ efforts aligned with the national foreign policy interests of the United States as John F. Kennedy revised and reinforced in his smart power policy response to the wall. The operational and command reforms of 1961 set the
tone for the unit for the rest of the Cold War, and allowed it to preserve the role of the United States in Europe, denied Khrushchev his prize, and retained West Berlin as a democratic enclave. This reassured allies, and particularly the West Germans, of the ultimate commitment of the nation to defend Western Europe. At the local level, Army Berlin worked with the democratically elected representatives of the free part of the city to balance these two oppositional roles, which allowed the United States government to remain in place to project smart power.

As street-level implementers of national policy, the U.S. Army cultivated and valued networks that allowed it to build broader trust with the Berliner population. These networks, both formal and informal, provided the opportunity to ease tensions and communicate between two cultural perspectives as they emphasized similarities and negotiated differences. This interaction was made more effective as American traditions of associative behavior in their own society assisted in achieving national policy in Berlin. American military leaders recognized the value of soft power long before it was branded by Nye and promoted their Good Neighbors expectations of the military community. They emphasized the American cultural importance placed upon civic virtues and community in associative behavior, particularly in its requirement of the commissioned officer ranks, designed to build positive social capital that redounded to the national interest.

First and foremost, Army Berlin was committed to projecting hard power in defense of the city. It modernized rapidly after the 1961 crisis, and updated its training facilities and doctrine to conduct operations inside the city, in both combat and civil disturbance roles. These mission requirements demanded unique practices inherent to this unit, which significantly differed from other similarly sized units in the U.S. Army. West Berlin could not be retained
through the use of soft power alone, nor could the unit itself accomplish its mission by projecting only forms of hard power. Kennedy’s policy choices in the summer and fall of 1961, viewed through Nye’s smart power concept, correctly understood as policy rather than a type of power, achieved all of the major goals in the short term. In the nearly three decades following, Army Berlin implemented national smart power at the local level. These interactions emphasized social capital and associative behavior across several of Nye’s versions of his theory, even as his ultimate theoretical paradigm does not incorporate the use of military resources as an effective foreign policy selection in projecting forms of culture and political power.

In the following chapters, the selection and implementation of smart power policies by Army Berlin as street-level implementers over the course of the period in examination is assessed. In Chapter Three, “Enforcing U.S. Rights in Berlin,” the early crisis selection and implementation strategies are reviewed. The origins of Allied rights in Berlin are considered in the context of forms of international agreements based upon consent, practice, and interpretation. President Kennedy’s shrewd election to use the erection of the Berlin Wall to separate West and East Berlin in the discussion, to give the Soviets a victory in a contest in which the western Allies had already forfeited their interests, in any practical sense, is assessed. Kennedy’s redefinition of the right of access, as well as the first appearance of the new right of viability, is examined in preparation for further discussions upon Army Berlin’s interpretations, selection, and implementation plans.

In Chapter Four, “Implementing National Smart Power policy in Berlin, 1961-1963,” the impact of the crisis and the reforms of Army Berlin are discussed in the context of stated national interests. An emphasis is made on the local interpretations and efforts to achieve these goals, as well as the distinctions made over the protection and exercise of these rights. Applying Nye’s
varied power thesis versions, bureaucratic mechanisms in which Army Berlin participated in this period, meant to reinforce the unit’s image as Cold Warriors for its Berliner neighbors, as well as its operational limitations, are considered. Efforts in doctrine and behavior to balance the two forms of power (hard and soft) which required particular public examination by elected leaders, the press, and the American and German public are discussed. The command’s activities to accumulate social capital through networks that built trust, as well as the impact of specific traumatic events upon forms of Putnam’s most valuable societal trust construct, generalized reciprocal thin trust, is reviewed. Army Berlin’s diplomatic and cultural views toward Berliners in this period are critical to this chapter.

Chapter Five, “Hard Power: America’s Cold Warriors for Berlin,” concentrates upon more traditional military issues that faced the command after 1963 which demonstrate Nye’s hard power distinctions. Significant periods of street-level stressors which impact the force over the time period of the study are investigated. Continued international incidents, even as the crisis spotlight faded, remained a routine part of life in Army Berlin. Geographic and legal restrictions on training practices challenged the unit to implement alternative methods in their basic soldier skills, maneuver training, and combined arms evaluations. These issues, consistent with Michael Lipsky’s assertions, provide evidence of the difficulty Army Berlin faced in meeting its own high standards for readiness in the context of broader Army training and doctrine.

Another issue is how the unit responded to the changing social expectations of both its American soldiers and Berliners as the unit served through the late 1960s and 1970s. This is an important part of the story, as well as the command’s efforts to negotiate with its Berliner counterparts on issues including noise, training damage, environmental concerns, safety, and crime through its Public Affairs Office and Community Relations staff. The value of Putnam’s
networks and trust theories are examined in the context of Cold Warrior hard power in terms of Nye’s aspects of relational power practices.

In Chapter Six, “Soft Power: America’s Good Neighbors in Berlin,” Nye’s soft power form takes command, and the relevance of his exclusions of military institutions as capable projectors of non-coercive influence is contested through an investigation of the broad, repetitive programs and policies that Army Berlin practiced. The distinctions Nye makes about “who” can best project national values in cultural, political, and foreign policy in any circumstance is tested, based upon the evidence of Army Berlin’s behaviors. How these three national values were transmitted at the street-level and who Army Berlin selected as ambassadorial Good Neighbors inside its military community, consisting of soldiers and their family members, is discussed in consideration of Nye’s definitions. The role of deep, cultural beliefs in American associative behaviors, and their impact on both planned and spontaneous efforts to transmit cultural and political messages that serve American interests in the city is analyzed using Putnam’s frameworks on social capital, networks, and trust. Instances of Berliner efforts to influence the Americans are also noted, where Americans of all levels in the city participated in specific bridging behaviors.

Finally, in the Conclusion, “Assessing Smart Power: Army Berlin’s Legacy,” the immediate post-unification period is examined to review and assess the effectiveness of Army Berlin as the smart power platform to achieve American interests. In the same confusion that spawned broad explanatory theories on the causes and meaning of the end of the wall, reunification, and ultimately the collapse of the Soviet system, Berliners and Americans faced uncertainty. Beyond the necessity of Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA) and the changing role of the Berlin Brigade into a deployable unit, long practices of bureaucratic partnerships were in
jeopardy. The change impacted joint German and American associative structures that had existed for many years, some of which operated at the highest levels of political and social life in Berlin. Further down the chain of command, a broader set of officially authorized organizations, which had served to bond trust between individual members and provide networks to bridge across cultural divides, now faced the specter of losing their American cohort. How these groups proposed to adapt and consider the continuation of relationships which had extended American influence through the distribution of all of Putnam’s trust forms into the broader Berlin community is reviewed, ultimately to close the case on Army Berlin as smart power policy.
CHAPTER 3. ENFORCING U.S. RIGHTS IN BERLIN

Throughout the Cold War, the specter of atomic warfare between the United States and
the Soviet Union caused American policymakers to recognize the potential cataclysmic outcome
and plan accordingly. President Kennedy’s successful attainment of the United States national
vital interest of avoiding nuclear war is certainly evidence of the administration’s application of
smart power policy selection in response to the construction of the Berlin Wall. This primary
national interest, appraised correctly as an existential threat, was not the only American foreign
policy interest at stake, even as it dominated the public narratives and private concerns of
American and allied leaders tasked with reacting to the situation as it evolved. Additional Cold
War national interests included containing communism and sustaining important economic and
military allies, the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

The city of Berlin had a significant role in support of each of these interests, particularly
in relation to the importance placed upon it by West Germany’s citizens and political leadership.
Their nation’s commitment to NATO rested heavily upon the resolve demonstrated by the allied
nations regarding Berlin. The projection of power by the United States, primarily understood as
a military issue, was a crucial factor. The varied rights which made the American military
occupation possible remained the source of that power, and how President Kennedy reinforced
clear consensual rights, altered implied rights, and creatively invented a new right are keys to the
behaviors of Army Berlin in the crisis period.

The scope of this chapter is limited primarily to the estimation, selection, and
implementation behaviors on the ground in Berlin beginning in the summer of 1961 in response
to President Kennedy’s policies toward Berlin presented in his July 25, 1961 address to the
nation. Kennedy’s speech projected his views on Berlin, a critical foreign policy issue unresolved in the Eisenhower administration’s response to the second Berlin Crisis. Kennedy’s policy statements as a candidate for the presidency, as well as his earlier record as a member of congress, provide background for his evolution toward the policy goals he declared that evening. With the erection of the wall in Berlin just a few weeks later, a third crisis appeared which offered Kennedy the opportunity to define American interests, based upon the consent and implied Allied rights of presence and access, as well as his creative invention of a new right, viability. For President Kennedy, this right carried one particular meaning, but Army Berlin, in its role as the street-level foreign policy force in the city, applied the right of viability based upon its own interpretation.

Connections made to President Kennedy’s decision-making process in this short but important period are not presented as a comprehensive approach or critique of the overall diplomatic efforts of the administration or the U.S. State Department. This chapter presents examples of street-level estimation which differed from the views of elected policymakers and appointed advisors to illustrate the implementation realities which the bureaucratic structure experienced, particularly in the U.S. Army in West Berlin. The Kennedy administration faced a set of policy choices that have been the subject of exhaustive comprehensive historical and policy analysis, but the connections to Army Berlin, the focus of this study, are significantly missing in the scholarly literature.


2 The field of policy studies and historical assessments of the Kennedy administration’s crisis decision-making in the period of 1961 to 1963 is voluminous: As examples of theoretical analyses, Honoré M. Catudal’s *Kennedy and the Berlin Wall Crisis: A Case Study in U.S. Decision Making*, (Berlin: Berlin Verlag, 1980) approaches the subject from the “rational-actor” mode of decision-making and places Kennedy and his closest advisors at the center of the story; In the broader sense of the link between the Cuban Missile Crisis and Berlin, For discussions on the Cuban
This chapter reviews the provenance and evolutions of these three Allied rights of presence, access, and viability, originating in the post-World War II Allied occupation period, and re-defined in the period of crisis from 1961 to 1963. The experience of more than fifteen years in negotiations with the Soviets over contentious issues, large and small, heavily influenced the estimation practices of those on the ground in Berlin who were responsible for delivering national policy. These experiences, while not entirely unproductive, had reinforced the perception that the Soviets were likely to act incrementally in their attempts to weaken Allied rights in Berlin.

While avoiding major crises was often the focus of diplomacy, it was considered equally likely that the Soviets would use episodes of tension to force official concessions on policy, or to practice a creeping bureaucracy that established precedents of behaviors that slowly restricted Allied rights and freedom of action. This perception was reinforced on the ground in Berlin, and institutionalized in the processes of estimation, selection, and implementation at that level, providing interpretive differences between Army Berlin and national policymakers.

A historical review of the origins, connections, and distinctions of these three rights follows in order to critically assess Army Berlin’s unique perspective on the importance of each


3 It is advisable to note that George F. Kennan, considered in the period as a leading Sovietologist even as he attempted to disclaim his influence on American foreign relations in the early Cold War, was consulted by the early Kennedy administration on issues of foreign policy regarding the Soviets. Kennan had long argued that Soviet, or more correctly, Russian history, pointed to a particular tendency for patient, long term, but clearly purposeful ideological actions. Reference to his assertions are throughout his written work, one example is his “Long Telegram” to George Marshall of February 22, 1946, where he noted that the Soviets “have learned to seek security only in patient but deadly struggle for the total destruction of rival power, never in compacts and compromises with it.” see “Telegram, George Kennan to George Marshall ["Long Telegram"]” February 22, 1946, 5-6, Truman Administration File, Elsey Papers, The Harry S. Truman Library and Archives, Independence, MO. Document online, available at: http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/documents/pdf/6-6.pdf
of these rights to American foreign policy interests. The manner in which President Kennedy reframed these national interests directly impacted Army Berlin’s own estimation, selection, and implementation process, as well as their efforts to exercise them prudently to achieve their mission.

Presence, Access, and Viability

In the case of President Kennedy’s approach to the crisis, three allied rights were repeatedly identified as the requirements of a successful outcome in any agreement with the Soviets. Throughout the period of destabilization that lasted into 1963, these terms remained at the center of American demands, although President Kennedy did not view each of them equally, or from the same perspective that Army Berlin held. These three “rights” were alternatively described in executive, diplomatic, and military channels in varied levels of importance at different phases of the period. In some cases, the semantic distinctions are minimal in the context of a particular discussion during the crisis. In other instances, the use of one or more of these terms denotes a very purposeful interpretation that distinguishes it from the other terms, a situation that applies regularly in the use of the term access, and, for different but important reasons, viability. Ultimately, however, the occasional assignment of the term “vital interest” to these rights often reflected the views of the presenting individual, influenced by their own level of responsibility for national interests or alternatively a local connection to Berlin itself.

4 The three rights repeatedly identified throughout the period (presence, access, and viability) are described by different American policymakers and advisors in the crisis as “requirements,” “rights,” or even “vital interests.” As an example, diplomatic distinctions between allied rights had been assigned the status of “vital interests” in early reaction to the crisis, which caused the Federal Republic of Germany concern, as these “vital interests” did not include the goal of future German reunification. See “Memorandum of Conversation, August 30, 1961,” Department of State, FRUS: 1961-1963, Volume XIV, Berlin Crisis, 1961-1962, Document 133. These fluid alterations in the terminology meant to assign importance to the issues caused considerable confusion in the estimation and selection process. For purposes of this work, the term “right,” in the legal sense, is assigned to presence, access, and viability. They each had a distinct genesis which will be described in the following section in this chapter.
An illustration of the difficulty in matching terminology and context in bureaucratic channels and organizational levels between policymakers and street-level implementation occurred in a briefing paper provided for President Kennedy’s military advisor, General Maxwell Taylor. A memorandum from Colonel Lawrence J. Legere, Taylor’s assistant, summarized Legere’s viewpoint of a meeting of the Berlin Task Force on August 22, 1962. Legere warned Taylor that the general consensus of the group in that meeting, engaged in its normal processes but in reaction to the heightened tensions in Berlin over the shooting of Peter Fechter on August 17, 1962, did not match the military’s assessment of what should be considered “vital.” In this case, the right of access to East Berlin was not considered a “vital” interest by the majority of the members of the combined diplomatic and military task force, and should not lead to an American over-reaction, including a retaliatory denial of Soviet entry into West Berlin. For these members, the vital form of access, matching President Kennedy’s intent, was the continued access from West Germany to West Berlin by autobahn, rail, and air.

For Legere, however, this was a misunderstanding of the term “vital.” “Whatever the motive, we should not back down one inch or anything anywhere, or the Soviets will have taken us once again. If we are blocked from East Berlin, we should shut the Soviets off from their Memorial as planned.” In this case, a form of an allied right based upon post-World War II treaties signed by three allied powers and exercised by particular extended agreements since the end of the war was not viewed in the same manner of importance by all advisory forums serving President Kennedy. LeGere applied an interpretation of allied rights in the city at this policy level which was more closely aligned with the perspectives of both Army Berlin and Mission 5

---

5 Memorandum From the Assistant to the President’s Military Representative (Legere) to the President’s Military Representative (Taylor), August 23, 1962,” Department of State, FRUS: 1961-1963, Volume XV, Berlin Crisis, 1962-1963, Document 101.
Berlin in this matter. The origins of these three rights are varied, and their inter-relationships are crucial to the role of Army Berlin as an effective smart power instrument of the United States.

*The Consensual Allied Right of Presence*

The historical and legal context in which the right of presence of the western allies in the Greater Berlin metropolitan area is rooted in treaty form, the most explicit structure of international law, consented to as a result of agreements between the victorious powers in World War II. Originally designed as a three-party system as negotiated between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, the agreement for the division of Germany and Berlin was accomplished officially on September 12, 1944, as part of the “Allied Protocol on Occupation Zones.”6 The original document defined the limits of Greater Berlin, as well as the partition of the city between them. The right of presence was guaranteed in force for the life of the occupation, unless explicitly amended by the agreement of all signatory parties.7 Agreed to prior to the end of hostilities, this treaty clearly established the right of presence of the western allies in the western area of Berlin.

*The Implied Allied Right of Access*

Similar to the right of presence, the right of access to Berlin, as well as the conditions for Allied access rights into East Berlin rested in another form of international law, customary international law, which is often established by precedents and behaviors. Access rights were

---


7 On July 26, 1945, this agreement was amended to add France as an occupying force in the western half of Germany, as well as providing it a zone in Greater Berlin (allocated by agreement out of the original zones assigned to Great Britain and the United States) in “Protocol between the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the provisional government of the French Republic on the zones of Occupation in Germany and the administration of “Greater Berlin,” September 12, 1944, as amended by the agreements of November 14, 1944 and July 26, 1945. Accessed online at the German Historical Institute: [http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/Allied%20Policies%207%20ENG.pdf](http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/Allied%20Policies%207%20ENG.pdf)
considered implicit in the governing occupation documents, and, in the opinion of the western Allies, confirmed in a series of early occupation communications with Stalin, as issues of access in the administration of the occupation became apparent. In their response to the early period of the 1948 Soviet blockade of Berlin, the United States and Great Britain issued identical notes to make their case for the right of access to Berlin, referring to the original protocols which:

- implied the right of free access to Berlin. This right has long been confirmed by usage. It was directly specified in a message sent by President Truman to Premier Stalin on 14th June, 1945, which agreed to the withdrawal of United States forces to the zonal boundaries, provided satisfactory arrangements could be entered into between the military commanders, which would give access by rail, road and air to the United States forces in Berlin. Premier Stalin replied on 16th June, suggesting a change in date but no other alteration in the plan proposed by the President. Premier Stalin then gave assurances that all necessary measures would be taken in accordance with the plan.8

The restriction of access rights by the Soviets was a reaction to the plan to merge the American and British zones in Germany into a single economic unit, which appeared to the Soviets as the first important step in creating a new state in West Germany.

The Soviets, excluded from several London conference sessions between the United States, Great Britain, and France in the summer of 1947, “regarded the conference as a threat to the Soviet state, not just to their interests in Germany.”9 After a series of access challenges began in January of 1948 failed to dissuade the west from its progress toward integration, the Soviets implemented a progressive series of harassments and access restrictions, which culminated in the full blockade of ground transportation in June of 1948.

In this test of the western Allies’ resolve to retain their critical access rights, the Soviets failed to achieve their goal of fracturing the plans for the beginning steps toward a unified West

---

Germany. The opportunity to squeeze the Allies out of Berlin by the application of a ground blockade in 1948 was lost after the successful implementation of the Allied Berlin Airlift, breaking the Soviet effort in May of 1949. Subsequent to this crisis, the right of access was affirmed by the Soviet government in its acceptance of “The New York Four Power Agreement on the lifting of the Berlin Blockade, May 4, 1949,” as well as the “Final Communiqué of the Sixth session of the Council of Foreign Ministers at Paris, June 20, 1949.”

With these written agreements, access rights now clearly possessed the characteristics of treaty law, and solidified the two rights of presence and access. However, the third right declared in Kennedy’s speech in July of 1961, viability, originated in an entirely different manner than the first two and provided even more interpretive possibilities and distinctions for policymakers and street-level implementers as they sought success in projecting American smart power during the crisis period of 1961 to 1963.

*The Invented Right of Viability*

In his July 25, 1961 address to the American public to announce policy steps his administration had implemented to deal with the ongoing Berlin crisis inherited from the Eisenhower administration, President Kennedy provided an assertive plan, organized primarily around military responses. Early in the speech, the President declared the basis for allied responsibilities and rights in Berlin:

Let me remind you that the fortunes of war and diplomacy left the free people of West Berlin [in 1945] 110 miles behind the iron curtain.... We are there as a result of our victory over Nazi Germany—and our basic rights *to be there* deriving from that victory, include both our

---

10 The May 4, 1949 meeting in New York produced an interim agreement removing Soviet restrictions and retaliatory measures by the United States, Great Britain, and France. This temporary solution was codified in the closing statements in Paris on June 20, 1949, in which the rights of access are specifically included in the statement. See *Berlin: Crisis and Challenge*, (New York: German Information Center, 1962), 49-51.
presence in [West] Berlin and the enjoyment of access across East Germany. These rights have been repeatedly confirmed [and recognized] in special agreements with the Soviet Union.\footnote{8}

In this portion of the speech, President Kennedy clearly referenced the first two rights, presence and access, in the customary understanding of treaty law as binding international law.

Immediately following this section, Kennedy added a third criteria, beyond consent-based law, which becomes an operative concept that experienced an etymological transformation eventually into a “right” of viability. “But in addition to those rights is our commitment to sustain—and defend, if need be—the opportunity for more than two million people to determine their own future and choose their own way of life.”\footnote{9} This third requirement was viewed in two distinct interpretations, one at the national strategic level, and one from the perspective of those responsible for street-level American foreign policy in Berlin.

Andreas W. Daum, in his 2008 work \textit{Kennedy in Berlin}, provides one explanation of the significance of this added Allied right, yet to be reduced to a single term at the early absorption of Kennedy’s July address on Berlin:

The United States now defined three vital interests in its policy for Germany and Berlin. If necessary, the United States was willing to fight for these ‘essentials’ — as they were soon referred to even in German- but only for them. The essentials comprised, first, the presence and security of Western troops in West Berlin; second the security and viability of West Berlin; and third, Western access to West Berlin. The eastern sector of the city and American access to it were no longer considered to be vital to American interests.\footnote{10}

Daum’s version of the redefinition of allied interests, characterized as the result of Kennedy’s statement on the American standards for the future of the Berlin issue, notes the distinction the President makes between access to West Berlin and access into East Berlin, just nineteen days

\footnote{8} “Radio and Television Report to the American people on the Berlin crisis, 25 July 1961,” Speech Files, Series 3, Papers of John F. Kennedy, Presidential Papers, President’s Office Files. John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum. This is a transcript version of the speech prior to delivery. Alterations in the actual radio and television presentation are noted in text [italics added] as delivered. Transcript version available online at http://www.jfklibrary.org/Asset-Viewer/Archives/JFKPOF-035-031.aspx

\footnote{9} Ibid.

before the Berlin Wall became a reality. Daum considers the term viability in the dominant historical understanding of the concept as applied to the Berlin crisis which began in 1961, focused upon national policymaker selection practices. The acceptance of the separation of “free” West Berliners from their fellow Berliners trapped in the east, as well as the idea that the western section of the city needed to remain “viable” in a political, economic, and social sense, were important new American policy distinctions.

In his July 25, 1961 national policy statement, President Kennedy had expressly separated West Berlin from the Greater Berlin issues of access into East Berlin. Additionally, he also made a distinction between the two populations; “the free people of West Berlin,” and those excluded by the zonal and sector lines behind the Iron Curtain.\textsuperscript{14} It was now national policy that Berlin’s \textit{status quo} as a divided city was no longer an issue of American foreign policy contention. It signaled a pause in efforts to press for the reunification of the city itself, either as a preparatory step toward normalization in the city, or as a hope of future German reunification, a message which caused great concern among West Germany’s political leadership and population.

For Army Berlin, deployed on the ground in West Berlin and as neighbors to Berliners, these policy changes were considerable. The redefinition of the right of access and the responsibility for the viability of West Berlin as a functioning, independent city which was capable of succeeding, required significant alterations of its estimation, selection, and implementation strategies.\textsuperscript{15} For the purposes of this study, the term viability meant something


\textsuperscript{15} Merriam-Webster defines “viable” (the root of the noun “Viability”) in numerous contexts, including: a) capable of working, functioning, or developing adequately; b) capable of existence and development as an independent unit; c) having a reasonable chance of succeeding.
quite different for Army Berlin on the ground in West Berlin, in its contemporaneous and local
sense, where American policy took form in interpersonal relations and associative practices.
While Army Berlin’s command prior to the Berlin Wall had clearly exercised national interests
that included Kennedy’s third new right in its defense preparations and interactions with
Berliners, the efforts themselves had not achieved “essential,” “vital,” or “right” status.

Army Berlin and the new Right of Viability

Army Berlin, reorganized in December of 1961 in response to the construction of the
Berlin Wall by the East German government authorized by the Soviets, now faced the dilemma
of the implementation of a national policy that accepted the existence of the Wall. President
Kennedy’s clear distinctions between access in the form of unimpeded transit from West
Germany to West Berlin and access into East Berlin also threatened the loss of the long-standing,
negotiated rights of reciprocal access between Berlin zones established through inter-allied
agreements and precedent. For Army Berlin, tasked with the roles of Cold Warriors in
protection of West Berlin and Good Neighbors in community with West Berliners, the prospect
of the loss of access into East Berlin was an operational defeat, depriving it of intelligence and
observation practices. As events progressed during the crisis, the challenge to Allied access into
East Berlin presented Army Berlin with additional stressors, unrelated to traditional military
tactical and strategic planning.

In relation to Kennedy’s viability concept, focused upon the civic, political, and
economic life of West Berlin, Army Berlin had an important role to play. The link between its
continued access into East Berlin, minimized in Washington, was considered critical in its
performance of duty for the maintenance of civic stability and particularly its Good Neighbors
function in the public eye. American social capital in the city, enhanced by the image of the Berlin Airlift, had been taken for granted by American policymakers.\textsuperscript{16} The impact on the Berliner public in its assessment of Kennedy’s pre-wall address, followed by the erection of the wall itself, required new estimation, selection, and implementation practices by Army Berlin. These responses in the crisis period challenged the new national policy that minimized the importance of access rights into East Berlin. This, in turn, was interpreted by the street-level implementers as a particularly damaging policy direction that would negatively impact the levels of functioning trust required between Berliners and Army Berlin.\textsuperscript{17}

The policy selection and implementation of an increased military capability, exemplified in the August 20, 1961 reinforcement of Army Berlin by a U.S Army battle group, was meant to signal an unwavering commitment to West Berlin by the Kennedy administration. As a symbolic act it was an effective early response in the face of the East German threat to the settled western Allied rights of presence and access. The period just before the erection of the wall and the beginning of the third significant crisis over Berlin mirrored the second crisis of 1958, in which Premier Khrushchev attempted to pressure the Eisenhower administration when he issued a deadline for the Allied acceptance of Berlin’s “Free city” status, as well as a proposal to transfer Soviet responsibilities for Allied rights to the control of East Germany. Khrushchev’s strategy in this 1961 confrontation was less direct, masked in the role of the East German leadership’s preferred solutions to its accelerating loss of population, particularly in the case of

\textsuperscript{16} For definitions of the term social capital and its use in this study, see Chapter 2, “The Framework: Theory and Policy.” Additionally, Robert D. Putnam’s \textit{Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community}, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000) is helpful in conceptualizing the theoretical basis and terminologies developed in this study. Additionally, Putnam’s application of the theory is topically related to the scope of this examination, as he assesses American social behaviors across the same time period.

\textsuperscript{17} The functional value of trust in society in different forms is a central element of Putnam’s version of social capital theory; Chapter 2 in this work (see fn16) develops the theoretical framework as it applies to Army Berlin, and Chapter 6, “Soft Power: America’s Good Neighbors in Berlin,” is particularly influenced by Putnam’s trust concepts.
educated and skilled workers seeking refuge in the West. Khrushchev unilaterally transferred many functions of inter-Berlin security procedures to the East Germans, who aggressively attempted to redefine Allied rights, particularly in the right of access into the Soviet zone of the city.

President Kennedy’s clearly symbolic early military responses ultimately provided the basis for effecting both the short term diffusion of the threat and securing the long term American goals of the preservation of presence and access, and the establishment of viability in West Berlin. Kennedy’s public adherence to these three rights forced the Soviets to negotiate in a manner that, while they obtained one of their critical foreign policy goals of denying West Germany a future of nuclear armament, the Soviet prize of an Allied-free Berlin was lost.18

President Kennedy’s foreign policy estimations on Berlin were informed additionally by his own domestic political interpretations of the importance to exhibit steadfast Cold Warrior behaviors and act with resolve in the face of world communism. This did not always match the analysis of the local street-level actors responsible for implanting national policy in the tense Berlin environment, where a different democratic population viewed the issue more directly. In recognition of this fact, the purposes of the three rights of presence, access and viability were approached from a different perspective by the institutional garrisons of military and diplomatic American representatives in Berlin. These differences in estimation of the critical nature of the rights, first in the basis for presence and then most distinctly in the definition of access, formed an early fissure between national-level policy and local-level implementation.

---

18 The success of both the Soviets and Americans in achieving long-term stability in Europe, particularly surrounding the issue of the German nuclear military policy question and guaranteeing the stabilizing nature of American forces in Europe and particularly in West Germany is detailed in Marc Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963*, (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999). Trachtenberg’s view of Nikita Khrushchev’s motives in this crisis is only one interpretation in the historiographical debate, a matter which is beyond the scope of this study.
Army Berlin, reformed on December 1, 1961, became the basis for the force that remained in West Berlin until the end of the Cold War. Over the course of its duty, it experienced internal regimental reassignments, upgrades to combat capabilities, and expansion of its duties. In this early period of crisis, the traditional metrics of manpower and technology took center stage in the reformed unit. Beyond the rotating reinforcing battle groups beginning August 20, 1961, Army Berlin received upgrades to its individual weapons systems, including the new M-14 Battle Rifle to replace the M-1 Garand, the new M-60 light machine gun, and the M-79 Grenade launcher.

In its heavier combined arms capabilities, the unit was upgraded to the new M-60A1 Main Battle Tank, which included a reorganization of its lone Armor force, company F, 40th Armor, which increased its stable of tanks to 36. A new permanent artillery battery of six self-propelled guns capable of firing 105 millimeter shells, Battery C of the 94th Field Artillery, became the Allies only guns in the city. These traditional forms of hard power were balanced by additional emphasis on the implementation and adaptation of soft power cultural and social programs to advance American interests through forms of Nye’s smart power. However, as the crisis unfolded during the first two years, the outlines of a smart power policy were yet to be fully developed.

Army Berlin, as well as its reinforcing battle groups that were rotated into the city from 1961 to 1966, were critical street-level bureaucrats of national policy, focused on the three vital interests of presence, access, and viability. The attainment of the long-term goals of American policy - the containment of communist expansion into Western Europe and the protection of vital allies and trade relationships - depended upon the ability of the United States to project its influence into Berlin. These forms of influence in Berlin - whether military, economic, or the soft
power of cultural attractiveness, political values, and the exercise of legitimate, moral foreign policies - rested upon Army Berlin’s presence.\(^{19}\) Determining who was responsible for policy estimation, selection, and implementation in Berlin, and how that influence was projected, were critical questions in the crisis.

On August 21, 1961, President Kennedy presented his early thoughts on the crisis regarding policy in a memorandum to Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Kennedy provided general guidance and conceptual parameters based upon possible policy responses to the building of the wall separating East Berlin from West Berlin, as he considered the structure of a new advisory group. In this memorandum to Rusk, Kennedy wrote “What you and I need is a small group of hard workers who can produce alternatives for our comment and criticism on an urgent basis.”\(^{20}\) His conceptual guidelines at this early stage in the crisis included the possibility of engaging in diplomatic talks with Khrushchev, although he was skeptical of the chance of progress with his Soviet counterpart. Kennedy cautioned that “Until we have something to suggest ourselves, we shall not get any more out of him than we have been getting since Vienna.”\(^{21}\)

Included in his six starting principles was the possibility of a radical alteration in the treaty basis for American forces in Berlin: Kennedy advised Rusk of his flexibility in his admonition “Do not insist on maintenance of occupation rights if other strong guarantees can be designed. Occupation rights are a less attractive base, before the world, than the freedom and

\(^{19}\) Nye, *The Future of Power*, 49. This 2011 version of Nye separates military power from his other two forms of power, Economic and Soft.


protection of West Berliners.” President Kennedy’s emphasis on occupation rights in world opinion as a potentially negative policy foundation hinted at his consideration of the importance of public opinion in the matter, subject to an alternative that could retain western rights in West Berlin.

In this early direction, President Kennedy instructed Rusk to consider granting Khrushchev a first step towards the primary Soviet goal that remained unattainable since 1945: the removal of Western Allied military forces in Berlin. This negotiating flexibility, meant to consider the broadest possible parameters for the resolution of the crisis, was a contrarian starting point to the policies of his Cold War predecessors, Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. Additionally, it required dependence upon a Soviet agreement to honor a new series of consent-based guarantees, a degree of faith that had not been justified to this point in the history of Berlin as an issue.

Even as Kennedy instructed Rusk to quietly gather a small team of close advisers to consider options that included replacing occupation rights with other forms of agreement, he assured Willy Brandt, Governing Mayor of West Berlin, of the fortitude of the United States to maintain its occupation forces in Berlin. In his letter to Brandt on August 18, 1961, Kennedy promised American military presence throughout the crisis and beyond:

On careful consideration I myself have decided that the best immediate response is a significant reinforcement of the Western garrisons. The importance of this reinforcement is symbolic- but not symbolic only. We know that the Soviet Union continues to emphasize its demand for the removal of Allied protection from West Berlin. We believe that even a modest reinforcement will underline our rejection of this concept.23

The centrality of Berlin in the American relationship to its allies and enemies had bedeviled America’s leaders from the end of World War II, and candidate Kennedy entered office

---

22 Ibid.
confident that he could chart a new course of diplomatic behaviors. The question of the legal authorization for military forces in West Berlin was deeper than Kennedy’s assertion that world opinion was critical to U.S. presence. The triangular relationship of the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the enclave of West Berlin was critical to America’s foreign policy goals for Western Europe and NATO.

Kennedy’s public statement on July 25, 1961, caused considerable concern among West German political leadership and the general public. His separation of West Berlin from East Berlin in the context of the future of German reunification discounted the hope of Berliners in a future in which the city would be made whole, and misjudged the role of Army Berlin in the city. Members of the unit performed as street-level actors in their use of access into East Berlin, and that right’s connection to the concept of the viability of the unit as a functioning American foreign policy instrument required a vigilant defense from Army Berlin. West Berlin was not a viable political or economic entity without the military forces of the Allies, and this required that Army Berlin was a viable force in projecting hard power, or as Nye revises in Nye Version 6.0, military power. It had to be capable of success, and Army Berlin’s command understood this.

The consideration of a change in the legal justification for the Allied military presence, in an attempt to remove the label of “occupiers” was not only unachievable, but contrary to U.S. national goals. Renegotiation of status risked the possibility of Soviet success in not only removing western troops from the city, but also the likely death of any hope for a unified, democratic, and free Germany in the foreseeable future. An American president that publicly made concessions on this point not only risked damaging his own domestic reputation as a committed Cold Warrior, but may have irreparably harmed German-American trust.
As America looked to Europe, it was increasingly clear that neither the French nor the British would provide the conventional military forces necessary for Europe to protect West Germany, nor would they finance the effort beyond their own current contributions. The added pressure of the accelerated conversion of U.S. currency to gold by allies since 1958 further challenged Kennedy in achieving his popular domestic goals of balancing the United States budget and reducing American funding of western defense. Only a re-armed and politically committed West Germany could take on the role of the primary European conventional military force in NATO; West Germany could only provide this with American military and political solidarity. A permanently divided Germany, with a Berlin no longer protected by the allies, posed a significant dilemma for both American and West German political leadership. At this moment, assumptions Kennedy brought to the office directed his concepts of diplomacy and global power, and limited his understanding of the realities of Berlin on a local level, where Army Berlin was engaged.

In *The Strategy of Peace*, published in 1960, Kennedy offered a selection of his own speeches on contemporary issues regarding world conflict. Meant to position Kennedy as a serious candidate for the presidency, he observed that opportunities for agreement with the Soviet Union on several pressing issues had been missed by an Eisenhower administration that had, like Adenauer, aged beyond its usefulness. These issues included “workable programs for peace and the control of arms. We have been unwilling to plan for disarmament, and unable to

---

offer creative proposals of our own, always leaving the initiative in the hands of the Russians.\textsuperscript{25}

In his opening chapter, the transcript of a speech made in Washington, D.C. on January 1, 1960, candidate Kennedy advised the public that “We should be ready to take risks to bring about a thaw in the Cold War.”\textsuperscript{26}

In Kennedy’s formula, America bore the burden to act to secure peace, to provide proof to the Soviets of the sincerity of its diplomatic negotiations. Critiquing the Eisenhower administration’s approach to Khrushchev’s 1959 state visit to the United States, Kennedy described five major issues he discerned from Khrushchev’s visit and speeches upon which the United States should act to achieve agreement. National security interests including limiting the arms race, avoiding nuclear war, stopping the proliferation of nuclear technology in other nations, and reducing the dangerous impact of atmospheric atomic testing on air quality were the first four issues in his address at the University of Rochester in New York on October 1, 1959.\textsuperscript{27}

To attain these goals, Kennedy prescribed a new attitude in negotiations, a new flexibility on the part of American leaders to identify those areas of tension that could be reduced by giving something to the Soviets that they desired, and that would not directly impact American security. Kennedy’s message to the crowd advised that “We look for deeds, not words. And we, too, must offer deeds, not words. We need to think through more carefully our own positions on such questions as disarmament and troop withdrawals, instead of offering only proposals which we


know in advance must be rejected.”28 The connection of Berlin in this formula arises in Kennedy’s final chapter of his attempt to promote his foreign policy vision.

In the closing chapter in *The Strategy of Peace*, Senator Kennedy submitted to an interview with John Fischer. In a series of questions surrounding Berlin and its role in European and American security and alliance, Kennedy acknowledged the difficulty in any agreement that reduced the European, and especially, the West German faith in United States resolve. Yet, assuming the Soviets continued to believe that the United States accepted the risk of nuclear war over Berlin were it cut off or attacked, he felt that “it may be possible for us to reach *a modus vivendi* with them.”29

Once the discussion moved to one of Kennedy’s four major goals, disarmament, Berlin arises as a possibility for American flexibility. In response to Fischer’s question on the correct order of priorities, Kennedy clearly linked Berlin to his goal of a disarmament agreement in his answer that “No, I would say disarmament is the key area. And I do think we could perhaps reach, as I said before, some agreement on Berlin that would ease the situation. But disarmament is the key area.”30 What Kennedy specifically considered acceptable accommodations on the city beyond a United Nations backed guarantee of access through existing corridors, or what he described to Fischer as a “thinning out of troops in Berlin” is not included in this political interview on policy issues.31 These omissions, unchallenged by Fischer in his role as friendly interrogator, do not provide the American or foreign public with a great deal of information

28 Ibid., 11.
30 Ibid., 215.
31 Ibid., 212.
beyond the impression of Kennedy as an educated elite, weaving the latin *modus vivendi* into the discourse.

These examples of President Kennedy’s positions prior to his inauguration are relevant in a particular, limited context. Well before his July 25, 1961 address and the realization of the Berlin Wall, Kennedy had experienced a series of public setbacks in foreign policy related to the Cold War. The debacle of the failed Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba, as well as his publicly acknowledged inability to make a persuasive first impression upon Khrushchev in their June 1961 summit, each had a sobering impact on the new president’s foreign policy judgment, ultimately disabusing him of many of his earlier ideals on the possibility of diplomatic success. However, the singular issue of Berlin, where American interests were seemingly lashed to a nervous West Germany, remained a particularly attractive possibility for a symbolic lessening of tensions, even in the midst of the rise of the wall.

Kennedy’s speech on July 25, 1961 before the wall’s appearance limited Allied, and specifically American, interests in East Berlin. The wall provided the opportunity to separate American interests from those of West Germany through Kennedy’s targeted emphasis of rights only in West Berlin. This specificity was intentional, and it offered the Soviets a first American step, consistent with his October 1959 speech in Rochester, New York, where he challenged the nation to “offer deeds, not words” which included the possibility of unspecified “troop withdrawals.”

Kennedy had certainly realized that anything less than a public stance of the defense of West Berlin was unthinkable. But just as the Berlin Wall stabilized the refugee problem in Berlin and reduced it as an issue that swept in Allied interests, it provided the President with a

---

chance to make a first gesture in the city. He signaled a concrete policy decision that he hoped might be a small starting point for future talks on Berlin itself, or perhaps much more importantly, a seed for the fruit of disarmament in the atomic arena.

As President, Kennedy faced the reality of a world in which other state’s interests played a role in the politics of peace between the United States and the Soviet Union. Just as he was unable to command the Europeans to reduce their swap of American paper for American gold, he had no authority to force the public in West Germany to accept his own political preference for chancellor. In this environment, the relationship Kennedy required to nurture to achieve his policy goals was with Konrad Adenauer, Der Alter, the Federal Republic of Germany’s elected Chancellor.

Unfortunately, President Kennedy had a long history of disrespect and criticism of Germany’s “Old Man” well before he gained the executive power of the presidency. This undiplomatic bias was displayed in an early choice to receive in Washington Willy Brandt, Lord Mayor of Berlin and member of the German minority SPD before meeting with Chancellor Adenauer.33 During the campaign for the presidency, Kennedy had made it known to his speech-writer, James O’Donnell, that he saw Adenauer as a relic of Europe’s past: “The real trouble is that he is too old and I am too young for us to understand each other.”34 Beyond this undiplomatic assessment of the possibility of mutual understanding between allies of necessity, the theoretical underpinnings of Kennedy’s view of the Cold War further handicapped his ability to assess foreign policy issues without pre-conceived solutions in the first year of his term.

As Kennedy assessed the political environment in West Germany, where the possibility of the return of Adenauer as Chancellor in the fall elections meant the continuation of a West German hard line approach to the Soviets, his frustration was apparent. This lack of personal preference for Adenauer was publicly known, even as the two leaders met just months before in Germany, and only added to the distrust in the wall crisis. In the recorded memorandum of a meeting with West Germany’s Ambassador to the United States Wilhelm G. Grewe on August 30, 1961, the German communicated his country’s concerns in the early days of the wall crisis:

The Ambassador then said that the FRG was somewhat bothered by public references made to the definition of the three vital Allied interests involved in the Berlin situation and press comments along this line. He said that the FRG feared that this would constitute an invitation to the Soviets to aggress in the sectors which were not included in this definition, such as the ties between West Berlin and the FRG.35

Ambassador Grewe’s concerns on West Germany’s role in West Berlin were both economic and political, which included countenance of threats by the Soviets to continue restricting trade between the two halves of Germany.

As an example of the economic interests the Federal Republic of Germany shared with West Berlin, a 1962 special edition of Berlin Im Spiegel, a popular quarterly pictorial magazine, provided graphs which compared American and West German financial aid to Berlin from 1949 to 1961. In “Berlin and the USA,” the transfer of American aid to West Berlin through West Germany, administered as part of the post-World War II debt assistance plan for Germany, was credited to total over 707 million American dollars since 1949.36 Comparatively, the Federal

36 “U.S. Financial Aid to Berlin,” in “Berlin and the USA,” special issue, Berlin Im Spiegel, (1962). The figures provided in this special issue are separated between American direct aid to Berlin and the West German contributions, made possible by the rising West German economy of the 1950s (the Wirtschaftswunder). The indirect impact of American assistance to West Germany in this same period, which allowed the Federal Republic to “assist” West Berlin is not calculated or noted.
Republic of Germany’s own direct aid to West Berlin over the same period was credited as “the DM-equivalent of 312 million dollars.”37

In the political realm, Chancellor Adenauer, facing a fall election, was especially sensitive to the critique from the portion of his public that doubted American resolve and advised a neutral policy toward both East Germany and the Soviet Union in the issue. The rise of the wall forced a public debate between Allies that had primarily been limited to private diplomatic discussions where the nuances of vital interests and political difficulties could be managed by those empowered to negotiate. Now, the East German move, under the protection of their Soviet benefactors, had placed a significant distinction between the interests of West Germans and Americans. It was crucial that Kennedy’s estimation and selection processes did not appear to the leaders of West Germany as a form of capitulation.

The achievement of a smart power policy balance that safeguarded American strength offered the Soviets a new path to stability in East Berlin, and this initiative at least assured the West Germans a defined guarantee of West Berlin’s viability: this was still not clearly apparent to the militarily indispensable West German state. After Grewe delivered his summary of West German doubts about American resolve to confront the Soviet support of East Germany as a sovereign authority in Berlin, a petulant Kennedy asked whether Germans would prefer Ulbricht as their leader:

As the Ambassador shook his head to indicate no, the President assured him that it is the very real purpose of the United States Government to maintain solidarity with the FRG. The United States was prepared and he felt that we were going to the brink of nuclear war. If we were willing to face this prospect, there must be good faith on both sides. This was a very serious question. The Ambassador said he could assure the President that there was no fundamental reversal of mood in the FRG. However there were the tendencies he had described and of course in an election campaign the Chancellor was particularly sensitive to them.38

37 Ibid. “DM abbreviation is for West German Deutschmarks.”
38 Ibid.
While Kennedy signaled that the United States was committed to the ultimate catastrophic possibility in his rebuff to Adenauer’s inquiry through Grewe, his challenge to the West Germans for “good faith” was, in the context of his persistent record of seeking a deal that might thaw the Cold War, difficult to trust. The idea that America would risk a nuclear war over the Allied rights of presence, access, or the newly defined right of viability did not match Kennedy’s criticism of Eisenhower for essentially threatening Khrushchev with the same outcome in the crisis of 1958.

Additionally, Kennedy’s version of “Flexible Response” was barely taking shape in United States military operational thought as it was introduced by Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in May of 1961. At that time, the capability of the United States Army and the Air Force to provide the president with non-atomic options at this point was in doubt, limiting the threat of the use of force in response to the future third crisis over Berlin. Beyond the doctrinal and operational inadequacies for military force responses in the case of Berlin, confusion in national strategic thought among American military strategists, scholars, and policymakers on the meaning of “Flexible Response” complicated the role of the U.S. military in a limited war scenario.39

Certainly, Kennedy’s early policy parameters considering renegotiating the terms of the lawful status of the occupation with the Soviets may have provided an option to reduce the possibility of a confrontation leading to any form of warfare, nuclear or otherwise.40 A difficulty at this point in the diplomatic planning process were the consistent attempts by Premier

---

39 For a thorough review of the limits of the military options in President Kennedy’s estimation and selection menu, see Ingo Trauschweizer’s *The Cold War U.S. Army: Building Deterrence for Limited War.* (Lawrence KS: University Press of Kansas, 2008). For specific background on the period and “Flexible Response,” Chapter 4 is especially relevant.

Khrushchev since 1958 to characterize the standing legal occupation of 15 years as an unworkable situation that could only be solved peacefully by Allied agreement to Soviet “Free City” proposals.41 This option, which required the withdrawal of all Allied forces from the city, including the Soviets, was a desirable outcome for the Soviets and the German Democratic Republic, but it was not universally beneficial.

Although the Soviet proposal made during the Eisenhower administration declared that the Soviet Union “solemnly promises to do its utmost to ensure normal conditions of life for the Free City as an independent economic entity,” it did not stipulate which economic system’s “normal conditions of life” comprised the standard.42 This initial proposal directed to the Federal Republic of Germany included the warning of a six-month window, designed to allow the Allies to withdraw. In Khrushchev’s plan, an automatic implementation of the “Free City” policy would occur immediately upon the expiration of the window, with the western Allies blamed for any conflict which resulted due to their refusal to remove their troops. In a combined response from the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, the rights of presence and access were vigorously reaffirmed. Kennedy’s third right, viability, was yet to be invented and not mentioned by name in this response.43

The retention of the two existing rights of presence, and access, and Kennedy’s newly defined right of viability were important enough to the President that he appeared willing to risk the possibility of war, even if the chances were remote. Additionally, the substantial increase in military spending to meet the demands of his “Flexible Response” defense posture, coupled with

42 Ibid., 61.
increased Berlin and Laos operational costs, threatened his domestic economic agenda, where he had hoped to focus on reducing deficit spending and growing the economy. In an early test of his acumen as President, Kennedy took the risk of explaining to the American people the need for increased military spending that would, at least temporarily, negate his campaign promise to be a fiscal conservative.

Additional risks Kennedy elected to accept in his willingness to assert an American lead in the early days of the crisis included the potential alienation of France and the United Kingdom. In his opening paragraph in the memorandum to Secretary Rusk just four days into the wall crisis, Kennedy makes his preferences clear: “I want to take a stronger lead on Berlin negotiations…I no longer believe that satisfactory progress can be made by Four-Power discussions alone. I think we should promptly work toward a strong U.S. position in both areas and should make it clear that we cannot accept a veto from any other power.”44 While the Allied rights were an issue for the three occupying western powers, the particular tension with West Germany over Kennedy’s restrictive definitions of access and viability exemplified the distance between not only the West Germans and Washington, but also between Washington and Army Berlin.

Army Berlin, with its co-located foreign policy ally, Mission Berlin, assessed the impact of the changing American policies at the local level. This provided Army Berlin a considerably different impression of the expected result of the new definitions of national interests upon its ability to perform its roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors at the street-level in the city. The triad of presence, access, and the new right of viability were now dependent upon one another. Weakness in any area, at either the diplomatic level or on the ground in Berlin, reduced

---

the possibility of American policy success in protecting the other two rights now declared vital to
Army Berlin’s mission goals.

The challenge to Army Berlin in this early crisis period tested its ability to continue
projecting hard power capabilities, while at the same time, promoting soft power affinity with
West Berliners. The estimation processes on the ground could not discount the impact upon the
morale of their neighbors, who looked to the western Allies, led by President Kennedy, for
security and sustainment. While the President saw a policy opportunity to use the East German
move to seal its borders in order to solve the serious issue of stability in Berlin, Army Berlin
judged the wall as a threat to its operational freedom of action, a requirement to maintain its
viability to succeed in its mission.

For President Kennedy’s requirement that West Berlin remained a viable city, capable of
political, economic, and social autonomy inside the Soviet zone of East Germany, Army Berlin
itself needed to remain a viable force in both of its roles, as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors.
The crisis and operational planning processes which developed this estimation logic resulted in
implementation strategies on the ground in Army Berlin that tested the limits of Kennedy’s
parameters.

In a few specific and serious incidents, Army Berlin’s estimation contradicted the
President’s public and private statements on the utility and purpose of challenging East German
obstructionism and Soviet acquiescence to the Ulbricht regime’s behaviors. However, Army
Berlin used its military command chain, as well as its close relationship with Mission Berlin, to
repeatedly request authorization of its own selection menus for implementation. Testing the
limits of bureaucratic solidarity up their command chain on policies that its commanders judged
to be either in error or lacking situational knowledge held at the ground level, Army Berlin contributed substantial policy adjustments which preserved American smart power in the city.
CHAPTER 4. IMPLEMENTING SMART POWER IN BERLIN, 1961-1963

Army Berlin’s ability to shape the direction of national policy as the Kennedy administration formulated its response to the Berlin Wall was necessarily limited by its role in the civil-military structure of American foreign policy decision-making. As street-level implementers of national policy, however, Army Berlin did possess some influence upon how those policies were debated, through their commanders efforts to recommend actions based upon their local knowledge of the city, its residents, and the historical patterns of Soviet and East German governmental behaviors. They exercised their assessments through their traditional military command hierarchies, and benefitted additionally from their close relationship with Mission Berlin and advocated adaptations to policies that, in their estimation, were not practicable based upon their experience.

Army Berlin structured its estimation, selection, and implementation menu in full recognition of its two roles in the city, as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors, and considered the impact of changes to national policies regarding Allied rights upon these roles. In this crisis period, Army Berlin was very concerned with its own viability, defined as its ability to succeed in its missions and roles. This was a separate requirement distinct from President Kennedy’s new right of viability, which focused on West Berlin’s ability to succeed in its political, social, and economic survival, and not directly related to military behaviors. For Army Berlin, the importance of retaining West Berliner’s trust in its abilities to defend them, as well as demonstrating soft power through attractive cultural and political behaviors, and particularly importantly in this period, a legitimate foreign policy shaped by moral authority, was paramount.¹

In the early days of the crisis, the internal debate in the administration over available military responses included two realities. The first was the fact that there were no illusions that the United States had the capability to move a sufficient force to the city in order to provide successfully for a defense of West Berlin from a Soviet military offensive. The second was that the U.S. Army was on the cusp of its operational shift from the politically successful but operationally failed Pentomic organizational structure into the reformed and West German inspired Reorganization Objective Army Division (ROAD 65). At the time of the crisis the existing Pentomic battle group concept, which had performed poorly in European theater exercises to this point, was the standing basic element of maneuver for the U.S. Army.² It was a single battle group, the smallest functional formation in this structure, which President Kennedy authorized as the element to reinforce Army Berlin as the first clear signal of American resolve to maintain its presence, access, and viability in West Berlin. The Soviet predicate of Allied military withdrawal from Berlin, and the reduction and ultimate surrender of presence, appeared non-negotiable, at least in the public statements of the administration.

In its effort to remain a viable instrument of American foreign policy in the city, Army Berlin’s command exercised its own initiative in estimation practices consistently. In June of 1961, just two months before the wall’s erection, USAREUR provided the Berlin Command the opportunity to offer its transformation recommendations for the Berlin Brigade in anticipation of conversion to the new Reorganization Objective Army Division (ROAD 65).³ This opportunity to customize its force structure, within the guidelines of Army strength and standardized

---

battalion format, was a unique accommodation which recognized Army Berlin as an anomalous entity.

In their position paper to USAREUR, the leadership of Army Berlin provided two proposed options for new capabilities based upon the ROAD 65 reorganization, each meant to enhance their viability. In its first option, the command anticipated that the permanent force structure in Berlin remained under the same manpower ceiling as the existing Pentomic-structure. This required that the two battle groups of the 6th Infantry in the Berlin Brigade would be split into three battalions, and one of these would carry an extra rifle company to absorb the manpower excess. The assigned armor company (F/40 Armor) was anticipated to be reformed into its ROAD 65 equivalent.\(^4\)

Given the opportunity to comment on force structure and manpower strength, the commander’s paper provided a second option for consideration, in which an additional 500 combat arms soldiers be permanently added to Berlin Brigade.\(^5\) Army Berlin listed this option as their “preferred course of action,” and allowed the brigade to add an additional rifle company to each of its three battalions. While there would be no change to the armor company, Berlin planners called for the addition of one ROAD 65 artillery battery of 105 millimeter self-propelled howitzers.\(^6\) At the time of the paper in June of 1961, Army Berlin had no towed or self-propelled artillery of its own, and in the early period of crisis, the first three rotating

---

\(^4\) “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” Box 2, 65, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.

\(^5\) The manpower levels for Army Berlin during 1961 in the period before the reinforcing battle group’s arrivals are estimated at approximately 5823 officers and enlisted. This figure is based upon the Calendar Year 1961 Historical report (see fn 19, page 11), by deducting 1500 total soldiers, the approximate size of the second reinforcing battle group in the city at the end of the year, from personnel figures. This number includes all Army Berlin soldiers, not limited to the Berlin Brigade combat arms structure, and may vary at the time of this request, due to fluctuations cause by redeployment and replacement figures.

\(^6\) Ibid, 66. In a comparison of the similarity Berlin Brigade would have possessed in its proposed organizational structure, it would have remained significantly under-represented when compared to a similar mechanized infantry unit in USAREUR (although there were no similar 3 battalion independent commands); its six proposed 105mm SP guns most closely resembled a ROAD 65 Airborne Division, which had six 155mm howitzers. See Trauschweizer, *The Cold War Army*, 116.
reinforcing battle groups brought their own assigned towed artillery.\footnote{The absence of a permanent artillery battery of the standard 6 gun structure in Berlin prior to late 1962 is mentioned in Grathwohl and Moorhus, \textit{American Forces in Berlin: Cold War Outpost}, p.120; Additionally, accessible Army Berlin organizational charts confirm this lack of capability prior to late 1962 throughout the Berlin Brigade collection reviewed at USAMHI.} Even as President Kennedy was in the process of formulating national policy, Army Berlin actively engaged in estimation practices that could deliver increased combat capabilities to achieve its own understanding of exercising presence, protecting access, and increasing its military viability in Berlin.

As the first reinforcing battle group arrived in Berlin on August 20, 1961 from its base in West Germany, the rights of presence and demonstration of viability were still in doubt. In a written follow-up report on his experience representing the President in Berlin in August of 1961, Vice-President Lyndon B. Johnson provided both encouragement and critical observation on the events he experienced, including the arrival of the 1st Battle Group, 18th Infantry, of the 8th Infantry Division from its station in West Germany:

> The morale of West Berlin, badly shaken and nervous, has now been restored. As important as the presence of our mission in the restoration of German respect for and confidence in American policy was the arrival of American troops. The single most important element in this process of restoring good relations was, beyond question, the sight of American tanks. The impact would have been immeasurably more significant if the tanks had been the new and shining models of our best equipment, fully symbolic of America’s power in this jet age.\footnote{Report by Vice President Johnson, Department of State, non-dated, \textit{FRUS: 1961-1963, Volume XIV, Berlin Crisis, 1961-1962}, Document 121.}

As the Vice-President noted, the M-48A1 Patton tanks of the Berlin Brigade were not the latest tank development the Americans possessed. The new tank Johnson referenced, the M-60 Main Battle Tank (MBT), was just beginning to be distributed to the U.S. Army. The first production run of the M-60 began in 1960, and the Berlin unit had not yet been upgraded.

Contrary to Johnson’s assertion, throngs of West Berliners cheering the movement could hardly discern the primary difference between the two tanks, the M-60’s increased firepower
with its 105 millimeter main gun. The American produced M-68 version of the recently
developed British L7A1. The British army developed the L7A1 to address the asymmetry of
contemporary Soviet tank technology, particularly the armor thickness of the T-54, which was
considered beyond the penetration capabilities of the M-48A1 Patton’s 90 millimeter main gun.\(^9\)
For the time being, the M-48A1 and its inferior gun needed to provide confidence to the public,
yet it had little impact on the actual military viability of the American force in Berlin.

Anticipating the need to improve its military readiness to enhance its viability as
defenders of the city, the command of Army Berlin made a series of significant inquiries in the
summer of 1961 to USAREUR for modernized equipment, including the M-60 MBT, as well as
additional combat manpower. These requests, made even as the prospect of the anticipated
successful defeat of enemy forces in combat was improbable, took the form of traditional
military prescriptions:

a. After the Soviets announced their intention to sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany
the following recommendations for additional combat units and modern equipment were
submitted to USAREUR on the dates indicated: (1) On 11 July 1961, a request was made for: (a)
Twenty-seven M-60 tanks to replace the twenty-seven M-48A1 tanks on hand. (b) Seven HU-1B
helicopters to replace the four H-13 and four H-19 helicopters on hand. (c) M-113 armored
personnel carriers to replace the M-59 armored personnel carriers on hand. (d) M-14 rifles with
bayonets to replace the M-1 rifles on hand. (2) On 2 August 1961, in order to fill a critical
military need and also to serve as concrete evidence of stated US intentions to stand firm in West
Berlin, this headquarters recommended that Berlin Brigade be immediately authorized and
provided: (a) Two additional rifle companies or their equivalent in infantry strength. (b) One
combat engineer company. (c) One 105MM Howitzer (SP) battery.\(^10\)

It is likely that Vice-President Johnson’s report to President Kennedy following his visit to
Berlin, which included his comment on the urgency of an upgrade to the armor of Berlin
Brigade, was influenced by his consultations with Major General Watson and Brigadier General
Hartel, who had made essentially that same request in July of 1961.

This varied menu included the latest available technologies in armor, transportation, and personal weapons, as well as an increase in manpower strength. Additionally, the proposal added specific combat elements of engineers and artillery, normally considered essential to combat operations by American forces. At the time of the proposal, Army Berlin’s organizational chart did not include these critical skills and technology. In any case, the presence of the 8th Infantry Division’s battle group itself began the process of reassurance to the West Berliners.

However, Vice President Johnson’s analysis of the importance of the appearance between the under-gunned paraded tank and the M-60 Main Battle Tank, was, like the reinforcement itself, a function of image more than reality. In the context of Army Berlin’s effort to operate as a successful military unit, this tank provided no significant additional viability. In the case of the important message of presence, however, Army Berlin required more than shiny tanks and marching men.

For the West Berlin population, the military capabilities of Army Berlin were perhaps a comforting reminder of the extension of America’s commitment to the city. However, the depth of the presence of America in its midst was also expressed in the continuation of long-standing policies and practices in the availability of authorized travel and permanent lodging for dependent military family members to live with their service members in the unit. Throughout the crisis, Army Berlin was granted special status in its retention of the right of dependent travel. While Army-wide policies on new dependent travel to Europe were temporarily suspended in the crisis for those dependents wishing to reside with their soldiers across USAREUR, permanent Berlin assignments retained the right to bring their families with them.
At the end of 1961, Army Berlin listed 608 officers and 6715 enlisted, for a total of 7323 military members. This figure included the second rotational battle group, the 1st Battle Group of the 19th Infantry Regiment, on a temporary rotation of 90 days which added an estimated additional 1500 troops. As an example of the significant number of military family members at risk, in its tally of spouses and children, the count was 4808, which did not include any family members of this new unit. This second unit had only made their rotation in late November of 1961 and had not received clearance to bring their families forward. For this 24th Infantry Division unit, stationed in West Germany, their families were eligible for short term visits to Berlin to see their soldiers, authorized shortly after their unit settled in.

Their predecessors in the emergency, the first reinforcing battle group from USAREUR’s 8th Infantry Division, benefitted almost immediately from the policy and national interest in shipping more Americans into Berlin as the crisis unfolded. Army Berlin’s 1961 historical report provided specific details: “Between 31 August and 30 November 1961, a total of 1070 dependents from the 1st Battle Group, 18th Infantry, and supporting units, visited 609 military sponsors.” This was a very public practice, and it was critical that Army Berlin promoted its continuance for its own efforts to improve troop morale. In the September 1, 1961 edition of *The Berlin Observer*, Army Berlin’s unit newspaper, these visits were described in great detail in its front page article. Under the heading “1st BG Families Visiting Outpost,” the following facts are shared:

Dependent families of the troops of the 1st Battle Group, 18th Infantry, began rotation visits to Berlin yesterday. The first contingent of 30 families, who arrived here at 7:56am Thursday, will depart from Berlin for Frankfurt on the Saturday evening duty train which leaves at 7:03. A

---

1. Ibid., 9-11.
2. Ibid., 21.
second 30 family contingent, departing from Frankfurt on the Saturday evening duty train, will arrive in the Divided City on Sunday morning. The priority of military families traveling to Berlin in this period, even for temporary visits, is significant. These rotations began within 11 days of the first reinforcing battle group’s arrival in the city, even though the planned rotation for the unit was to expire in 90 days. Additionally, exact information and details on the numbers of families traveling on the train which passed through East Germany on its way to Frankfurt was provided in a manner that would normally be omitted from publication in the interest of security.

Even though the Berlin Observer was written for the Berlin military community, this unofficial public statement could be replicated in West Berlin’s press, projecting Army Berlin’s presence. Additionally, Army Berlin employed a small population of Berliners with access to the paper as Local National (LN) workers, who read and shared the paper with their fellow Berliners. This was a less than subtle method to promote the confidence the U.S. government wished to project to the West Berliners, as well as West Germans in general, on American’s commitment to remain in the city and increase its risk, as it added to the potential hostage count, another form of presence.

In the continuation of the battle group rotations, the third unit ordered to Berlin, the 2nd Battle Group of the 47th Infantry Regiment, experienced a different deployment scenario. This battle group, a part of the Strategic Army Corps (STRAC) concept, was the first Berlin reinforcement rotation that originated from the continental United States. The pre-Kennedy STRAC concept, originated in 1958, designated specific regular army units “to increase the strategic mobility of the army.” The practicality of the movement of troops utilizing the existing airlift capacity of the U.S. Air Force, however, was not fully realized at this time.

13 “1st BG Families Visiting Outpost,” Berlin Observer, September 1, 1961, Berlin Observer Collection, USAMHI.
Additionally, the assigned units to STRAC were reduced due to general force reductions in 1959 under the Eisenhower administration.\textsuperscript{15} However, the 4\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Division, stationed at Fort Lewis, Washington, remained in the reduced strategic reserve.

The military buildup announced by President Kennedy on July 25, 1961, emphasized the sweeping need for multiple reforms and additional investment in military capability. One of the pressing needs, among many, was the increase in strategic air transportation to move large numbers of troops and their equipment into a theater of conflict. In January of 1962, the U.S. Army attempted its first rapid deployment of a significant portion of an American combat division to Europe as a NATO exercise. In “LONG THRUST II,” three battle groups of the Army’s 4\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Division at Fort Lewis, Washington were airlifted from the United States to West Germany.\textsuperscript{16} Upon arrival, the units were engaged in field exercises at Hohenfels, West Germany with USAREUR’s Seventh Army. Following this training, one battle group returned to Fort Lewis and another remained in West Germany as part of the short term reinforcement strategy of U.S. Seventh Army. The remaining STRAC battle group, the 47\textsuperscript{th} Infantry’s 2\textsuperscript{nd} Battle Group, the “Panthers,” convoyed on four separate movements into Berlin across East Germany after additional training at Augsburg, West Germany.\textsuperscript{17}

In addition to continuing the reinforcing rotations, this movement was meant to project the ability of the United States, as part of NATO, to bring stateside units directly into Berlin, exercising the Allied right of access to Berlin and the viability of Army Berlin. Their entry, like the previous two rotations, required significant adaptations by Army Berlin’s leadership to

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 95.
\textsuperscript{17} “19\textsuperscript{th} Inf Leaves as Lead Elements of 47\textsuperscript{th} Panthers Enter Post,” Berlin Observer, March 9, 1962, 1, Berlin Observer Collection, USAMHI.
ensure that they were prepared to integrate with the permanent force, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} battle groups of the 6\textsuperscript{th} Infantry Regiment.

The “Panthers” arrival under the STRAC concept was unlike the movements of the two prior battle groups from West Germany, and this impacted their dependent travel opportunities. In the case of this rotation, there were no family visits authorized, as their purpose in the LONG THRUST II exercise was to test and demonstrate the movement of combat troops in a scenario that anticipated imminent threat. This unit also retained the Pentomic organizational structure, whose replacement by the ROAD 65 return to battalions in divisions had been delayed by the third Berlin crisis.

Additionally, from a tactical perspective, the battle group experienced another significant omission, the denial of permission to bring its organic anti-tank vehicle, the M-56 Scorpion, into Berlin.\textsuperscript{18} This decision by USAREUR had little impact on the unit’s symbolic value of presence, but certainly did not add to its military viability in the event of armed conflict. Unlike the absence of field artillery and engineers in the permanent Army Berlin organizational and operational structure, this battle group regularly trained and planned on the use of these vehicles to enhance their chances of success against armored vehicles. The loss of this anti-tank capability, however, was not a significant detriment to the reinforced Army Berlin’s ultimate chances of mission success, which were limited to the delay of Soviet forces and the destruction of infrastructure. This portion of their Cold Warrior mission, however, addressed external threat. Another set of scenarios, internal in nature, required their own operational behaviors.

Cold Warriors for a Viable West Berlin

As the population in the western section of Berlin struggled with the devastating impact of the increased separation from their eastern family members, friends, and neighbors, Army Berlin was challenged in projecting its rights of presence and its viability in Berlin as a military force capable of success in its Cold War missions. West Berlin’s political and economic viability as defined by President Kennedy depended upon a stable, independent city. Army Berlin was the key American foreign policy hard power street-level force, ultimately responsible for keeping peace in the streets. As a function of its military readiness and preparation, Army Berlin was organized under a series of operational plans that envisioned the use of American military forces not only in defense of the city from Soviet or East German conventional attack, but also to include the likely scenario of civil unrest or riots.

These directives envisioned that the purpose of a Soviet-inspired riot would be to weaken the integrity of the full complement of Army Berlin’s operational element, the Berlin Brigade, and to force the Americans to respond to the threat in a manner which demonstrated their inability to restore order, perhaps replaying the Soviet response in East Berlin in 1953. In order to prepare for this contingency during the crisis, Army Berlin altered its operational plans and assigned the reinforcing battle groups primarily to static posts. These included Tempelhof Central Airport, the Berlin Brigade headquarters, and the Dahlem housing area which included a large population of military spouses and children. This relieved the two permanent battle groups of the 6th Infantry to concentrate on the American sector, splitting it into two sections between the two battle groups, where they would exercise control of security and civil disturbance response. Additionally, this maximized the permanent force’s capability to continue access into

East Berlin using well-trained, experienced soldiers in the sensitive process of patrolling East Berlin.

Due to the restrictions of the occupation agreements forbidding the existence of German military presence in the city, no German military component was available to respond to situations that extended beyond the capacities of West Berlin police. Unlike their West German counterparts, the elected district mayors and councils had no additional state police or army reserve forces to call upon in a crisis. This left the western Allies, independently in their zones and collectively, responsible as the final means of quelling disturbances. This scenario demanded a different set of operational and tactical behaviors in which alternative technologies and training were required to minimize the dispensation of lethal force by troops normally tasked with its application.

Army Berlin’s significant preparations to respond to civil disturbances in West Berlin, anticipated as the result of expected Soviet and East German political and social interference in the allied zones, were central to the vital national interests of the United States in the retention of West Berlin as a wedge against communism. In the period before the erection of the wall, the regular movement of the population between East and West Berlin provided the possibility of a sudden coordinated uprising requiring Army Berlin’s response, and contingency plans were in force. In its “Internal Security Directive (U), Short Title: BC-ISD 60 (U)” of August 15, 1960, the command’s standards for readiness and training were spelled out in great detail for all of its permanent and temporarily-assigned “lodger” units:

2. (C) Purpose: The purpose of this directive is to: a. Prescribe standards, procedures and responsibilities to maintain this command in an effective posture of readiness for emergency operations. b. Outline procedures for alert notification and for liaison between U.S. Military,
Allied Forces and West Berlin Police during Civil Disturbances. c. Outline procedures for alerted units in the quelling of Civil Disturbances.  

This directive, issued almost a year before the East Germans closed the border in Berlin, addressed each of its purposes in a series of detailed annexes attached to the two page master order.

Of particular importance in the case of an actual civil disturbance, the significant differences in the mission objectives from war were detailed for the infantry battle groups that comprise the force tasked with response against a civilian uprising. In attached Annex E to BC-ISD 60 (U), the scope of the annex in support of the master plan had four objectives:

a. Procedures for units of this command in assuming control from West Berlin Police at scene of Civil Disturbance; b. Principles for employment of US military forces in quelling Civil Disturbances; c. Ammunition and equipment requirements for use by US military forces in quelling Civil Disturbances; d. The use of firearms in quelling civil disturbances.

Critically, the two battle groups of the 6th Infantry that made up the permanent force of the Berlin Brigade were each expected to function according to the Directive, even though the command plan anticipated that one of the battle groups would carry the primary tasking for quelling riots. Each infantry company was expected to maintain its operational capabilities to assume all assigned tasks and be prepared for emergency detachment from their own principle battle group to augment their sister battle group if the situation arose.

A significant dilemma arose in an alternative scenario, one in which the Berlin Brigade responded to a civil disturbance that required use of elevated force against civilians. As a propaganda opportunity for the Soviets, even a successful restoration of order through the use of aggressive tactics or technology may have exhibited American callousness and hypocrisy, which could significantly reduce the social capital which Army Berlin had accumulated in the city.

---

an effort to mitigate this risk, Annex E included specific guidelines and standards on the types and quantities of technology that could be employed, the standards for the unit in meeting the mission, and ultimately a limit on the escalation of force for commanders on scene. A preparatory issue, however, was the transition of authority from West Berlin Police to the “street level” representative of American authority, the commander of the deployed company or battle group:

3. (C) PROCEDURE FOR ASSUMING CONTROL FROM WEST BERLIN POLICE:…
   c. Upon commitment of a US unit all West Berlin Police engaged in the particular area of the disorder will come under the command of the Commander of the US unit so committed. d. When law and order have been restored, the commander of the US unit will return control of the area to the senior West Berlin Policeman, report this action to this headquarters, and remain in the area until relieved.  

This straightforward sequence of the transfer of authority for control of both the American force and the West Berlin police to the American officer acknowledged the gap in Berlin’s civil order structure and lack of its own military personnel available to respond to civil unrest. This authority to assume command of West Berlin’s civil security structure unilaterally was based upon the retention of the formal occupation agreements in force in Berlin.

Army Berlin acknowledged the possibility of their employment for this purpose and designed the directive accordingly. In an attempt to provide clear guidelines, however, the authors of the directive were forced to adapt their rules to the reality of the chaotic nature of civil disturbances. In the section listing the “Principles” to guide commanders, the first listed principle on the “Application of Force” set the contradictory tone of dealing with a riot. “…the force will be determined, aggressive, and only the minimum necessary [force] will be applied to

---
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accomplish the mission. Cruelties will be avoided; physical contact will be made only when it becomes necessary."^{23}

In the anticipated scenario, the necessity for American involvement made the possibility of negative public relations more likely, even as the ground commander exercised all due care in regulating his own force. This risk to the image of Army Berlin as a protecting force of Good Neighbors to Berliners, actively working to build its soft power social capital in the city, was of great concern to the command of Army Berlin. The importance of preserving accumulated social capital and especially Berliners thin trust of Americans as the “generalized other” weighed heavily in the regulations governing civil disturbance behaviors.

In regard to the potential elevations in the use of force, Annex E of BC-ISD-60 stipulated the order of application clearly through its listing of authorized weapons and their approved use and restrictions. The initial levels authorized included “Clubs, rifle butts and/or bayonets…when force is required…If above force is ineffective, the hand grenade, tear, riot, CN, will be used. If CN proves ineffective, CS will be used. Use of CS will be promptly reported to G-3.”^{24} At this trigger point, the final stage of force was contemplated, the use of firearms. “Shotgun and/or rifle fire will be used only as a last resort and will be preceded by a verbal warning to the crowd; it will be directed at identified belligerents and will be discontinued as soon as the desired results

---

^{23} Ibid., 1-2.
^{24} Ibid., 2. CS (chlorobenzylidenemalononitrile) and CN (chloroacetophenone) are two of the most common riot control agents, or tear gases, which can be dispersed by hand grenade, grenade launchers, and as aerosol sprays emitted from directional spray nozzles. The effects are rapid, usually within 20 seconds of exposure, and cause extreme burning and pain in the eyes, nose, and throat of those exposed without gas masks. They are considered non-lethal but effective agents in riot suppression. CS is also used in United States military training to instill confidence in military-issue protective masks and clothing. Typically released in an enclosed building, the subject removes their mask to experience the effects. For more background, see “Medical Management of Chemical Casualties Handbook,” 2nd ed., (Aberdeen Proving Grounds MD: United States Army Medical Research Institute of Chemical Defense), September 1995, available at [http://fas.org/nuke/guide/usa/doctrine/army/mmceh/index.html](http://fas.org/nuke/guide/usa/doctrine/army/mmceh/index.html)
have been obtained.”

This last stage, the ultimate authorization of the use of deadly force, warranted its own detailed separate appendix. Appendix 5 to Annex E opened with a reflective statement on the meaning of the use of lethal force in response to a civil disturbance:

It should be recognized that opening fire in civil disturbances is, in a measure, admission of failure. All efforts should be directed toward restoring order without resort to firearms. Actual firing will be effected only after all other practicable means have been tried and found inadequate. When the situation permits, a field grade officer will accompany the unit to the scene of the disturbance and will be designated as the responsible military commander. Before opening fire, the military commander should take all practicable means to warn the crowd of his intention to do so and should advise the crowd to disperse peaceably.

Appendix 5 also included additional detailed stipulations on the criteria for the extreme measures that were contemplated, but ultimately left the decision in the hands of the situational commander, subject to the guidelines.

It is significant that Army Berlin’s BC-ISD-60 did not include reference to alternative forms of crowd control. The gap from riot control gas to the use of firearms, preceded by an announcement using public address systems, if available, specifically denied an authorization for warning shots. Additionally, due to the lethality of their issued M-1 Garand battle rifles in use against a crowd, doctrine specified the commander’s selection authority and implementation options. Each infantry platoon leader was expected to select one individual soldier as the “platoon security guard” who would receive his superior’s command to fire, and then “with maximum effect at identified wrongdoers insofar as they can be determined.”

While these doctrinal safeguards focused on the command and control of troops and reflected an attempt to minimize the chance of an excessive lethal response in a civil disturbance that had escalated, it did not guarantee the result. All soldiers in the formations were required to

---
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carry a modified maximum load of 48 rounds for the M-1.\textsuperscript{28} In the final analysis, the success of American foreign policy, the image of Good Neighbors and protectors, depended on the discipline of “street-level” Americans to restrain additional fire beyond the platoon security guard in a situation that had degraded to the point of selective lethal force.

One additional section in Annex E itself lists the unit’s expected supply load for the situation, both for the individual soldier as well as the M-59 armored personnel carriers and M-48A1 tanks that would accompany the deployed unit to a civil disturbance. In each case, the vehicles were limited to 1/3 of their basic loads of ammunition, while one bulldozer from the civil engineer division was placed on ready status for “clearing road blocks or other obstacles.”\textsuperscript{29} However, the events of the next year provided the opportunity for the unit to review and update its plans and technology to support civil order, one of its central missions in the city. The support of the civil order in West Berlin was one of the concrete expressions of American vital interests of presence and viability, Army Berlin’s ability to succeed in its mission requirements.

The challenge of controlling large crowds through a calibrated and appropriate elevation of force doctrine required practical tools and techniques that offered a wide selection menu of response. In the following sections, three examples of Army Berlin’s implementation procedures which incorporated existing combat technologies through creative adaptations to meet its unique civil disturbance mission in West Berlin are reviewed. Each of these provides a specific capability designed to protect Army Berlin, and by extension, American foreign policy, from the damaging effects of negative public opinion, press reports, and communist propaganda designed to undermine the rights of presence, access, and viability.

\textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 2-3.
Adapting Lethal Weapons to Protect Good Neighbor Social Capital

Army Berlin’s street-level estimation indicated that the odds had increased that American troops would be required to step in to the role of direct civil confrontation against crowds of Berliners. This realization was sobering, if understood in the context of Joseph Nye’s theory that Soviet communism’s soft power influence was reduced by factors that included the world’s revulsion at repression of political protest, as in the case of Hungary in 1956.30

In its unique role in American foreign policy, Army Berlin was required to accomplish two seemingly contradictory missions: The primary task as the defender of West Berlin, and secondarily, as a force which could suppress possible destabilizing public demonstrations sponsored by communist infiltrators into the western half of the city. U.S. commanders on scene, possibly junior officers in platoon leader slots or even senior non-commissioned officers, needed additional non-lethal but effective technology to influence larger disobedient crowds, in order to avoid appearing as an oppressive occupying force.31

In the first month of the crisis initiated by the wall, it was critical that the American and German public believed in Army Berlin’s ability to perform its primary missions, the defense of the city and the suppression of civil disturbance. In the September 28, 1961 edition of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin highlighted the unit’s unique capabilities, beginning with its strict discipline and military bearing: “The G.I. in Berlin, in the words of an officer, has to be

---

30 Nye, writing in 1997, allocates the loss of Soviet communist Soft Power to numerous factors, including brutal repressions of social unrest in satellite states of Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968, and Poland in 1981. Although two of these events occurred well after the period discussed here, the impact of the Hungarian images are instructive. See Nye, Joseph S. Jr. Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History. (New York: Longman, 1997), 118.

31 The command of Army Berlin was not alone in its recognition of the potential for the negative public impact of excessive force (i.e. fn 45); This problem faced the East German regime throughout its existence, as documented in Mary Elise Sarotte’s The Collapse: The Accidental Opening of the Berlin Wall. (New York: Basic Books, 2014). Sarotte provides an excellent background on the regime’s dilemma in dealing with rising protests (particularly in Saxony) which strained, and eventually played a role in defeating, the East German state.
‘rough, tough and ready and at the same time as fancy pants as anyone.’” Baldwin further reassured readers that “Berlin, in the event of war, is unlikely to be the target of nuclear weapons.”

Baldwin discussed two scenarios the unit anticipated in Berlin, the challenging operational environment of combat in cities or civil disturbance. The unit’s unique training practices for urban combat is highlighted, followed by comment on the civil disturbance mission. “The principal role of the Berlin garrison is considered to be the ‘rapid and decisive repression of civil disturbances.’” The addition of several technologies to the unit’s civil disturbance arsenal, not available in 1960 at the time of the issuance of BC-ISD-60 (U), were briefly mentioned, yet significant. “An armored personnel carrier has been fitted with an electrified fence as wide as the average Berlin street. It can give a nasty shock to the rioter who touches it. Tear gas and riot gas are available and so is a powerful water gun to drench and disperse the rioters.” These new forms of force addressed a critical gap in the unit’s prior tables of organization, and the origin of them, as well as a new munitions type developed specifically for Army Berlin for use in an infantry weapon system already in the city, was not mentioned in the public story.

The modified armored personnel carrier Baldwin described was developed as an emergency response to the reality of the wall and the fast-paced rise in tensions between the public and its civil police force in West Berlin. The shock of the wall, the inability of the West Berlin government to restore travel rights for East Berliners to its half of the city, and especially

33 Ibid.
34 Ibid. For an examination of Army Berlin’s unique urban warfare operational environment, see Chapter 5, “Hard Power: America’s Cold Warriors for Berlin,” in this study.
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the muted response of the Allies gave rise to a series of incidents which involved crowds and security forces. This modified M-59 Armored Personnel Carrier (APC) was designed by the unit itself under the guidance and approval of USAREUR to fill these gaps, even as the unit was woefully short of these vehicles.

At the time of the crisis, Army Berlin carried a very limited stock of M-59s on the organizational tables of its single Armor unit, Company F, 40th Armor. The M-59 was designed to transport a standard ten-man infantry squad into battle, but the shortage in Berlin had required their consolidation at the command level, away from the battle groups that were expected to be proficient in their use. As a comparison of USAREUR-wide availability of M-59s for infantry units, General Bruce C. Clarke, CINCUSAREUR, summarized the status of divisional stocks in September of 1961 in his close of command “Report of Stewardship: October 1960- April 1962.” “Before mechanization, each infantry division in USAREUR had 180 armored personnel carriers. A division could mechanize no more than the combat elements of approximately between one and two thirds of its five battle groups.”36

In comparison to Clarke’s report for its USAREUR contemporaries, Army Berlin entered 1961 with only six M-59s shared by its two infantry battle groups and single supporting armor company. Five more APCs were added in January 1961, and nine more arrived on January 20, 1961, convoying in with the first reinforcing battle group, for a total of twenty APCs at the close of 1961.37 These allocations were modified in the last quarter of 1961, with each battle group in the 6th infantry assigned eight, leaving two for F/40th Armor and two assigned to the unit’s Ordnance Division. The fact that Army Berlin, with its two battle groups, ended 1961 with so

37 “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” box 2, 74, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
few mechanized infantry vehicles is an indication of the difference between its mission and that of a standard combat infantry unit. Combat units in Seventh Army, USAREUR’s operational command containing V and VII Corps in West Germany, were organized in divisional structure, and possessed the capability to allocate approximately 35 M-59’s to each battle group, while Army Berlin at the end of 1961 could only assign 8 to each battle group.

Compared to similar battle groups in Seventh Army, Berlin Brigade remained under-represented in mechanized capacity even after the Army’s decision in September, 1961 to replace truck transports, which infantry units currently relied upon for the majority of its mobility, with APCs. For V and VII Corps, this was a critical first step towards the adoption of the ROAD 65 structure and the eventual acceptance of *Bundeswehr* tactical doctrine for the defense of Europe as a model for future U.S. Army reorganization.38

The absence of these vehicles in Army Berlin was not justified by issues of rail transport or potential provocation of the Soviets in the city. It might be surmised that in the allocation of USAREUR-wide APCs, the prospect of Berlin Brigade using the transports in its urban warfare mission were low. Additionally, Army Berlin’s lack of maneuver potential against Soviet and East German forces surrounding Berlin may have been a factor in their denial.

The limited stock of Army Berlin’s M-59s made this new custom configuration for civil disturbance suppression a unique policy decision, as it captured one of Army Berlin’s Ordnance Division’s two M-59s and became the single vehicle selected to “give a nasty shock to the rioter

---

38 For deep background on this transformation, see Trauschweizer, *The Cold War U.S. Army*. In Trauschweizer’s well-supported view, West Germany’s Army influenced American strategic and tactical thought in the U.S. Army as the *Bundeswehr* was constituted in 1955. The composition of U.S. Army maneuver units and their required integration of mobility through mechanization and the incorporation of APCs into operational planning was critical to the ROAD 65 concept and its successor in European land warfare doctrine. The timing of the change to APCs coincided with the adoption of the M-113 to replace the heavier, slower M-59.
who touches it.”39 Even though this tasking required the loss of 5% of the full complement of
Army Berlin’s APCs, it represented a loss of little tactical consequence, as the entire Berlin stock
of M-59s massed together could only transport and protect one reinforced rifle company.

An M-59 APC and its two-man crew of driver and commander normally carried a single
.50 caliber machine gun, the Browning M-2, which was intended primarily for use against light
armored targets. This capability, however, was incompatible with the need to influence crowds
through a practical yet non-lethal threat, and was removed from the electrified M-59. Army
Berlin’s modified M-59, designed and built by the Ordnance Division of the unit, provided the
occupants of the vehicle protection while they advanced to disperse the crowd and clear the
street. The specifications listed in the annual historical report of 1961 provided technical data on
construction and use:

Ordnance Division designed and fabricated an electrified crowd-pushing device for the M-59
armored personnel carrier during the third quarter of 1961. It consisted of a center-section
mounted on electrical insulators at the front of the vehicle and 2 adjustable wing sections that can
be folded back while the vehicle is in transit or extended (from inside the APC) into a fence, 4
feet high and 30 feet wide. The fence was fabricated 2-inch metal pipe and heavy gauge,
diamond-fence material. A connection was made to an automatic-ignition type high-voltage
electrical supply which could be switched on or off by the driver.40

This configuration provided an imposing physical presence, and operating in coordination with a
disciplined formation of infantry advancing upon a crowd brandishing their M-1 rifles with
bayonets affixed, it was considered an improvement in lessening the necessity of using direct
lethal force to quell a riot.

While the vehicle itself could cause serious injury or death to individuals who might be
struck or even fall under its tracks, the electrified fence was meant to stun and dissuade groups of
protestors from persisting. However, with the reality of the shortage of additional modified M-

39 Hanson W. Baldwin, “Berlin GI’s Specially Trained For Combat in the Troubled City,” New York Times,
September 29, 1961, Section 1, 9.
40 “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” box 2, 81, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
59s, the burden of the mission remained squarely upon the dismounted formations of infantry, who continued to be exposed to direct physical threat, and the potential for unnecessary lethal violence was not yet removed. An additional form of crowd control was developed, fitting on the force spectrum between riot gas and rifle fire. However, this technology was less publicized when it became operational in early 1962.

As an infantry unit, the Berlin Brigade constructed its plans around its authorized equipment and manpower limitations. In the role of civil disturbance suppression, while there were several stages of non-lethal force available, these tactics and technologies were not guaranteed to produce the final desired results. With the addition of the single modified M-59 electrified APC, an important option had been added. However, in the case of a large and committed crowd of protestors, should the limited ability of a single vehicle in breaking the crowd be exceeded, it would fall upon the company and platoon leadership to address.

Seeking to provide a persuasive option that could engage a large crowd with an aggressive but intentionally non-lethal tool, a central U.S. infantry weapon system, the M-67 recoilless rifle, was brought into civil disturbance planning in early 1962. The M-67 was a 3-man portable weapon system, originally designed as an anti-tank weapon that could be integrated into infantry operations, mounted or dismounted. It also had the capacity to fire a lethal anti-personnel round, the M-590 Antipersonnel Canister, which contained approximately 2400 fin-stabilized flechette projectiles, primarily designed for use against mass formations of individuals.\(^4^1\) However, up until the 1961 Berlin crisis and the new estimation of the increased possibility of American forces facing civil unrest, the U.S. Army had not contracted for or developed a less lethal option for the M-67 recoilless rifle. Once again, Army Berlin’s Ordnance

Division, acting as street-level implementers of national policy, improvised and developed an answer:

Based on a requirement for a 90mm, “rock salt” canister round, the Ordnance Division developed sketches and computations for a proposed round. USAREUR Ordnance Division was requested to furnish assistance in developing and producing this round. Three versions were initially developed and test fired at Grafenwoehr, West Germany. After several tests and modifications, a satisfactory round was developed in November. Production of the “rock-salt” rounds, consisting of a 90mm cartridge, 105mm powder charges, and a cardboard canister containing coarse rock-salt, was begun in December.42

On the ground in West Berlin, commanders had sought an answer to the dilemma of restoring order to an uncontrolled crowd, while still preserving the image of American restraint, if not benevolence. The answer, apparently, was a direct fire weapon that could discharge a psychologically devastating wall of salt against an unresponsive or noncompliant crowd that had not yet exhibited its willingness to yield to the verbal warnings and progressive displays of American determination.

This weapon, however, was not in all instances non-lethal; fired into a crowd at close range on a level trajectory, the central blast could potentially cause death. Under the right training and supervision it was expected that, if necessary, a slightly elevated trajectory at greater distance would not normally result in life-threatening injuries. Additionally, in a large mass of protestors with depth, a greater elevation might be employed to rain salt onto protestors not in the front ranks, breaking the mass apart and encouraging others to flee. Referred to as the “Morton Salt Round” in the minutes of a mid-March, 1962 Berlin Brigade Command and General Staff meeting, the purpose and effectiveness of the round was part of a series of training demonstrations for members of both the permanent 6th Infantry and reinforcing 47th Infantry.43

---

42 “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” box 2, 81, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
A third upgrade of capabilities for the unit in its civil disturbance mission came from the development and distribution of a new weapon system that had recently been introduced into the U.S. Army just as the crisis was beginning. Like the M-67 recoilless rifle, it became an integral part of infantry operations and tactics army-wide, and its versatility in both lethal and non-lethal applications made it tactically valuable in Berlin. The M-79 grenade launcher fired a single 40 millimeter grenade, and it loaded and unloaded exactly in the manner of one of the most basic forms of traditional shotguns familiar to many soldiers, a break-open action at the breech end of the simple single barrel, making its introductory training cycles rapid.\(^{44}\)

This one-man weapon provided a much more versatile alternative to the prior grenade-launching technology, the battle rifle muzzle-launched M-31 High Explosive Anti-Tank (HEAT) rifle grenade. Although its warhead was significantly smaller than the M-31 and not designed to defeat medium armor, the M-79 provided a longer maximum range in its lethal role, 400 meters, as well as a wider range of munitions.\(^{45}\) In the case of the civil disturbance role in Berlin, the M-79 could fire two forms of riot control projectiles. For CS tear gas, the XM674, or for smoke only, the XM675, dispersing red smoke. Each of these had a maximum range of 230 feet, reduced by the lower charge load of propellant to decrease the potential for accidental lethality.\(^{46}\) It was lightweight, simple, easy to maintain, and soldiers could be quickly trained to become proficient in its employment, which made it an asset in the unit’s viability in both riot control and combat.

The arrival of this new weapon system was anticipated by the command elements as well as the unit’s public affairs specialists, who made sure that it was highlighted in news stories in

\(^{45}\) Ibid., Appendix B, 1-5.  
\(^{46}\) Ibid., Appendix B, 8-9.
the Berlin Observer. On the front page of the paper on January 19, 1962, a photo of Colonel Wayne M. Winder, the commanding officer of the 3rd Battle Group, 6th Infantry, depicts the Colonel receiving training tips from a sergeant of the 1st Battle Group, 19th Infantry, the second reinforcing unit in the city.47 The M-79, which later proved its utility in its combat role in Vietnam, was a tool that addressed the gap between the distance a soldier could toss a hand grenade and the minimum range of the Berlin Brigade infantry company’s organic 81-millimeter mortars. However, at this early stage, its versatility and design to incorporate riot control applications was integrated into the unit’s demand for civil disturbance advantages that minimized the possibility of damaging publicity in the event of anticipated unrest in the middle of the crisis.

Fortunately, these advancements in technology were not employed in their full capacity, even as sporadic events tested the discipline of the unit from the beginning of the crisis. As the first days of the wall developed inside the divided city, Army Berlin increased its patrol and presence in its sector, including the margins of West Berlin. In the first two days after the East Germans officially restricted all foreign access through one crossing point at Friedrichstrasse, soon known as “Checkpoint Charlie,” soldiers of the 6th Infantry battle groups took up increased patrol and observation positions near this site. Crowds of Berliners inside the American sector of the city also came to the crossing point, gauging Army Berlin’s intentions and reactions. In this role, Army Berlin’s street-level implementers, in direct contact with the population of Berlin and particularly the East German Volkspolizei, found themselves at the forefront of American foreign policy.

47 Uncaptioned photo, Berlin Observer, January 19, 1962, 1, Berlin Observer Collection, USAMHI.
Army Berlin Demonstrates Presence at the Berlin Wall

The Berlin Observer chronicled one of the early incidents in which Army Berlin asserted its right of presence, and demonstrated its commitment to performing a functional, successful role in Berlin, its viability as Cold Warriors. “Private Mexico was standing guard at the Friedrichstrasse Crossing, the sole allied access point to East Berlin, when hostile forces from that sector placed an armored vehicle capable of ejecting a high pressure stream of water and pointed it directly at him.”48 The unit on duty August 24, 1961, was company B of the 2nd Battle Group of the 6th Infantry, PFC Mexico’s company. His citation for the Army Commendation Medal made him “the first American soldier to be decorated for duty” at the ‘wall of shame.’”49

While PFC Mexico stood at his post in the middle of the crossing point boundary, an East German water cannon truck attempted to force him to retreat, first by aiming the weapon in his direction. When this failed, the cannon was swung away and fired, followed by a stream that was set on an arc headed toward him. Instead of retreating, PFC Mexico stood his ground, “pulled a chemical grenade from his battle gear, and prepared to throw it if hit by the water.”50

This defiant act by a single soldier was an example of the manifestation of national will at the “street level” in Berlin.

As President Kennedy gathered advisors to assess and select implementation strategies to achieve national policy interests and to insure American presence and access, the behavior of individuals on the ground were observed critically by the residents of both halves of Berlin, as well as the East German and Soviet leadership. Even though the water cannon used by the East Germans was classified as non-lethal technology, the act of aiming and firing a high pressure

---

48 “Army Honors PFC Mexico For Dedication,” Berlin Observer, January 19, 1962, 3, Berlin Observer Collection, USAMHI.
49 Ibid.
50 Ibid.
stream at an American soldier, armed with a loaded M-1 Garand battle rifle, was an example of the risks the East Germans were willing to take in the conflict. The training and discipline required of an individual in PFC Mexico’s situation must align with national interests, as communicated by his immediate superiors. A retreat signaled weakness, while an overreaction in response was equally damaging to U.S. interests in the city.

PFC Mexico’s decision to act as an individual responsible for the success of his mission to provide presence also demonstrated Army Berlin’s local interpretation of the term viability, which emphasized its own ability to succeed in projecting American hard power in Berlin.51 This behavior was also consistent with contemporary theories and doctrinal text on the impact of leadership in the American military, as well as the interpretation of the history of the United States fighting man. The Department of Defense handbook, *The Armed Forces Officer*, contemporary to the period, described the individual nature of military service: “Within military forces, an element of command is owned by every man who is doing his duty with intelligence and imagination. That puts him on the side of the angels, and the pressure he exerts is felt not only by his subordinates but of those topside who are doing less.”52

In this 1960 revision of the original 1950 Department of Defense publication, *The Armed Forces Officer*, the U.S. military provided its officer corps a historical and philosophical treatise on important issues including leadership, morale, and human nature in the context of their

---

51 For the purposes of Army Berlin’s interpretation of its right of viability, Merriam-Webster defines “viable” (the root of the noun “Viability”) in numerous contexts, including: a) capable of working, functioning, or developing adequately; b) capable of existence and development as an independent unit; c) having a reasonable chance of succeeding. Where President Kennedy had asserted a new “right” of West Berlin’s viability economically, politically, and socially, this extension went beyond the agreements between the Allies in regard to the rights of presence and access (see chapter 3). These two rights were Allied rights, not Berliner rights. What Kennedy demanded in his policy, and apparently intended, was to extend Allied standing to Berliners. In the context of viability as an Allied right, it was interpreted by Army Berlin to mean its viability as a military force governed by treaty and precedent in the city.

profession. Numerous vignettes on the nature of the American soldier were included in the book, drawn from important historical figures in American military history. An early Prussian emigré and the first Inspector-General of the Army, Friedrich von Steuben, described American soldiers in a letter to a fellow Prussian officer in his home country. “You say to your soldier, ‘Do this!’ and he doeth it; but I am obliged to say, ‘This is the reason that you ought to do that,’ and then he does it.”\(^{53}\)

This example, representative of numerous anecdotes throughout the book, served to remind the newly commissioned officer of the power of the mythic image of the American military member’s spirited individuality. The balance between reward and punishment, as well as the proper care and leadership to achieve the missions that were assigned in furtherance of national interests, were central themes as well.

PFC Mexico, whether he knew it or not, was exercising national policy as effectively as President Kennedy had to this point in the first ten days of the crisis, simply by standing in the middle of the road, acting as a “street-level” bureaucrat of American foreign policy. PFC Mexico exemplified presence, guaranteed access, and demonstrated the purpose and usefulness, or viability of Army Berlin.

PFC Mexico and his fellow soldiers from “Bear” Company of the 2\(^{nd}\) Battle Group, the “Guardians,” experienced at least one additional event at the Friedrichstrasse crossing point that had a national impact that summer. However, in this case, the estimation and policy selection practices of the command in Army Berlin and its 2\(^{nd}\) Battle Group of the 6\(^{th}\) Infantry resulted in a series of negative reactions that echoed back to the halls of the United States Congress. As the border crossing at Friedrichstrasse came to represent the “hottest” spot in the Cold War in the

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 98.
public narrative, the competing needs of military engagement and restraint appeared to have clashed, at least in the interest of public relations and media access.

On September 7, 1961, Jack Paar taped a portion of his show at Friedrichstrasse with the assistance of Army Berlin. Paar, one of the most popular American television celebrities of the period, had coordinated with Army Berlin’s Information Officer, Lieutenant Colonel Dallas Hoadley, who authorized Paar to tape a short segment at Friedrichstrasse in the pre-Checkpoint Charlie period. Hoadley, the appropriate Army Berlin contact point at the local street-level responsible for dealing with media and press issues in West Berlin, had cleared the taping with the command of Army Berlin. Additionally, Paar requested permission to interview Army Berlin members, subject to the approval of command and in accordance with security regulations. This was also approved, and these interviews were to be conducted near the restricted area, adjacent to the wall, increasing the dramatic impact. The soldiers who were provided for Paar’s interview were not pulled from the standing security shift deployed in the area of the Friedrichstrasse border crossing point, in order to avoid disrupting standard behaviors which Army Berlin had instituted to increase its presence at the location.

A series of miscommunications, misrepresentations, and unexpected occurrences ensued, exacerbated by the public statements of elected leaders and policymakers far removed from the city. In the selection of its assistance it appeared the unit had provided personnel and equipment in a method and amount that threatened the fragile American influence. The event allowed the American press to quickly characterize the policy implementation of presence and viability as “the biggest turnout the United States Army had yet made along the wall that divides the city—and it was all for Jack Paar, the television star.”

By the next day, the U.S. Congress had weighed in, followed by the opening of a Department of Defense investigation. U.S. Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Democrat, Montana, addressed his colleagues in the Senate on September 8, 1961, regarding reports of an incident at Friedrichstrasse in which American military personnel had participated. Mansfield declared that, “Berlin was a world tragedy, not a television spectacular to be made into some kind of game for the personal profit of personalities in the entertainment world.”55 Joining his fellow Democrat in the Senate on the floor, Hubert H. Humphreys, assistant majority leader feared “that Premier Khrushchev could use an incident of this kind for propaganda and beat us over the head with it.”56 President Kennedy’s fellow party members and Senate leaders appeared to have deep concerns regarding the foreign policy acumen of Army Berlin and did not delay in as they registered their displeasure.

In a spirit of bi-partisanship, Leverett Saltonstall, Republican Senator of Massachusetts, added his own interpretation of the incident, based upon initial press reports. “I couldn’t believe it when I saw it. Out of such a thing, extreme results could come.”57 The sources of the information prompting the dire warnings from leaders of the U.S. Senate were the public reports by correspondents in Berlin covering events in the city. As it was portrayed in the early media reports, this particular occurrence underscored the U.S. government’s lack of strategic clarity as it dealt with the rapidly changing environment and the influence of the press in co-opting the situation for its own benefit.

While elected leaders expended congressional resources to match their conclusions to the narrative, the bureaucratic machine in the Pentagon shifted into its own self-defense mode.

56 Ibid.
57 Ibid.
Exemplified by a preemptive condemnation from Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, an apparent lack of institutional discipline and thoughtful inquiry ensued: “If the newspaper reports are accurate, it was a disgraceful episode. If Army officers were responsible, they showed very poor judgment.”

Completing the trifecta of uninformed voices in Washington, President Kennedy’s press secretary, Pierre Salinger, at least qualified his response by responding to a press pool inquiry that he “agreed with Sylvester on the need for an investigation.” Assistant Secretary Sylvester, a bureaucrat ensconced safely in Washington, apparently did not delay in his assessment and policy selection, according to a report on the incident:

The Pentagon took action against two Army officers in Berlin today for having permitted the use of United States forces in the filming of a Jack Paar television show. The Defense Department announced that Lieut. Col. Dallas Hoadley, public information officer of the Berlin Command had been relieved of his duties. It said the action was taken against him for ‘improper performance of his duty.’ Col. John R. Deane Jr., commanding officer of the Second Battle Group, Sixth Infantry in Germany, was admonished for ‘exercising poor judgment.’

The characterization of the event as a “disgraceful episode” that risked handing the Soviets a propaganda victory was not uniformly shared at the street level in Berlin. In fact, in the early days of the crisis, the public in West Berlin had begun to question the level of determination the United States would exert to protect its right of access into East Berlin and the viability of Army Berlin in its mission to protect West Berlin.

The stationing of a semi-permanent force of soldiers at Friedrichstrasse was in response to the East German actions of August 22 and in the following days. This period included the water cannon incident for which one of Colonel Deane’s troops, PFC Mexico, was decorated later, in early 1962. In the course of the investigation it was determined that, contrary to press

reports, speeches in congress, and Assistant Defense Secretary Sylvester’s speculation, Colonel Deane and Lt. Col. Hoadley “had done nothing that was injurious or discreditable to the country or the Army.” The finding, announced on September 27, 1961 by General Bruce C. Clarke, Commander in Chief of USAREUR, included his statement that “action against the two colonels will be withdrawn, to right an injustice.”

Colonel Deane, who had remained in command of the 2nd Battle Group, 6th Infantry after receiving a letter of admonishment, had his record cleared. For Lt. Col. Hoadley, the immediate impact was removal from his position as Berlin Command’s Information Officer. He had been transferred to Heidelberg, where he assumed a new posting, and was not returned to Berlin after his clearance.

In the interest of projecting American rights of presence in the city, local commanders and soldiers adapted to the changing environment and interpreted the intent of national leaders where formal orders and policies appeared unclear or contradictory. In the case of the actions on August 24, 1961, a representative of the national interest in the eyes of Berliners took the form of PFC Mexico, a low-ranking enlisted infantryman who interpreted his mission to stand his ground included risking bodily injury or death. His actions, in the context of the threat to American access into East Berlin, epitomized presence and projected the viability of the force, its ability to succeed in meeting the East German provocations. Additionally, the retention of the infantry in the immediate area of this border crossing defended Allied access rights into East Berlin, even as the East German government successfully changed the rules in its restrictions as they forced non-Germans to enter East Berlin only at the Friedrichstrasse crossing point. However, in the

---
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case of the turmoil surrounding the Paar incident just two weeks later, the behavior of the military leadership on the ground in Berlin was criticized for its aggressiveness. In staging a backdrop for a popular television show that appeared in many American homes, the opportunity to reinforce the message of resolute American presence was a calculated risk.

For the local commanders, both the American and German public opinions were relevant to their agreement to provide Paar with access to the additional thirteen men from Bear Company, 2nd Battle Group. The troops assigned to this detail, including PFC Mexico, had been on duty on the day of Mexico’s action. They were ordered to Friedrichstrasse for the filming, where Mexico and several others were interviewed by Paar.

At this point, the request approved through Lt. Col. Hoadley resembled a normal public relations interaction, calibrated in scope to provide NBC with access to one squad of infantry to interview and film, while the normal posted security of the 3rd Battle Group remained in position. The only other material request NBC made was the use of a jeep in the background, parked on the white line and framed so that Paar and his guests would appear beside it and under the white sign marking the limits of the American sector. This request was fulfilled by Colonel Deane, who made a last-minute decision to mount an unloaded machine gun on the prop jeep.64

The circumstances on the ground which led to the sensational charges first leveled by the New York Times that Army Berlin had unnecessarily increased the force to film the Paar show were not the result of an aggressive military commander. Instead, the Berlin weather had altered the schedule due to technical issues with production, delaying the start of filming from the agreed time of 1:00 pm for over an hour. When the heavy rain turned into a drizzle just before 2:00 pm, the decision was made to begin filming, and just as the cameras began rolling, the relief

---

shift of soldiers from the 3rd Battle Group, 6th Infantry arrived, moving up Friedrichstrasse behind the production crew. As they completed their turnover process, the relieved shift of soldiers remained on the scene as curious spectators, hoping to get a glimpse of the process, as well as Paar and Peggy Cass, American celebrities.65

For the media, this explanation did not support the narrative of a military unit exceeding its authority in pursuit of national interests, even as NBC offered the explanation of the shift change for the increase in its response to press inquiries.66 Instead, the opening three paragraphs of the New York Times story advised the public:

Fifty armed United States soldiers moved rapidly down the rain-spattered street, then smartly took possession of buildings overlooking the East-West Berlin border. A jeep mounting an anti-tank gun and several others mounting machine guns moved into position along either curb. One jeep with a machine gun had a front wheel planted right on the white stripe that indicates the border between East and West.67

What was a normal implementation of the national policy of presence in Berlin, the relief of troops in established positions by armed soldiers accompanied by their assigned crew-served weapons, was characterized by the press as a military blunder, damaging to national credibility. The addition of one squad and one jeep, positioned forward of the posted troops but not beyond the border of West Berlin and the U.S. sector, apparently was not sensational enough to report as a unique development. It required the omission of the fact that the arriving force was in its normal implementation of its duty, simply relieving a similarly-sized force that already occupied the positions. The public, perhaps unaware of the steps and deployment of forces that had occurred due to the crisis, could reasonably conclude this single act was an exception and disproportionate to the threat, not a regular rotation to display the president’s assertion that America required presence and Army Berlin’s interpretation of viability.

65 Ibid.
In the case of the U.S. senators who uncritically accepted the overblown news stories, the opportunity to appear on the senate floor as reasoned “statesmen” at the earliest public moment afforded them outweighed any motivation to inquire and discern before condemnation. In the military bureaucracy itself, the same reflexive instinct had demanded the swift assignment of blame at the lowest level possible. Lt. Col. Hoadley, the public information officer in Berlin for Army Berlin, had started the morning of September 7, 1961 in Berlin believing he had negotiated a public relations coup that would highlight the early work of the unit in the crisis and also inform the public through a popular medium. On September 9, 1961, he was removed from his position “for improper performance of his duty.”

The management of public information in Berlin was a priority of the command before the wall appeared, but after its erection and this early signal of the importance of perception through public information and propaganda, new forms of communication and interaction were required. Ironically, the impact of the press in roiling national and international issues for the purpose of creating news had struck at both ends of the command chain repeatedly in the first month of the crisis. Like the officers accused in Berlin, President Kennedy had been forced to address press headlines based upon rumors and leaks that had undermined his message to allies, especially those in West Germany who depended on American commitment to protect and expand their interests in West Berlin.
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69 SEE Memorandum of Conversation, August 30, 1961, Department of State, *FRUS: 1961-1963, Volume XIV, Berlin Crisis, 1961-1962*, Document 133. As an example in this case, the early press reports of discussions of American and allied emphasis on a set of vital interests that did not appear inclusive of the West German requirement for increased political and financial ties with West Berlin.
Army Berlin’s Soft Power Strategies

Army Berlin reinforced its presence and viability through a wide range of practices that were normally not considered to be military forms of foreign policy practice. In Berlin, in practices similar in concept to other overseas United States military duty stations, efforts to integrate the command element, operational units, individual soldiers, and their family members into the community required significant diplomatic behavior. In the summer of 1961, the first German-American Volksfest in Berlin was held, sponsored by the American Youth Activities Association, (AYA) Berlin. Supervised by Berlin Command’s Personnel Services Branch, G1, this first attempt at a joint German and American festival was held on U.S. military property at the command’s Sports Center Field. Beginning on July 29, 1961 and closing on August 13, 1961, a crowd of approximately 175,000 people attended the first event.70

This initial Volksfest was a new effort to exercise a form of Nye’s developed concept of soft power, well before his term was inserted into the diplomatic lexicon in the 1990s. An initiative entirely the responsibility of Army Berlin, the Volksfest grew into the largest single annual event in which cultural diplomacy between Berliners and their American “Good Neighbors” occurred. Combining German carnival rides and cuisine with an American historical theme that regularly reinforced the American West of Karl May’s fictional native-American heroes “Old Shatterhand” and “Winnetou,” the Volksfest offered Berliners the chance to experience American food, popular culture, and friendship.71 The success of the Volksfest in

70 “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” Box 2, 17, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI. This specific festival in 1961 is described in numerous sources as the first Volksfest, although prior versions occurred in the period of the 1958 Berlin crisis. The acronym AYA represents the American Youth Activities Association in Berlin.
attracting a diverse population of West Berliners, and before the wall’s erection, East Berliners, directly benefitted the members Army Berlin who had children living in West Berlin.

The AYA, the financial beneficiaries of the 1961 Volksfest, provided morale and family support by directly serving the youth of Army Berlin, focused on three major program objectives. It organized sporting leagues inside the American military community for the children of military members, sponsored the Berlin chapters of Boys and Girl Scouts, and planned social activities in order to meet the needs of young Americans living in a foreign nation.

Lieutenant Colonel Louis Waple, Social Activities Director, credited the comprehensive program with addressing one of the major concerns military communities had with dependent youth in a foreign nation. According to the Berlin Observer article on the meeting, “Colonel Waple then pointed out that during 1961 there was not a single reportable incident attributable to juvenile delinquency and contributed this achievement to the three fold AYA program.” Just as the military worked to ensure that the enlisted and commissioned officers acted as Good Neighbors and representatives of American ideals, it was critical that the children of soldiers also received cultural and social support in playing their part.

Americanization of the Vietnam War through the 1970s. As an Army Berlin initiative, Greene assesses the impact of the Volksfest in transmitting American culture to a broad population that was often beyond the reach of other American cultural efforts, particularly those efforts emphasizing high culture. The use of iconic American Western themes is a particular topic. The influence of Karl May upon German idealization of the American West through his late 19th and early 20th century fables of the noble savage, Winnetou, and his link by honor to Karl (Old Shatterhand), a German “man of the West” (Westmann) is a substantial cultural phenomenon in German expectations of Americans. As Greene demonstrates, Army Berlin regularly accessed these tropes to enhance its efforts.
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74 The behavior of young Americans living in foreign nations as part of American occupation or consent-based agreements with host nations (ie Status of Forces Agreements, SOFAs) is a particular source of common tensions. In the case of West Berlin, the youthful behaviors of Americans are subjected to increased scrutiny by both the command of Army Berlin as well as the civic leaders and general
The second annual *Volksfest*, planned for the summer of 1962, required additional support from line units in providing “volunteers” to assist in making it successful. This tasking was relayed in a May Command and Staff Luncheon by the Brigade’s G1 personnel officer:

Plans are moving rapidly for our 2nd annual German-American Volksfest, to be conducted 28 July – 12 August. One of our biggest problems now is obtaining the necessary personnel to assist us in this operation. Within the near future, it is quite likely that we will be asking for some assistance from the subordinate units. Recognizing the many training requirements and commitments during this period, it is hoped that we can count on your support in this regard.75

This second festival, set in the two week period immediately preceding the first anniversary of the wall, was considerably more successful, when measured by attendance. During the August 13, 1962 Chief of Staff conference, The Berlin Brigade’s Assistant Chief of Staff reviewed the impressive metric results of the intentional transmission of cultural soft power. He proudly announced that “approximately 420,000 persons attended the *Volksfest*. Of this total, approximately 330,000 were paid admissions.”76 The offering of American cultural narratives, presented as historical, mythic America through music, folklore, and food, was combined with displays of American progress and particularly military commitment to West Berlin.

One of the institutional responses made by Army Berlin was the establishment of a new community relations partnership in the city between the command and the elected civic leadership of West Berlin. Prior to the crisis, there had been no formal structure beyond ad hoc meetings with the district mayors. While the Berlin Command had fostered personal population of West Berlin. Examples of these cultural and generational fault lines are covered in more depth in Chapter 6, “Soft Power Community: America’s Good Neighbors in Berlin.” Contemporary American views of juvenile delinquency in American society, analyzed by institutional studies and government committees exemplified by “The U.S. Senate Subcommittee to Study Juvenile Delinquency in the United States” during the 1950s are an important cultural phenomenon in this period; its influence in shaping the way in which Americans viewed the challenges in their own society also had an impact on cultural interactions in places like West Berlin.

---

76Memorandum for Record: Record of Chief of Staff’s Conference, 1100 hours 13 August 1962, Berlin Brigade HQ, 14 August 1962, NA, RG 549, box 10.
relationships with several of the district mayors and other elite members of West Berlin, many
issues in the West Berlin community were considered primarily German concerns. The
implementation of a new formal network between American military leaders and the civic and
elected leadership of West Berlin, the German-American Committee, resulted in its first meeting
on July 13, 1962. The initial notes for the meeting included an agreement that “the German-
American Committee meet periodically as a group and that working committees in specific areas
be developed as needed, to meet on an informal, as needed basis.”77

Additionally, the American side suggested that the Berlin Brigade’s battle groups should
schedule annual parades in their partner districts, at the district mayor’s invitation. This idea was
“favorably received” by the mayors, and the practice which had been implemented earlier that
summer in three districts was expanded.78 The display of American military commitment to
maintain its presence was essential not only to American vital interests, but in the interests of the
elected leaders of West Berlin’s districts.

An early example of the promotion of the parade in the American sector which followed
this suggestion occurred on October 6, 1962, as reported in the European edition of Stars and
Stripes: “West Berlin police estimated that 30,000 residents of this democratic outpost lined the
march routes Saturday to watch American soldiers, armor, and artillery parade the city streets.”79
Held in the Schoeneberg district, the parade closed with a rifle salute sequence by two squads of
infantry, who disembarked from their Armored Personnel Carriers in front of a reviewing stand
and discharged their M-14 battle rifles loaded with blanks.80

---
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In other cases, however, suggestions for alternative forms of official German-American interactions were not as easily received. Briefing notes for the first meeting of the new German-American Committee, prepared for Albert Watson, II, U.S. Commander of Berlin, recommended that a proposal for “German-American Friendship Week” be declined, which would have been a new program in Berlin, suggested by the German members of the group.81 This initiative had been popular in linking U.S. Army units to their German neighbors in West Germany under the sponsorship of the Federation of German-American Clubs, and the West Berlin mayors wished to implement it in their city.

The briefing points provided to Major General Watson recommended that the program was “neither necessary nor appropriate” for implementation in Berlin, and included the following negative comments, which were based upon their unique setting that did not match those of American units in West Germany:

2. Berlin Brigade has not conducted such an event in the past for the following reasons still considered valid:
   a. There has been no local Federation club to sponsor it.
   b. It is unnecessary for the Army to schedule a special week to emphasize the amicable relations which already exist among Americans and Berliners.82

The recommendation to resist an additional form of exchange between Berliners included a long list of the extensive community relations programs that were already connecting Americans and Berliners, both from the military unit’s efforts, and importantly, their diplomatic partners. It argued that “The Commander’s community relations program in Berlin is part of an extensive, year-round program in which other U.S. Government agencies participate: i.e. extensive USIA

---
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cultural affairs programs, *Amerika-Haus* activities, German-American school and numerous special projects.”

This rejection also acknowledged the potential damage such a program might cause in Army Berlin’s relationships with their vital Berlin allies, Britain and France. “Focusing special attention, unilaterally, on friendship of American and Berliners could be embarrassing in view of the presence in Berlin of British and French Allies.” This particular objection, while diplomatically focused, appeared to disregard many of the command’s existing efforts to be Good Neighbors to Berliners, which apparently were not limited by similar considerations of their Allies in the city.

Holidays provided Army Berlin with additional opportunities to be Good Neighbors, and they were considered particularly successful, even in the wall crisis period. Army Berlin’s Calendar Year 1961 Historical Report noted that, in celebration of the American Thanksgiving of 1961, “Approximately 1,800 German guests were invited to share in the observance of Thanksgiving Day activities. Families, orphanages, and invalids were invited to dinner by the troop units, clubs and social organizations of the command.” Included in the 1961 historical report, “Operation Good Cheer,” a program that had been in place to connect American soldiers and the broader American military community to the West Berlin population, continued the opportunity to reach out:

It was estimated that the projects undertaken during this period benefitted over 1,400 Berlin children, 40 needy families, 7 homes for the aged, and 200 patients in six Berlin hospitals. In turn, over 300 members of the U.S. Army, Berlin, accepted Christmas invitations from Berlin families. It was estimated that an equal number received personal invitations from their Berlin friends.

---
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The vital interest of the presence of American troops in Berlin had a significant impact on relationships as the command was focused not only on general community relations, but also efforts at charitable and socially conscious projects. The role of civic virtue as a foundational aspect of Putnam’s social capital theory, activated through formal and informal networks and associations, was central to Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors image. These events provided another expression of Army Berlin’s usefulness, its capability to succeed in projecting soft power.

Beyond the large, planned public events designed to promote Americans as Good Neighbors who were primarily present in the city as defenders and guardians, the command looked for other opportunities to promote its role as an instrument of social good for the individual Berliner. In another example from 1961, two of Army Berlin’s administrative divisions coordinated their efforts in partnership with West Berlin’s municipal government to aid a Berliner who worked for Army Berlin. Employed in a position requiring the ability to operate an Army Berlin sedan, the gentleman was retained in his gainful employment after losing one of his legs. This was accomplished by the adaptation of a sedan to accommodate his disability, and as a successful collaboration, it was critical that Army Berlin received credit for this behavior in the West Berlin press, affirmed in Army Berlin’s 1961 Historical Report as a significant event.87

In this instance, like the larger more formal holiday events, the public nature of the recognition served an important social capital function. Theoretically, the individual worker impacted might have experienced an increased thick trust assignable in his work relationships to specific known Americans due to the private good he received. Additionally, this may have also translated into an increase in his generalized reciprocal thin trust toward Americans in general.

87 “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” box 2, 16, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
The wider web of impact, promoted through positive press accounts circulated into Berlin’s population through the media account of the combined efforts of American military members and their own municipal government, might have increased the beneficial aspects of social capital. In particular, generalized, reciprocal thin trust, the form of trust Robert Putnam considered the most valuable form of societal trust. Putnam posits that this form of trust makes it possible for societies to operate more efficiently and allows for the extension of rational goodwill to the “generalized other,” in response to interactions with individuals or groups who have exhibited repetitive positive social and cultural norms. These examples of command-driven actions toward promoting Americans as Good Neighbors reflect continual efforts by the leadership of Army Berlin to enhance strong bonds with their neighbors. In the environment of a Berlin that included temporarily assigned reinforcing battle groups, the practice of American idealism regarding social behaviors in a foreign community was on display, even by those troops unfamiliar with the city.

The second rotating reinforcing battle group, the 1st Battle Group of the 19th Infantry, arrived in late November and moved into their assignments just as the 1961 Christmas holiday season began. The *Berlin Observer* article attested to exhibited behaviors consistent with USAREUR-wide Good Neighbors doctrine in the unfamiliar city: “…undaunted by the fact that they had arrived here in the divided city too late to get into the full swing of Operation Good Cheer…Company E invited eight families from Zehlendorf District in Berlin to be their guests of honor for a dinner complete with toys and gifts for each family.”

---

89 “Chickamaugan Unit Hosts Eight Families,” *Berlin Observer*, January 5, 1962, 6, Berlin Observer Collection, USAMHI.
This unit was not included in the pre-planning for “Operation Good Cheer” and was not expected to participate in the program due to its late arrival. Additionally, it experienced none of the command pressure placed upon permanent Berlin Brigade battle group and company line officers to demonstrate their commitment to support the command’s community relations goals in their assigned partner districts. However, the Good Neighbors mission, a USAREUR-wide policy, appeared to be carried with this single company from its base in West Germany, which acted as new street-level American diplomats in uniform in West Berlin.

The USAREUR policy of being Good Neighbors to the German people extended into West Berlin in other examples. A front page story in the Berlin Observer in March, 1962, highlights the exhibition of civic virtue, a prerequisite for a society that accumulates social capital through networks, formal or informal: “The STRAC soldiers ran up the winding staircase and awakened the families on each floor. ‘They wanted us to get out quickly, because the roof might have fallen,’ Fräulein Imgard John said afterwards.”90 One of the soldiers who had recently arrived from America as part of LONG THRUST II, Sergeant Emil J. Miller, Jr., of Charlie Company, 2nd Battle Group, 47th Infantry, performed a different community service in Berlin on March 10, 1962, when he broke down a door to enter a burning building.91 This effort, from a soldier who had not been in the city for more than a week, provided concrete proof of American presence and Army Berlin’s successful viability as an instrument of soft power, the usefulness of Americans in the city.

Sergeant Miller, unfamiliar with the families he assisted prior to the encounter, acted in a manner that is described in Putnam’s theories on the value of generalized reciprocal thin trust.

---
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Miller belonged to his own formal network, the United States Army. In the episode described, his reactions appeared to disregard an instinct to avoid danger. Instead, he acted in a manner that an exceptionally Good Neighbor might in a similar situation in his own home community in America. Sergeant Miller, whether he understood it or not, added to the American government’s social capital account and enhanced the image of Americans in the city as “protectors.”

Fräulein John experienced the success of American foreign policy through the usefulness of Sergeant Miller, an expression of Army Berlin’s viability made possible by presence. Numerous examples of soldiers and their family members who acted regularly not in self-interest, but instead, as part of the broader community, extended credit to increase Berliner generalized reciprocal thin trust toward Americans. The relationships between the two roles of Army Berlin as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors, and the functional exercise of the Allied rights of presence and access, as well as the new right of viability, its usefulness in the city, were paramount to American foreign policy success in projecting smart power. Army Berlin exercised smart power in this case through Miller, an infantryman, a hard power instrument, in the formulation developed under Nye’s direction in 2007, which defined smart power as “neither hard nor soft- it is the skillful combination of both.”

Army Berlin’s Interpretation of the Right of Access

While the vital interest of Allied presence was primary, the associated needs of viability and access required significant efforts by Army Berlin in its role as the face of American policy in Berlin. The physical presence of American military force in West Berlin, often described in symbolic terms, depended upon the ability of the force to be resupplied from outside the city. Described as the right of access, the rights in protection of the means and routes of transport into

---

the city were occasionally challenged by Soviet representatives, most clearly in the first Berlin crisis of 1948, which precipitated the Allied response of the successful airlift. This right of access to West Berlin was a practical consideration in support of continued Allied presence and viability well beyond the early days of the crisis, which required a vigorous defense by national policymakers, as well as a detailed and tenacious application of principles on the ground. In addition, a separate form of access existed, where the right of Army Berlin and the diplomatic representatives of the United States to enter into East Berlin provided important operational intelligence as well as observations of the conditions in which East Berliners lived.

Army Berlin viewed these two different forms of access rights as fundamentally inseparable from each other, and consequently, each form was considered from Army Berlin’s perspective on the ground in Berlin as vital interests or rights. Their experience before the crisis informed their estimation of the consequences of acceding to Soviet and East German threats to their ability to move outside of West Berlin, and their implementation practices during the first two years of the crisis reflected their emphatic defense of their access rights in either form.

The distinctions between these two forms of the right to access made by politicians and diplomats in order to gain larger concessions from the Soviets bore little relation to the facts on the ground in Berlin. The increase in East German obstruction and insistence of identification procedures presented the Kennedy administration with a broader set of estimation scenarios than their diplomatic or military representatives in Berlin considered advisable. For the street-level Americans, circumstances narrowed their considerations of proposed responses, and the influence of the facts on the ground as they experienced it consistently colored their policy advice sent up the chain of command.
For Army Berlin, there were two significant sources of potential conflict in performing its duty in projecting American influence effectively in West Berlin. The direct and most visible source was the assumption by the East German government and para-military *Volkspolizei* (VOPOs) of a broader range of Soviet responsibilities for facilitating Western Allied rights. The dilemma of the potential additional restrictions of access imposed by the East Germans required an active policy of aggressive tests of the conditions by Army Berlin as they occurred and mutated daily. The strict enforcement of Army Berlin’s internal regulations on both official and unofficial access between West Berlin and West Germany provided the unit an implementation strategy that was not significantly altered from the pre-wall period.

However, the other source of conflict emanated from its own civilian and military chain of command, where President Kennedy’s outlines of the vital rights signaled a redefinition of the meaning of the term access as it had been understood since the earliest days of the governing occupation agreements. The continuation of military, diplomatic, and personal access into East Berlin became a renewed challenge for the unit, as American policymakers outside the city voiced their concerns over the wisdom of risking confrontation to retain the right of access into the Soviet zone of the city. President Kennedy had clearly indicated the limits of his policy, focused and promoted as a resolute defense of West Berlin. At the same time, he declared East Berlin’s status as a Soviet possession settled by the course of fifteen years of history, and separated American rights to access into that part of the city from his view of vital interests.

Unlike other Cold War U.S. military installations, access was not a logistical problem worked out with Allied host nations or controlled by the United States military itself. Instead, access was negotiated in daily interactions with both Soviet authorities and the increasingly bold East German government representatives, who challenged United States interests at every
opportunity and access point. In the first two years of the existence of the wall, a new relationship was forced upon Army Berlin which complicated U.S. national policy, particularly in regard to the processes of access into East Berlin under Allied agreements. These provocative interactions were practiced by the East German government with the aid of their Soviet protectors, who took advantage of the wall and its stabilization of East Berlin to restructure their command and control in the city. This move placed the Americans in new and diplomatically hazardous scenarios as the Soviets relinquished *de facto* control to East Berlin’s security forces, in violation of the occupation agreements that had normalized behaviors since the end of the war.

During this early period, there were repeated, systematic challenges to Allied standing access rights. Some of these incidents resulted in a gradual adaptation of institutional practices and acceptance of revised access capabilities. In other cases, however, significant traumatic events inside the city forced Army Berlin’s command structure to push back, not only against their East German or Soviet counterparts, but occasionally in conflict with their own military and civilian chains of command. In some cases, Army Berlin was successful in influencing national policy in a manner in which their operational circumstances were improved, at least in the interest of providing itself additional options or discretion. However, at the start of the crisis in August of 1961, the linkage between the two forms of access rights was not uniformly recognized or accepted in Washington in the context of local conditions as they were perceived by Army Berlin. This distinction remained in contention throughout the first two years of the Kennedy administration’s policy choices, even as events changed the meaning of the word access.
**President Kennedy’s Vital Form of Access: West Germany to West Berlin**

The form of access that President Kennedy considered vital, the continued ability to transit the East German autobahn from Helmstedt in West Germany to Babelsberg at the edge of Berlin, as well as rail and air access, provided the basis for both presence and viability. Kennedy’s defense of this portion of the right was unequivocal, even as he considered the possibility of an eventual renegotiation of the legal basis for American presence in Berlin itself. His emphasis on this form of the right of access reflected the recent and relevant memory of the Soviet blockade of West Berlin in 1948, where all ground transit between the Western zone of Germany and West Berlin had been closed.

In the case of air access, the air corridors managed by the Berlin Air Safety Center (BASC) had been repeatedly challenged by the Soviets, causing policymakers responding to the wall crisis additional and significant concern. According to the official Department of Defense history of U.S. Forces in Berlin from 1945 to 1994: “Military and commercial planes in these corridors faced sporadic harassment. Between 1946 and 1964, Soviet fighters attacked 12 U.S. aircraft, leading to the deaths of 36 crew and passengers. During the 1960’s, Soviet jets continued to buzz western aircraft.”

For the ground forces of Army Berlin, the majority of their stocks required to sustain their viability were transported by rail or on the autobahn through the Soviet zone of East Germany, based upon the original occupation and subsequent controlling agreements. In each of these modes the attempted transfer of control over these routes from the Soviets to the East Germans caused immediate concerns. A series of low-level incidents highlighted the new diplomatic environment, even before the wall appeared.

---

In Army Berlin’s 1961 historical report section on significant events that year, a small detail on the rail transport of freight cars appeared: “On 14 June 1961, freight cars rated less than 120 km/hour were refused movement from Helmstedt to Berlin by the Deutsche Reichsbahn. These cars were attached to the U.S. military duty train. Subsequent negotiations thru the Deutsche Bundesbahn resulted in the lifting of this ban.”94 The U.S. duty train consisted of a series of specially assigned cars, traveling between Frankfurt and Bremerhaven, West Germany, and West Berlin. Restricted from carrying anyone not on orders to travel on the train and under the command of a permanently assigned Train duty officer, it operated only at night and was secured by armed Military Police while it was inside East Germany. It provided the most consistent link for Army Berlin’s soldiers and their family members to the free world outside of West Berlin.

This exertion of bureaucratic control was a test of East German sovereignty challenging the standing agreements on critical transport that had been agreed upon between the Soviets and western Allies. In the short term, it constricted the ability of Army Berlin to receive fungible supplies necessary for it to remain viable in presence. The rated freight cars included those capable of transporting large single items, including the new M-60 tank that Vice-President Johnson lamented as absent in the August 20, 1961 display of American might. The American duty train, operating under separate access rules, was designed to carry personnel and dependents, mail, and other light cargo.

By transferring the logistical burden of the movement of heavy freight to the duty train, the East Germans had tested their ability to modify the sustainment capabilities of the Allies in West Berlin, and in this case, Army Berlin, if only momentarily. The special status of the duty

train constituted a unique form of access strength for the United States, and it did experience other early crisis events that required American authorities to press their rights in contravention of the East German government.

In accordance with Army Berlin policy, American soldiers were forbidden from providing any active assistance to refugees attempting escape from East Berlin or East Germany. These regulations addressed involvement by American soldiers, regardless of whether they were motivated by humanitarian sympathies or economic motives, both of which posed problems in Army Berlin. In the first few months of the wall, the urgency of refugee action impacted the U.S. duty train, and the recorded incidents of the last months of 1961 reflect both successful and unsuccessful escapes. Aided by the fact that the passenger cars of the train were off-limits to East German authorities, as well as by the refusal of American train passengers and security to turn away the enterprising refugees, several East Germans crossed the border into West Germany courtesy of American transport. Army Berlin’s official command history of 1961 recorded that:

On 28 October 1961, 4 East German nationals boarded the US Frankfurt-Berlin duty train while it was proceeding at a slow rate of speed through the outskirts of Potsdam. Entry was gained by breaking the door windows of a passenger coach. The refugees were transported to West Berlin undetected.95

The duty train was a difficult method for East Germans who attempted to travel undetected into West Germany. However, without the challenge of East German authorities, the risk these refugees took trusting that they would not be turned in by Americans was rewarded. This result, replicated in a similar escape in December of 1961 by 2 East German nationals, was not guaranteed.96

A single East German who attempted a similar escape on the duty train on November 22, 1961, was not as fortunate as the October group. The same historical report of 1961 noted that
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“On arrival at Marienborn, the East German conductor advised the Soviets of the unauthorized passenger. The train was detained for 15 hours and 31 minutes by the Soviets. The train was allowed to proceed only after the refugee was released to Soviet control.”97 The train delay of more than 15 hours at Marienborn, the Soviet end of the west-bound rail and autobahn access points that preceded Soviet check-through to the American Military Police detachment at Helmstedt, West Germany, was a significant hardship for the authorized passengers on board.

The hesitance to remit a single East German on the train may have constituted an exercise of local command willpower, as well as an effort to provide not only that individual a humanitarian outcome, but also to send a message that America sympathized with the victims of the communist system.98 The humanitarian instincts, under cover of the Cold War narrative of opposing systems, offered another example of American military practices in occupied Germany that supported Army Berlin’s image as Good Neighbors. This standoff was ultimately resolved in the East German government’s favor by American adherence to the formal agreements between the superpowers, which acknowledged Soviet authority in the East German territory. The unsuccessful escapee was turned over to the Soviet authorities at Marienborn by the duty train commander to resolve the confrontation.

At this early stage in the transfer of Soviet responsibility to the German Democratic Republic, still officially unrecognized by the United States, standing occupation authority remained in effect. While the Soviets had stepped back in East Berlin, they did not relinquish control of Allied access into East Germany to their client state. The inability of the East Germans to stem the flow of their fleeing population, as well as the continued Allied use of
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ground access to West Berlin remained contentious well beyond the end of the crisis, and was not normalized until the establishment of the Quadripartite Agreement of 1972. In this amending agreement, the United States acknowledged East German authority in recognition of the changing German political context. This development brought United States policy into alignment with West German Chancellor Willi Brandt’s Ostpolitik policies after his party’s 1969 victory. However, until this change, the local street-level Americans in Army Berlin, tasked with protecting American vital interests, remained engaged directly in resisting East German encroachment on access rights.

The duty train also provided Army Berlin with an important connector to troop and family member support capacities that were not available in Berlin. Army Berlin’s 279th Station Hospital lacked the capability to provide the full spectrum of care to the unit’s soldiers and dependent family members, and travel to West Germany was a crucial need. In the November, 1962 Command and Staff luncheon, the commander of the 279th Station Hospital made his assessment of the issue in his report, as he listed various forms of specialized care that were available only at the larger American military hospitals in Frankfurt-am-Main and Landstuhl, West Germany. The duty train was the most economical form of travel for soldiers and their family members to seek medical attention outside of Berlin. However, beyond the Berlin to Frankfurt train connections, the costs of transportation were borne by the family if they needed to seek treatment beyond the Army’s 97th General Hospital in Frankfurt.99

The exercise of Kennedy’s intended vital form of access preserved the ability of Army Berlin to transit between its significant institutional support structure in West Germany and the enclave of Berlin, which provided the members of Army Berlin with critical physical and morale

support. The commitment to keep the families of service members in Berlin, even at the height of the crisis in 1961, demonstrated American resolve to the Berliners and broader West German public. The practical terms of caring for the members of the command and its families required not only unfettered access to transportation, but realistic appraisals of the medical needs of the Berlin American military community that included the spouses and children of serving soldiers.

In spite of the early duty train issues involving East German nationals and the international complications surrounding the right of ground access, the military function of conducting personnel transfers in this period remained intact. The command in Berlin was intent upon retaining its image as a premier duty station, serving on the front line of American duty in the Cold War. However, even in this selective unit, normal difficulties in morale and discipline occasionally arose. In the first six months of the crisis, the unit became a focal point of increased readiness and rapidly attempted to adapt to the new strains, and the duty train was not immune from the effects of stressors on the street-level implementers of American foreign policy.

For soldiers released from the unit and returning to either the United States or a new duty station, the American duty train also served as the method of transportation out of Berlin. This process provided additional opportunity for occasional disciplinary issues behind the Iron Curtain. In a Berlin Brigade Command and Staff luncheon in late February, 1962, a discipline issue on the duty train was discussed. “It was noted last Sunday night that some enlisted personnel departing on the Bremerhaven duty train for rotation to CONUS had obviously been drinking.”

---
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The prospect of Berlin soldiers arriving at their assigned point of embarkation for transport to the United States in “pretty sad shape” threatened the reputation of the command as a premier unit.\textsuperscript{101} This concern reflected the importance of maintaining a public image of the American soldier of Army Berlin as the best representative of American ideals inside the Iron Curtain. The Berlin Brigade’s G1, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, reminded commanders that prior practice in Berlin Brigade included company-level commander responsibility to inspect the soldier immediately prior to their official transport to the duty train. In this instance, this reminder was delivered in the manner of a strong suggestion, and depended upon the professional officers to interpret the mention of the issue as a potential problem they should be prepared to address in their own areas of responsibility.\textsuperscript{102}

\textit{East Berlin: Army Berlin’s Vital Right of Access}

As a vital interest, access between West Berlin and West Germany seemed an orderly and logical military practice. While Kennedy’s distinctions between the two forms of access may have been less clear to the American public, his separation of access into East Berlin did offer local military and diplomatic officials the opportunity to address problematic issues of the practice. Issues of state, as well as personal and unit discipline practices were a challenge for the local leaders of Army Berlin even as they disagreed with President Kennedy’s estimates of the importance of continued access into East Berlin, based upon their interpretation of the local meaning of Army Berlin’s viability.

In the case of Army Berlin’s role in preserving order and protecting the citizens of West Berlin, the importance of the retention of access rights into East Berlin was considered critical to its mission success. In order to project smart power through a balanced selection of military, or

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{102} Ibid.
hard power and soft power, it required that Army Berlin exhibited an American foreign policy which Berliners might “see… as legitimate and having moral authority.” This caused the unit to adapt its procedures and argue for more latitude from the national command chain through its USAREUR headquarters. Army Berlin practiced its own local estimation, selection, and implementation behaviors in its authority regarding access into East Berlin, and exercised it as a vital interest, which was often a radically different perspective from other U.S. institutional bodies.

Local commanders considered American military access into East Berlin an operational necessity, and the practice of exercising rights in the city followed specific regulations in the interest of demonstrating presence and increasing the local military and soft power viability of Army Berlin. In the pre-wall period, the infantry battle groups of the Berlin Brigade each had an area of responsibility in East Berlin, with specific installations assigned for observation. These were a vital tool to gather not only military intelligence, but to provide an additional channel of observation to the American foreign policy establishment.

The opportunity to assess the conditions in East Berlin through a public exercise of rights offered the United States government the added benefit of cover for its covert operations. This policy required the normal elements of military organizational doctrine, starting with basic operational guidelines, included in an Army Berlin circular of October, 1960: “There will normally be a minimum of two (2) patrols by each Battle Group into East Berlin each week, for
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103 Nye, *The Future of Power*, 2011, 84. This version of Nye’s evolution in his power theories, described in chapter 2 as “Nye 6.0,” places the selection of the proper mix of his three power types (Military, Economic, and Soft) in the hands of policymakers, presumably at the national command level, in order to achieve Smart Power policy. It is the contention in this work that Army Berlin used its local level estimation, selection and implementation practice to achieve a successful set of outcomes during the crisis period that delivered Smart Power (only assessable as a post-implementation judgment, based upon the actual outcomes achieved) that not only preserved American military freedom of action in East Berlin for future Army Berlin operations, but also extended social capital benefits in Berlin that delivered optimal outcomes throughout the remainder of Army Berlin’s life in the city.
periods specified... Each patrol will consist of a minimum of 3 personnel including the driver, one of whom will be designated patrol leader.” 104

Strict regulations on the behavior of the patrols, meant to reduce the chance of international incidents, were prescribed for the patrols. Classified “Secret,” these were particularly detailed regarding the importance of each individual soldier’s role as an expression of American fortitude, as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors, including:

8. (S) Special Instructions:
   a. Patrols at all times demonstrate the ultimate in military efficiency and courtesy.
   b. Patrols will not enter any area marked “restricted” or “off limits” to Allied personnel.
   c. They will be extremely careful in their driving so as not to violate any traffic regulations in East Berlin.
   d. Patrols will not deal with East German officials. If stopped or challenged, the answer will be that “they are American personnel, traveling in East Berlin in an American vehicle.” If the East Germans continue their harassment, they will demand to see a Soviet officer. 105

The guidelines were meant to avoid issues in East Berlin, and importantly, to prevent acceptance of East German authority to regulate American rights of access through bureaucratic security practices. While these regulations preserved the right of access into East Berlin without compromising diplomatic resistance to East German authority, they applied only to the official patrols.

Additionally, the issue of American military members crossing into East Berlin on personal travel was regulated as well. This form of access, when exercised against regulations, was a cause for command concern. Under the Four Power Agreements, American soldiers in uniform were allowed to cross into East Berlin without showing their identification cards. However, if members of the United States military attempted to cross in civilian clothes, they were in violation of Army Berlin regulations and the long standing agreements with the Soviets.
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Their lack of uniforms allowed the East Germans to demand identification and refuse access without it. Army Berlin’s Provost Marshal’s report during the Chief of Staff conference held on May 28, 1962, discussed the issue:

> We are receiving reports that military personnel are traveling into East Berlin on commercial buses in civilian clothes and showing I.D. cards. The matter will be investigated. Additional effort must be made to disseminate instructions that military personnel may travel into East Berlin only in uniform.\(^{106}\)

These regulations served to limit the chances that American soldiers in East Berlin might find themselves subject to harassment or identification procedures, as their uniform clearly identified them as exempt from East German authority. They were, however, subject to Soviet authority in the event of involvement in any civil or criminal incident while in East Berlin, and were required to present identification to Soviet authorities if requested.

Beyond the physical act of entering East Berlin, relationships between American soldiers and residents of East Berlin required official reporting. In Army Berlin’s 1961 historical report, the results of a USAREUR-level investigation uncovered six cases of unauthorized correspondence with “German female friends living in the Soviet zone or Soviet Sector.”\(^{107}\) The threat of Soviet and East German intelligence organizations gathering sensitive or classified information through these relationships was a real operational concern of Army Berlin throughout the Cold War.

These realities of the environment in which Army Berlin operated were risks that may have supported President Kennedy’s concerns about the limited importance of continued access into East Berlin. In the local context, access into East Berlin for official purposes served the national goals of projecting the image of a force “capable of success,” the literal meaning of the

---

\(^{106}\) Memorandum For Record: “Subject: Record of Chief of Staff’s Conference, 1100 hours, Monday, 28 May, 1962,” May 29, 1962, NA, RG 549, box 10.

\(^{107}\) “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” box 2, 37, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
term viability, a precondition for President Kennedy’s recognition of the importance of a functioning, free West Berlin.

In the context of Kennedy’s distinctions between the two different forms of the right of access, it might be a contrarian understanding to view the right of access into East Berlin as a vital interest or right. This is, however, the policy estimation, selection, and implementation viewpoint Army Berlin consistently held throughout the crisis period of 1961 through 1963. A series of repetitive incidents, and one particular event in the late summer of 1962, verified the validity of Army Berlin’s smart power policy strategies to preserve its stored social capital in the city and ultimately retained the basis for its Good Neighbors reputation.

In a letter written over a year after the erection of the Berlin Wall, President Kennedy addressed a reply to Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. On August 25, 1962, Mansfield had written to the President concerning United States access rights to enter East Berlin. President Kennedy restated his primary concerns, and reminded Senator Mansfield of his distinction between access to West Berlin for U.S. forces and access into East Berlin by U.S. forces:

The crucial question remains that of West Berlin, and our attention is currently focused on what we should do to sustain the vital interests which do indeed exist there, in the event of further Soviet steps looking toward the increasingly complete incorporation of East Berlin into East Germany. There may be important things which we can do to strengthen our own ties to West Berlin, and perhaps the ties of West Berlin to West Germany, in this event. The three basic rights-of presence, access, and viability—which we have been asserting throughout this Administration all relate to West Berlin and not East Berlin; it is on this position that we shall continue to base our planning. I entirely agree with your view that we should keep our Allies with us as we move ahead in this crisis and use the UN wherever it can help us. But both Allies and the UN seem to me to have their main importance in connection with West Berlin and not with the remnants of our role in a section of the city which has been under effective soviet control for a decade and a half.\footnote{Letter From President Kennedy to Senator Mike Mansfield, Department of State, August 28, 1962, \textit{FRUS: 1961-1963, Volume XV, Berlin Crisis, 1962-1963}, Document 106. This letter was a response to Mansfield’s August 25, 1961 memorandum on the situation in Berlin, following the increase in tensions after Peter Fechter’s death on August 17, 1962.}
Senator Mansfield had recently written a memo that counseled the President to consider additional armed response policies to the denial of American access rights into East Berlin, at a moment of increased tension on the ground in Berlin.

*The Death of Peter Fechter and the Allied Ambulance Plan*

The August 17, 1962 shooting death of East Berliner Peter Fechter in the Soviet sector border shared with the U.S. sector presented a new public problem for the Americans. The young bricklayer had been shot as he attempted to scale the wall and was left bleeding to death for approximately 40 minutes on the East Berlin side of the wall, unattended by the unidentified East German VOPO who had inflicted the wounds.\(^{109}\) Fechter’s death violated contemporary humanitarian standards for the treatment of the wounded, and was unusually cruel, even by VOPO regulations, which authorized the use of deadly force against escapees. The resulting outrage in West Berlin included protests against American troops of Army Berlin. The world’s attention had been focused once again upon Berlin, and now specifically on Allied rights in the Soviet zone.

Mansfield had earlier been concerned about the possibility of an escalation in tensions or the misinterpretation of American force deployments at Friedrichstrasse when he had joined the early and ill-informed initial Senate reaction to the Paar incident in September, 1961. Now, the changing public pressures from West Berlin and West Germany appeared to have caused him reflection and a reversal in concerns.

\(^{109}\) “Suspended Terms for 2 Berlin Wall Guards,” *Chicago Tribune*, March 6, 1997. Two former VOPO border guards received suspended sentences for manslaughter in German court. The post-unification process of adjudicating Germans for their crimes against other Germans in service to the East German government included numerous trials, and Fechter’s death was similarly brought before the court. In this case, two of the three potential defendants were convicted (the third was deceased), although it could not be determined which VOPO fired the fatal round that struck Fechter in the pelvis.
Kennedy’s reply to Mansfield clearly distinguished between the two forms of access that the United States had exercised before the wall was erected, even as Army Berlin began to reformulate its own response to the civil unrest and border tensions that were renewed with Fechter’s very public and agonizing death. The distinction between the forms of access rights that were required on the ground to achieve national policy were critical, even as the broader West German and West Berlin public became increasingly concerned about the commitment and capability of the United States to protect them from violence. Kennedy’s contention that the United States interests in East Berlin were beyond the interests of international bodies, or even its major Allies in Berlin, clearly demonstrated his acceptance of the Soviet control of East Berlin as outside of the vital interests of U.S. policy.

Kennedy clearly was not willing to takes risks over issues that were, in his estimation, settled as “remnants of our role in a section of a city which has been under effective Soviet control for a decade and a half.” These distinctions were based upon the experience of the occupation of Berlin under Allied agreement to this point, and practical in keeping order in the city. However, from the beginning of this crisis, the estimation, selection, and implementation processes in this period regarding both forms of access were, for Army Berlin, different from their political masters in Washington. The killing of Fechter only served to further delineate the differences in policy estimation between U.S. forces stationed in Berlin and policymakers in Washington regarding the significance of Allied access into East Berlin. This dissonance between Army Berlin’s interpretation and national leaders was, in some cases, also apparent in their American military command chain in Europe.

---

Peter Fechter’s death had a very significant impact on the estimates for local “street level” implementation of U.S. national policy, where Army Berlin was caught between the West Berlin public’s demands and Kennedy’s diplomatic distinctions. In an early conversation following the incident, Arthur R. Day, Political Officer at United States Mission, Berlin, emphasized the immediate damage to America’s image as a benevolent “guardian” in the eyes of West Berliners to Frank E. Cash, State Department Office of German Affairs in Washington:

I should tell you that the atmosphere in Berlin right now has a considerable anti-American overtone as a result of the shooting on Friday and our inability to aid the wounded refugee. The crowd which formed during the day along the border attacked by jeers and slogans the Americans as well as the Soviets. Within the past hour we had a small demonstration outside the Mission gates in which autos passed back and forth blowing their horns in protest. I don’t want to exaggerate this sentiment, but it does exist and it is difficult to say right now whether it will die away or increase.111

The West Berliners responses to the public death of the young man were focused on many different power structures in the city.

Looking east, West Berliners denounced the particular East German border guard who fired the fatal shots and rendered no care to the suffering young man; the East German government which was increasingly gathering control of the eastern zone of the city; and the Soviet military which continued to exercise its own full rights in both halves of the city while removing itself from the risks of responsibility for the wall and crossing point security. In their own half of the city, West Berlin’s elected leaders and the West Berlin polizei were criticized for their inability to assist and for interference with citizens who had attempted to throw first aid items across the wall to Fechter.

The strongest protests, however, were reserved for American soldiers who failed to provide humanitarian aid to Fechter and declined to exercise their rights of access into East

Berlin in an effort to provide Fechter humanitarian, Good Neighbor assistance. As the young man had been shot approximately 200 yards from the crossing point at Friedrichstrasse and was attempting to escape into the American sector, it was logical that West Berliners held Army Berlin more accountable on this shooting than their Allies, the French and the British. In terms of its immediate impact on American social capital in the city, it strained the West Berliners capacity to retain substantial generalized reciprocal thin trust towards their American defenders.

However, in compliance with standing regulations designed to reduce international incidents due to American actions, the American military patrol in West Berlin that arrived on the scene observed and reported without taking action. This may have been a prudent policy in the interest of stability and peace between the Western Allies and the Soviets, but for the Berliners it undermined one of the crucial purposes of the American military presence in West Berlin. Additionally, in the context of the wall, the ineffectiveness and lack of presumed purpose of Army Berlin in this event struck at the heart of the command’s efforts to define themselves as viable Good Neighbors. The significance of Fechter’s death was described in a special report to the New York Times, in which Sydney Gruson offered a diagnosis of the roots of Berliner’s emotional response to Fechter’s death:

Something snapped in the West Berliners, it is now clear, when eighteen year old Peter Fechter was shot down by East German border guards on the wall between the two Berlins and was left to die in sight of anyone who cared to look from the western side… More than any single event since the wall was built, Peter Fechter’s lonely and brutal death has made the West Berliners feel a sense of helplessness in the face of the creeping encroachment being worked so subtly by the Communists… When Peter Fechter was dying, one of the American soldiers at the border was said to have remarked, “He’s not our problem.”

Contrary to the rumored utterance of an unidentified “street-level” American justifying the limits of known American power, or at least the unwillingness to exercise it in response to the horrific treatment of the young Berliner by the VOPOs, Peter Fechter was most certainly

---

America’s “problem.” The unsubstantiated remark, reportedly made at the location of the 
incident, reflected the ominous implications of Kennedy’s closing remarks in his response to 
Senator Mansfield’s memorandum, which was written to the president the same date that Gruson 
submitted his special to the *New York Times*.

Kennedy’s consistent approach to East Berlin’s wall to this point had been an acceptance 
of the structure as *status quo*. Additionally, the avoidance of unnecessary conflict over the 
exercise of America’s treaty rights of access into East Berlin was not only a recognition of the 
reality of Soviet control, but perhaps a small, first step toward a potential form of détente which 
might lead to his grander foreign policy goals. For a different level of American policy 
implementers in the city, however, it was clear that America did have a “Fechter problem.”

The shock which Gruson described in Berlin, a city that had already experienced tragic 
deaths at sector boundaries even before the wall, presented Army Berlin with a new urgency in 
developing a smart power strategy. The outrage and disappointment Berliners directed at their 
American neighbors required a new set of estimates and actions for implementation to salvage 
the benefits of fifteen years of hard experience and valuable lessons in the use of smart power 
policies in the local context of Berlin. For the most part, and most clearly since the Berlin 
Airlift’s role in transforming the enemy American “other” into a valued part of the Berlin 
community, the image of the American military in Berlin had amassed a great deal of social 
capital in the city. This new threat to the foreign policy goals of the United States in the loss of 
critical soft power influence, practiced in the implementation of cultural and political programs 
and exhibiting a moral foreign policy, was recognized immediately by Army Berlin and Mission 
Berlin.
Within days, Army Berlin selected a series of proposed actions within its authority and in consultation with their British and French allies. In pursuit of authorization for expanded access into East Berlin, Army Berlin had a valuable national foreign policy partner in Mission Berlin, who, like their military counterparts, viewed the general issue of access rights differently than their own institutional hierarchy in Washington.

The strong reaction of the West Berlin public to the impotence of the Americans was described by Gruson as “the almost unbelievable scene of West Berliners fighting their own police and taunting the American soldiers with the shaming ‘Ami, go home.’” While this refrain had not yet effectively echoed to Washington, for Army Berlin and Mission Berlin, the need for action compressed the time period available for policy estimation and selection processes, and demanded rapid implementation actions. Within three days after Fechter’s death, the outlines of a plan to provide humanitarian assistance to unsuccessful escapees who were injured and trapped in East Berlin was constructed by Army Berlin’s command, in close consultation with Mission Berlin and their British and French allies in West Berlin.

Described in the 1962 Historical Report for Army Berlin, a specific operational plan labeled generically as “The Ambulance Plan” was placed into temporary effect. Its significant premise, however, depended upon a series of operational assumptions that differed from the Kennedy administration’s general approach to Allied access into East Berlin and its relevance to American vital interests. In order to gain authorization from nervous policymakers and command levels distant from the streets of Berlin, the plan required a detailed and progressive series of estimation and implementation procedures that provided sufficient controls to avoid the

---
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risk of triggering nuclear Armageddon. Army Berlin’s 1962 Historical Report described the early purpose and parameters of the plan. “In order to provide medical assistance to East German refugees who are wounded and left unattended within sight of the wall, an ambulance was posted at Checkpoint Charlie on 21 August 1962.”

The initial stationing of a marked ambulance by Army Berlin at the sole authorized crossing point for Allied access into East Berlin first required approval from its Europe-based chain of command. The basic emergency plan was approved at the top of the Allied military command in Europe by General Lauris Norstad, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR). General Norstad’s initial direction stated that “measures be taken to provide immediate medical assistance to persons who, while attempting to flee to West Berlin, were wounded by communist fire and left unattended within sight of West Berlin, and that such persons would be evacuated to a West Berlin hospital.”

This affirmative direction was incomplete without an acknowledgement of the reality of the possibility of conflict with the East German border authorities, who were increasingly left in control of the border with limited Soviet control. SACEUR Norstad, in his message to Army Berlin commander Watson, “suggested that necessary troops, tanks, or other military equipment be used to protect medical aid teams, but that their conduct and location be such as not to constitute unnecessarily a challenge or dare to the Soviets.” With this addition to the humanitarian nature of the medical aid team, Norstad provided Army Berlin the use of its own organic combat elements to enter East Berlin, at nearly exactly the same time President Kennedy was arguing against the importance of access into East Berlin.

---
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Not surprisingly, “The Ambulance Plan” originally proposed by Army Berlin was subjected to revision as it moved through channels inside the American and Allied diplomatic and military structures. In a subsequent communiqué with SACEUR Norstad on August 25, 1962, General Watson informed SACEUR of his command’s proposal. The approved original plan to remove a wounded East German through a checkpoint to a West Berlin hospital was revised, and it required that the unsuccessful refugee be delivered to an East Berlin hospital, regardless of the expectations of East German punishment to the offender. The purpose of “The Ambulance Plan” was to make a practical effort to render assistance to the individual and demonstrate the western Allies determination and humanitarian behaviors to the West Berlin public that had recently experienced the disheartening lack of American reaction.

Army Berlin’s plan had encountered U.S. State Department resistance in Washington, which noted dissent in both Paris and London:

The plan provided for the evacuation of wounded refugees to an East Berlin hospital. This provision was based upon guidance provided by State Department message 189 to USBER… and upon the fact that the British and French refused to agree to the evacuation of wounded refugees to a West Berlin hospital.118

This retreat by both the U.S. State Department in Washington and in the capitals of the Allied partners in Berlin was a substantial setback for the original plan, although more consistent with President Kennedy’s policy statements. It required, after the risk of pressing the right of access into East Berlin, that the U.S. military or other Allied ambulance on duty surrender the wounded unfortunate to East German authorities. While this adjustment was consistent with American military policy that forbade individual soldiers or commanders from rendering any assistance to escape attempts prior to the individual’s successful entry into West Berlin, it solved one community relations problem by substituting another.

118 Ibid. USBER is the common Department of State acronym for U.S. Mission, Berlin, herein referred to as Mission Berlin.
The adherence to the policy as it was issued on August 25, 1962 presumed that the critical distinctions in the Allied plan were clear enough to separate a humanitarian mission of relieving unnecessary suffering from the active participation and assistance in an escape. Additionally, the plan assumed that the need for an armed escort into East Berlin was unfeasible, and substituted a standby team. “A military police sedan with four riflemen, weapons concealed, would be prepared to follow a route in West Berlin paralleling the course to be followed by the ambulance.”\textsuperscript{119} However, it is unclear from the available records what constituted the limits of the use of force pertaining to the actions of this sedan in order to protect the dispatched ambulance inside East Berlin.

As the weeks progressed after the initial implementation of “The Ambulance Plan,” it continued to be revised by commanders outside of Berlin. The issue of the preferred evacuation destination, originally proposed by Army Berlin as an assertive removal to a West Berlin hospital and subsequently overruled by the U.S. State Department in Washington, was revisited. SACEUR Norstad, in his concurrent capacity as Commander in Chief, Europe (CINCEUR) of all U.S. forces, sided with the street-level policy implementation team in Berlin on August 30, 1962. Army Berlin’s 1962 Historical report summarized Norstad’s acceptance of Army Berlin’s policy estimation and selection outcome: “The requirement for a military sedan to precede the ambulance was deleted by order of CINCEUR on 30 August. In addition, interim instructions were issued to the medical aid team… to attempt to evacuate the injured to a West Berlin hospital.”\textsuperscript{120}

This reassertion of the original aggressive procedure, based upon standing agreements and precedents of allied access into East Berlin, did not mirror President Kennedy’s recent letter

\textsuperscript{119} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 32.
to Mansfield. Neither was it consistent with the original charging instructions the president gave Secretary Rusk to form a small advisory group in August of 1961 to consider renegotiating the original occupation rights, the legal basis for allied rights in the city. On the ground in Berlin, however, the loss of any rights in the eastern side of the city was considered the loss of an actual vital interest, not simply a rhetorical one.

The evolutions of “The Ambulance Plan” over the course of the remainder of 1962 reflected the tensions inside the American foreign policy establishment, both civilian and military. As an Allied operation, however, there were additional diplomatic and operational details that were required to implement the plan. It was critical that both the United Kingdom and France participated in the rotations, and in order to assure this, Army Berlin’s commanders negotiated with their allied counterparts on the plan as well. In the Western Allied military structure in West Berlin, the three nations operated as a tripartite entity, complete with a rotating position of “Chairman Commandant.” At the initial emergency meeting held on August 20, 1962 regarding Fechter’s death and the repercussions felt throughout the city, the broad concepts were first discussed formally by the three military commanders.

Although the specific implementation details that followed the initial commandants meeting occasionally caused considerable disagreement, it had been agreed then that as long as the ambulance plan was in place, the duty to provide the ambulance was rotated to the nation whose commander sat in chairmanship.\textsuperscript{121} Coincidentally, the month of August, 1962, in which the Fechter incident occurred, was the American commander’s chairmanship, with France taking control on September 1. This left Army Berlin with approximately 11 days to formulate a workable response, and for that same period, to gauge the damage to its Good Neighbors image

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.
and rapidly improvise an action response that served to reduce tensions before the French assumed the ambulance duty at Checkpoint Charlie.

As the Friedrichstrasse crossing point was located in the U.S. sector and had been designated the only access point into East Berlin for non-Germans since August 22, 1961, the issue of the ambulance’s effectiveness in the Soviet zone adjoining the British and French zones was more complicated. The aroused West Berlin population, sensitive to the issue of refugees requiring humanitarian efforts, expected all of the Allies, not only the Americans, to exercise their access rights forcefully. By stationing their ambulances at Checkpoint Charlie in alignment with their American Allies, the British and French military leadership endorsed the general policy direction that effectively negated President Kennedy’s estimation parameters one year earlier. Additionally, the President’s consistent views shared with Senator Mansfield after Fechter’s death pointed to a continued reluctance to appreciate the importance Army Berlin placed upon access into East Berlin.

While there were no recorded incidents that necessitated the deployment of the ambulance into East Berlin during the first American rotation in August, their Allies each were tested on their watch. In the case of the French ambulance for the month of September, one incident occurred. Described in the European edition of *Stars and Stripes*, the report of the September 4, 1962 shooting of another refugee who had attempted to cross the wall caused the French ambulance to move toward the border crossing point. It was recalled before it entered East Berlin upon receiving a subsequent communication that the refugee had died quickly, and the response of the VOPOs at the Friedrichstrasse entry point was not tested.\(^{122}\)

The British ambulance stationed at Checkpoint Charlie in October of 1962 experienced several events on its watch. On the morning of October 6, 1962, the British ambulance was denied entry to the Soviet sector as it attempted to respond to reports of a wounded West Berliner in an East German apartment building. The victim was a participant in a tunnel operation discovered by the East Germans, and this highlighted a recurrent dilemma, the appearance of official support of escape attempts through medical assistance operations, albeit incidental to the efforts of private citizens.

While the British ambulance was allowed to advance upon the arrival of the Assistant Provost Marshal of the British forces at Checkpoint Charlie, it was over an hour after the original dispatch. The medical team was unable to move close enough to the scene to make a rescue effort possible, as the East Germans had closed traffic in the area. It was reported in *Stars and Stripes* on the following day that the ambulance had crossed into East Berlin at approximately 8:00 am, but upon its entry “East German guards lowered a barrier pole across the concrete gap about 20 yards inside the border.” A separate U.S. military patrol in East Berlin, flexing the access rights Kennedy considered a less vital interest to the nation, was also blocked from the apartment building, but observed that an “unmarked East German vehicle, probably an ambulance, arrived at the scene of the incident.”

These incidents brought Mission Berlin to the forefront of the debate, and in most cases, the question of access into East Berlin as a vital interest which required assertive behaviors by the Allied military forces was supported by the American diplomatic corps in West Berlin. The general insistence to East Berlin access rights by the Allies stationed in Berlin was based upon
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numerous operational needs, but this particular issue was directly related to demonstrating humanitarian goals which were a significant basis for West Berliner’s faith in the Allies.

One of the unanticipated positive consequences of the rapid selection and implementation of “The Ambulance Plan” by the Allies under the forceful leadership of Army Berlin and Mission Berlin was the pressure placed upon East Berlin’s leaders. At a time in which the East German authorities continued their harassments and restrictions of Allied rights in East Berlin, they were forced to provide a response that might justify their continued denial of a rapid response of humanitarian assistance. In its 1962 historical report, Army Berlin assessed the immediate East German countermeasure to the Allied plan: “The action of stationing an ambulance at Checkpoint Charlie had a favorable impact. Subsequent reports indicated that the East Germans ‘have provided an ambulance themselves to deal with future issues of this kind.’”

It is difficult to assess the conditions and parameters for response in which the East German ambulance operated in coordination with other border security forces in East Berlin. The appearance of the ambulance itself was considered a sign that the East Germans recognized their own risks in not providing an option allowing them to deny access to the Allies under their long-standing legal rights into East Berlin. Even as the East German government responded with medical support of their own, they characterized the humanitarian efforts of the Allies as an offensive act. In a subsequent story on the October 6, 1962 incident, *Stars and Stripes* depicted the report made to the East German population by East Germany’s state news agency, Allgemeiner Deutscher Nachrichtendienst (ADN): “ADN described the episode as ‘a new attack
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on the protective wall in Berlin.”¹²⁷ This pressure, brought to bear on the East Germans by American military capacity and Allied action, served to present the Allies in a favorable light and helped to reverse some of the negative public relations the Fechter tragedy had caused.

Army Berlin received substantial support from the diplomatic representatives of Mission Berlin regarding its proposals on “The Ambulance Plan” as it was revised in continued discussions with Washington. Diplomats, including Mission Berlin Political Officer Day, previously a member of Kennedy’s Berlin Task Force before his recent arrival in Berlin, recognized the risks of the loss of access into East Berlin. The Berlin Mission was sensitive to the expectations of the Berliners, as well as the management of positive diplomatic relations with the United Kingdom and France in matching their definitions of vital interests regarding Berlin.

The local context provided Mission Berlin with a different understanding of the importance of access rights into East Berlin, compared to the President’s consistent statements beginning the previous year and repeated in his message to Senator Mansfield on August 26, 1962. While the President justified his decision not to threaten the use of force for access into East Berlin, Mission Berlin and Army Berlin estimated that any additional surrender of this authority was irreconcilable with their smart power policy goals. In its role to preserve stability in West Berlin, and to avoid further degradation of Berliner’s perceptions of Americans as Good Neighbors, Army Berlin considered access into East Berlin a vital national interest worthy of defense.

The division of the city, originally the result of the end of World War II and the establishment of zones by the Allies, was not viewed by Berliners as a permanent or positive development. The construction of the Berlin Wall fifteen years later, while further solidifying

the fissure, was not the end of the Berliner’s view of their city in its complete sense. The hope of a unified and free Berlin, much like the hope of a single democratic and independent Germany, had not been sufficiently extinguished to allow an American president to cede East Berlin to the Soviets and their East German beneficiaries. The street-level implementers of American policy in both Mission Berlin and Amy Berlin recognized this as a matter of fact, not as a theoretical exercise in estimation. Each incident that challenged Allied rights in East Berlin, exemplified by the denial of the British rescue effort on October 6, 1962, required further critical analysis from the team in Berlin.

In response to the incident involving the British ambulance, Mission Berlin produced an estimation paper for the Secretary of State, with a proposed selection menu for implementation consideration, building upon “The Ambulance Plan.” Summarized in Army Berlin’s 1962 Historical Report, the diplomats in Berlin recommended “that two feasible courses of action were open to the U.S.”128 The two options offered “were to continue planning to reach wounded refugees through the access point, or to cross the wall to render assistance.”129 The first advised option was an endorsement of the military’s plan as it had evolved, even as the diplomats mentioned the possibility that this may not be a permanent requirement. This was also dependent upon East Berlin’s policy response to alleviate the cruelty of their exercised violence, or at least their capacity to respond with humanitarian facilities making the Allied ambulance redundant.

In the meantime, Mission Berlin recommended that the Secretary of State endorse “the use of a sedan as the first step in attempting to reach a wounded, unattended refugee.”130
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extension of the medical team had originally been part of Army Berlin’s plan, but was rescinded after CINCEUR Norstad’s August 30, 1962 implementation guidelines denied it as a resource. 131 In this October recommendation, Mission Berlin appeared to be circumventing the military chain of command’s decision-making process in Paris, in order to gain State Department sanction and cover for the original locally aware recommendation they had supported with Army Berlin. This enhancement to the status quo exercised nothing more than the standing access rights into East Berlin in order to project an Allied, and in no small part American, foreign policy Good Neighbor strength in a humanitarian mission.

The second option offered in this message to Secretary of State Rusk by American diplomats in Berlin was a much more aggressive response to the problem. The possibility of preparing a military operation to “cross the wall to render assistance” as a means to fulfill the humanitarian need and project positive Allied community relations in West Berlin was a complicated and decidedly undiplomatic approach. Mission Berlin’s estimation practice on this recommendation was summarized in Army Berlin’s 1962 Historical report: “With respect to the second course of action, USBER pointed out the many inherent risks, but concluded that growing West Berlin sensitivity to the problem might make such risks acceptable.” 132 The presentation of this alternative as an implementation possibility might be interpreted in a number of ways, but in any understanding, it would be difficult to assess it as smart power policy, a prudent plan choosing the correct mix between hard power and soft power capabilities with a reasonable expectation of success.

The fact that diplomats recommended it to the Secretary of State directly, as opposed to shunting it into a bureaucratic process that might have easily dismissed it as untenable, is telling.
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Their support for the idea as a possibility, while tentative, was based upon the importance of the West Berliner’s sentiments, rather than a reasoned estimate of the potential for success in the execution of a wall-breaching operation, an action that only Army Berlin could attempt, and an aggressive hard power plan. Additionally, this particular option listed by Mission Berlin bore little relation to the policy direction President Kennedy had clearly taken since the wall appeared.

Beyond offering this second alternative, Mission Berlin advanced one additional course of action which was to be implemented in conjunction with the ambulance strategy in place, a detail also included in Army Berlin’s 1962 Historical Report: “USBER further stated that in the event an ambulance was denied access to East Berlin that Soviet vehicles, except those carrying BASC personnel, would be denied access to the U.S. Sector of Berlin regardless of whether tripartite agreement on the subject had been reached.”\(^\text{133}\) This conditional response was designed to transfer the price of East German belligerence to their Soviet protectors who repeatedly claimed an inability to influence the actions of the East German security forces in East Berlin.

This suggestion recognized that, based upon the same Four Power agreements that Army Berlin pointed to in its continued demand for access into East Berlin, the Soviets expected to travel into West Berlin. The American diplomats on the ground were willing not only to apply this pressure to the Soviets, but they additionally counseled the abandonment of consensual multilateral consultation with France and the United Kingdom. The only exception to the proposal option of the restriction of Soviet access into West Berlin was the continued admittance of the Soviet staff of the Berlin Air Safety Center (BASC), and this was a practical priority in maintaining safe Allied air access to Berlin through the agreed upon corridors.

\(^{133}\) Ibid.
For Army Berlin these conditions advanced by diplomats required modified operational orders to execute. While Mission Berlin could recommend punitive responses, enforcement was the domain of the military representatives of American foreign policy in the city. Concurrent with the efforts of the diplomatic corps, the military command in Berlin continued its own adaptations to the fluid situation. Allied access rights into East Berlin provided more opportunity for the Americans to make additional attempts that might ameliorate the suffering of wounded refugees and to maximize efforts to gain back Berliner’s generalized thin trust in Allied humanitarian goals.

While the ambulance scenario was a very public response to the issue of refugee endangerment in East Berlin, Army Berlin continued to revise its procedural behaviors in order to make the execution of the policies practical and enhance the expected community relations improvements. Placing the ambulance at Checkpoint Charlie was a highly visible response, and if the goal of the plan was simply to improve the public relations issue, this was a step in the right direction.

However, it is apparent from review of other operational orders and practices that Army Berlin considered the mission more than a public relations effort. The importance of East Berlin access for American forces, contrary to President Kennedy’s recent assertions in his letter to Mansfield, was crucial in this regard. The vigilant defense of these rights, originally emphasized during this third crisis under the advice of retired General Lucius D. Clay in his early role in the city as Kennedy’s personal representative, provided the foundation for additional forms of protection on the eastern side of the wall.
American military patrols in East Berlin, which operated under the Berlin Brigade command structure or as Army Berlin staff vehicles, became an additional avenue for potential response to a refugee humanitarian emergency. In its 1962 Historical Report, Army Berlin describes the adaptations made to the patrol’s mission and uniforms in order to make it possible for U.S. military personnel already in East Berlin on their normal duties to be diverted for refugee assistance:

In mid-October, first aid kits and red cross arm bands were added to the equipment of all Berlin Brigade 2-G-2 patrol vehicles and staff tour vehicles, (both operating in East Berlin). The OIC or NCOIC of each patrol or tour was to be prepared to proceed to the location of a wounded refugee on order of the USCOB, don the arm band and render first aid. (Refresher first aid training was given to 2-G-2 personnel in November).134 These patrols, while not specifically tasked for this purpose, increased the odds that a reported humanitarian need in East Berlin (specifically restricted to the Sector to Sector border area and not throughout East Berlin) would receive some form of Allied assistance.

Under Army Berlin’s covert plan, once the vehicle had cleared the East German checkpoint located at Friedrichstrasse, it would proceed on its normal intelligence gathering mission. In the event that a wounded refugee report was received, the vehicle would not be delayed by East German authorities at the border, having already gained access into East Berlin. The patrol would immediately proceed to the location, where they could apply first aid and await the assumption of care by the East Germans or the Allied ambulance, whichever arrived first. These patrols, unlike the marked ambulance, were not authorized to transport injured refugees to either an East Berlin or West Berlin hospital. This requirement served to reduce the chances of East German charges of direct assistance to escapees by the patrols, still strictly forbidden as well by U.S. Army regulations. Unlike the marked ambulance continually stationed at
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Checkpoint Charlie, a very public response promoted openly by Army Berlin and its allies to the Berliners, this capability remained a covert operation.

One significant additional revision occurred in November, 1962 when the Americans relieved the British in the stationing duty of the Checkpoint Charlie ambulance, concurrent with the rotation of the commandant chairmanship back to Army Berlin’s commander. Major General Watson requested an additional vehicle authorization from CINCUSAREUR Clarke on October 31, 1962, and the affirmative reply was received on November 1, 1962. The response by General Clarke, summarized in the 1962 Historical report, noted that he agreed to the addition of an unmarked sedan in East Berlin specifically for “wounded refugee assistance operations.”

This additional vehicle authorization allowed Army Berlin to put another vehicle into East Berlin at any time specifically with the humanitarian mission disguised as a normal patrol, avoiding the deliberate delay of the Allied ambulance by East German authorities. As access rights into East Berlin had been substantively preserved since the beginning of the crisis by the vigilant efforts of both the diplomatic corps and the action arm of the U.S. foreign policy establishment, Army Berlin, this sedan could not be barred as easily as the marked ambulance. This episode illustrates Army Berlin’s commitment to the continued assertion of western access rights into East Berlin and its distinctly different policy estimation, selection, and implementation viewpoint from that of the White House. Army Berlin and Mission Berlin based their policy advice upon the existing Allied treaties on Berlin and the series of adaptations reinforced after the 1948 Blockade and affirmed by Premier Stalin in subsequent written agreements.
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However, this additional tactical asset did not entirely clear the U.S. State Department’s approval unscathed. In a message from the Secretary of State to Mission Berlin dated November 8, 1962, Secretary Rusk approved of the continued use of the ambulance at Friedrichstrasse, as well as the concept of the retaliatory denial of Soviet access to West Berlin. Rusk “expressed reservations concerning the dispatch of a sedan to the site of the wounded person.” His reservations, duly noted by Army Berlin and Mission Berlin, did not alter the use of the sedan by the military in its operational behaviors, as the facts on the ground in Berlin after the Fechter tragedy outweighed the Secretary’s minimal objection for the record.

With this final tactical enhancement, the implementation of a smart, calibrated public response to the situation on the ground provided the United States military and its allies the necessary means to justify their continued presence in the city to the citizens of West Berlin. Peter Fechter’s death, which occurred near the middle point of this third crisis period, remains an important historical and emotional example of the inhumane effects of the wall and the application of brutal force by the East German government in its attempt to exert its increasing sovereignty over the border.

In its persistent, generalized response to East German provocations, and in the case of “The Ambulance Plan” in particular, Army Berlin exercised a successful smart power policy process. In the first two years of the crisis, the important decisions made at the national level were successful in achieving the ultimate goal of avoiding an armed conflict over Berlin that may have escalated into a nuclear exchange. The implementation by Army Berlin of its own interpretation of the right of access preserved a wider range of the United States national
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interests than may have been the case if access into East Berlin had been abandoned as a negotiation point.

*Army Berlin’s Implementation Outcomes in the Berlin Wall Crisis*

The preservation of the three vital interests of presence, access, and viability was achieved, even though there were distinct differences in opinion between the varied levels of American policymakers and implementers on the definition and prioritization of the rights themselves and the manner in which they should be exercised. Army Berlin, along with its diplomatic allies in Mission Berlin, shaped the national policy into a functional set of behaviors that were suited for Berlin. On a number of the most contentious issues that arose due to President Kennedy’s personal desire to make a deal that would settle Berlin as a foreign policy dilemma, Army Berlin was significantly successful in crafting their own smart power policy. These efforts enhanced their image as West Berlin’s Cold Warriors and cultivated their Good Neighbors approach to projecting American power. The command’s policy determination during the crisis ultimately preserved American influence, as West Berliners settled into the post-crisis wall period.

The local understanding of the link between the three vital interests and the insistence upon the continued occupation regime to protect these three interests benefitted President Kennedy immensely, even as the grand bargain he envisioned was never entirely realized. Linked with the Cuban Missile Crisis in October of 1962, the smart power policies exercised in the Berlin Wall crisis of 1961 made it possible for Kennedy to stand in Berlin in June of 1963 and deliver one of his most famous speeches, with included one of his most memorable lines. “Ich bin ein Berliner.”\(^{138}\) Additionally, President Kennedy had regained confidence in his own

\(^{138}\) John F. Kennedy, “Remarks at the Rudolphes Wilde Platz, Berlin,” excerpt from *One Day in Berlin,*
foreign policy decision-making and in the processes through which those decisions were implemented by the distant representatives of American foreign policy deployed on the ground as street-level bureaucrats.

Within two months of his speech in Berlin’s Rudolphe Wilde Platz, President Kennedy accomplished one of his major foreign policy goals, signature of the “Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963.” This treaty, although ultimately unsuccessful in restraining states from nuclear development, was the first to address the fears of a world of nuclear proliferation. As Marc Trachtenberg argues, it played an important role in stabilizing issues surrounding the role of West Germany as a critical NATO military member, while assuring the Soviets that the western nuclear powers, led by the United States, would not provide atomic technical assistance to the Federal Republic of Germany.139

The work of Army Berlin and its soldiers, and particularly their resistance to the conceptual loss of access rights into East Berlin, paved the way for Kennedy’s speech at Rathaus Schöneberg. The flashpoint of Peter Fechter’s death, solidified as a symbol of the stark difference between the two competing systems in their approach to humanitarian principles, forced the Americans to look behind the wall once again to protect their viability in the eyes of Berliners. The Berliners who were in the crowd listening to President Kennedy had already experienced the latest reminder of American determination in defense of the city, and were unaware at that time how forcefully Army Berlin and Mission Berlin had worked in their own bureaucratic channels to keep full American access rights into the Soviet zone of the city.


The mood that Sydney Gruson and other reporters observed in August of 1962 in the city after Fechter’s agonizing death had been assessed correctly by the street-level bureaucrats of American foreign policy. Berliner expectations of an armed response may have been beyond the pale of smart power actions. However, their continued support of Allied occupation depended also upon their perception of the foreign policy legitimacy and moral authority of their occupiers. Army Berlin’s stubborn refusal to accept East German government attempts to restrict access into East Berlin and the unit’s consistent counsel to Washington against surrender of any form of that right was instrumental in fostering the warm and grateful attitude Berliners greeted President Kennedy with during his triumphal visit.

Army Berlin, with its local ally, Mission Berlin, exercised creative policy estimations, constructed calibrated selection menus, and implemented responses to retain access into East Berlin. Its understanding of the duality of the right of viability, in particular, maximized its effectiveness and provided the conditions for the successful viability of West Berlin itself. It had successfully balanced its two roles of Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors during the crisis period.

Through subsequent American administrations to the end of the Cold War, Army Berlin worked to enhance its standing in both of its roles. As Cold Warriors, it continued to exercise these three rights in Berlin, which were challenged increasingly by the East Germans as they attained sovereign recognition from West Germany, and then eventually, the United States. Army Berlin adapted to the unique challenges of its responsibilities and operational limitations, and its particular emphasis on training for the urban battlefield provided the U.S. Army its first post-World War II functional specialists in this challenging combat environment.
In their role in West Berlin as Good Neighbors, Army Berlin combined traditional, proven programs of community service and took innovative risks, growing closer to the Berliners through a new series of associative behaviors. It sought new avenues to increase cultural and political exchange, and cultivated its social capital in the city to provide it with the flexibility to project Nye’s soft power type more effectively in the city, a practical development in its understanding of the needs of its West Berlin neighbors. In this expansion of its behaviors, it ultimately demonstrated the capacity of a military unit as an instrument suited to intentionally project soft power. This required that it presented an attractive American culture, lived up to American political values, and practiced a foreign policy that was legitimate and based upon moral American ideals.\textsuperscript{140}

As the crisis period in Berlin subsided and Army Berlin settled into its new operational and behavioral stance, the opportunities and challenges to its effective projection of American national foreign policy in its roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors continued to test the unit. New theaters of the Cold War global conflict began to replace Berlin as the “hottest” spot in the Cold War; yet there remained a critical ideological contest to be won in the city, and Army Berlin continued as the key American force of influence.

\textsuperscript{140} Nye, The Future of Power, 84.
CHAPTER 5. HARD POWER: AMERICA’S COLD WARRIORS FOR BERLIN

For the members of Army Berlin during the period of the Berlin Wall, the challenges of their duties continued throughout the remainder of the Cold War, even as the crisis period normalized in 1963 between the United States and the Soviet Union. With President Kennedy’s visit to West Berlin in June of 1963, which culminated in his speech in front of Rathaus Schöneberg, it appeared that the period of danger was past.¹ His successful management of the Cuban Missile crisis in 1962 and its linkage to the Berlin issues, the denial of West Germany’s access to nuclear weapons, and the first international agreement on nuclear proliferation, all helped the President overcome his missteps earlier in Cold War foreign policy.²

This examination contends that while achieving the significant vital national interest of avoiding armed conflict that may have escalated into “general war” was the most important national vital interest, it was not the only national interest that was threatened.³ On the ground in the city, Army Berlin remained tasked with its original Cold War mission of defending West Berlin from the external threat of Soviet military force, as well as providing stability operations in their zone of the city against civil disturbance. These two missions relied upon the hard power of Nye’s military power type and required a particularly unique series of behaviors by Army

³ Trauschweizer, The Cold War U.S. Army, 162-63. Trauschweizer provides background on the differences in the use of terms in this period regarding doctrinal understanding of the major categories of war (general, limited, and sub-limited) which complicated the application of the terms between the political, military, and theoretical communities in the United States as they attempted to draft policy, reform doctrine, and construct strategic and tactical plans and forces.
Berlin to achieve its mission success.\textsuperscript{4} It was critical that Army Berlin projected its ability to perform these two tasks: the defense and protection of West Berlin and the suppression of civil strife, while it also remained Good Neighbors in accordance with United States Army, Europe doctrine. A third requirement, fundamental to their two primary tasks, was the maintenance of the right of access in both forms through vigilant and active monitoring and regimented practices of disciplined behaviors in contact with both Soviet and East German officials.

For Army Berlin, the paradox of its roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors was further complicated by external challenges to its ability to project American power in West Berlin. The right of access between West Germany and West Berlin was reaffirmed, yet it continued to be problematic in practice, subject to Soviet, and increasingly East German, manipulation. The successful retention of military access into East Berlin, achieved by Army Berlin’s aggressive defense in its policies toward East German security practices as well as in its bureaucratic efforts inside United States foreign policy channels, remained tenuous. An additional external issue which challenged Army Berlin through the remainder of its service in West Berlin prior to German reunification involved the changing political, cultural and social milieu of West Berlin, which mirrored broad changes sweeping West Germany itself.

Army Berlin also faced internal challenges that originated in its unique operational requirements which distinguished it from the larger American Army in Europe. The military mission of Army Berlin continued to deviate from the focus of United States Seventh Army, and the requirements of duty in West Berlin, as well as practical and political limitations in the city

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{4}See Nye, \textit{The Future of Power}, chapter 2 “Military Power” for his most recent formulation on the definition and use of the military as primarily a hard power resource, and its ability to moderate its behaviors. Nye includes four behaviors, or “modalities” a military may employ (Fighting, Coercive Diplomacy, Protection, Assistance) to gain its objectives. While he notes that militaries may also provide soft power outcomes, they tend to be limited to the influence of their coercive basis, or limited to “Assistance,” which he primarily views as military cooperation and training of foreign states, or as Disaster or Humanitarian Relief.}
challenged Army Berlin’s adaptability of the larger doctrinal changes occurring in this period, and presented additional stressors on the force. These included particularly difficult training requirements and limitations involving crucial weapons systems and combined arms maneuver skills beyond close quarter combat in cities.

In regard to the force itself, the decades of the mid-1960s to the end of the 1980s brought with them sweeping military and societal reforms in the American Army. Driven by the impact of the Vietnam War and its aftermath, Army Berlin’s members faced many of the same deep transformational social and political revolutions that the broader American society struggled with, in a very similar manner as their fellow American service-members stationed in West Germany. Their unique location and the retention of occupation status did provide Army Berlin with a limited form of protection from the broadest damage which occurred in the U.S. Army during the 1970s, but it did not insulate the force entirely.

Even though it is undeniable that Army Berlin was intended as a coveted duty station populated only by the best available officers and enlisted soldiers, Army-wide manpower shortages required some flexibility in the selectivity process. Additionally, issues of low morale, troop and dependent welfare challenges, racial tensions, illegal drug use, and general declines in discipline struck the unit during the remainder of its duty period.5

---

In response to these internal and external challenges, Army Berlin relied upon its renewed relationships within the city to buoy it as the unit navigated through these troubled waters. The expansion of formal and informal networks in the city, begun in 1962 with the establishment of the German-American Committee and its working sub-committees, provided some measure of relief. However, the political leaders of West Berlin also experienced great pressures from their own constituency to assert more control over the military behaviors of their American protectors. Army Berlin skillfully used this formal network as the basis for continued dialogue with decision-makers in West Berlin’s political and upper social strata. In its interactions with Berliners, it practiced nuanced diplomacy when possible, and reserved its rights as an occupation force to command Berliner acceptance of military training and readiness conflicts. These conflicts increasingly took the form of democratic, popular protests over issues including safety, noise, environmental concerns, and maneuver training damage to both the urban and rural landscapes of West Berlin.

Berliners had wholeheartedly embraced President Kennedy’s bestowal upon their section of the city the right of its viability, their own ability to succeed as an independent political, economic, and social space deep inside East Germany. Increasingly across the period in examination, West Berliners sought to exercise that right more forcefully in relations with their American neighbors. Similarly, Army Berlin was equally vigilant in preserving its own established rights of presence and access, and to sharpen its capability to succeed in its assigned missions as proof of its own viability as a functioning military command. The difficulties of their assigned area of operations and the distance from both logistical and tactical support in West Germany required innovative training and operational behaviors.
Challenges to Army Berlin’s Access to West Germany and Seventh Army

Army Berlin’s logistical support lines of access to West Germany were based upon consensual international law since the end of the Berlin Blockade in 1949, yet were regularly under threat. An example of a tactic employed during the crisis period and manipulated by the Soviets in their negotiations regarding Allied ground access using the Autobahn occurred on June 15, 1962. Lieutenant Colonel Robert Sabolyk, Army Berlin’s Provost Marshal, delivered his protest to a Soviet Army officer, described in a memorandum for the Berlin Brigade commander:

At about 1645 hours, 15 June 1962, a U.S. military vehicle was stopped on the Autobahn for no apparent reason by a VOPO approximately five kilometers east of Marienborn. In addition to that, the same VOPO reached for his pistol with the obvious intention of intimidating the U.S. soldier. You will agree with me that such provocative and dangerous actions may have serious consequences and impair relations between our two countries. I demand that the Soviet authorities who have asserted all along their responsibility for the Autobahn, punish the responsible person and adopt necessary measures to preclude future repetition of such incidents.6

The Soviet major acknowledged receipt of the complaint and promised that he would report it to his superiors. He then offered a kind suggestion that might alleviate another problem that had plagued the Soviet checkpoint, the corresponding site to Allied Checkpoint Alpha at Helmstedt. Referring to the regular traffic backups which affected both military and civilian vehicles processed through Marienborn as they moved either east toward Berlin or West into the Federal Republic, he proposed “the desirability of advance notice on U.S. convoys…that those notices would be of mutual benefit.”7

This proposed accommodation between the two occupying powers, subtly suggested in the midst of a separate and primarily unrelated incident, was one of the regular bureaucratic

---

7 Ibid.
efforts by the Soviets to persuade the Americans to cede additional controls over their convoy traffic procedures across the autobahn. American officers responsible for interaction with Soviets on these matters of state were well-versed in recognizing the attempts and instructed to politely ignore them, or when appropriate, restate standing policy.

However, dilemmas occurred when other Army Berlin micro-implementers of policy accepted encroachment upon Allied rights. These street-level decision-makers of American foreign policy were governed by Army Berlin doctrine and strict regulations, designed by the command in coordination with Mission Berlin and the Department of State in Washington. The Soviets and East Germans continued testing the doctrine and discipline of Army Berlin regarding its autobahn travels. In 1967, a series of minor tests at the convoy level necessitated command and diplomatic policy estimation, selection, and implementation processes in order to preserve Allied access rights on the critical roadway. For the Soviets, however, their goals were significantly much broader than limiting the mobility of Army Berlin’s vehicles and troops between West Germany and West Berlin.

In this period, Army Berlin did not operate under different procedures based upon the size of the military convoys, which applied to a single vehicle up to the largest possible convoy. All drivers, passengers, and the assigned convoy commander were required to behave in specific manners in relation to interaction with the Soviets in their checkpoint processes. They were further bound by strict regulations in any dealings with East German officials, who were representatives of a non-state in the view of the United States. These East German officials increasingly exercised powers deferred to them by Soviet inaction at critical access entry and exit points.
On March 27, 1967, a single American military truck was delayed for two hours and 23 minutes by Soviet authorities as it attempted to move east through the Soviet Marienborn checkpoint. The truck commander, following Army Berlin regulations and practice by precedent, refused to accept the order of the Soviet duty officer, who attempted to direct him to leave the autobahn and park in the Soviet parking lot. Instead, he remained in the eastbound right autobahn lane and awaited clearance as prior practice and Army Berlin policy required. His vehicle was cleared to proceed only after the U.S. Checkpoint Alpha duty officer met with his Soviet counterpart, who rebuffed the officer, stating, “The Soviets make policy for their own checkpoint and do not try to run the U.S. checkpoint.”

As this Mission Berlin message to the Secretary of State attests, the issues were much more important to the national interests than a simple delay of a single truck. A major issue for the United States was the increased role that the East German government was placed in by the Soviets at the official Soviet checkpoints. There was an assigned Soviet commander at Marienborn, and the facility was staffed with Soviet duty officers and enlisted personnel for the purposes of dealing with the Allies in recognition of the existing occupation agreements. The checkpoint was also staffed by East German *Paß-und Kontrolleinheiten* (Pass and Control Units) who had assumed their responsibilities well before the Berlin Wall crisis.

These East Germans, officially unrecognized by American policy as representatives of a sovereign state, exercised additional powers under the protection of the Soviets. The members of the *Paß-und Kontrolleinheiten* maintained their own series of traffic controls, primarily focused on civilian vehicles traveling the autobahn, and had begun applying their barricades to Allied military traffic. To facilitate this, they constructed their own temporary barricades in the
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8 “Subject: Small Convoy Parking, Ref. 1263,” 27 March 1967, USBER from WYMAN to SECSTATE, Staff Message Control Book, 01MAR67 to 31MAR67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
eastbound lanes of the autobahn, where Allied vehicles had, by precedent, parked while the Soviet duty officers processed Allied convoys heading to West Berlin.9

This new process was abetted by the Soviets who exhibited a lack of interest in addressing the East German barricade and guard post which segregated Army Berlin’s large convoys in a lane of the autobahn for East German processing, contrary to prior Soviet and United States agreement. In his message to the Commander in Chief of USAREUR, Major General John E. Franklin, Jr., commander of Army Berlin, described the process as he wrote that “Within a few minutes an East German stationed in the processing area walks over, opens the portable barriers, and takes the barrier pass from the lead vehicle.”10 This practice, while not technically conflicting with standing regulations refusing East German authority, did have an effect on convoy behaviors.

As USCOB Franklin recognized that the Soviets did not appear to be willing to return back to prior behaviors and were likely to support the East German’s additional practices, he formulated his own policy estimates and offered his preferred implementation in response to input from the Department of State. Franklin advised CINCUSAREUR that the risk of an incident which might result in not only serious injury or death due to the confusion of behaviors was difficult to justify, if in the end it was likely that Washington would ultimately accept the new restrictions. He felt it was a better option to use the issue to negotiate with the Soviets to get an agreement on standardized practices which they would hopefully exert on the East Germans.

He was concerned with the impact of repeated success by the East Germans that had altered Army Berlin’s necessary military convoys. In addition, he was particularly troubled by
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9 “Subject: Small Convoy Parking, Ref. USAB-033,” 21 MAR 1967, USCOB to CINCUSAREUR, Staff Message Control Book, 01MAR67 to 31MAR67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
10 Ibid.
the potential damage to Army Berlin’s carefully cultivated image as a viable military force capable of success in confronting the Soviets. Franklin notes in his telegram that the first incident, which occurred at Marienborn on February 2, 1967, had required a press release to limit negative public opinion.\textsuperscript{11}

In Franklin’s estimation, to accede to the Soviet demands presented a number of problems. Viewed at the tactical level, once military vehicles moved into the parking lot, should the Soviets or East Germans attempt to restrict their exit, the United States had few options to secure their release. In the current practice, unless the East Germans completely closed the autobahn, a convoy commander had the capability to order it to proceed, if he deemed it necessary to protect soldiers from harm. The image of Army Berlin’s regular military traffic coming under the jurisdiction of Paß-und Kontrolleinheiten presented another difficulty in preserving the American national policy of non-recognition of East Germany as a sovereign state.

General Franklin’s estimation and selection process included three options, and his preferred plan for implementation, Option B in his presentation to CINCUSAREUR, recommended a pre-emptive compromise with the Soviets. While the Soviets wanted all military convoys to pull off the autobahn into a parking lot behind permanent barriers, Franklin recommended that only small convoys of two to four vehicles be subjected to the new procedure. For large convoys, five vehicles or more, Army Berlin required that they continue to park in the right autobahn lane, where the Soviets had the responsibility of clearing them to avoid traffic congestions, and which also preserved the convoy’s freedom of movement in the case of an emergency. This distinctions between convoy sizes were important, as the regular necessary

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid.
training in West Germany for the Berlin Brigade’s combat elements was accomplished by transporting troops in trucks organized into the large convoy format.

Franklin requested guidance from CINCUSAREUR based upon his proposal options, and additionally requested that he be granted authority to alter or amend within the scope of the final decision by USAREUR. He further proposed that if either of his proposals recommending a change in policy be implemented, he preferred a sixty day trial period for reassessment.\textsuperscript{12}

On the same day Franklin sent his telegram to CINCUSAREUR in Heidelberg, the commander of USAREUR approved Franklin’s preferred option, and forwarded it to USCINCEUR, his commanding officer, stating that “Unless you object this headquarters proposes to approve the recommendations contained in paragraph 6 of reference message.”\textsuperscript{13}

Army Berlin’s proposed Option B, along with the authorization for USCOB Franklin to make adjustments to the implementation on the ground, were acted upon as approved by CINCUSAREUR, and over the course of the trial period the message log books indicate the high level of interest in the American diplomatic and military channels in Germany and Europe. Daily updates on the character of incidents relating to the processing of Army Berlin vehicles were requested by all of the previously involved military channels, as well as Mission Berlin, the American Embassy in Bonn, and in some cases, the office of the Secretary of State. In his assessment at the end of the sixty-day trial period, USCOB Franklin reported to CINCUSAREUR that the result of the vehicle processing compromise with the Soviets had improved traffic flow and preserved Army Berlin’s large convoy integrity through the

\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{13} “Subject: Small Convoy Parking, (U),” 21 MAR 1967, CINCUSAREUR to USCINCEUR, Staff Message Control Book, 01MAR67 to 31MAR67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
checkpoints. Franklin credited the Soviets for responding to several issues that had become problematic with the interference of the East Germans, stating “Soviets have made a genuine effort to improve the allied traffic through the checkpoint.”

In this small series of incidents relating to normal Army Berlin traffic on the East German autobahn, the importance of Army Berlin’s ability to control the messages that might influence the West Berlin public’s generalized reciprocal thin trust in Army Berlin was central to the concerns of USCOB. The ability of the East Germans to impose a limited but effective form of sovereignty was a threat to U.S. policy, and both the Department of State in Washington and Army Berlin recognized their position of actual weakness. Without a realistic threat of physical force or armed response to preserve the regimen of behaviors that had been established with the Soviets prior to this period, Army Berlin had few options.

In this case, Franklin exercised one of Nye’s aspects of relational power, setting preferences in his formulation to negotiate with the Soviets, the only aspect available in the situation to Army Berlin and the United States foreign policy establishment. In its simplest terms, there was an element of cooperation between the two rivals, albeit not due to a shared ultimate outcome of mutually acceptable results, but instead a rational judgment of the short term payoffs in reaching a temporary agreement to each state’s self-interest.

As a policy advisor, General Franklin completed a detailed assessment at the beginning of the pressure by the Soviets and provided policy advice that was at first glance focused upon military issues. However, beyond the operational problems, Franklin recognized the diplomatic
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14 “Subject: Small Convoy Parking, (U),” 11 MAY 1967, USCOB to CINCUSAREUR, Staff Message Control Book, 01MAY67 to 31MAY67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
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implications and made his recommendations based also upon those factors. The implementation proposal resulted in a new set of practices, which, for a period of time, reduced the possibility of confrontation.

Unfortunately for Army Berlin, this comity between the Soviets and Allies was a fleeting moment of agreement, and the normal state of relations regarding the use of the autobahn was reflected regularly in the European edition of The Stars and Stripes. Headlines including “West Berlin Traffic Stacked Up for Five Miles,” and “Soviets Reject Berlin Traffic Snarl Protests,” were regular fare for the popular newspaper. For the Allies, while their rules of access and process were distinctly different, the effects of the East German Paß-und Kontrolleinheiten were felt by drivers of civilian automobiles and particularly commercial truck traffic entering East Germany from the West.

The political fallout did not always land on the East Germans, and although the traffic issue had been a consistent problem from the beginning, internal German politics were part of the discussion. In interviews conducted by Frank Crepeau of The Stars and Stripes, drivers waiting during an unexplained delay at Helmstedt in early 1971 attempting to enter East Germany had various theories for the inexplicable but consistent practice. One gentleman, “A businessman driving a sports car,” told Crepeau that “this shows the success of Brandt’s Eastern policy. He ought to know that you can’t make deals with communists.”

The demands of diplomatic behavior in this situation, however, did require that Army Berlin attempted to “make deals” with their adversaries in order to retain both its capability to remain successful in their primary military missions, and to consistently earn the trust of their
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West Berlin neighbors. Their efforts to continue building upon their reputation as both Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors included the regular exercise of their guaranteed rights of access into East Berlin.

**Challenges to Army Berlin’s Access into East Berlin**

The distinction in access between West Germany and West Berlin and access into East Berlin for Allied forces remained in place for the duration of Army Berlin’s duty during the Cold War. One unique “benefit” of serving in West Berlin was the opportunity, subject to all applicable regulations and updated procedures, for soldiers to enter into East Berlin during periods of normalcy in relations. The remainder of East Germany was off-limits to United States military members unless under orders, and entering it was a serious violation which could result in court-martial proceedings for the soldier, as the United States Commander in Chief, Europe reminded his entire command in the spring of 1967:

> With the advent of summer and holiday travel, we can anticipate a further increase in violations unless action is taken to ensure complete compliance…Most serious is the illegal entry by private auto into the Soviet zone of Germany at points other than Helmstedt. Such entries further the Soviet and East German camping [sic] to establish official U.S. recognition of the German Democratic Republic. 19

The issue in this case, the use of USAREUR-licensed privately owned vehicles to enter East Germany through other entrance points on the inner-German border was not only a violation of regulations, it was considered detrimental to the national policy of the United States. Unlike the policy in East Berlin, where the occupation agreement did not allow East German officials to demand identification from uniformed American soldiers, this did not apply in the rest of the Soviet zone. The demand for identification could not be refused in this case, and upon presenting a military ID, the soldier had violated U.S. national policy. If the soldier attempted to
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19 “Subject: Travel To and From Berlin,” 04 MAY 1967, USCINCEUR to CINCUSAREUR, Staff Message Control Book, 01MAY67 to 31MAY67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
substitute a passport to avoid this dilemma and it was subsequently marked with the German Democratic Republic stamp, it was rendered invalid as a U.S. passport.\textsuperscript{20}

This same rule applied in East Berlin, but the occupation status and standing agreements required that only Soviet officials were capable of demanding identification from a uniformed American soldier. However, American soldiers in East Berlin were required to cooperate to a limited extent with East German authorities in unique circumstances, in order to avoid complicating the normal forms of incidents which occur in human interaction, particularly in an urban area.

Army Berlin’s continued practice of regular patrols in U.S. military sedans into East Berlin, preserved throughout the wall crisis and confirmed in right by Soviet adherence to the standing consensual agreements, was not immune to the hazards of city traffic. During an early morning patrol in July, 1967, an Army Berlin sedan was struck in the rear by a woman driving a civilian vehicle, which fortunately resulted in light damage only and no injuries. However, the patrol remained at the scene for East German VOPOs to arrive and assess the incident, a form of cooperation which allowed the VOPOs to determine that the East German driver was at-fault. Subsequently, the VOPOs did not interfere with the U.S. sedan as it continued its patrol.\textsuperscript{21} The incident report makes no mention of any VOPO request of identification of the uniformed American patrol, a standard police procedure in any other similar incident. The lack of mention in the daily Situation Report (SITREP) of an unreasonable delay in the patrol’s return to duty as a result of VOPO obstruction in pursuit of identification would certainly have been the most significant detail in the report, required as an official incident. This example of practical

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
benevolence by the East Germans was not indicative of a broad acceptance of Army Berlin in their half of the city.

These Army Berlin patrols served numerous functions, including general observations of East Berlin and its population, showing the flag of the United States, and collecting operational intelligence. An unusually aggressive encounter between East Germans and a U.S. sedan routine patrol was described in a USCOB message marked “priority” on March 16, 1967:

At 160555Z March, a routine U.S. military patrol sedan touring in East Berlin near Erkner at VU135105 was deliberately forced from the road by the lead vehicle of an oncoming East German convoy consisting of 6 XBTR-152’s. The U.S. sedan was forced to take evasive action in order to avoid a head-on collision with the East German BTR-152 which had suddenly cut into the eastbound lane from the westbound lane.22

Fortunately, no injuries occurred in this incident, which potentially may have resulted in a frontal collision between a standard U.S. sedan and the BTR-152, a six-wheeled armored personnel carrier, weighing in at 8,950 kilograms (19,731 pounds), a clear mismatch between the two vehicles.23 This minor incident may have been an example of the risks President Kennedy viewed in 1962 as unwarranted in “a section of the city which has been under effective soviet control for a decade and a half.”24 However, for Army Berlin, the risk was justified in maintaining its capability to succeed in its primary missions, preparing for combat in the urban environment of Berlin and guaranteeing the stability of West Berlin in the case of civil disturbance, fulfilling as well its role as Good Neighbors.

22 “LIVE OAK Message, France, Germany, United Kingdom, and United States Eyes Only,” USCOB to Standard Berlin SITREP ADDEES, Staff Message Control Book, 01MAR67 to 31MAR67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI. Note: the time stamp “160555Z” in the first line is one version of a common military date and time consolidation for “Zulu Time,” the nomenclature for Greenwich Mean Time, (GMT) to standardize time zones in reports. The first two digits are the date (March 16), and the final four are the GMT, listed as 0555am. The final “Z” denotes that the report is using GMT, not the local time period report.
The death of Peter Fechter in August of 1962 had impacted both the Berliner population and Army Berlin’s view of the importance of its unfettered access into East Berlin to preserve its role as a force exercising soft power that exhibited a moral and legitimate foreign policy. The emergency implementation of the Allied “Ambulance Plan” to address similar situations in the early days after Fechter’s death had reassured the Berliners of Allied interest in their safety, if limited by the realities of the divided city in the age of nuclear threat. Army Berlin did not forget the lesson, and in 1974 another event, not as dramatic as the young bricklayer’s death, set a standing operational plan in motion to deal with another potential border trauma.

The 1974 Army Berlin Historical Report includes in its significant events section the tragic story “of an elderly West Berlin woman who had been denied G.D.R. permission to reside with her daughter in East Berlin.” During the early afternoon of January 8, 1974, two West German school children reported observing what they believed to be a dead body across the Landwehr canal from the U.S. sector in the Kreuzberg district. The body was reported lying between the two sets of Berlin Wall sections, the original and the improved structure set back from the first. The West Berlin Polizei, who received the original report, “alleged that they had reported (by telex) the body to East German police but had received neither acknowledgement nor confirmation.” At this point, Army Berlin had only monitored the situation, leaving the investigation process to their West Berlin Polizei partners, who, based upon years of associative behaviors, had earned Army Berlin’s generalized reciprocal thin trust as the Germans acted in the interest of preserving order in the city.
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By the next morning, January 9th, when West Berlin’s Polizei reported no confirmed response from East Berlin police, Army Berlin, concerned about damage to their image as Good Neighbors, “directed Berlin Brigade to prepare to implement BB-OPlan 4 (‘Peter Fechter’) to secure the removal of the body.”27 A humanitarian recovery of a body, yet to be identified at this point, went into motion, with a U.S. Army observation helicopter dispatched to provide confirmation and intelligence for any planned action by Berlin Brigade to assert United States moral foreign policy. The helicopter was unable to verify the location of a body, and without that certainty, no further steps in implementing the operational plan named in memory of Fechter went forward, and Berlin Brigade was released from its preparatory warning order.28

Once the West Berlin Polizei learned that Army Berlin was prepared to take such a drastic step, exercising its access rights into East Berlin for the purpose of contrasting American ideals with communist callousness, they were forced to confess a significant error to avoid a potential incident between Army Berlin and the East German and Soviet authorities. In their early zeal on January 8th to assert their own ability to deal with the apparent cruelty of their East Berlin counterparts, members of the West Berlin Polizei had crossed into East Berlin territory without authorization from the East Germans and without informing the Americans. Unable to reach the body but able to observe it, they retreated and decided to falsify the report to avoid drawing the ire of Army Berlin, who would have assessed it as an imprudent act that might have international consequences.29

According to Army Berlin’s historical report, “West Berlin Polizei President Klaus Huebner had deliberately withheld this information from USCOB, presumably to conceal the
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unauthorized entry of WBP into East Berlin territory.” The identity of the woman was subsequently provided by the East Germans, and a potentially serious event had been avoided. However, the behavior of the chief law enforcement officer of West Berlin’s municipal government certainly did not enhance the relationship between the Polizei and Army Berlin, and in Huebner’s case, it is reasonable to conclude that it certainly impacted any trust he had accumulated with his Army Berlin counterparts.

Unfortunately, there are no more available details on Army Berlin’s Operational Plan “Peter Fechter” in the existing records reviewed. It is not surprising that Army Berlin had an operational plan for this type of scenario, as the military practice of estimating and preparing for its potential mission-centric actions is a rational and productive process. However, it is significant that it was named after Fechter, a testimony not only to the emotional impact of his death twelve years before, but the significance of its role in altering Army Berlin’s thoughts on access into East Berlin. Just as the emergency period in 1962 altered the street-level thinking in West Berlin and challenged America’s elected policymakers then, the event had been seared into the institutional memory and written doctrine, allowing it to be pulled off the shelf in 1974.

However, the potential consequences of an executed effort to recover what was already reasonably assessed as a corpse, had Army Berlin implemented this action, might have justified Kennedy’s caution earlier in 1962, and should have given cause for reflection in this case as well. Perhaps in the future, additional details on the estimation, selection, and implementation stages in “BB-OPlan 4 (Peter Fechter)” will become available and allow a more complete historical analysis of this incident. However, another form of access risk, one which was
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unrelated to military power, caused Army Berlin diplomatic and disciplinary problems throughout its Berlin wall period.

In the same historical report for 1974, a series of incidents characterized as “exfiltration activities” were reviewed in connection with the behaviors of members of Army Berlin and its associated Americans in West Berlin, including the U.S. Air Force and Department of the Army civilian employees. A significant concern listed was the possibility that continued efforts by Americans to assist East Germans in escaping through East Berlin or using the Berlin-Helmstedt autobahn access protections might have “endangered unimpeded access and thus Berlin’s viability.” The report described the political problems facing Army Berlin in the context of West German political sensitivities: “Senat and West German officials were extremely reluctant, for political reasons, to take action against exfiltration organizers for exfiltration per se. In some instances, however, action was taken against the same people for criminal activities such as drug traffic.”

For Army Berlin, the situation demanded estimation, selection, and the implementation of regulations which reduced its own member’s deviant behaviors that threatened American access rights. At the same time, however, it needed to communicate its continued respect of West German and West Berliner public opinion which generally supported escapees, provided they were not guilty of criminal activity beyond the act of attempting to leave the East German police state. This was a complicated balancing act between Army Berlin and its West Berlin allies, and required separating the interests of the East Germans from the Soviets, while Army Berlin’s
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32 The term “exfiltration” is normally associated with military usage; Merriam-Webster defines the root exfiltrate as “to remove (as soldiers) furtively from a hostile area,” and dates its first usage to 1947.
33 “1974 Annual Report of Major Activities (Historical),” Headquarters, United States Army, Berlin, September 1975, box 2, 118, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
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command also looked inside its force to ascertain the factors which led to the participation of its soldiers in this enterprise.

Army Berlin correctly assessed that, on the West German side, there was no deep interest in changing its own policies, and there were no violations of Federal Republic of Germany laws by its own citizens, foreign nationals, or U.S. military forces. Further, while Army Berlin’s legal counsel advised that Allied Ordinance No. 511 could be used to charge non-U.S. military members who attempted to induce soldiers to assist in escape attempts by venal methods, including bribery, forgery, or fraud, the prospects of success were unlikely. Those charged under the ordinance would be tried in West German courts which were reluctant to complete the process, and to prove the charges, the involved U.S. soldiers would have to be called as witnesses for the prosecution, “thus publicly disclosing the nature and extent of American involvement.”

Along with increased criminal offenses in the unit relating to drugs, particularly heroin, the issue of U.S. military members involved in exfiltration became a significant dilemma. On September 10, 1974, a member of the 287th Military Police Company, Army Berlin’s only permanent force Military Police Company, was detained as he waited to cross back into West Berlin through the East German barriers opposite Checkpoint Charlie. The enlisted man, wearing his off-duty uniform in accordance with access regulations, had attempted the exfiltration using his USAREUR-licensed private auto, but was blocked by the East Germans. Military Police on duty at Checkpoint Charlie, watching the incident from their position, observed the East Germans pull a woman from the auto and take her away. The soldier, an
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assigned member of the Checkpoint Charlie detail, was turned over to the Soviets, who held him until September 17, 1974, a particularly long detention.  

The subsequent investigation by Army Berlin’s Criminal Investigation unit (CID) “revealed that the soldier had attempted, at the direction of persons he believed to be exfiltration organizers, to bring out an East German couple concealed in his car. He was to have been paid DM 4,000.” The soldier received an Article 15, an administrative form under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), which avoided a court martial proceeding as the soldier consented to the punishment. He was assessed a fine of $300, a reduction of three pay grades, and a reassignment out of Army Berlin.  

This case, one of the more public exfiltration cases in the records of Army Berlin in 1974, conformed to Army Berlin’s assessment of the problem they faced. Army Berlin estimated that the most likely factor in its personnel’s involvement in exfiltrations were financial in nature. “Organized exfiltrations were commercially motivated and involved large sums of money. Thus organizers were able to offer attractive inducements to involve U.S. personnel, particularly those in lower pay grades.” Additionally, a series of exfiltration incidents in the months of September and October of that year, involving members of Army Berlin, the U.S. Air Force, retired service-members living in Berlin, and Berliners were uncovered. 

According to the report, in every case, the organization was financially motivated, and prompted the Soviets to file protests in Berlin and even a “sharply-worded demarche to the Department of State on November 13.” This threat to Army Berlin’s freedom of movement resulted in a joint State-Army task force, with its goal to select “acceptable measures…which  
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would further deter the abuse of privileges without further restricting the necessary exercise of Allied rights." An important distinction between the attitudes of West Germans, sympathetic to these attempts even if commercially motivated, and the responsibility of retaining its occupation rights in full was necessary for Army Berlin. In order for it to remain a viable force, capable of success in preserving West Berlin’s viability, it was necessary for Army Berlin to honor its quadripartite agreements with the Soviets.

A series of measures were recommended by the task force, based upon the exfiltration practices observed and the estimate that the most at-risk population for economic exploitation by organized groups were lower ranking enlisted men:

All USAREUR POV’s exiting G.D.R. – controlled territory—entering the F.R.G. at CP-ALPHA, entering the WSB at CP-BRAVO, and re-entering the WSB at CP-CHARLIE—would be thoroughly searched by MP’s to ensure that they carried no unauthorized passengers…

Specifically it was proposed to ban the use of van-type vehicles for travel to East Berlin. In addition, personnel in grades E-6 and below (and their civilian equivalents)—those deemed most susceptible to the financial inducements of exfiltration organizers—were to be subject to special restrictions on travel to East Berlin and on the Berlin-Helmstedt autobahn. At CP-C, personnel in these grades would be processed in groups of not less than three; walking groups would not exceed five; one individual would be given responsibility of the group while in East Berlin; and each group would be required to remain together, entering and exiting East Berlin as a group. In addition, personnel in these grades were to be prohibited from the autobahn during the hours of darkness.

The comprehensive nature of the recommendations signified that both Army Berlin and the Department of State were deeply concerned about the problem and were particularly in agreement in their estimation of the threat in the lower ranks. They did not wish to restrict members of the U.S. military from exercising their personal access rights into East Berlin on unofficial visits.

These rights were held as important national rights of the United States, circulating very public displays of American presence in East Berlin. Instead, their recommendation focused on
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using American Military Police to essentially enforce East Germany’s border regulations on its own population, and through limitations on the use of USAREUR-licensed privately owned vehicles in any form as escape platforms as they returned through the only authorized re-entry point, Checkpoint Charlie.

The enactment of these procedures met varied outcomes. As of the report submission in 1975, only the van ban had been approved for implementation.\(^{45}\) It went into effect on Monday, February 24, 1975, and remained as proposed, applying only to personal travel into East Berlin.\(^{46}\) However, it did not escape critical commentary by affected members of the U.S. Army. In an editorial in *The Stars and Stripes*, a complaint in the “Letter to the Editor” section argued that the USAREUR-wide van ban was “prejudicial to van owners assigned to Europe. Present economic conditions, both here and in the States, have forced many travel-minded families to buy campers in order to cut expenses.”\(^{47}\) The author, his name withheld, closed with a question of USAREUR. “Why must we continuously cut off the hands of all men because one strangled his neighbor? Let’s get back to punishing the guilty, rather than the innocent.”\(^{48}\)

The fate of the regulations which specifically targeted lower ranked enlisted proved to be less certain. CINCUSAREUR Michael S. Davison made the determination that these policies, in all proposed formulations, were “a form of class discrimination.”\(^{49}\) General Davison was successful in obtaining the agreement of the U.S. Ambassador to West Germany, Martin J. Hillenbrand in this assessment. The historical report summarizes Hillebrand’s policy stance, “stressing the need for good judgment and personal responsibility of the immediate commander
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authorizing travel, the Secretary of State also acquiesced and the measures pertaining to grades
E-6 and below were not implemented.”50 While the standing prohibitions remained in place,
these regulations formed much of the basis for the task force’s proposal which accepted the risks
of future incidents in order to continue exhibiting American access rights into East Berlin.

In another access incident, potentially a serious threat to international relations, a more
lethal weapon was unleashed, this time wreaking a considerable amount of havoc in the city:

At 0645A hours a combat-loaded M60-A1 tank of Berlin Brigade’s Company F, 40th
Armor, was stolen by its assigned driver (a 22-year-old SP5), who crashed it through the
gates of Turner Barracks. Tank and driver raced through the city at speeds in excess of 70
kilometers-per-hour (KPH) to Checkpoint Charlie. Evading efforts by a U.S. MP vehicle to block
him, the driver halted the tank at the East German guard tower (c. 0505AO). Finding the opening
in the Wall too narrow, the driver turned the tank around and returned to the U.S. Sector,
uprooting in the process the first East German pole barrier and the guard railings and traffic signs
adjacent to the Allied Checkpoint. The tank then returned across the entire length of the U.S.
Sector to Allied Checkpoint Bravo. Again evading efforts to block him, the driver proceeded
through the checkpoint, bringing the tank to a halt at Soviet Checkpoint Drewitz (c. 0530), where
he dismounted.51

This incident, involving the primary main battle tank in the United States arsenal and Army
Berlin’s most significant heavy weapons system outside of its six assigned artillery self-
propelled guns, was a startling reminder of the position the unit held in the Cold War. Perhaps
nowhere else on the planet could a single American wield such brute force directly in the face of
the Soviet Union. Weighing in at 48,987 kilograms (approximately 48 long tons), travelling at
an estimated maximum speed equal to 43 miles per hour, there would have been nothing in the
city capable of halting the tank except perhaps another one, Soviet or American.52
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51 Ibid., 106. “SP5” is a U.S. Army rank for enlisted “Specialist 5,” a rank tier which allowed promotions to pay
grades equal to the second level of non-commissioned officer rank E5, Sergeant, without requiring the soldier to
assume the duties of a non-commissioned officer; “MP” represents Military Police; the codes in parentheses
following “East German Guard Tower” and “Soviet Checkpoint Drewitz” are time estimates at each location.
52 Foss, Jane’s World Armoured Fighting Vehicles, 93. Note: Foss lists the maximum road speed of this model at
48.28km/hr, significantly lower than the report estimate. A “long ton” (British Ton) equals 2,240 pounds.
The young tank driver was reportedly distraught over marital issues involving his German wife and the failure of the Military Police to solve the matter to his satisfaction. He was diagnosed with severe depression and evaluated as “sane, rational, and pecuniarily liable for damages in excess of $5,000. After psychiatric evaluations in Berlin, and at the Army General Hospital in Landstuhl, the soldier was ultimately medically evacuated to Fort Ord, California.”

In the case of the Soviets, they expeditiously cooperated with securing the tank and granted its return to the Americans within an hour of the driver’s voluntary surrender at their checkpoint.

After the U.S. Mission Berlin Protocol Officer offered “the Soviet authorities the sincere apologies of the U.S. authorities in Berlin,” he thanked the Soviets for their cooperation. In response to the bizarre incident and the U.S. Protocol Officer’s statement, the Soviet Protocol Officer, “Expressing personal incredulity…undertook to relay the U.S. statement to his superiors.”

The remedies which USCOB approved after a review of the incident included increased key control and security measure reviews with the 6941 LS Guard Battalion, a uniformed unit staffed by Germans which provided most of the static security for Army Berlin. Additionally, a new fence system inside the Turner Barracks compound separated the tank park, where the soldier had accessed his M-60A1, from the general access to the complex, and included its own new guard post. One area that could not be addressed was the issue of keeping the tanks combat loaded at all times. The increase in response time to secure full ammunition loads for the tanks from the ammunition storage bunkers was judged as prohibitive, so they remained fully loaded.
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for combat. The maximum combat load possible in the vehicle for the 105 millimeter main gun of the M-60A1 was 63 rounds, although the records reviewed do not stipulate the number authorized in Army Berlin at the time of the rampage.

The primary role of the M-60A1 for Army Berlin, like any main battle tank, was focused on combat, combining firepower, speed, maneuver, and tactical deployment based upon the area of operations. Critically, however, Army Berlin’s area of operations, with the exception of the large Berlin Grunewald area, was entirely urban. In this tactical situation, the use of Army Berlin’s tanks was not envisioned in the contemporary manner in which the remainder of USAREUR’s units prepared for battle. In the surrounded city, Army Berlin expected to be encircled by enemies from three sides, depending on their Allies to the north, the French and the British, to protect that flank. Army Berlin recognized the unique challenge to its capability to succeed in its primary military mission, as stated in its 1961 historical report: “To defend West Berlin, containing the maximum enemy forces as long as possible, and doing such damage to means of communication through, and installations of military significance in, West Berlin as is compatible with such defense.”

**Army Berlin’s Urban Combat Training Challenges**

In its primary hard power mission, the defense of West Berlin, Army Berlin faced significant external challenges beyond the Soviets and East Germans. In addition to the training complications of the distance from NATO and American training sites in West Germany, its singular mission focus remained primarily outside U.S. Army operational and doctrinal
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behaviors that were dominant in the broader force. The unit’s necessary but distant link to the operational American combat force in West Germany, U.S. Seventh Army, required regular convoys on the East German autobahn. This was a critical practice which also served the national interest of flexing the right of access as units traveled to and from the large training sites for their “zonal training,” the common term used in Army Berlin for its visits to West Germany. However, while travel to West Germany ranges provided critical space to qualify and train with its heavy weapons systems, the effectiveness of this training requirement varied across the period.

In its training adaptations and use of the limited space inside West Berlin, Army Berlin maximized its training opportunities and established its own unique physical training spaces. It developed one of the U.S. Army’s training weaknesses, the set of behaviors known at the time of the reformation of the unit in 1961 as “Combat in Fortified and Built-up Areas.”59 Army Berlin’s leadership sought creative means to make up for the gap in live-fire training opportunities that were essential to combined arms exercises which familiarized soldiers in relation to their likely battlefield, the city. The limitations placed upon Army Berlin were not entirely the result of the limited space available, as a significant source of the problematic training environment arose from the political and civic life of its fellow West Berliners.

Army Berlin operated in an urban environment in which the training and preparation practices required in order to maximize its combat effectiveness in defense of Berlin necessitated regular disruptions in West Berlin’s civil society. The population of West Berlin, which had experienced life in the city during the sixteen years from the end of World War II to the

59 In 1961, the applicable field manual, FM 31-50, Combat in Fortified and Built-up Areas, was little-changed from the early post-World War II updates which had been designed based upon American experience to that point. Army strategic and tactical planning considered this operational environment one which ground commanders should attempt to avoid if possible. In the post-Korea period’s debate over ground combat and its place in relation to atomic technology, this planning gap remained in U.S. Army training and field manual updates.
beginning of the Berlin Wall’s existence, had resigned itself to the fact that the price of keeping the Soviets out was the presence of Allied troops. This was a fact that West Berliners tolerated less as they experienced political and social change across the three decades of Army Berlin’s history in review, and it was increasingly contested by a West Berlin public represented by new civic leaders as each decade passed.

Army Berlin’s recognition of the dynamics and political future as it assessed the city in early 1962 and the decision to establish a functioning formal network, the German-American Committee, strengthened bonds with existing civic and political leaders in West Berlin. Further, it put into place a working structure that became a channel for the new leaders of West Berlin, as they were selected in the exercise of democracy, to constructively work with Army Berlin, even on matters which became increasingly contentious between the occupied and their occupiers. While this structure added immensely to the possibilities of success in Army Berlin’s soft power role as Good Neighbors which is the topic of the following chapter, it also had a positive impact in the unit’s ability to project hard power capabilities in West Berlin.

Scheduled demonstrations of the proficient use of all available forms of military technology were a particular form of reassurance, often regardless of the implications the use of such technology in an actual battle in Berlin might represent. However, the unit that entered 1962 in West Berlin had particular deficiencies in numerous areas, and the reformed Army Berlin energized by the Wall crisis required some improvement. The pre-wall version of Army Berlin had developed its own series of behaviors in the city, reflective of the conditions in which it was deployed. While it was tasked with essentially the same two hard power missions, defense of West Berlin and the responsibility for civil disturbance response, it had emphasized the routines of Army garrison life, albeit with a great deal of international attention and prestige.
Beginning in his first year of command, the Berlin Brigade commander appointed as of July 30, 1961, Brigadier General Frederick O. Hartel, sought to instill a new sense of the infantry unit’s purpose in the reformed Army Berlin. Issues including leadership, professionalism, training, and the integration of the new weapons systems coming into the unit as part of increases in the military’s conventional arms budget were necessarily addressed. In an October, 1962 Command and Key Staff meeting, BG Hartel emphasized the need for the Berlin Brigade to reform its standards for the professional leaders of the unit:

The performance of students from Berlin Brigade at the 7th Army NCO Academy has been good, but not outstanding. We can improve our performance primarily by eliminating those students who have to be sent home from the school upon their arrival, and by insuring that our candidates meet all entrance requirements before they leave Berlin. The problem of student selection and failure was discussed with other commands and it was learned that many organizations have a board of first sergeants screen the candidates records before departure to ensure that he meets all entrance requirements and has all equipment and funds that will be necessary.60

This discussion of the professional training of non-commissioned officers in Army Berlin, mentioned by Hartel to his command leadership, highlighted a particular problem that plagued the unit, well beyond its physical distance and mission-based distinctions from other USAREUR units. The unit’s separation from other forces in West Germany had also disconnected it from an important source of institutional knowledge. In this case, a practice that had been implemented in other commands to assist their members in the enlisted ranks identified as potential future leaders had not been instituted by prior command policies, and did not reflect well on its prior commitment to professional development.

The importance of setting standards was addressed in the same meeting by the Chief of Staff, Berlin Brigade, regarding a key component of military readiness, the physical fitness of the fighting force, as he reported a troubling statistic on the most recent Army physical fitness test administered. “Of the personnel in the command required to take the test, 30% were excused for
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some reason and failed to take it. This figure is unacceptable and G3 has been asked to take this problem up with the units concerned, and insure that the necessary corrective action is taken.”61

This excusal rate is a particularly high percentage in the Berlin Brigade, the combat arm of Army Berlin, and did not reflect a command attitude that had been established prior to the annual physical test which made it a priority. While comparable statistics on contemporaneous USAREUR or U.S. Army-wide performance levels in this metric were not readily available for review, it can be safely regarded as an indicator of complacency on the part of prior leadership in its emphasis on military preparedness.

One other example of the paradox of Army Berlin’s role as both Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors in West Berlin which required tactical capabilities while it also regularly performed as a parade-ready unit for West Berliners was mentioned by the brigade’s Chief of Staff. In response to a request from members of the command for a consideration to allow their vehicles to be painted in gloss paint “to assist the drivers to keep the vehicles clean and shiny,” the Chief of Staff replied that “this consideration was studied and it is felt that in the long run it is best to abide by the regulations.”62 The regulations in question are not mentioned in the text, but it is likely these rules were formulated above Army Berlin’s command level, and were based upon the long-standing tactical knowledge that, in a combat engagement, a glossy, shiny vehicle is not an advantage.

61 Ibid. “G3” denotes the Assistant Chief of Staff (Operations) in a U.S. Army command responsible for the direction of operations.
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These indicators of deficiency notwithstanding, in regard to its primary mission of fighting in the city, the pre-wall version of Army Berlin had taken important steps to professionalize its fighting force in this critical and unique mission. During the 1950s, the command had developed its first dedicated site for training in the complicated battle space which they referred to as “Combat in Cities,” designated by the acronym CIC.

According to the official Cold War Department of Defense history of American forces in Berlin, “Army engineers completed a new urban warfare training area in the Lichterfelde district, and U.S. Army units began using it in 1959.”63 This original site was located on Parks Range, one of Army Berlin’s three dedicated training ranges, and was significantly expanded in 1975, when it became “known as Doughboy City.”64

Army Berlin’s unique primary mission had challenged its command to consider the reality of their unit’s situation, and their response in building this site encouraged a form of operational planning which was significantly different from the rest of the U.S. Army’s intellectual exercises in the same period. While the U.S. Army of the 1950s struggled for its survival in the atomic age and the distorting impact of the Vietnam War upon doctrine in the 1960s and early 1970s, Army Berlin quietly and professionally began the task of conceptualizing modern urban warfare for the future U.S. military.

Well before the establishment of the United States Army’s Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) in response to Vietnam, Army Berlin drew from the existing Field Manual, *Combat in Fortified Cities and Built-Up Areas*, FM 31-50, to begin their own series of training developments. Using its newly available training site which duplicated a small city
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including multi-story buildings, intersections and infrastructure, the unit cycled its infantry, armor, and artillery units through exercises which provided simulated small unit warfare in the urban environment.

This allowed the unit to test the skeletal field manual, FM 31-50, and more importantly, to break the broad concepts down into tactical training exercises that could be replicated by its own leaders at the battalion, company, platoon and squad levels. Without this local command-driven emphasis upon a form of small unit combat skills which were generally neglected in the U.S. Army, the Berlin Brigade, required to accomplish a delaying and destructive defense of the city, was not a viable force to achieve its mission. In addition, like their armor company, the restrictions on live fire training due to safety and noise issues was a significant problem in the city where they remained committed to projecting soft power as Good Neighbors. This was not the case for their contemporary fellow soldiers in West Germany, where ranges were readily available and located in rural areas that offered greater distance from Germans, lessening the conflicts.

In January of 1968, Army Berlin adapted an innovative training practice developed outside of the command which made it possible for the unit to drastically expand its training opportunities inside the city while reducing the noise and safety impact on Berliners. Developed by the U.S. Army to address the tactical realities of jungle combat in Vietnam based upon its ongoing experience, the new “Quick-Kill “ technology and training on rifle marksmanship suited Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors dilemma and its Cold Warriors mission perfectly.65 The

alignment with either of Army Berlin’s roles, or its specific urban warfare mission, however, was not the focus of the U.S. Army’s new training technique, noted in the Berlin Observer:

Reports from Vietnam pleaded for a way of teaching individual riflemen how to rapidly engage close-in surprise targets. In the jungle terrain of Vietnam, there frequently is not time to sight in the enemy and then fire. The key to Quick-Kill is very simple. The main point of the method is teaching a soldier to hit a target instantly at short ranges (zero to 50 meters) without using his weapon’s sights.66

This new training technique, developed as a response to the costly lessons the U.S. Army experienced in Vietnam, was constructed around a simple concept and an even more rudimentary technology. This skill incorporated a form of “instinct shooting” practiced by legendary gunfighters and modern practitioners and was combined with a modified air-rifle without sights and firing BB pellets. Soldiers trained to react to small moving targets at close range by pointing the rifle rather than aiming carefully, a long-standing basic practice. “Quick-Kill” required that the soldier disregarded their primary marksmanship skills which emphasized proficient use of their sights to engage targets at the maximum effective range of their rifle, and instead required reliance on natural instincts adapted for close-quarter battle.67

While the U.S. Army was concerned with the war in Vietnam, this method of training was even more suited to the tactical realities of an urban environment, where fire and maneuver is limited by buildings, streets, canals, and other obstacles. Additionally, the use of buildings in defense and the necessity for building-clearing practices in this environment matched the “Quick-Kill” target engagement parameters of 0 to 50 meters. This unintended but positive consequence of institutional learning in Vietnam benefitted Army Berlin’s ability to remain viable in its ability to succeed in a delaying and destruction mission and significantly reduced the costs of training as well as the nuisance of their Berliner neighbors.
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In one of the broadest modern reforms of the Cold War United States Army, the development of the United States Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) under the leadership of the Army’s Chief of Staff in 1973, General Creighton V. Abrams, began a critical step in the post-Vietnam era. The role of doctrine, now placed in the forefront of preparations for training Army-wide, was given priority and standardized into training practices. As Walter Kretchik writes, “by the 1980s, the Army had established a long history of written keystone doctrine to regulate the chaos of war.” In the period between the establishment of TRADOC and its success in the 1980s, the details of every form of U.S. Army training was subjected to scrutiny and revision, beginning with the master plan, FM 100-5, *Operations*. In the 1976 version, the first developed under TRADOC guidance, “the Army’s primary mission was clearly stated: winning the land battle.”

Army Berlin’s mission and necessary practical training techniques, however, remained outside the scope of the reforming large land warfare emphasis reasserting itself in the U.S. Army. What Army Berlin did have, however, was a unique and critical skill set which would find its way into future U.S. military training and doctrinal manuals, and ultimately provided the intellectual basis to prepare troops and unit leaders for one of the most lethal and complicated battle problems a military force might face.

In a September 1978 cover letter to George Schecter of Analytics, Incorporated, Lieutenant Colonel Ronald C. Becker, the Operations Chief of Staff in Army Berlin, updated Mr. Schecter on his plans to attend a Military Operations in Urban Terrain (MOUT) conference in
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the United States. Becker offered to “provide the MOUT working group a short talk on Berlin Brigade initiatives in MOUT.”71 Included with the letter were two publications of Army Berlin on their urban warfare training doctrine, which was under development in the U.S. Army using the new MOUT acronym. The first document was a detailed, bound publication in the format of a Program of Instruction (POI) which opened with an introductory letter from Brigadier General Walter E. Adams, Berlin Brigade’s commander during the period of June 11, 1976 to August 25, 1978:

For several years the Berlin Brigade has been engaged in training units from outside Berlin in fighting techniques on urban terrain. This mission has complimented the geographic requirement that the Berlin Brigade place special emphasis on urban training and tactical exercises. This has led to a decision to formally present the lessons learned by soldiers within the Brigade and from visiting units in the form of a training package. The purpose of this effort is to prepare an urban warfare training program which can be used at any post in the United States Army. “Training for the Urban Battle” has been prepared from periodically revised lesson plans used in the Brigade.72

This publication reversed the order of normal doctrine and training distribution and purpose. At the same time that the U.S. Army was working its way through TRADOC’s priorities, placing conventional, large scale war against Warsaw Pact forces in Europe at the top of its agenda, Army Berlin, as a street-level implementer of American foreign hard power policy, was pushing training information back toward TRADOC.

Army Berlin’s goal in this effort was not to replace the existing field manual with their publication. Instead, it was presented as a ground-up instructional package with lesson plans that could be broken down into specific skill sets required for success in an urban warfare environment. As a single collection, it constituted an early form similar to the U.S. Army’s current versions of Army Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (ATTP) manuals, which did not

71 Training for the Urban Battle, The Berlin Brigade, (APO New York: Commander, Berlin Brigade, June 1978), USAMHI.
72 Ibid., ii.
exist for urban warfare at the time of Becker’s letter to Schecter. Further, Army Berlin had
developed an additional individual booklet, *How to Fight on Urban Terrain: Entering and
Clearing Techniques*, which was designed as an accessible training tool derived from its larger
Program of Instruction format. This small booklet, provided step-by-step instructions on one
of the many separate individual and small unit skill requirements, the correct methods to clear a
building. It featured easy to understand text accompanied by illustrations similar to black and
white cartoon structure, for broad consumption by the members of the force.

The U.S. Army did revise its Urban Operations doctrine in 1979 with its publication of
FM 90-10, *Military Operations on Urbanized Terrain*, shortly after Becker and Adams had
promoted Army Berlin’s unique expertise to the U.S. Army’s MOUT Working Group involved
in the development. Additionally, in this same period, the Army Readiness and Training
Evaluation Program (ARTEP) requirements standardized by TRADOC across the force had not
developed a MOUT ARTEP manual. The ARTEP concept allowed the U.S. Army to
standardize the evaluation of units in their ability to perform the essential tasks expected in
combat, identifying those units that were proficient and units that exhibited deficiencies and
which required command attention. In the case of the Berlin Brigade, since its primary mission
was to fight in the city, it designed its own ARTEP in 1979.

In Army Berlin’s subsequent ARTEP edition in 1982, it was noted that the document was
“reviewed by elements of United States Army, Europe, (USAREUR), United States Army
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Forces Command, (FORSCOM), and United States Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC)."  This ARTEP, which Army Berlin published for its own use, now aligned with the Army-wide Military Operations on Urban Terrain (FM 90-10), and it was provided through the command structure in the TRADOC, USAREUR, and FORSCOM channels. The transformation of its local experience in West Berlin into useful tactical and technical skill sets which could now be replicated, revised, and improved through a broader discussion outside of the city greatly benefitted both the larger U.S. Army and Army Berlin itself.

Its impact in the city was measured in other ways, by a much different population, who needed to trust that Army Berlin’s soldiers, their own Cold Warriors, were prepared to use these unique skills. At the same time, Army Berlin and its members were required to act as Good Neighbors in their training and operational behaviors in the city. Army Berlin, for the most part, was successful in meeting these conflicting roles, although it did experience difficult periods of conflict with its Berliner neighbors.

*Army Berlin’s Urban Warfare Good Neighbors*

One of the other challenges to Army Berlin’s ability to train to standard for its primary mission of defending West Berlin from external threats was its inability to use its heavy weapons systems in the city, primarily due to safety concerns, but also in its responsibilities as Good Neighbors to Berliners. An early attempt to provide its armor unit, Company F, 40th Armor, the ability to fire one form of its 90mm main gun ammunition resulted in an unfortunate surprise for a German neighbor. In its 1961 Historical Report, the incident is described:

A tank firing pit was completed at Rose Range on 25 June 1961. This pit, constructed according to Ordnance specifications, permitted the firing of 90mm service “shot” ammunition. Firing began in July but was ceased permanently on 10 August when a round ricocheted from the pit and
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passed through the roof of a German national. This was a “freak” accident, the exact cause of which could not be determined.\textsuperscript{78}

Fortunately, there was no mention of any injury in this incident that might have shaken the confidence of the local population near Rose Range in their estimation of Army Berlin as Good Neighbors. The projectile which punctured the Berliner’s roof was an inert, solid shot with no explosive properties, further minimizing the damage.

The primary location for the training of Army Berlin’s tanks occurred at the Seventh Army Training Center in Grafenwöhr, the largest maneuver space in West Germany, which allowed armor and artillery to train using their full complement of projectiles. In order for Company F, 40\textsuperscript{th} Armor to retain enough active armor in the city at all times, the unit rotated crews back to Grafenwöhr, where they borrowed tanks from one of Seventh Army’s forward deployed Corps, V and VII. The transport of Army Berlin’s tanks was a complicated matter requiring train transport and strict security through East Germany, and therefore, was not part of their training practice.

Army Berlin’s requirement to borrow its primary equipment from other USAREUR commands for the armor company’s vital training was also a complicated matter. In a telegram to CINCUSAREUR in September, 1969, VII Corps informed its chain of command that it could not provide the required 10 tanks and 17 Armored Personnel Carriers for Army Berlin’s use at Grafenwöhr, due to a conflict in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Armored Cavalry Regiment’s scheduled training at Hohenfels.\textsuperscript{79} VII Corps justified its denial by illustrating the maneuver training loss it would sustain during its scheduled period, and further argued that any transfer of the needed vehicles

\textsuperscript{78} “U.S. Army, Berlin Historical Report CY 1961,” box 2, 45, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.

\textsuperscript{79} “Subject: Berlin Brigade Support Requirements,” 05 SEP 69, VII CORPS FROM AETSCC to CINCUSAREUR FOR AEAGC-TU, Headquarters, United States Army, Europe, and Seventh Army, Staff Message Control Book, 01 August – 31 September, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
would negatively impact the operational capabilities of any Seventh Army unit giving up its armor for approximately two months.\footnote{Ibid.}

The VII Corps command did make a recommendation for the permanent relief of the operational units from this tasking when it suggested that CINCUSAREUR arrange for sufficient vehicles to serve the Berlin Brigade by moving European Theater stocks to either Grafenwöhr or Hohenfels, where they could be maintained and moved as needed for Army Berlin’s needs.\footnote{Ibid.} There was no available record of the disposition of this specific dilemma, or of any action by CINCUSAREUR in adopting the alternative solution offered by VII Corps to use theater stocks. This was a practical suggestion, as these were in plentiful supply due to the Kennedy administration’s decision to support the LONG THRUST exercises and Seventh Army’s wartime needs by pre-positioning these vehicles in West Germany, beginning in 1961.

The limitations of their operational area in the city required that Army Berlin seized any opportunity to incorporate training alternatives, and in the case of Company F, 40th Armor, it took advantage of a unique training device acquired in 1968 for its tank crews. As the opportunities for Army Berlin’s lone armor unit to fire live ammunition for their main guns were rare, in this case the 105 millimeter of the M-60A1, a simulated sight and firing tripod was adopted.\footnote{“Brigade Commanders See Demonstration of Training Device to Help Tanker’s Firing,” The Berlin Observer, March 15, 1968, 2, Berlin Observer Collection, USAMHI.} The unique sight device had recently been used by the 3rd Squadron, 14th Cavalry, a unit of the U.S. Army V Corps, to improve its tank team qualification scores significantly during their fall 1967 Grafenwöhr tests. This unit was positioned forward of the main body of V Corps, stationed in the critical Fulda Gap, and had adapted their version of the training aid from a Bundeswehr armored force also in the Fulda area, the 5th Panzergrenadiers.
The German tank crews of this mechanized infantry unit had constructed the apparatus, which consisted of a tripod and firing mechanism that could be dry-fired for classroom instruction. Additionally, if a small arms indoor or outdoor range was available, including those rated for only the smallest calibers, the .22 caliber semi-automatic rifle used by the system to replicate the firing of the main gun could engage a paper target and allow for qualification simulation. The crews of the 14th Cavalry squadron borrowed their German allies design, and adapted it to mount the M-60A1 sighting components.

For Army Berlin’s isolated and restricted armor unit, this system was anticipated as a highly successful training aid. As an additional advantage, the tank crew’s increased proficiency using the .22 caliber round, which cost less than one cent each, meant less necessary repeat qualifications for failures. Compared to the average cost of the tank’s main gun 105 millimeter round at fifty dollars, the U.S. Army was preserving valuable resources that could be used in the event of war.83 Year round, night or day, in a classroom or on nearly any small arms range in West Berlin, the teams could improve their marksmanship.

This cooperation between the Germans and Americans sharpened Army Berlin’s ability to accomplish its delay and destruction mission in its defense of West Berlin.84 Additionally, it provided a solution that reduced the frictions between their Berliner neighbors, and certainly lessened the chance of another potential blow to Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors efforts, as in the case of the tank firing pit accident in 1961.
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84 This is a micro-level example of Ingo Trauschweizer’s theory on the dynamics of German and American military thought, and the influence the Bundeswehr had on U.S. Army operational and doctrinal thought. See The Cold War U.S. Army: Building Deterrence for Limited War, (Lawrence KS: University Press of Kansas, 2008), or “Learning With an Ally: The U.S. Army and the Bundeswehr in the Cold War,” The Journal of Military History 72, (Society for Military History: 2008) 477-508.
The tank accident in 1961 was an extreme example of the potential for clashes over the necessary exercise of Army Berlin's combat technologies and training regimens practiced in every specialty. As illustrated previously, Army Berlin’s use of space in West Berlin included outdoor ranges where it could exercise basic soldier small arms training, and particularly its unique specialty in urban warfare using its “Doughboy City” complex at Parks Range. However, one of the key training points in urban operations is the exploitation of the terrain that is likely to be the future battlefield, and again, Army Berlin was unlike any other unit in Europe, where it already knew where it would conduct its combat mission throughout its active fight. This gave it one particular advantageous characteristic of the defensive form of operations. The defending force can familiarize itself utilizing regular “terrain walks” to make defensive fortification improvements and design defensive echelon plans, basic principles of urban defensive battle planning.85

Throughout its duty in West Berlin, while the unit used its dedicated urban warfare range for training, Army Berlin had also developed a training program for its infantry units in the American sector. It regularly scheduled in-city training periods where its troops would simulate urban battle in the areas of the city that it projected as future battle sites. Advanced skills taught in urban warfare principles included building data on avenues of approach, range cards for crew-served weapons, and instructing soldiers on the proper selection and preparation of firing positions.86

Once again, however, the conflicting roles of Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors required that Arm Berlin occasionally deferred to the needs of the Berliners, even though it

86 Ibid., Annex N, 1-11.
possessed the legal status of an occupying force with the command power to require compliance. In this case, unlike the Army Berlin decision to implement their German-American Committee to assist in a limited relational power transfer to enhance its Good Neighbors role, a different group of West Berlin’s residents exerted influence over Army Berlin’s Cold Warriors behaviors.

In a memorandum addressed to the United States Commander of Berlin, Major General James G. Boatner, Lieutenant Colonel Jouni Keravuori, Deputy Chief of Staff, informed the newly installed general of a significant interruption in Army Berlin’s in-city training for the remainder of 1981:

> The Senat Chancellory has informed us that there will be no in-city training sites available throughout the remainder of this year. Just for information (not to be taken seriously) the Senator for Housing and Building suggested we conduct training on the volksfest grounds. Although the squatters are making it difficult, both politically and physically, for Senat to obtain training sites, I will ask Mr. Bock, Senat Liaison, to press the senator from Housing and Building on this matter, so that if an opportunity arises we don’t miss it.\(^\text{87}\)

The issue in this case was the result of the political and social developments relating to the entrenched squatters movement which had arisen in West Berlin, like much of the rest of Europe, in the 1970s. A different form of counter-cultural protest which combined the social movements of radical environmentalists, peace activists, socialists, and individual materialists, among others, had a substantial impact on West Berlin. These *Hausbesetzungen*, or squatters, comprised a new political challenge to West Berlin’s stability, and the inability of the Senat to address the problem in the late 1970s and early 1980s had ramifications for Army Berlin’s primary mission preparedness.

In a study on the youth protest movements of Western Europe, Joyce Marie Mushaben notes that in a *Polizei* sweep of the squatters in West Berlin on December 12, 1980, forceful evictions and protests resulted in the death of 1 protestors, injuries to 200 more, and 70 police
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officers. The incidents of violence between West Berlin’s law enforcement and squatters, described as “eviction-related street battles,” were examples of the type of confrontations that Army Berlin itself had been successful in avoiding during the height of the 1960s in Berlin.

While Lieutenant Colonel Keravuori noted the folly in the Senator for Housing’s suggestion of the use of the mock buildings constructed for the 1981 summer German-American Volksfest, this alteration was a serious impediment to vital training in the city for Army Berlin. The practice of using vacant commercial buildings was a means of testing the unit’s ability to maneuver, to familiarize new troops into the mission, and to demonstrate to the West Berlin public the United States commitment to defending the city. Army Berlin remained an occupying power, with the legal right to appropriate property to meet its obligations, yet its relational behaviors with the Berlin district mayors and Senat were established in a primarily cooperative manner.

The enforcement of its right to train in the city, even in its primary hard power mission, was less important in this case than avoiding damage to its soft power image. The squatter’s movement, at least for a short period, impaired the military preparations of Army Berlin. Risking a political battle over the use of the normally available vacant urban properties with its local Senat and municipal allies, with whom Army Berlin had long, formal bonding relationships that enhanced both thin and thick trust, was not a credible foreign policy choice. This soft power decision to preserve Good Neighbors policy at the expense of tactical Cold Warriors skills, even if the primarily impacted squatters were violating West German law and Allied Ordnances, was consistent with Army Berlin’s national goals.
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Throughout Army Berlin’s service during the wall period, the Berliner population registered its dismay over inconveniences, annoyances, and serious threats to safety as they occurred. Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Office (PAO), and in particular its Community Relations section, had the task of providing a venue for Berliner complaints, and whenever possible, some form of resolution. The range of complaints it experienced across the period of 1961 to 1994 was quite diverse, coming from individual citizens of West Berlin, local organized community associations (some of which were organized specifically to present their petitions to both Army Berlin and their elected leaders), and the elected leaders themselves.

The Public Affairs Office addressed these issues in numerous forms of response, proactive press releases, and regular cooperation with the elected leaders of West Berlin using the German-American Committee. This formal network association, implemented by Army Berlin in 1962 to facilitate a closer, formal dialogue with West Berlin’s civic leaders on a regular basis, was a very successful policy selection at that stage in West Berlin’s occupation experience.90

As an example of an incident in which Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Office was required to present the Berlin Brigade’s case regarding numerous military disturbances in the city, the unit’s Operations Chief of Staff in early 1977, Lieutenant Colonel Vernon E. Ebert, provided the PAO office with his response to complaints regarding noise. Complaints had been registered regarding the noise generated by soldiers running through Berlin’s streets early in the morning and calling cadence. Ebert explained that the infantry battalions were required to start their training days very early, and it was necessary for them, as part of their physical training process,

---
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to run. He stated that “singing cadence assists the soldier in maintaining the body rhythm
required for long runs. However, I see no reason why we could not prohibit such noise, outside
of our kasernes, before 0800. This, however, needs to be coordinated through DBC.”91 Added
at the end of this accommodation, written in long hand, is the qualifier for the PAO’s
understanding, “so don’t put it out as gospel.”92

Included in this disposition form, Ebert noted that Army Berlin had made
accommodations already on the ceremonial cannon firing practice at McNair barracks by
cancelling the opening cannon salute in the morning. He further stated, for the PAO’s response
to the West Berliner’s complaints, that this was a significant concession in consideration of its
role in “maintaining morale and spirit within the military.”93 Finally, regarding the complaints
about the firing of weapons at the Wannsee Firing Range, he provided the PAO with an option of
potential compromise, but with conditions which were likely even less attractive to the
complaining Berliners. “If the pressure is great enough to cause expenditure of funds and
dedications of a part of the Grunewald area to U.S. military use, it is certainly feasible to switch
all demolition firing— not small arms (at Rose Range)—to the Grunewald.”94

In this example, the influence of Nye’s aspects of relational power theory, a component
of his 2011 revision of the exercise of smart power, is evident. Army Berlin’s status as an
occupation force, broadly interpreted, legally permitted it to use its discretion in behaviors in
West Berlin, subject to international standards regarding the required protection of the occupied
population from physical harm and maintenance of the necessary public services to sustain life.
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The complaints included did not rise to these standards, yet Army Berlin continued its practice of seeking some form of accommodation.

Through their complaints the citizens of West Berlin attempted to exercise the only possible available aspect of their relational power, their ability to establish preferences, although still subject to Army Berlin’s policy decisions. Neither of the other aspects of Nye’s relational power, commanding change or setting agendas, could be exercised by the citizens of West Berlin. For its part, Army Berlin had already altered both functional and traditional U.S. military behaviors in order to promote Army Berlin’s role as Good Neighbors projecting American soft power through a foreign policy that was both moral and legitimate in the eyes of the Berliners. This one example in the unit’s records does not reference West Berliner’s in the practice of constructing formal networks in their attempt to alter Army Berlin’s behaviors, but numerous other examples do exhibit these characteristics.

*Army Berlin Good Neighbors and West Berlin NIMBY’s*

In the same time period, a West Berlin formal network was organized as a campaign to restrict Army Berlin’s training and usage in Lichterfelde, an area in which American ranges had long been established. The *Umweltschutz-Initiative*, or “Environmental Initiative,” had begun its campaign at the top of the American policy decision-making chain in a letter to President Carter on June 15, 1978. The issues raised by the group included noise from helicopter, tank, and weapons training at Parks Range, a facility in the Lichterfelde area which housed Army Berlin’s “Doughboy City.” This was the key training environment for the Berlin Brigade’s combined arms exercises in its primary hard power mission, the defense of West Berlin.
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Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Officer, Lieutenant Colonel Gerald R. Roys, reminded the group that Army Berlin’s mission was the freedom of West Berlin, and this should mean that “you will have some understanding for the necessity of our training.” The group had requested that Army Berlin limit the use of helicopters to daylight periods and cease weekend flights entirely. Noting that helicopters and tanks were vital to realistic training, and that Army Berlin already severely limited its night training and flights, PAO Roys made his case for the use of the Lichterfelde area. “As I am sure you are aware, the U.S. Forces are severely limited in maneuver area in Berlin, and due to the geographic situation have no area where these types of exercises can be carried out which is not adjacent to residential areas.”

Additionally, this German formal network complained about a regular Saturday afternoon stock car racing series held also on the range grounds in which American soldiers and West Berliners participated together as a form of recreation. The approved activity between Germans and Americans was designed by Army Berlin to connect its soldiers as Good Neighbors in a cultural context, which itself was an example of Robert Putnam’s bridging informal networks. The petitioning Lichterfelde group, what Mushaben refers to as “an extra-parliamentary opposition to the party system,” was a local, specific-issue citizen’s initiative, or *Bürgerinitiativen*. The democratization and institutionalization of the radical 1960s protest movements had ironically been nurtured in West Berlin under Army Berlin’s soft power goals of projecting a moral and legitimate American foreign policy.

Groups like the *Umweltschutz-Initiative* were representative of one sector of the German public exercising its maturing voice and agency in its society, willing to engage in “a more
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systematic political critique directed against unrestricted economic growth and technological assault on the environment."99 Unlike the generally younger, more anarchic and primarily apolitical squatter movement in the same period, the typical members of a German citizen’s initiative, according to Mushaben, were “highly educated, well-informed, and self-confident in their own political skills.”100 As settled residents in the city they exhibited rational self-interest similar to movements across the globe, including forms of organized protest later represented by the English language acronym “NIMBY” (Not in My Backyard).101

In a bold proposition, this formal network citizens’ initiative requested that Army Berlin cease its use of the area in order to convert the property into a recreational area for Berliners. In each case, Roys parried the suggestions based upon military necessity, without any reference to the legal realities of occupied West Berlin. Since the request by the group referenced a recreational activity, the stock car races, U.S. Army regulations required that the U.S. Army Military Personnel Center for Europe (MILPERCENEUR) be informed for their records, prompting an additional internal communication. In Roy’s draft for MILPERCENEUR forwarded to another office in USCOB, Roys wrote in his cover letter that, while he felt he had addressed the issues in full, “we should not get ourselves into the position of running a training area based on restrictions imposed by outside groups who have a very personal axe to grind.”102

Roys acknowledged the threat of gradual accommodations simply to avoid conflict with this special interest group that was organized locally specifically against the critical training sites. The connection of the vital national interest invented for West Berlin by President
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Kennedy in 1961, its viability, and Army Berlin’s credible threat as a fighting force required continued use of Parks Range. These quality of life issues for Berliners consistently arose over the remainder of Army Berlin’s existence in the city, particularly in the late 1980s. In each case, how the disputes were resolved often depended upon the existence of formal relationships connected to Army Berlin. In the case of the *Umweltschutz-Initiative* in 1978, its political power and ability to exercise any form of relational power was limited to the strategy of establishing preferences through political pressure and dialogue.

*Institutional Shields for Army Berlin’s Cold Warriors*

During the November 7, 1986 German-American Committee meeting, Mr. Hans-Joachim Vollpracht, in attendance at the meeting as the German representative of its subcommittee for housing, addressed the group regarding an issue that had been a regular problem since the beginning of the occupation. The record reflects the exchange between Vollpracht and Brigadier General Woodall and states “that damages to streets through tracked vehicles exceeded last year’s figure by approx. 100,000 DM. BG Woodall thanked him for raising this item and bringing it to his attention. He told the committee that LTC Marcello would look into the matter to find ways to reduce damage on public streets.” In this formal network, where bonding practices had long been established, the trust element of social capital between the civic leaders of West Berlin certainly influenced the terms of discussion. Unfortunately for West Berlin and Mr. Vollpracht, the issue was not easily resolved.

In the subsequent regularly scheduled German-American Committee meeting held on February 20, 1987 at Rathaus Neukölln, Mr. Vollpracht’s agenda item on maneuver damages to West Berlin’s streets ran into an institutional brick wall. USCOB Public Affairs Officer,
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Lieutenant Colonel Gary A. Oedewalt, deferred from answering the query. Instead, PAO Oedewalt remarked that Lieutenant Colonel Marcello had observed that “it was very important to find out when and by whom the damage was done. He also indicated that it would be valuable to have the date, time, and [vehicle] serial number in order to investigate and report the incidents to CR as soon as possible.” Over the course of the next regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, the issue was discussed but never resolved.

The last available discussion on the matter occurred over a year later, when Zehlendorf District Mayor Juergen Klemann informed the committee that, due to the lack of resolution, his district council was in the process of introducing a bill to “Request Zehlendorf contact the appropriate U.S. Command administration office in charge of tank traffic in Zehlendorf.” By this time, the Zehlendorf residents now requested that tank traffic be restricted, from 0900 to 1800 hours on weekdays only.

The German-American Committee, from its inception in 1962, was a successful formal network between the municipal and civic leaders of West Berlin and Army Berlin and the committee had achieved many improvements in the Berliner’s quality of life in the city with their military neighbors. It had also been extremely successful for Army Berlin in developing its Good Neighbors status as it provided Berliners an opportunity to experience some limited agency through its own committee members who exercised their voice in pursuit of Berliner’s goals. The processes of sharing some aspects of relational power, particularly setting preferences and on occasion, a limited exercise of controlling agendas, were made available by Army Berlin on numerous issues to the committee members. However, on this issue, along with
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any that the command felt impacted Army Berlin’s ability to prepare for its primary military
mission, Army Berlin controlled the agenda and retained its ability to command, or thwart,
change.

Lieutenant Colonel Oedewalt’s role as the PAO included his ability to deliver both good
and bad news in the name of other authorities. This was especially important on issues like the
maneuver damage report, where an estimate from West Berlin authorities required some measure
of trust. However, Oedewalt’s indication in the first subsequent meeting that the claims needed
to be substantiated by witnesses providing identifying information, while theoretically
preferable, was not practical in many cases. The use of city streets to move armored vehicles to
and from ranges was not a new phenomenon in 1986, and the reality of regular damage was
already known. It is probable that there were dynamics of relational power and institutional
behavior operating in this series of exchanges that explains PAO Oedewalt’s role in a more
complete sense.

In his 1971 article “Street-level Bureaucracy and the Analysis of Urban Reform,”
Michael Lipsky offered a series of insights into the behaviors of “Street-level bureaucrats” in
American cities in the 1960s.107 One of Lipsky’s contentions was that the formation in
government of special structures ostensibly designed to address ineffective or unresponsive
behaviors on the part of “street-level bureaucrats” can actually be a hindrance to reforms that
might achieve redress for citizens who have been unfairly treated. While Lipsky focused on the
impact in American urban ghettos primarily, burdened not only by inadequate resources for
public services but also the additional handicap of systemic racism, his analysis of mediation
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boards or public relations committees contended that they were a problematic response in general:

We may see the development of human relations councils, citizen review boards, special equal opportunity units, and other “community relations” bureaus for what they are. They may provide citizens with increased marginal access to the system, but, equally important, they inhibit institutional change by permitting street-level bureaucrats to persist in behavioral patterns because special units to handle “human relations problems” have been created.108

By applying Lipsky’s theory to the German-American Committee and in particular to Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Office in this case, a pattern in the series of exchanges which began on November 7, 1986 can be discerned.

The original statement by Mr. Vollpracht was made in the presence of Brigadier General Woodall, commander of the Berlin Brigade, who acknowledged the statement and referred it to Lieutenant Colonel John J. Marcello, also in attendance but not credited in the records with a statement. As Berlin Brigade’s commander, BG Woodall might have opted at that time to address the issue personally, but if he did, it was not recorded. At the following German-American Committee meeting, LTC Oedewalt, USCOB PAO, made his statement regarding the need for West Berliners to positively identify the units who damaged their streets in order to make a determination of the damages, an unrealistic standard for resolution.

LTC Marcello, identified by BG Woodall in the previous meeting as the authority on the subject was also in attendance at this meeting but again made no statement listed in the record. BG Woodall, who commanded every armored vehicle that might have damaged the streets also made no recorded statement pertaining to this issue of Berliner concern. By the third meeting in which the topic of tank traffic was recorded, well over a year after the first report by Mr. Vollpracht, the German side of the table had apparently given up on the idea of compensation

108 Ibid., 399-400.
and attempted to use the discussion to at least gain an accommodation on use restrictions by armored vehicles in Zehlendorf.

In Lipsky’s formula, the initial deferral of authority by BG Woodall to LTC Marcello began the process of insulating Woodall from the issue. Once Marcello presented a series of post-damage requirements through PAO Oedewalt in which Marcello suggested that the Berliners should have observed and reported the offenders distinctly, he was also removed from responsibility, unless directly challenged by a member of the committee. Shielded now by LTC Oedewalt, the unit’s Public Affairs Officer, Woodall and Marcello sat silently while Oedewalt played the role of the powerless authority. This left the West Berliners no option but to attempt to negotiate a lesser preference in the hope of achieving some form of progress for their Zehlendorf constituents.

This process and outcome certainly appears to validate Lipsky’s theory. There is little doubt that had BG Woodall wished to address the matter from the beginning he possessed the authority to do so, or to reverse LTC Marcello’s disappointing response. In the diplomatic and regimented behaviors that had developed on the committee over its long history, the value of the relationships for each side had been proven. In many ways the German-American Committee was very successful for both sides as they worked to coexist in the isolated city. However, this is not to suggest that the relationship was transformed into an equal partnership delivering equitable benefits in all cases. The committee did, however, offer its members many opportunities to interact socially and in cultural connection, and for the Germans, it also provided some additional benefits.

German members of the committee were regularly treated to special access to observe training both in the city as well as in Army Berlin’s zonal training in West Germany. In April of
1968, Tempelhof District Mayor Bernhard Hoffman was pictured on the front page of *The Berlin Observer* as he held an armed 81 millimeter mortar shell at the mouth of the tube and awaited the command to release it to send it down range. Over the years, members of the German-American Committee were regularly given helicopter rides to observe training in the city, as well as numerous trips on Air Force transport planes to attest to the airlift capabilities of the U.S. Air Force, which would deliver additional divisions to West Germany. These trips included not only flights to West Germany, but scenic destinations including Charleston, South Carolina, and Naples, Italy, to name but a few.

Fortunately for Army Berlin, its decision in 1962 to establish the German-American Committee under the direction of Army Berlin’s “Commander’s CR Advisory Council” paid dividends during the volatile 1960s, when political and social unrest increased the threat to West Berlin municipal and American authority.

*Hard Power as Smart Power in Revolutionary Berlin*

Army Berlin’s secondary hard power mission in West Berlin was its role in responding to civil disturbances in the city, not limited to the protection of American installations. The infantry units trained regularly for this contingency, even though the West Berlin *Polizei* had primary responsibility in the city and were well equipped to handle demonstrations. One scenario that had concerned Army Berlin before the wall’s erection was the possibility that East Germans, exercising their ability to cross into West Berlin, would attempt to disrupt the civil order in a coordinated demonstration that might incorporate communist sympathizers or trade
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unions in the western half of the city. Just as the Berlin Wall stabilized the situation by solving West Berlin’s refugee problem, it also reduced this worst case scenario for Army Berlin. Instead, the turbulent 1960s, in which American foreign policies played a large part in the controversies, delivered a different form of civil unrest to Army Berlin’s doorstep.


This group, which stated that it was composed only of U.S. citizens with residency in West Berlin when it applied for its first Polizei permit for an authorized demonstration on April 29, 1967, was under surveillance by both West Berlin Polizei and Army Berlin. In its pre-march assessment, Army Berlin’s main concern was whether any members of the unit were involved, and in regard to the possibility of violence, the group was assessed as a low threat. However, even before its first march, Army Berlin considered that, should the group remain intact in the future, “it is only problematical that the ‘US Campaign’ will be able to keep itself free of violently anti-US fringe groups if it continues in existence beyond the immediate future.”

There is no additional information in this early morning report which justified the basis for the prediction of the group’s future potential for violence. In its post-march telegram, Army Berlin noted that the protest “was completely orderly,” and “Although not all the marchers could
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112 “USCOB to CINCUSAREUR for DCSI,” 14 APR 67, Staff Message Control Book, 01 APR 67 – 30 APR 67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
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be recognized most of them did appear to be Americans.” ¹¹⁴ This incident is also discussed in Martin Klimke’s The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties.¹¹⁵ Klimke asserts that Mission Berlin’s reaction to this group’s protests “marked the first instance when American and Allied officials seriously considered prohibiting antiwar protest and thereby interfering with the civil government of Berlin.” ¹¹⁶

Klimke’s work analyzes the global nature of the protest movements, linking intellectual influences and the disparate organizations and goals which found common cause around numerous issues, in particular racial discrimination and the Vietnam policies of the United States. He emphasizes the crucial year of 1968 as well as the origins of the association between the Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund (German Socialist Student League, SDS) and an American organization originally founded to combat segregation and fight for civil rights, the American Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).¹¹⁷ The paradox of American influence in the protest movement and its ability to be a source of both energy and controversy as protestors considered their goals and strategies in confronting American imperialism, war policies, and civil rights issues is a constructive viewpoint illuminated by Klimke.

Cold Warrior Fraternization: Teen Girls and Socialists

For Army Berlin, which had informally emphasized its role in connecting with West Berlin’s youth since the early years of the occupation, the timing of the establishment and early years of both the American SDS and the distinct West Berlin SDS were not yet a matter of concern. Through its formalized network established with its single initial command-driven

¹¹⁴ “USCOB BERLIN to CINCUSAREUR for DCSI,” 29 APR 67, 1400Z, Staff Message Control Book, 01 APR 67 – 30 APR 67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
¹¹⁶ Ibid., 165-166.
¹¹⁷ Ibid., 17-18.
meeting in July of 1962, the German-American Committee, Army Berlin connected with the political leadership of West Berlin to adopt programs to reach out to the youth. These were organized through the German-American Committee’s permanent working committee, the sub-committee on recreation, which held only its second meeting on June 23, 1964.  

These early efforts were primarily guided by the concerns of West Berlin’s elites in gaining institutional support from Army Berlin’s own recreational associations, club systems, and access to facilities. For Army Berlin, the broader goals were to establish itself as a committed partner in the civic life in West Berlin including its early suggestions that the German-American Committee establish two permanent working committees on education and welfare. Additionally, Army Berlin hoped to establish a “Youth” program that allowed for monitoring its primarily young, single, and male soldiers in their fraternization with West Berlin’s female population, a concern shared by the municipal leaders of West Berlin.

An example of this fraternization issue was discussed in its June 6, 1967 meeting, brought to the table by Herr Heinz Frick, a particularly engaged member of the committee in its early years and the youth minister of the Schöneberg district. Herr Frick attempted to explain German’s reluctance to encourage the attendance of young women at dances held in American service clubs:

Herr Frick has written many letters to various schools within the American Sector. One Home Economics School in Neukölln answered no because the standard of the girls was too low. Many other schools have written that they do not wish their girls to attend dances with American soldiers because American soldiers have legal advisors who tell them to always deny the fact if
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118 “Resume of the 23 June Meeting of the Recreations Sub-Committee at White Rose Inn,” 28 July 1964, Headquarters, United States Army, Berlin, Information Division, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI. For more background on both the German-American Committee, its working sub-committees and origins, see Chapter 6, “Soft Power Community: America’s Good Neighbors in Berlin.”
they are accused of fathering a child.\textsuperscript{119}

For their part, Army Berlin’s recreation clubs, which operated on American military sites and were regulated by USAREUR regulations, had made its efforts to invite West Berlin’s female population to social functions held with the young American male soldiers.

Previously, in the fall of 1966, the director of the Skyrider Club, Mrs. Diana McKinney, reminded the committee that the invitations distributed to all six American sector districts seeking the attendance of West Berlin’s youth group members included both male and female Berliners. However, she emphasized that she hoped that “particularly girls over 16 years,” attend the planned Halloween Dance, and “assured the committee that the dance would be well-chaperoned- no alcohol is served.”\textsuperscript{120} Similar to the June 1967 discussion by Herr Frick, it was apparent that in this effort, Army Berlin faced significant resistance from West Berliners responsible for young females in viewing this foreign policy as moral or legitimate.

As its early occupation experience had exhibited to Army Berlin, there were different forms of fraternization, not all acceptable for official support. Unlike the approved municipal youth groups, the West German SDS, with its politically active chapter in West Berlin, was recognized by Army Berlin as a potentially radicalized network. In the case of the political opposition to American foreign policies which escalated in the same period, Army Berlin had a different opinion of fraternization with West Berliners who were members of various political opposition groups. While Army Berlin, along with Mission Berlin, monitored the groups

\textsuperscript{119} “Minutes of the German-American Sub-Committee on Recreation Meeting of 6 June 1967 at Amerika Haus,” Office of the U.S. Commander, Berlin, Information Division, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.

\textsuperscript{120} “Minutes of the German-American Sub-Committee on Recreation Meeting on 7 September 1966 at Kreuzberg Youth Center,” Office of the U.S. Commander, Berlin, Information Division, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
composed of German nationals, its issue with the group of Americans in West Berlin participating in the “US Campaign” was a different problem.

Army Berlin was very interested in the “US Campaign” as a potentially negative influence upon its own soldiers with regard to their personal views on the Vietnam War. The organization, which specifically formed to protest the United States war in Vietnam, restricted its membership to American civilians living in West Berlin and routinely sought and received permission for its demonstrations through the West Berlin Polizei. However, in the case of one particular American citizen participant, Reinhold Lettau, the Polizei assumed a different approach.

Lettau, who listed his occupation as a free-lance journalist in his application for residence in West Berlin, was considered by the Polizei as a threat, “for inciting riots against the police and actions inimical to good order.”\textsuperscript{121} The Polizei announced that they would shorten his residency permit from a November 30, 1967 termination to a June 30, 1967 end date and warned him to be out of the city by that date. However, in the same cable, Army Berlin noted that the Polizei action had been reversed by West Berlin’s Senat.\textsuperscript{122} USCOB’s report does not indicate its opinion in the matter, but at the same time, another incident in which the West Berlin Polizei wished to exercise authority over protest activities is assessed as a policy decision.

Army Berlin’s estimation of the broader anti-American and anti-Vietnam war protests occurring in West Berlin during 1967 is evident in another classified cable issued the same day as a “Spot report.” A demonstration held that same date had been broken up at the Free

\textsuperscript{121} “Subject: BERLIN SITREP (Period 261600Z – 291600Z May 1967),” USCOB from IO/USCOB SGD DAVIS to STANDARD BERLIN SITREP ADDEES, 29 MAY 67, 1000Z, Staff Message Control Book, 01 MAY 67 – 31 MAY 67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI. All information provided in this cable marked “Classified” and limited in distribution as a LIVE OAK message to France, Germany, United Kingdom, and United States “Eyes Only.”

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid.
University by the *Polizei*, based upon the absence of a permit, and they also confiscated leaflets criticizing United States foreign policy in the war in Vietnam. The basis for the *Polizei* action toward the material was the long-standing occupation period laws regarding “material defamatory to any one of the three occupation authorities.”

These specific objectionable leaflets, which had been distributed in large numbers beginning the prior week, were reviewed by West Berlin’s district attorney at the request of the *Polizei*. He concurred with the *Polizei’s* opinion that the leaflet in particular did violate Allied Ordinance number 501. Additionally, he supported the *Polizei* in its wish to prosecute, viewing the exercise of the Allied law as appropriate. There was one technical legal difficulty facing the *Polizei* position, the fact that there was no applicable German law to enforce.

Army Berlin advised its allies in the cable that it did not wish to see the law enforced at this point and reserved that decision based upon future developments. To have enforced Allied Ordinance 501 required that the Allies reverse long precedents of rejecting the use of the law in similar situations. Army Berlin was concerned that prosecution could be viewed as both undemocratic and hypocritical on the part of the Americans, and contrary to national interests. Specifically, the use of this law was estimated to be more damaging to Army Berlin’s soft power efforts than any benefit it may receive, an act that lessened its moral authority and attractive foreign policy in the city. Without Allied support, this prosecution was not a credible threat to the protestors in the city, and the *Polizei* were restricted to the application of their own legal options, which did not possess the sanction power of the original Allied Occupation Ordinances.

While Army Berlin deferred in its lawful ability to engage legal proceedings against peaceful protests and the distribution of critical leaflets and other printed materials, it did
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consider threats made by specific groups against American installations, West Berlin high profile locations, and important but controversial visitors to the city in its preparations. In a May 25, 1967 telegram, Army Berlin noted that the group “Kommune I,” which it described as a “West Berlin Maoist Group,” distributed leaflets threatening violence against specific targets:

Leaflets were distributed in West Berlin today signed by “Kommune I,” evidently the West Berlin Maoist Group, expressing gratification for the recent Brussels’ department store fire and threatening and calling for similar fires in West Berlin stores (i.e. the large Ka Dewe department store, the Hertie, Bilka, and Neckermann stores and local Woolworth branches). The leaflets also expressed regret that anti-US activities had reacted “so mildly” toward Vice-President Humphrey’s recent visit and stated that the next visitor (the Shah of Iran on 02 June) would be met with more violent action.\(^\text{124}\)

In its response to this information, CINCUSAREUR in Heidelberg requested that Army Berlin reply “ASAP as to what action you propose to take to counter demonstrations cited in ref msgs, especially para 4, ref. a”\(^\text{125}\) This particular section was in regard to the upcoming visit to West Berlin by the Shah of Iran, which in fact did turn into a violent protest. While there is no available record in the reviewed files of a specific Army Berlin response, the concerns of violence were justified when a German student of the Free University, Benno Ohnesorg, was shot to death by a member of the West Berlin Polizei during the anti-Shah demonstration on June 2, 1967.\(^\text{126}\)

In the period before the Shah’s arrival, Army Berlin itself became the target of a proposed unauthorized demonstration, according to reports based upon the public statements of several leftist groups, including the German SDS. The planned demonstration, scheduled for 4:00pm at the main entrance to the U.S. headquarters, intended to “block the exit of military

\(^{124}\) “Subject: Berlin SITREP (Period 241600Z – 251600Z)” USCOB from IO/USCOB SGD DAVIS to STANDARD BERLIN SITREP ADDEES, 25MAY 67, 1600Z, Staff Message Control Book, 01 MAY 67 – 31 MAY 67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.

\(^{125}\) “Subject: Anti-US Demonstrations Berlin,” CINCUSAREUR HEIDELBERG GER to USCOB/CG USAB BERLIN GER, 26 MAY 67, 261112Z, Staff Message Control Book, 01 MAY 67 – 31 MAY 67, box 36, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.

\(^{126}\) Klimke, The Other Alliance, 78.
personnel. The planners of the demonstration reportedly hope that the military police will be called into action.¹²⁷ Unfortunately for the protestors, the Berlin weather changed their strategy, and the organizers cancelled the demonstration, apparently having made no contingencies for rain. While Army Berlin’s Military Police stood guard inside the gate, the West Berlin Polizei responsible for security outside the compound remained in place while they advised sporadic would-be protestors that it had been cancelled.¹²⁸

_Army Berlin, German Socialists, and American Black Power_

A final example of Army Berlin’s activities in the city linked to the broader global protest movement was noted in its daily report for the period of July 27, 1967 to July 28, 1967. As Martin Klimke has traced the international connections of the protest movements of the 1960s, and in his emphasis on the West German and American relationships, the report by Army Berlin noted a significant piece of information regarding the impetus for the German SDS connections to the American “Black Power” movement. The telegram included this passage:

SDS, a West Berlin leftist student group, has contacted American Negro students at the Free University in order to ascertain the address of US ‘black power’ leaders. The use the SDS may make of these addresses is uncertain, but a letter of solidarity would be the least expected from this group. A West Berlin newspaper article has indicated that this same group has initiated correspondence with Leftist student groups at the University of California at Berkeley in order to arrange possible student exchanges.¹²⁹

In the case of this inquiry, as Klimke notes, the five days of the Detroit riots beginning July 23, 1967, brought the “black power” struggle into the mainstream of the German SDS movement.¹³⁰
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¹³⁰ Klimke, _The Other Alliance_, 111-112.
American racial segregation and civil rights issues had been the topic of German SDS interest previously, but the horrific events in America’s “Motor City” sparked a new flame in West Berlin. Klimke predates the relationships between these two groups and the important trans-Atlantic connections in the broader movements which had developed earlier, but the Army Berlin report of additional outrage which motivated students in West Berlin at least matches his thesis that this event was one of many catalysts.

The tensions in West Berlin in the late 1960s remained a topic of discussion for Army Berlin throughout the decade and inter the early 1970s, but it appears in the available records that it did not require a significant exercise of its civil disturbance role in the city. The West Berlin Polizei were generally well-equipped to handle demonstrations and protests, which allowed Army Berlin to continue its concentration upon its hard power mission as Cold Warriors and soft power behaviors as Good Neighbors.

The challenges that Army Berlin faced as it projected American hard power as a credible military force across the time period in study, from the erection of the Berlin Wall to the end of 1990 and the democratic reunification of Germany, were based upon both external threats and internal complications. The unique mission requirements, isolation from support in West Germany, and continued challenges to its viability as a credible force capable of succeeding in its primary military purpose in the city required significant efforts. Contrary to accepted narratives, the period after President Kennedy’s successful negotiations on Berlin and its linkage to the issue of nuclear non-proliferation was not characterized by a substantial change in Soviet and East German acceptance of Allied rights. The role of Army Berlin in retaining both forms of access after 1963 is a significant chapter that has been neglected in the Cold War narratives on topics surrounding Berlin.
Army Berlin, with its limited training space and urban issues in West Berlin, maximized its abilities to prepare for its mission. It developed, refined, and then published its own training programs in its own unique way, becoming the U.S. Army’s most professional fighting force in the specialization of Urban Operations in the period. When the U.S. Army experienced its vital reforms in the 1970s, Army Berlin offered its expertise which it had tested and refined for over 19 years since its first urban warfare training site was built and provided U.S. Army TRADOC a complete training program based upon the existing doctrine.

Additionally, the use of the formal network which Army Berlin established in 1962, the German-American Committee, provided benefits for both West Berliners and Army Berlin through the rest of the Cold War. As a policy decision, Army Berlin’s nuanced and progressive relational power practices assisted it in both of its roles, as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors, particularly in the ongoing conflicts which occurred due to the necessary training which was required in close proximity to its residential neighbors. The committee assisted the command as it established and maintained thick trust through this bridging and bonding network with West Berlin’s civic leaders and fostered relationships critical to maintaining positive relations in the six districts which were impacted by Army Berlin’s military requirements.

As Cold Warriors, the dominant imperative for Army Berlin was to maintain its hard power capabilities, but the continued goodwill of the West Berliners was also a requirement, in order to continue the projection of a legitimate and moral foreign policy. The exercise of Army Berlin’s soft power as Good Neighbors made it possible for the unit’s implementation policies which would have been much more difficult without the early commitment in 1962 to engage with West Berliners in the broader society. The following chapter will analyze the role of soft power in Army Berlin and its influence in meeting America’s national interest.
CHAPTER 6. SOFT POWER: AMERICA’S GOOD NEIGHBORS IN BERLIN

Army Berlin’s unique behaviors and skill sets as Cold Warriors, which required innovative practices and adaptations described in the previous chapter, prepared the unit for its non-traditional role as a member of the primary land warfare force of the United States. The unit developed training and doctrinal advancements which made it the Army’s most professional Cold War operational force in urban warfare, one of the most complicated battle spaces in which any military force may be required to conduct operations.¹

In Army Berlin’s training practices inside West Berlin where it prepared to fight in order to accomplish the primary wartime mission of delay and destruction, its behaviors were limited by agreements with their Berliner neighbors. Additionally, the added safety and training maneuver damage risks involved in the city further complicated their task. While the infantry units scheduled city-wide training to familiarize themselves with their potential battleground, these were, like their use of ranges inside the Grunewald, increasingly restrained by the West Berliners. The residents of West Berlin, through their elected leaders, gained some voice, if not agency, in the use of their city. They were aided by Army Berlin’s increased emphasis on Good Neighbors behavior, and the implementation of formal networks designed to increase Army Berlin’s effectiveness in community relations.

The relationship between its hard power capabilities and soft power practices in Berlin represented a duality in Army Berlin which remained a policy planning complication for its command. As the most current doctrine on combat in cities, U.S. Army FM 3-06, Urban Operations, (Washington DC: Department of the Army, October 2006), it was recognized that the United States military did experience combat in urban areas under the existing post-World War II FM 31-50, Combat in Fortified and Built-up Areas. Examples include the assault from Inchon into Seoul in 1950, and the isolation and suppression of Hue, Vietnam, in 1968. However, neither of these events were guided by advanced doctrinal and training practices in the urban battlefield, in which Army Berlin developed and honed its own training methodologies and institutional accumulated knowledge.

¹ In post-Vietnam development of the modern doctrine of Military Operations in Urban Terrain (MOUT), which ultimately evolved into the current FM 3-06, Urban Operations, (Washington DC: Department of the Army, October 2006), it was recognized that the United States military did experience combat in urban areas under the existing post-World War II FM 31-50, Combat in Fortified and Built-up Areas. Examples include the assault from Inchon into Seoul in 1950, and the isolation and suppression of Hue, Vietnam, in 1968. However, neither of these events were guided by advanced doctrinal and training practices in the urban battlefield, in which Army Berlin developed and honed its own training methodologies and institutional accumulated knowledge.
Operations, states, the challenges in a city are deeper than the topography and physical battle space. FM 3-06 warns that “Hundreds, thousands, or millions of civilians may be near or intermingled with soldiers-friendly and enemy. This second factor, and the human dimension it represents, is potentially the most important and perplexing for commanders and their staffs to understand and evaluate.”2 The problem, in the military sense, is the people. This reality applied to Army Berlin as it engaged in the Cold War’s ideological conflict in the midst of a foreign city.

The focus of this chapter is on the “human dimension” of Army Berlin’s duties in the city during the wall period and up to German reunification, as it worked as street-level implementers with its Berliner neighbors to develop and strengthen the relationships between the two groups. The role of Army Berlin as Good Neighbors derived from USAREUR doctrinal texts which recognized the importance of command and troop efforts to present the American presence as a positive social good. This was particularly important in this city, where two opposing ideological and economic systems coexisted.3 The projection of soft power through both official and unofficial efforts by American soldiers and their family members was an important factor in the pursuit of United States national policy in the Cold War.

Contrary to Joseph Nye’s evolution of his power type terminologies and definitions which have consistently rejected the role of the U.S. military as a soft power tool, Army Berlin,
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3 The Good Neighbors expectations in USAREUR are first explicitly evident during the command of General Bruce C. Clarke, who promoted the campaign using this specific term during his tenure as CINCUSAREUR from 1960 to 1962, see General Bruce C. Clarke, “Report of Stewardship, October 1960-April 1962,” (Heidelberg: United States Army, Europe, 1962), 65. Clarke, in an oral history, takes credit for promoting the concept as CINCUSAREUR. See “Oral History Interview with Bruce C. Clarke, January 14, 1970,” The Harry S. Truman Library and Archives, Independence, MO, notes 41-45. However, earlier efforts to promote Americans and American values during the occupation period existed, as in the 1950 admonition from HICOG commissioner John J. McCloy to General Thomas T. Handy (CINCEUCOM) to engage his troops and their family members to assist in orientation of Germans in the American style of democratic society. (see chapter 1, fn 74).
similar to other overseas military communities, considered this power type inside its spectrum of force. It exerted significant resources to share its version of an attractive American culture, strove to live up to its political values in relations with Berliners, and, perhaps most importantly, served the purpose of demonstrating an American foreign policy which was based upon American ideals of morality and legitimacy. The assumptions upon which Army Berlin’s leadership based its programs and efforts were American in context, and certainly influenced by the cultural, social, and political beliefs which existed in American society in the period reviewed.

Nye’s 2011 work, *The Future of Power*, described the latest version of his power types and important secondary elements of the use of power which influence this analysis of Army Berlin’s implementation practices in the city to shape public opinion and interact with their neighbors to achieve smart power outcomes. Nye’s three aspects of relational power, which he named commanding change, controlling agendas, and establishing preferences, were relevant to Army Berlin’s estimation and selection processes in practicing a legitimate and moral foreign policy. Nye asserted that a policymaker wishing to exert smart power, which is by definition successful in its outcome, must also consider these three aspects in the reverse order of traditional, Machiavellian power selection. “A policymaker should consider preference formation and agenda framing as means of shaping the environment before turning to the first, or command, face of power.”
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4 Nye, *The Future of Power*, 84. These qualities of culture, political values, and foreign policies are the three basic resources Nye contends are the basis for a nation’s soft power. This specificity was not developed fully in Nye’s earliest works referring to soft power and smart power, and is found most clearly in this 2011 work.

5 Ibid., 10-11.

This chapter demonstrates that Army Berlin exercised all three of Nye’s aspects of relational power in its interactions with West Berlin’s civic and political leadership. Over the course of the Berlin Wall’s existence, Army Berlin adapted to changes in both American and German social, political, and cultural life and sought to apply policy processes that considered Berliner input. It responded, as bureaucracies must, in hierarchical fashion to many of the requests from Berliners for accommodations or adaptations to military and social behaviors.

In recognition of its primary hard power mission, in situations where conflict existed between Berliners and Americans, the unit’s military needs took precedence. However, well before Nye refined his power types and aspects, Army Berlin’s command made attempts to address conflicts by acting in the relational power order Nye considered evidence of smart power. Whenever possible, Army Berlin reserved its occupation status, the source of its command power, as the last form of relational power exerted. The erection of the Berlin Wall, which forced reform in the military and diplomatic structure of Berlin, assisted in another important practice in West Berlin, which was instrumental in Army Berlin’s pre-Nye relational power practices.

Army Berlin, following its establishment of a new German-American Committee in 1962, gained an important new tool in practicing smart power policy. This formal network, which had its first meeting on July 13, 1962, grew into an invaluable asset to Army Berlin for the remainder of its service in the city. Through this regular exchange of issues with West Berlin’s political and civic leadership, Army Berlin gained a valuable institutionalized program to select policy actions and exert relational power beyond their occupational command power.
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7 “German-American Committee Report, July 13, 1962,” unattributed, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
The committee provided a public good through a formal network which developed bonding between its participants, enhancing what Robert D. Putnam refers to as thick trust, the form of trust “embedded in personal relations that are strong, frequent, and nested in wider networks.” Among its many functions, the German-American Committee became a resource that allowed Army Berlin to gather important social, cultural, and political information on West Berlin, particularly as it dealt with social concerns in the city, which included juvenile delinquency, crime, drug use, and many other challenges.

As West Berlin experienced social and political changes across Army Berlin’s duty period from 1961 to 1994, the focus of this study, the unit became further engaged in its assistance to West Berlin’s leaders in their civic goals, to the extent that the unit had the resources to do so without impairment of its military capabilities. In some instances, Army Berlin’s inability to provide assistance caused noticeable stress in the relationship, while cultural differences and perceptions, apparent on both sides of the relationship, interfered with the effectiveness of programs attempted by the committee. While the German-American Committee was not the only avenue of official American efforts to exercise soft power, it connected Army Berlin’s command lines more effectively to West Berlin’s policymaking bodies.

Army Berlin’s command elements tasked with establishing and maintaining Good Neighbors relations with their fellow Berliners were primarily located in the office of Community Relations and the Public Affairs Office. The Community Relations office acted as an official intermediary between the Berliner public and Army Berlin, and often officially addressed formal or informal networks as the spokesperson for the United States Commander, Berlin. In
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In the case of the Public Affairs Office (PAO), it concentrated on the promotion of positive press accounts of Army Berlin’s efforts in both roles as Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors. Additionally, the PAO acted as a central informational link between Army Berlin’s command and its subordinate units with regard to their mandatory participation in efforts to project soft power.

In the case of unofficial or spontaneous examples of American behavior as Good Neighbors, the PAO coordinated press accounts for the Berlin Observer, Army Berlin’s unit newspaper, as well as the European edition of The Stars and Stripes. In regard to the press in Berlin, it coordinated with several West Berlin newspapers and other periodicals to provide access to units or individuals for positive accounts. It monitored and translated relevant stories that appeared in the West Berlin free press for Army Berlin command review, whether positive or negative. In its coverage of the state-run East Berlin press, it also translated stories relevant to Army Berlin, which were predictably negative in assessment of the Allies, and stories on Americans were particularly noted.

Outside the official Arm Berlin command structure, organized in formal networks governed by United States Army policies, another group of “unofficial ambassadors” implemented their unique forms of cultural, political, and foreign policy influence in distinctly American ways. Alvah examines the military family, particularly the wives and children, in their role in projecting soft power. However, Army Berlin’s operational area of deployment in the Cold War’s front lines intensified the scrutiny and expectations of all members of the

---

9 Donna Alvah, *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War, 1946-1965*, (New York: New York University Press, 2007). Alvah’s label “Unofficial Ambassadors” applied to the full population of the military communities reviewed in her study. Her study focuses primarily on the roles of gender and race in the period of the immediate occupations in Germany and Okinawa up to 1965 and advances the concept of Nye’s power types in this regard. The scope of the study does not incorporate any significant review of Berlin, and while the time period briefly overlaps, making her observations relevant upon the earlier period up to 1965, it does not match this examination’s goals.
military community, including these critical members of the command acting in the role of Good Neighbors. In their approach to extend the American examples of liberal internationalism and democratic principles, the members of Army Berlin’s military community acted in behaviors similar to Alvah’s military families.

Participating in voluntary associations engaged internally with other military family members, they supported the hard power of American foreign policy through bonding networks that served the needs of the military community itself. Externally, their efforts at building social capital bridging networks that extended into the Berliner community served to connect individuals who normally belonged to separate social, ethnic, or cultural spheres into regular association. Actions of civic virtue in the city, a valuable “public good,” were often the means by which Army Berlin connected with their neighbors, in both official and unofficial modes.

An important clarification on the use of social capital theory in this chapter’s analysis is warranted prior to engaging the historical record on Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors. As it is applied to the behaviors that occur in the projection of soft power, where attractive cultural and political policies that support a moral and legitimate foreign policy are Nye’s criteria, American values, historical myths, and contemporary narratives in the Cold War play an important role in the story. This historical assessment is not engaged in analyzing the validity of these beliefs, as they are the subject of a much broader discussion on issues that are beyond the scope offered here.10

---

The crucial point to consider is not the substantiation of the views and belief systems of Army Berlin’s members in any period of its covered service, but instead to acknowledge these beliefs and values, and their role in defining their own judgment of a moral and legitimate foreign policy. Additionally, social capital theory is often applied in the context of a specific population and its interactions, and less likely to be a tool for assessing cross-cultural experiences or as a comparative methodology, although there are relevant exceptions. Army Berlin’s commanders, soldiers, and their family members approached their Berliner neighbors in their task as Good Neighbors based upon their understanding of a functional, liberal democracy’s prerequisite behaviors, and these efforts began at command level.

In the early period of the new official formal association, Army Berlin’s German-American Committee, the command elected to rely upon an aspect of relational power that Nye described as controlling agendas, where one actor or group takes advantage of its ability to set

American frontier themes were encouraged regularly by Army Berlin, and are particularly relevant in the story of how Germans view Americans in the period.

As examples of Social capital theory’s use in a comparative manner, see first Eric M. Uslaner, “Morality Plays: Social capital and moral behavior in Anglo-American democracies,” In Social Capital and European Democracy, Jan W. vanDeth, Marco Maraffi, Kenneth Newton, and Paul Whitely, eds. (London: Routledge, 1999), 213-239. Uslaner compared three nations, the United States, Canada and Great Britain, in moral behaviors, the role of reciprocal trust in the societies, and what shapes it in each society. Uslaner concluded that, in his three studied countries, strong moral codes in a society are important in the formation of voluntary associations slightly more than an individual motivation to secure reciprocal trust. In a separate study of a different set of nations, Sweden, Germany, and the United States, based upon the World Values Survey sets of 1981 and 1990, Stolle and Rochon investigated the link between associational membership and social capital and particularly questioned the assumptions of de Tocqueville and Max Weber on the exceptionalism of American associative behaviors. In summation, the team found that the three nations had similar powerful effects upon levels of trust in political associations; that the three nations also had similar outcomes in overall translation of associative behavior upon generalized social capital (each with distinct differences in where the benefits of social capital are delivered); and finally, that social capital theory’s central premise that associational membership creates generalized trust is valid in all three countries. The only significant difference between the compared countries is that, in the case of the U.S., generalized trust was enhanced in all forms of associational membership tested (Community, Cultural, Economic, Group Rights, Political, Private interest), while Sweden and Germany each failed to translate generalized trust through all forms of association. See Dietlind Stolle and Thomas R. Rochon, “The Myth of American Exceptionalism: A three-nation comparison of associational membership and social capital.” In Social Capital and European Democracy, Jan W. vanDeth, Marco Maraffi, Kenneth Newton, and Paul Whitely, eds., (London: Routledge, 1999), 192-209.
the rules or framework for discussions on issues. The German-American Committee was a creation of Army Berlin, not developed through the impetus of West Berlin’s leadership, placing Army Berlin in the superior power position. This fact is not meant to suggest that the civic leaders of the city did not wish for more consistent or effective forms of interactions with Army Berlin to achieve political goals. It was likely, however, that the occupation period experience of fifteen years, which ultimately left the Allies in control of much of the way in which they interacted with Berliners, had not conditioned them for this new form of association.

To the extent that Army Berlin’s command desired to construct a new formal network and communicated this fact to West Berlin’s civic leadership, this strong request may have been received more likely as a form of Nye’s most forceful aspect of relational power, commanding change. The initiative was, in effect, a new manner of relationship for both sides of the table which required some level of adjustment.

Prior to the second recorded meeting of the full German-American Committee, scheduled for March 28, 1963, Army Berlin’s internal group, the “Commander’s Community Relations Advisory Council,” met to agree upon its emphasis to control the agenda. This meeting was a refresher on the results of the first meeting of July 13, 1962, in which formative ideas on meeting frequency and sub-committees remained unresolved. This advisory council, comprised only of Americans, also included several representatives from Mission Berlin, and together it designed specific recommendations for presentation to their Berliner counterparts in the full German-American Committee. The advisory council voted to recommend that the full German-American Committee meet on a regularly scheduled quarterly basis, and proposed that it establish
permanent “working committees in welfare, education, and fair housing practices.”

Additionally, the Americans formulated an offer to construct two shelter houses in the Grunewald, Berlin’s sprawling park which also contained military ranges and maneuver training space critical to Army Berlin. To insure public credit for Army Berlin as Good Neighbors, the proposal included a presentation ceremony and plaques “identifying them as a Berlin Brigade contribution for the Berliners.”

This first offer by Army Berlin to construct two log shelter houses in the American section of the Grunewald was met by the Berlin representatives with appreciation, who also took advantage of this new opportunity to exercise their own relational power. Wilhelm Zerndt, Deputy Mayor of Neukölln, stated that “this should not only be discussed with the Berlin Forestmasters, but also the Berlin Association of Architects, who should participate in the planning and building in order to make this shelter fit from the architectural point of view. The Berlin Office for Construction (Senat for Building and Construction) should participate in the project.”

What had originated as an internal Army Berlin project envisioned as a gift of two shelter houses to the Berliners in their own park now involved at least three municipal bureaucratic structures in Berlin. In this small, first step, Zerndt had exercised West Berlin’s most available relational power, the aspect of establishing preferences through this new formal associative network. This project was ultimately scheduled for completion in 1964, supervised by Grunewald’s German Forestmasters, who harvested the log materials from the park itself. Army

12 “Minutes of the Meeting of the Commander’s Community Relations Advisory Council on 6 March, 1963,” 24 May 1963, Information Division, Headquarters, United States Army, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
13 Ibid.
14 “Minutes of the Meeting of the German-American Committee of the Commander’s Community Relations Advisory Council on 28 March 1963,” 10 May 1963, Information Division, Headquarters, United States Army, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
Berlin’s combat engineers of Company A, 20th Engineer Battalion, who had been added to the unit temporarily due to the Berlin Wall crisis, would construct the shelters as a training project.15

While this was a small beginning project, it provided Army Berlin with the opportunity to support the Berliner’s interests in preserving both civilian access and the use of their beloved park. For the civic leaders of West Berlin, it sent a signal that Army Berlin recognized the political benefit for the elected leaders in addressing Army Berlin’s use and restriction of a significant portion of the park for ranges and training maneuver space. Army Berlin exercised smart power, exhibited in its offer to build shelter houses in the Grunewald and its increased willingness to be engaged in social issues in the city.

Additionally, Army Berlin requested the district mayors provide several dates on which its units could conduct their district parades, a reinforcement of the perception that Berlin’s district mayors possessed one of Nye’s preferred aspects of relational power, the ability to establish preferences.16 These were important details in making the new committee a formal network which might deliver the social capital benefits of bridging the gaps between the two bureaucratic structures of West Berlin’s municipal government and Army Berlin.

At this point in the German-American Committee’s development, there were still important issues ahead to be addressed, particularly in the turbulent next few decades. Over the course of its existence, the group built strong bonds between Army Berlin’s command staff and a broader group of civic leaders. For the Berliners, it offered them the opportunity to experience the American version of formal networks and associations, and to engage in a form of agency in issues that, prior to the committee’s establishment, often depended upon a smaller group of

15 “Grunewald Committee Report,” ca. 1964, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
policymakers. For Army Berlin, the feedback from Berlin’s elected representatives, gathered together regularly, provided them with important advantages in their policy planning. It sharpened their estimates and selection menus, and reduced the chances of unnecessary setbacks in their implementation and evaluation stages.

As street-level implementers of American foreign policy, Army Berlin’s voluntarily inclusion of West Berlin’s civic leaders in the 1960s into a process that presented a foreign policy based upon faith in its legitimacy and moral values was a contrast to the system across the Berlin Wall. This implementation was not without risks, as inevitable conflicts occurred, when Army Berlin exercised its discretion to act in contravention of clear signals from their partners’ preferences and reverted to use of its powers under the standing occupation authority. In these cases, Army Berlin depended not only on its reserve of accumulated generalized reciprocal thin trust, but also on the soft power of ongoing American efforts to improve the lives of Berliners through acts of civic virtue.

As the records of the first years of the German-American Committee demonstrate, the role of civic virtue, expressed in charitable acts and programs developed by Army Berlin in partnership with a web of Berlin associations and inside its own internal formal networks, played an important function in projecting soft power.17 Even as West Berlin had experienced its own revival as a result of not only American financial aid and the broader West German Wirtschaftswunder, the “economic miracle” of the 1950s, there were significant populations in West Berlin still suffering from situations of economic and personal debilitation.

17 The role of “civic virtue,” in Putnam’s formulation, is strongly related to social capital, but alone does not constitute it. One may act with an individual spirit reflecting “civic virtue,” but that does not necessarily require the existence of formal or informal networks or associational behaviors. See Putnam, Bowling Alone, 18-20.
American interest in the youth of Germany, and specifically Berlin, had achieved iconic status in both nations, perhaps most famously in the initiative of Gail S. Halverson, the first “Candy Bomber.” Like the young pilot during the Berlin Airlift, Army Berlin’s members who served during the Berlin Wall period exhibited particular interest in the youth of Berlin. In a special edition of Berlin Im Speigel issued in 1962, the relationship between the children of Berlin and American soldiers was contrasted with the other western Allies:

In the course of years we in Berlin have naturally learned to distinguish from each other the American, English, and French uniforms. We also know the difference between tanks of the U.S. Army and those of the British Army, but we really wouldn’t have to know that in order to distinguish the different groups of Allied troops from each other: if one of those armored monsters drives out somewhere and is within five minutes surrounded by a happy, noisy bunch of Berlin scamps for the “harvest,” then it is definitely an American vehicle.18

While the image of Americans throwing candy or gum from a tank as captured in Holz’ description supported the narrative connecting Halverson to the soldiers in the city, Army Berlin needed to implement an intentional Good Neighbors master plan which effectively gauged Berliner’s perceptions.

The German-American Committee became a powerful tool in focusing Army Berlin’s efforts at projecting soft power through more effective coordination of the military community members’ need to individually exhibit their own versions of moral and legitimate foreign policy. The committee, working through its permanent and ad hoc sub-committees, brought Army Berlin unofficially into the civil structure in a formal network that was an important institution of support to West Berlin’s government on the social problems in the city. How these issues were identified and addressed by the joint engagement of civilian Berliners and military Americans changed over the period of Army Berlin’s duty in review. The policies selected and

---

implemented often were influenced by American views on the importance of particular issues and the populations served.

*Army Berlin and Young Berliners: Ghosts of the Wandervogel*

The historical context of the role of the young in Nazi Germany was a particularly important factor in Army Berlin’s efforts to develop programs and connections between Americans and West Berlin’s youth, constructively and in purposeful implementation. It was commonly acknowledged that the hope for the future of Germany depended upon many factors, and the youth of Germany were at the top of the list in terms of political and social efforts to construct a democratic nation. In the divided and isolated city, Army Berlin bore no small responsibility for projecting a moral and legitimate American foreign policy which would specifically be attractive to German youth. The first step required informed assessments gathered from knowledgeable theorists in order to select and implement policy.

In Walter Laqueur’s *Young Germany: A History of the German Youth Movement*, published in 1962, the pre-Nazi developments in Germany’s independent youth movements were examined as Laqueur sought to understand the link between Germany’s recent tragic past and the early post-war youth movements, a question on the minds of Germany’s leaders and its occupying allies.\(^\text{19}\) In a historical irony for Army Berlin and its own interest in the current youth of Germany, Laqueur located the birthplace of the *Wandervogel* movement, his primary subject

in the period, in the Steglitz Rathskeller, one of Army Berlin’s six districts in its occupation sector.\(^\text{20}\)

This early movement was organized as a formal network in the rural suburb of Berlin around 1902, complete with regulations and hierarchies, although not in the form of association officially recognized in Wilhelm’s Germany. The characteristics of the members of the local groups that were loosely linked to each other varied widely, and in the preface to the book, R.H.S. Crossman referred to the *Wandervogel* groups as often *völkisch* (racist) and in all cases, ‘*nationalgesinnt,*’ or “passionately nostalgic for the lost territories in the East and contemptuous of the ‘liberalism’ they associated with Weimar.”\(^\text{21}\) This attitude toward the inter-war democracy in Germany remained fresh upon the minds of policy-makers, American and German alike.

According to Laqueur, the early *Wandervogel* included a relationship with another formal association for guidance and political support, “an *Eufrat* (Parents and Friends Advisory Council), which undoubtedly helped to remove many obstacles. Above all, it made it much easier for the *Wandervogel* to be recognized by the school authorities.”\(^\text{22}\) Later, a competing group of dissidents, unhappy with the direction of the movement and its leadership, took the next step in Wilhelmenian Germany, by appropriating the name and officially registering itself as “a new group, ‘*Wandervogel*, registered association in Steglitz.’”\(^\text{23}\)

The practice of constructing a formal network, as Putnam notes, does not always constitute a “social good,” as associative behaviors may be used for malevolent purposes.\(^\text{24}\) In the context of the early *Wandervogel* movement described by Laqueur, its origins in the youth of middle class Wilhelmenian Germany, where progress to a liberal democracy had been stunted by

\(^{20}\) Ibid., 17-18.

\(^{21}\) Ibid., xviii.

\(^{22}\) Ibid., 19.

\(^{23}\) Ibid., 20.

the reign of Wilhelm and the policies of Bismarck, strongly influenced its development. Laqueur considers the *Wandervogel* a rejection of bourgeois lifestyle, and instead it focused upon a romanticized, mythic Germany of nature.

The development of kinship and culture inside the group, including its own language and symbols, were some of the traits of the early movement which appealed to a group of young Germans not previously connected to religious or political groups. From this formal network sprang various offshoots and competitor youth groups, impacted by reactions to the German experience in World War I, the fall of the monarchy and revolution, the threat of communism, and even the competition of the German branch of the Boy Scouts. Another group which was developed by Englishman John Hargrave in 1920, known as “Kibbo Kift, the Woodcraft Kindred,” taught tribal crafts such as “how to build wigwams, make tom-toms, and read a trail,” drawn from Native American skills, also developed its own following in Germany.25

Ultimately, the *Wandervogel* movement, individualistic in aspiration but expressed in informal networks that were transformed in most cases into more formal associations, was superseded by the collective mentality of the *Bünde*. This caused the local, limited *Wandervogel* groups to be drawn together into a larger form of association that possessed more political power than the individual groups themselves.26 This larger association of youth movement groups retained its anarchic character due to its lack of universally accepted hierarchies, which resulted in continual struggles by factions and leaders to define the social and political goals of the German youth *Bünde*.

Laqueur argues that the youth of Germany found their associative powers most rewarding during the social upheavals in German society. In particular, rejection of the Weimar Republic

25 Laqueur, *Young Germany*, 136-137.
26 Ibid., 229-230.
was a common theme, even among radically different groups. The fertile ground for the distrust of a liberal and democratic Germany, preserved in the numerous mutations of the original *Wandervogel* movement throughout the 1920s and early 1930s, included youth groups on both extremes of the political spectrum.

This historical assessment by Laqueur in his 1962 study of the pre-World War II non-religious youth group development had implications in the contemporary designs of programs meant to avoid the disastrous outcomes of the earlier period. In his closing section on the youth landscape in Germany in the post-war period, Laqueur describes a paradox in the rebirth of youth Bünde in West Germany in the fifteen years following the end of World War II:

> The old songs are still sung, the old books read and the old stories told…there are summer and winter camps, night attacks on other groups and attempts to steal their banners…The closely knit community is giving place to the ordinary youth club, making fewer demands on the individual. This development is often (but mistakenly) called the ‘Americanization’ of youth; what it really represents is modernization- the evolving of ways of living more suitable, for better or worse, to modern industrial society.27

Laqueur’s analysis of the state of German youth in the period contemporary to the Berlin Wall and Army Berlin’s duty appeared to be shared in the efforts of both the municipal authorities in West Berlin and Army Berlin, who developed a closer working relationship after the establishment of the full German-American Committee in 1962. Whether it was understood as the cultural “Americanization” of Germany’s post-Nazi youth efforts, or the broader historical sweep of “modernization,” Army Berlin expended significant resources to project soft power to the young. How it deliberately designed the full German-American Committee, envisioned from the beginning to address important civic and social problems, paved the way for the long-term relationship.

---

27 Ibid., 221-222.
Once the formal rules and policies on the structure and format of the primary body began to take shape under the guidance and authority of Army Berlin itself, a transition to a forum that provided West Berlin’s leadership more access to Army Berlin’s estimation, selection, and implementation processes evolved. At the same time, Army Berlin increased its own soft power capabilities by formalizing a structured process in which it would assess the appropriate relational power strategy to solve a problem. These ranged from the available coercive-based form (commanding change) which derived from its occupation status to the softer practices of designing the discussion (controlling agendas) or even attempting to convince the West Berliners to accept Army Berlin’s preferred or acceptable outcomes (establishing preferences). Army Berlin went further than establishing a high-level talking club to assuage the elite leadership’s need to appear connected to American decision-makers; it agreed to joint sub-committees that emphasized West Berlin’s preferences, and the committee that held responsibility for youth issues was especially active.

The German-American Committee’s sub-committee on recreation is an example of a formal network which bridged the different bureaucratic structures that existed in West Berlin between Army Berlin and Berliners. Prior to the establishment of this group, Army Berlin’s recreation facilities and youth programs had no significant formal association practices which regularly included West Berlin representation. Since the beginning of the occupation, Army Berlin had interacted with the West Berlin municipal programs for Berlin’s youth primarily in a sporadic and uneven basis, relying upon the West Berliners to identify their needs and request assistance. This practice, however benevolent it might have been, appeared less as a partnership between committed institutions and instead, reduced West Berlin’s civic leadership to assume
the role of dependent. The command decision to allow Berliners use of its functioning property for recreation was an important signal to its German committee partners.

These American facilities provided Army Berlin’s soldiers and families critical opportunities in West Berlin for relaxation in the city, cut off from the broader possibilities Americans had in West Germany. They included service clubs, recreational areas, and sports fields, and in regard to American youth, the American Youth Association (AYA) was well integrated. Located in American-controlled complexes or generally off-limits to Berliners, they were viewed by the Germans as potential additional resources for use and coordination through Army Berlin’s civilian directors for support. However, without the action of Army Berlin’s command to enact German-friendly policies, there could be no improvement.

In the second meeting of the committee following its establishment and appointments, the emphasis Berliners placed upon the youth and elderly population was evident. In reply to a request from the separate sub-committee on welfare asking for its peer-committee’s agreement to make several requests of the American infrastructure for better support of the elderly, the recreation committee agreed that:

(2) senior citizens are automatically welcome to all programs sponsored by the German youth centers, as are the parents of the youngsters; (3) that the senior citizens could be invited to more activities sponsored by the American recreation centers. However, when such invitations are extended, the host recreation center should carefully select and guide soldier participants.

The stipulation upon the directors of the American service clubs to insure that they screen, train, and supervise soldier volunteers who were willing to assist the elderly Berliners recognized the potential for negative interactions, an outcome in neither community’s interests in the expansion of access. For their own part, the elderly were restricted to “passive, or directed, activities, such

28 “Resume of the 23 June Meeting of the Recreation Sub-committee at White Rose Inn,” 28 July, 1964, Information Division, Headquarters, United States Army, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
29 Ibid., 2.
as shows, etc. due to their age.”30 From this early beginning in bridging another network of Germans and Americans in an associative behavior, the role of Good Neighbors performed by Army Berlin’s members through this committee expanded the chances for cultural and social contacts.

The recreation sub-committee, which emphasized relations between the young, sought to integrate German youth programs with the facilities that served the families and children of Army Berlin. The joint German and American group designed its early bonding and bridging activities through promotion of traditional forms of civic virtue, supported through Army Berlin’s infrastructure. It was significantly dependent upon Army Berlin’s soldiers to provide both skilled and unskilled labor on a wide variety of projects and initiatives, with special emphasis on the young.

An example of a program which offered Army Berlin’s troops the opportunity to engage in charitable activities which promoted their Good Neighbors role and was supported by unit involvement was a Christmas initiative under the German-American committee’s sub-committee on welfare. According to Herr Schnitzer, West Berlin city council, “Operation Toy Box… showed again a wonderful German-American cooperation. More than 5800 toys have been collected. Most of the dolls were repaired by the aged in old people’s homes. The toys will be packaged and distributed in each district soon.”31

This toy drive engaged Army Berlin’s troops in a number of roles, which included staffing static collection locations and providing transportation of the toys, primarily second-hand donations, to a central Army Berlin collection point. Once the toys which required repair

30 Ibid.
31 “Minutes of German-American Committee Meeting, 10 December, 1964,” 28 January 1965, Information Division, Headquarters, United States Army, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
were complete, the were added to the rest of the toys and Army Berlin separated them into lots, and delivered by Army Berlin trucks to West Berlin’s district offices for final presentation to the children identified in need of these second hand gifts.

This triangle of multi-generational and multi-cultural participants, which included elderly Berliners in the repair of dolls, Army Berlin’s volunteer soldiers as logistical support and repair work at Army Berlin’s Ordnance shop, and finally Berlin’s youth as recipients, served as an effective early program of the German-American Committee for American soft power projection.

The extension of civic virtue by Army Berlin, absorbed into the budget of the unit as it impacted transportation costs and man hours, combined a bonding impact between two societies that shared a common, if not universal religious belief system. Importantly, a positive bridging network was strengthened as new associations were made, where at both the committee level and the less formal interactive volunteer associational groups repeated contacts were made to make thick trust possible.

The success of “Operation Toy Box” during the Christmas season of 1964, with its spirit of cooperation and positive feedback from both sides of the German-American Committee, marked the zenith of this program focused on the collection of used toys for distribution in the districts. Over the next few years, a number of factors limited the success of the program, which included the decreasing demand for used toys in a West Berlin that continued its economic improvements, as well as diminishing donations. Additionally, Army Berlin had run into a manpower strength shortage which appeared in 1966. Major Lillian E. Baker, Community Relations Officer for USCOB, summarized the problem, stating that, “Operation Toy Box had been valuable in terms of German-American working relationships…U.S. Army personnel is
now low as far as bus drivers and ordnance repair shop workers… Operation Toy Box should be
reevaluated in regard to over-all personnel problems.”

There is no additional explanation in the record for Army Berlin’s personnel shortages, but the period aligns with the continued demand for troops in South Vietnam, which impacted USAREUR in its overall manpower assignments. Major Baker’s first comment on the importance of the working relationships between Germans and Americans provides the opportunity to consider social capital in its full context, beyond “Operation Toy Box” and its civic or moral virtues which enhanced American soft power. The value that Baker acknowledged was associational, organized through a formal network on two different levels, the full German-American Committee and its recreation sub-committee. Through these, important bridging behaviors could be converted into bonding experiences for Germans and Americans.

The basis for the possibilities which allow individuals to develop thick trust - as well as the broader social and cultural effects of a generalized, reciprocal thin trust between Berliners and members of Army Berlin through associate positive perceptions of the unknown “other” - were embedded in “Operation Toy Box.” Major Baker, the senior American representative in attendance for the sub-committee meeting, recognized the Smart Power policy involved.

“Operation Toy Box” was held for the last time during the Christmas season of 1970. By that time, the program had devolved into essentially a junk collection drive in which the Berlin districts performed most of the repairs and distribution, while Army Berlin provided

32 “Minutes of the German-American Sub-Committee on Recreation on 7 September 1966,” Information Division, Office of the U.S. Commander, Berlin, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.

33 The manpower issues in USAREUR during this period were exacerbated by numerous factors, including the limitations of support personnel in military occupation specialties, another form of allocation constriction due in part to the post-1965 Americanization of the conflict by President Johnson. For a different perspective, see James H. Willbanks, “The Legacy of the Vietnam War for the U.S. Army,” in America and the Vietnam War: Re-examining the Cultural History of a Generation, Andrew Wiest, Mary Kathryn Barbier, and Glenn Robins, eds. (New York: Routledge, 2010), 271-290.
transportation of the collected items. It was discontinued by the unanimous vote of the six district representatives who commented that “thirteen truckloads of trash were hauled off to the refuse area.”

At first glance, the death of “Operation Toy Box” denied Army Berlin an ongoing civic virtue program fostered by cooperative behaviors in a formal network, and might signify a defeat for the new German-American Committee. However, as Major Baker correctly noted in her frank assessment of the future of the program as early as 1966, the needs of Berlin were changing as well, shaped by important cultural and political forces.

Issues pertaining to an older cohort of American and Berlin youth were raised in the German-American sub-committee on recreation in the summer of 1966, and in this case, the discussion records illuminated how these formal networks functioned in more complicated and contentious situations. Cultural and social differences between German and American solutions to the problems of juvenile delinquency were exhibited, informed particularly by distinct historical experiences and guided by contemporary theory regarding the connections of youth behaviors and adult criminality.

Like other American military units serving overseas, Army Berlin sought to exercise control of both its soldiers’ conduct and the behavior of their family members, particularly as it impacted relations with West Berliners. This emphasis, a critical practice in protecting its Good Neighbors role, expressed itself through military law under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). There were, however, significant gaps which existed between the forms of authority a military commander could exert on a soldier and those he could apply to his family members to

34 “Minutes of the German-American Sub-Committee on Recreation Meeting of 11 January, 1971,” Adjutant General Division, Headquarters, Berlin Brigade, box 29, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
discourage deviant behavior. As a force governed by Allied occupation authority, Army Berlin retained special legal status compared to its fellow contemporary Cold War military communities in West Germany, and this distinction remained until the 1990 Germany-wide vote for reunification. This reality, not always a popular fact in the city, provided Army Berlin particular leverage in dealing with issues of dispute over deviant behavior, or in some cases, perceptions of inequities in opportunity between Berliners and Americans.

The issue of the behavior of military family members as Good Neighbors in the city was particularly challenging regarding the children of soldiers and civilian employees. Army Berlin considered its role in the Cold War as an elite representative of American ideals and enforced its military regulation authority aggressively in recognition of this fact. The impact of a sub-standard soldier on the battlefield had clear consequences and affected the mission readiness of the force. In its mission to project smart power, which required retaining its soft power influence, discipline issues in the youth of Army Berlin were often a topic of German and American discussion, including at the level of the German-American Committee.

During the German-American sub-committee on recreation meeting held on June 15, 1966, Herr Heinz Frick, of the Schöneberg Youth Office, stated that it was important “that the

35 For a study on the role of different forms of controls Army commanders possessed and exercised in Cold War Germany over their troops and family members, as well as the limits of the forms of punishment, see John P. Hawkins, Army of Hope, Army of Alienation: Culture and Contradiction in the American Army Communities of Cold War Germany (Westport CT: Praeger, 2001). Hawkins, an anthropologist and Army Reserve Officer, conducted a study in West Germany over a two year period, including interviews of enlisted, Non-commissioned Officers, Officers, and their family members regarding a wide range of issues including morale, health and wellness, and unit discipline, among other concerns. Although Hawkins’ field work was accomplished near the end of the period under study here and not focused on Army Berlin, the mechanisms of authority granted under the UCMJ, as well as the other non-judicial and behavioral remedies exercised by commanders to motivate soldiers to keep their family members within community standards are applicable. Hawkins also explains the relationship between West German laws in his time period under the Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) which applied in West Germany, not in West Berlin, where occupation authority was not rescinded prior to the Reunification vote in 1990.
American community be familiarized with the terms of the German Youth Protection Law.”

Major Baker reminded Herr Frick that the punishments under the law were directed at guardians of the minors who allowed “misbehaviors,” or “with the owners of establishments where such misbehavior is permitted to occur.”

As Army Berlin’s soldiers were exempt from German law in their occupation status, the German Youth Protection Law possessed no power of enforcement. Herr Werner Dolata, of the Zehlendorf Youth Office, attempted to support Frick’s inquiry as he noted that “American soldiers are not the only ones who contribute to occasional strained German-American relations.”

As Dolata advanced his case, it became apparent that his inquiry was derived from a perceived inequity in the treatment of minors based upon the legal status afforded Americans through their exclusion from parental responsibility for youth who violated Berlin curfews. Dolata acknowledged that “German curfew laws, for example, do not apply to American children. During the German-American Volksfest, German children felt resentful because they had to leave at a certain hour, while American children were permitted to remain.”

Community Relations Officer Baker, directly attached to the office of USCOB, offered to arrange a meeting between Dolata and an American legal representative to address his concerns and explain the American position, an offer accepted by Dolata.

In this case, the sixth annual German-American Volksfest, the premier yearly event Army Berlin engaged in to share an attractive American culture and promote Army Berlin’s role as Good Neighbors, became an issue over the disparate treatment of American youth. Short of an
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Army Berlin command decision to voluntarily attempt to enforce a similar restriction upon its dependent youth, there was no likelihood of a solution to Frick and Dolata’s complaints. West Berlin Polizei had no authority to enforce curfew law on Americans, even if the German-American Volksfest was not held on American military installation property. Neither could they cite the parents of a child in violation of the “Youth Protection Laws,” passed in 1957 in West Germany and considered by West Berlin’s municipal government as valid in their community.

There are several points to consider in this incident in relation to Army Berlin’s use of the German-American Committee, and in this case, the recreation sub-committee, in reinforcement of its ability to retain control of the issue without acceding to Frick and Dolata’s efforts to force a change in national policy. First, Army Berlin, which proactively established the German-American Committee in 1962, had provided West Berlin’s elected leaders and appointed bureaucrats access to an associative, formal network in which Nye’s aspects of relational power were utilized regularly.

For their part, Berliners - in this case Frick and Dolata - exercised their authority to speak on behalf of their constituencies, and, if unsuccessful in their attempt to persuade Army Berlin to modify its behaviors, they at least had the opportunity to express preferences. Their statements, recorded in the minutes of the sub-committee, were evidence of their faithful advocacy to address a social concern and also provided cover for their district’s elected local officials. There was little chance that Army Berlin would accept their preference, as it required a policy diminishing one of the central sources of American influence in Berlin, its role as an occupying force, exempt from West Berlin’s authority.

This is an example of the consistent practice of Army Berlin which regularly attempted to negotiate on issues that could be handled through less coercive aspects of relational power, while
it reserved the right to exercise its occupation authority to command change - or in this case - no change. Predating Nye’s counsel in 2011, Army Berlin regularly exercised Nye’s preferred tactics of controlling agendas of the discussion or simply by establishing preferences for selection in negotiations. In this situation, Herr Dolata’s goal to “assure equity of treatment for German and American children,” which required Army Berlin to adopt enforcement mechanisms to match West German law, was not an option for policy revision.\textsuperscript{41} American society had its own issues with juvenile delinquency in 1966, reflecting the influence of the series of sensational claims made by social scientists in the 1950s which pointed particularly to the negative impact of mass culture on youth. There is little doubt these concerns resonated with the generation of leaders in command of Army Berlin, yet national policy could not be altered.\textsuperscript{42}

This threat to German society was also a focus of conservative West German political leaders, who viewed the influence of mass culture from a different historical perspective, and lead to the adoption of the Federal Republic’s “Youth Protection Law” in 1957. The curfew issue, one of the more enforceable methods designed to control the misbehaviors of the young, was a concrete action which Berlin’s leaders considered valuable in preserving stability in the city.

\textit{Army Berlin to Mayors: West Berlin is not Saigon}

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{42} The purported links between juvenile delinquency and post-war crime waves in America were investigated in the 1950s by various government agencies, particularly under the guidance of J. Edgar Hoover’s Federal Bureau of Investigation. Additionally, the U.S. Senate Subcommittee to Study Juvenile Delinquency in the United States, established in 1953 and chaired by Senator Estes Kefauver beginning in 1955, had the impact of placing the crisis at the front of public consciousness. Various factors were blamed for the apparent rise, including mass popular culture, under the influence of comic books, films, and books. An example of an influential study is Fredric Wertham’s \textit{Seduction of the Innocent}, (Port Washington NY: Kennikat Press, 1953). Wertham, a psychiatrist who was considered an expert on the threat mass culture posed to American society, particularly attacked the influence of comic books. For a critical analysis of the processes in which dubious theories on juvenile delinquency became linked to adult crime and the political interests invested in promoting them, see James Gilbert, \textit{A Cycle of Outrage: America’s Reaction to the Juvenile Delinquent in the 1950s}, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
Army Berlin’s full German-American Committee provided the Berliners additional opportunities to use this formal network as a format to gain Army Berlin’s support on even more serious social issues which plagued both communities. In its meeting held on June 13, 1975, two particular problems were brought by West Berlin’s representatives, who were a mix of the elected district mayors and councilors. The first issue brought to the table after the customary introductory pleasantries was the recent fall of Saigon in April 1975, and the political repercussions in West Berlin, particularly in regard to the continued U.S. commitment to defend West Berlin.

Mayor Dr. Wolfgang Rothkegel, of district Zehlendorf, “felt that it was important to discuss the decision of the United States to withdraw from South Vietnam, since this decision had very deeply shocked most Berliners and created fear that America would not support this city in case of a crisis.” Rothkegel was a member of the Christian Democrats (CDU), the dominant center-right political party which traditionally had supported many American policies in Germany throughout the Cold War. He stated further that “leading members of his party even considered demonstrating against the new regime in South Vietnam but, being afraid that such a demonstration could be misunderstood by the population, decided not to.” In reply, Neukölln Mayor Dr. Heinz Stuecklen, a member of the primary opposition party to the CDU, the Social Democrats (SPD), “felt Berlin and South Vietnam could not be compared, due to the special agreement between the United States and Berlin.”

Brigadier General R. Dean Tice, Commander of the Berlin Brigade, in attendance as senior representative of the United States side, replied by reassuring the Berliners that:
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He would like to repeat what Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said during his recent visit to Berlin, assuring the determination of the American population and the U.S. Government to sustain its present position in Europe and Berlin...the U.S. Army is trained to be combat ready at any time to support the U.S. government’s position. He stated it was important for the Germans and Americans in Berlin to have this understanding and that the German-American Committee meeting was one means of reinforcing support.\footnote{Ibid.}

The concerns expressed by Mayor Rothkegel, that the United States might retreat from its commitment to West Berlin’s right of viability, were a question of American national will to retain Army Berlin in the city. General Tice’s response acknowledged the social capital purpose of the German-American Committee without explicitly stating its value in building thick trust in the city’s elite network. The committee, a formal network which succeeded in both bridging and bonding social capital goals, had operated successfully for over 13 years and provided Army Berlin the consistent opportunity to not only address Berlin’s social issues, but also to communicate the continued viability of Army Berlin as a combat force. Mayor Rothkegel, whether for the purpose of making a strategic statement on the record, or perhaps in a sincere inquiry into the usefulness and commitment of Army Berlin, offered General Tice the chance to unequivocally reassert American policy in Berlin.

For Army Berlin, although the tactical complications of their isolation from the mass of its own army and NATO Allies in Western Europe remained, a period of “abnormal normalcy” had set in.\footnote{“1974 Annual Report of Major Activities, (Historical),” Headquarters, United States Army, Berlin, box 2, 14-15, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI. This Historical report, originally classified Secret, also provides details on the two-stage process in which the latest Quadripartite Agreement (QA) signed September 3, 1971, was implemented. Although that was the date that QA 3 Sep 71 was signed in Berlin by the four Ambassadors, it was not in effect until 0001 hours on June 4, 1972 after the separate agreement was signed, the Final Quadripartite Protocol (FQP) on June 3, 1972, which set the inner German agreements and protocols in force.} The character of the continuing harassments had changed, particularly since the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and the Soviet recognition of East Germany. However, as the 1974 Command Historical notes, in the face of continued provocations against both Allied and civilian access to West Berlin by the Soviets and the East Germans, America had not
reduced its force in West Berlin. The combined Army Berlin and U.S. Air Force personnel count at the end of 1974 numbered 6,130 individuals (including 1,207 Lodger Unit troops); of this number, Army Berlin constituted 3,899 permanent soldiers.⁴⁸ The count for dependents of the combined force of Army and Air Force was 6,129, one single person less than the military totals.⁴⁹

The German members of the full German-American Committee, as the senior representatives of their districts, were often the district mayors themselves. Although they could send an authorized representative, mayors normally hosted the meetings in one of the six districts in the American sector, held on a quarterly basis, and less often, the hosting task rotated to Army Berlin or the U.S. Air Force at Tempelhof. The regular interaction of these small groups of Army Berlin command officers and special representatives with their German counterparts made it possible to consider this group a bonding network, where repetitive interactions had established thick trust among a majority of the participants. However, this did not preclude the necessity to discuss difficult issues of the city in frank terms, and while the possibility of weakened American resolve was considered, there remained more pressing issues which threatened to damage Army Berlin’s image as Good Neighbors.

These relationships developed through this officially sanctioned formal network had welded Army Berlin deeper into the framework of Berlin’s social challenges, and during the trials of the late 1960s and early 1970s in the city, the German-American Committee again proved its usefulness. However, unlike the early occupation period, where Berlin Command had exercised complete authority in its own sector to foster a liberal, democratic system, by this time,
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much of that control had been returned to the Berliners themselves, aided by the committee’s work.

*The Downside of Soft Power: Hashish, Heroin, and “Hippies”*

West Berlin in the late 1960s and 1970s was no stranger to the impact of social unrest, and this included the effects of illegal drug use inside Army Berlin and in the wider Berliner community. The German-American Committee once again served an important role in preserving Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors image, even as the unit struggled with drugs in the force.

In 1974, Army Berlin experienced a marked decrease in its clinical positives for hashish usage in its force, totaling 130 registers, down from 244 in Calendar Year 1973. The decrease was credited not due to a particularly successful interdiction plan of available drugs, nor to its implemented programs for rehabilitation, but instead, the marketing and supply strategies of the drug dealers in West Berlin. “Readily available, the use of heroin in West Berlin was believed to be more wide-spread than ever before. Moreover, hashish was reportedly being kept off the market, at least to some extent, in an effort to induce ‘consumers’ to use hard drugs which provide higher profits for traffickers.” Unfortunately for Army Berlin, this was consistent with their figures for 1974, where Heroin clinical positives numbered 144, up from 133 in 1973. These internal figures, included in the classified historical report for 1974, were not only a concern to Army Berlin’s command, but they were also the topic of German-American Committee discussions over the course of this trying period.

---

50 Ibid., 165.  
51 Ibid., 164.  
52 Ibid., 165.
During the June 13, 1975 German-American Committee meeting, Neukölln district Mayor Stuecklen reported to the full committee on the progress of the Sub-committee for Drug Abuse, where he also “stated that heroin incidents are the biggest problem.”

Like their Army Berlin neighbors, the population in West Berlin was experimenting with legal pharmaceutical medications, alcohol, as well as the illegal and more addictive heroin. The Germans on the sub-committee were interested in Army Berlin’s efforts to address drug and alcohol abuse, and sought support for their own efforts in the West Berlin population. Beyond sharing strategies, they wished to access American public service films and radio announcements for their own use, and requested a screening of these resources at the RIAS office, which was supported by the American members subject to RIAS approval.

Dr. Stuecklen closed his remarks by stating that “he was glad the urine test ban was lifted by the U.S. Government early this year.” The sub-committee was congratulated on its work by Mayor Rothkegel of Zehlendorf, who noted that “it was very encouraging to hear of the progress of the Sub-committee for Drug Abuse since this problem has been discussed for the past 18 months.”

However, not every member of the full German-American Committee was disposed to consider the work of the sub-committee a success. U.S. Air Force Colonel Lajeunesse, the Vice-Commander of Tempelhof Central Airport (TCA), “said he could not understand why nothing was being done to prohibit the sale of drugs at the Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church.” In his response to Colonel Lajeunesse, Mayor Stuecklen complained that “it is especially difficult to
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catch the drug pushers. He believed ‘hippies’ congregate in a spot, as in any other big city, and in Berlin they use the Memorial Church area.”

In this case, we see a reversal of Nye’s aspects of relational power in regard to the normal dynamics of power in the committee. Army Berlin, as well as the co-located Air Force unit, was presumed to be the dominant legal authority in Berlin, based upon their rights of occupation. The armed forces of the United States in Berlin possessed not only the legal right to enforce occupational laws, but theoretically the resources to do so. However, they were not now in a position to command change, contrary to assumptions otherwise. Army Berlin’s repetitive efforts to exert soft power, to project a foreign policy that was both legitimate and moral, had changed the expectations of West Berlin’s municipal mayors and bureaucratic specialists.

As a street-level implementer of America’s interests, the Vice-Commander of Tempelhof Central Airport, one of the key historical symbols of American moral foreign policy and benevolence through the memory of the Berlin Airlift, found himself in an exasperating position. Neither able to command change, nor even to control the agenda, Colonel Lajeunesse was reduced to an attempt in which he could only establish his preference for priority and action. The impact of drugs on force readiness and morale, already a challenging task in the U.S. military in 1975, was a serious threat to the viability of both Army Berlin and Air Force Berlin.

It is worth noting that this is the same German-American Committee meeting which followed the April 1975 debacle in Saigon. On televisions around the world, America had retreated from South Vietnam in what appeared as a chaotic and ultimately shameful manner, leaving thousands of South Vietnamese allies behind to face the new communist government. Those images were no doubt in Mayor Rothkegel’s mind as he questioned the resolve of the
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United States to remain in Berlin. However, in regard to the threat to military readiness and
discipline illegal drug use had upon Army Berlin’s viability, its ability to succeed in its mission,
Mayor Stuecklen was less alarmed. Although he had rebutted Rothkegel for his undue alarm
over the American withdrawal from South Vietnam, it appeared he discounted the fact that the
“special agreement between the United States and Berlin” depended upon Army Berlin’s ability
to fight.59

There was no recorded statement from Berlin Brigade commander Tice on the issue after
the exchange, but it is clear from the order of other records in the meeting that he was in
attendance when this issue was discussed. The balance of power in Berlin, at least on this issue,
appeared to have shifted. It could be hypothesized that, in a comparable difficulty for the Soviets
in East Berlin, it is unlikely Soviet authorities would not have exercised their command power to
solve their problem. Mayor Steucklen neither denied Lajeunesse’s premise, nor did he feel
compelled to feign surprise in learning that “hippies” sold drugs in the center of the city with
impunity in a well-known public space.

In a subsequent meeting of the German-American Committee on June 25, 1976, Mayor
Stuecklen reported on the latest Sub-committee for Drug Abuse, held on April 29, 1976. Dr.
Stuecklen noted that “Berlin police reported that pharmacy burglaries had increased considerably
during the past few months. The main object of the burglaries were to obtain opiates and
morphine. The number of deaths due to overdoses of heroin reached 28-30 this year.”60 This
report, a year after the exchange over the “hippies” at Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church, made
no mention of the situation there. At this point, assessing these interactions regarding the issue

59 Ibid., 2.
60 “Minutes of the German-American Committee Meeting, 25 June 1976,” Department of the Army, Office of the
U.S. Commander, Berlin, Public Affairs Office, box 29, 1-2, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
of drugs, it appears that Army Berlin had ceded its moral authority to West Berlin’s leaders, and had implemented a “hands-off” neighbor’s policy on this critical issue.

Fortunately, the relationship between Army Berlin and its Berliner neighbors was reinforced by a much broader series of interdependent strands that were repeatedly renewed and adapted to meet the needs of both communities. The important institutional German-American Committee, developing thick trust at the elite strata in West Berlin and supporting the wider goal of gaining generalized reciprocal thin trust in the community, was balanced by a regular celebration of American cultural and historical myth and narrative.

The German-American Volksfest, the subject of Herr Dolata’s inquiries in 1966 over the inequity of the legal status of American youth in comparison to their Berliner peers, was an important form of cultural diplomacy for America in Cold War Berlin. As Benjamin Greene states in his study on the Volksfest, “For the U.S. Army in Berlin, the volksfest was the most important ‘community relations’ event of its annual public diplomacy campaign. While the German-American Committee established in 1962 built the solid formal networks that Army Berlin increasingly depended upon as it sought to project itself as a soft power platform in the leadership networks of West Berlin, the Volksfest democratized and amplified American culture in Berlin. In its deliberate and sustained practice of sponsoring the two week event, Army Berlin specifically took advantage of one of Nye’s three soft power resources a nation may possess, “its culture (in places where it is attractive to others).”
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While this annual festival was highly regarded by many people in both Army Berlin and the West Berlin population, its value in delivering returns in projecting the foreign policy benefits of the socially engaged version of Army Berlin as Good Neighbors was not without contention. Street-level bureaucrats in Army Berlin itself, responsible for their own policy implementation, occasionally found themselves in conflict over the festival’s purpose and impact in West Berlin.

*Scarves, Ties, and Bear Pins: What is Soft Power Worth in Deutschmarks?*

In a series of bureaucratic communications which began August 1, 1984 and ended in early February, 1985, fiscal disagreements in regard to the purpose of funds raised by Army Berlin through its annual *Volksfest* appeared regarding the Good Neighbor value of Army Berlin’s Community Relations spending. Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Office forwarded its requests for use of funds from the 1984 *Volksfest*, in order to establish its 1985 community relations budget.

The “Request for Financial Assistance” series of forms originally submitted by the PAO were a standard annual practice, forwarded by Army Berlin elements nearly immediately upon the close of the festival in the year prior to the upcoming year. This was a critical timeline, based upon Army Berlin precedent in distributions of profits into the West Berlin community beginning the following calendar year, and all requests were due by October 1, 1984, with a warning that “Requests should not be inflated for the pure sake of ‘padding.’”

In its original submission, PAO requested DM 4,000 for each of the six American sector District Mayors for use at their district’s discretion, as well as a general charity fund of DM 20,000 to be divided equally among ten charities named in 1985 based upon the needs in West
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Berlin. Each of these allocation formulas were standard annual practices prior to 1985, although the amounts varied. An additional DM 4,500 was requested for two medical facilities, the Klinikum Steglitz and the Oskar Helene Heim Hospital, consistent with donations in the past and reaffirmed by the personal pledge of Army Berlin’s Commanding General in 1984. Finally, PAO requested DM 13,000 to replenish its depleted stock of mementos popular with Berliners, including friendship Bear pins, ladies scarves and men’s ties with the unit crest, and DM 10,000 to fund the July 4, 1985 fireworks display. The total requested by PAO was DM 76,000, equivalent to $24,127, based upon the listed conversion rate of DM 3.15 to $1.00.

In his original reply dated January 24, 1985 to Lieutenant Colonel Robert E. Ahrens, the requesting PAO officer, Lieutenant Colonel James S. Davison, Deputy Chief of Staff, Community Affairs, informed Ahrens that Army Berlin’s Best Efforts Committee (BEC) had determined that the PAO request was approved. However, it was reduced to a total of $7,000, or DM 22,050, well below the DM 76,000 requested.

This drastic reduction in PAO access to Volksfest funds raised in 1984 resulted in Ahrens’ submission of a “Decision Paper” request on January 31, 1985. Sent to the office of the commander of Army Berlin, Major General John H. Mitchell, Ahrens made his case for the full requested amount, arguing that each of the donations were justified. Ahrens wrote that there were long traditions of annual remittances to the districts since the first Volksfest. The donations to the two West Berlin medical facilities had been promised by the Commanding General himself, and the pool of DM 20,000 for ten West Berlin charities served a valuable purpose in advancing Army Berlin’s interests, also with long historical and uninterrupted precedents.
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Additionally, the request for mementos, a seemingly large request at DM 13,000, was a significant restock of numerous items that were highly prized as gifts by West Berliners, which showed their connection to Army Berlin. Ahrens provided Davison pricing details on the products, and explained the large quantity discounts provided by their West German suppliers as a fiscally responsible decision for the items. Particularly important were the ladies scarves, the only item specifically for women, and which Army Berlin’s commanding general and the Berlin Brigade’s commander each kept at hand for the occasion of extending friendship to the women of West Berlin. These scarves, along with Army Berlin’s friendship pins displaying the Berlin Bear, the adopted mascot of Army Berlin from its host city, accounted for DM 8,000 alone.68

In the format of the “Decision Paper” submitted by Ahrens, a form of command appeal, the office which generated the disputed reduction offered its Non-concurrence to the request. Davison refused to alter his offer to the PAO, and provided his personal allocation suggestions on the PAO use of Volksfest funds. He recommended that the District Mayors each get DM 2,000, rather than the requested DM 4,000. In regard to the pool of money for charitable donations, requested in the amount of DM 20,000, Davison suggested a total of DM 10,000.

LTC Davison continued to deny the funds for the two medical facilities which occasionally provided care for American soldiers. The fact that they had been promised these funds by the Commanding General himself, included in the narrative of the original “Request for Financial Assistance” forms, did not seem to influence Davison’s consideration of withdrawing his non-concurrence to that portion of the issue. Finally, he recommended that both the fireworks and the mementos be paid for out of the Community Commander’s Contingency

68 Ibid.
fund. In closing, Davison offered his own opinion on the value of donations in the West Berlin community:

> The thought and appreciation behind a donation should not be how much it is, but the mere fact that it is being given. Therefore, a reduced amount should not be questioned nor do I think it ever will. I don’t feel we can get in the habit of donating the same amount each year, just because we did it in the past. The amount should fluctuate yearly.  

Fortunately for Ahrens and the PAO office, and especially the West Berlin district mayors, charities, and future recipients of ties, scarves and Bear pins, Major General Mitchell disagreed with Davison’s assessment of the value of these efforts at remaining West Berlin’s Good Neighbors. By February 12, 1985, Mitchell ordered Lt. Colonel Davison to honor the PAO request in full at DM 76,000, and to transfer funds immediately.

> The urgency of the transfer was another significant recognition of the importance of the relationships Army Berlin had fostered through its German-American Committee. For over 20 years without a lapse, Army Berlin had presented the district checks to the mayors at the February meeting of the German-American Committee, accompanied with great fanfare and recognition in the American and West Berlin press. The crucial relational meeting was scheduled for February 15, 1985, just three days after Mitchell’s reversal.

Contrary to Lt. Colonel Davison’s personal views, Army Berlin’s success in the city since the erection of the wall was in no small measure a reflection of the establishment of a series of formal networks and associative behaviors. The connection between charity, or civic virtue, and the Berliner’s acceptance of Americans as community members, fully invested in the city, was paramount to Army Berlin’s projection of smart power.
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At the command level, the full German-American Committee, in which the leadership of West Berlin and Army Berlin came together beginning in 1962 to regularly interact and build social capital, benefitted both Americans and Berliners. While the personal relationships which existed before the Berlin Wall were important, the fifteen years of occupation since the end of World War II had been managed through a less structured series of connections. In a relationship in which one side holds the command power, it is difficult for the subordinated group to share in the control of the agenda, or even to effectively establish preferences.

The German-American Committee, within just a few years of its formation in 1962, put in place mechanisms that provided Berliners their first opportunity to share in the agenda process, even if the path to commanding their own city was not yet within reach. The decision by Army Berlin to form the committee was fortuitous. As critical as the German-American Committee was in fostering new levels of trust at the elite level of Berlin society, there were numerous other officially-sanctioned Army Berlin programs to extend soft power as Good Neighbors. These programs provided a much broader population of Army Berlin’s members the chance to participate without gaining access to the small but influential formal network the German-American Committee represented.

Outside of the German-American Committee and its working sub-committees, Army Berlin maintained a series of ongoing programs, organized internally in the military units themselves, as well as in its support of networks, informal and formal, which sought to project American soft power. Like their military counterparts, these organizations were deeply invested in presenting an attractive American culture to the Berliners. In Army Berlin’s case, many of the organizations were national American associations, organized around formal regulations,
constitutional in form and democratic in practice, and often engaged in acts of civic virtue, similar to their military contemporaries.

The Armed Peace Corps: Christian Soldiers and Officers’ Wives

The acts of civic virtue by these Good Neighbor Americans were often focused specifically toward particular needs, as in the case of a movement to build homes for German orphans and mentally handicapped adults. This civic solution was originally organized by a formal West German network, the “Albert Schweitzer Children’s Village Association.” Their 1968 project in Hanau, West Germany, was the latest in a series of similar facilities built by the association in numerous towns in West Germany, including West Berlin. This movement, begun in 1954, built its first children’s village in 1959, in the Bavarian region near Schwabisch Hall, West Germany, with the assistance of U.S. Army Engineers. These villages, designed as single family homes in order to de-institutionalize the care of West German orphans and the handicapped, benefitted from American efforts in bridging the activities of American military-related formal networks with their German neighbors.

In the case of the Hanau project, numerous local American networks worked together to raise funds for the project by constructing Christmas Ginger-bread houses from plywood, which were then used by the buyer to build their own ginger bread houses. “American supporters of the sales campaign include the Hanau Officers Wives Club, Army Community Service, Roseland and Skyline NCO Clubs, and the Pioneer Post Exchange Toyland which are selling the houses.” This bridging practice between American and German formal networks, replicated across West Germany and in West Berlin over many decades, was an important additional
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resource for the projection of soft power in the USAREUR-wide role of Good Neighbors. Like their soldiers, the wives of the United States Army engaged in socially conscious activities which mirrored candidate John F. Kennedy’s earliest promotions of his proposed new national service plan. As national policy, these behaviors were embodied in the establishment of the Peace Corps, a program envisioned to project American influence through peaceful means, primarily in underdeveloped nations.

In a speech on November 2, 1960 as the campaign for the presidency came to a close, Kennedy acknowledged the role of the street level implementers of national foreign policy he envisioned for his administration without referring to the term:

> Whoever our next President may be-whomever he selects as his Secretary of State-their efforts for a successful foreign policy, their efforts for peace, will depend in large measure on the men and women who must carry out that policy. A program for peace can be no better than those who implement it. Our stature abroad can be no more respected or influential than those who speak for us. The policies may be decided at the top—but they are planned and executed here, and accepted or rejected abroad, at a somewhat lower level.75

Kennedy’s vision, which began its first missions in 1961, was available in its infancy only to select nations in his plan to compete with communist ideology and efforts in the underdeveloped world, and did not focus upon Western European nations. These nations had benefitted from massive American humanitarian aid and engagement, increased significantly by American Cold War goals and military spending. Although much of Europe was still in the process of rebuilding their infrastructure and societies after the devastation of World War II, Kennedy viewed the battleground in terms of the broader global contest, well beyond Western Europe.

On the military side, the challenges Army Berlin faced as Cold Warriors during the first few decades of Army Berlin’s experience in the period of the Berlin Wall were marked with broad turmoil on the strategic use of conventional forces. This struggle, epitomized in
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Kennedy’s intentions for his new “flexible response” plans, was linked to the balance of military forces he considered necessary to wage war in the third world nations, through increasing use of counterinsurgency tactics.\(^76\)

In West Berlin, Army Berlin also possessed a force available to display a “program for peace,” in the operational area and willing to act as Good Neighbors. Like the Hanau military community’s support of the children’s village, Army Berlin benefitted from these street-level implementers of American foreign policy soft power. Underlying that power was a common belief system in the ideals and behaviors that should represent American values. In a reflective essay by Sargent Shriver, the first director of the Peace Corps, the president’s brother-in-law offered a vignette in support of the effort made by the organization in its earliest days in nations seeking American assistance:

“I shall always remember a visit I received in India in early 1961, while I was exploring the prospects of sending one of our first contingents for service there. Ashadevi Aryanayakam, an extraordinary woman who had been an associate of Mahatma Gandhi, traveled three days and nights on a train to see me in New Delhi. “Yours was the first revolution,” she reminded me. “Do you think young Americans possess the spiritual values they must have to bring the spirit of that revolution to our country? India should not boast of any spiritual superiority. There is a great valuelessness spreading around the world. Your Peace Corps volunteers must bring more than science and technology. They must touch the idealism of America and bring that to us, too. Can they do it?”\(^77\)

The statement by Aryanayakam on the importance of spiritual values in the Americans that Kennedy hoped to send forward as ambassadors of America’s peaceful outreach to the world is relevant to Army Berlin as well. The question posed to Shriver regarding “American spiritual values” in this period was a consistent message in the command directives regarding the ability

\(^76\) For an excellent examination of this issue in the U.S. Army, and particularly the Army in Europe, see Ingo Trauschweizer, \textit{The Cold War U.S. Army: Building Deterrence for Limited War} (Lawrence KS: University Press of Kansas, 2008).

of Army Berlin to meet both its wartime mission as well as its USAREUR responsibilities as Good Neighbors.

In his address to the Army Berlin chapter of the “Protestant Men of the Chapel,” Major General Ralph M. Osborne, United States Commander, Berlin from December 15, 1959 to May 4, 1961, made a forceful connection between Christianity and foreign policy: “General Osborne pointed out that increased church attendance on the part of the American community will invariably work to the disadvantage of the atheistic communist armies presently surrounding the divided city.”78

The “Protestant Men of the Chapel” was a U.S. Armed Forces sponsored organization administered through the military chaplaincy which operated globally in the goal to “Develop men in the skills of prayer, evangelism, friendliness, stewardship, teaching, and social service-against a background of personal spiritual development.”79 While much of the focus of the group was a bonding function, focused inward to the members of the group, it also encouraged missionary work in the broader community. The guidelines for Chaplains and local group leaders to encourage service performed by American Christian military members were universal in nature, and included numerous examples of civic virtue which might be considered, including the support of orphans and the elderly.80

While General Osborne’s statement was not made in the same context or ideological struggle Aryanayakam appeared to reference, the connection between American spiritual values and idealism, exercised through both hard power and soft power, is evident.

80 Ibid., 12.
Throughout Army Berlin’s service in the wall period, the command elements of the force continued their emphasis on the importance of American Christianity in the city. The connection between Christianity and morality, deeply embedded in American culture, played an important role in Army Berlin’s efforts to connect with Berliners. Outside of the context of the legal status of Berlin as an occupied city, this practice was replicated across West Germany in the German-American relationship. As an example, for Protestant American service-members, the Protestant Bishop of the West German Army invited up to 200 to celebrate “the 450th anniversary of the Protestant Reformation.” For a devout American Protestant, and particularly a Lutheran, this was an opportunity not to be missed.

Regularly, Berliners and Americans gathered together to celebrate important religious holidays, in both inter-denominational services and sectarian congregational worship. On April 14, 1968, Army Berlin hosted its annual German and American Easter sunrise service, where “several hundred residents of the German and American communities in Berlin gathered in the Berlin-American High School auditorium.” While chaplains and their assistants from Army Berlin and the U.S. Air Force at Tempelhof performed the majority of the service, the two central roles, those of the reading of the scripture and the Easter message, were reserved for pastors of Berlin churches. “The Easter message entitled ‘Revolution to a New Life,’ was delivered by the Reverend Max Dietrich Wewerke, pastor of the Martin-Luther-Kirche in Berlin Lichterfelde.”

In Army Berlin’s decision to defer the lead role on one of the biggest days of celebration in the Christian faith is another example of its intentional efforts to emphasize its moral and
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legitimate foreign policy, one of Nye’s three resources which constitute a state’s soft power. Repetitive acts of kindness, whether spontaneous acts of Americans or intentional programs designed to promote civic virtues certainly meet the criteria of behaviors that can positively impact social capital and the important forms of trust. The cultural meaning of a shared religious background certainly adds a deeper dimension to the exercise of smart power. The important forms of “bridging” networks that these relationships engendered provided a deeper form of cultural and social familiarity at a much broader level than the “elite” connections of the critical and strategic German-American Committee processes.

While these faith-based groups did not project the pure cultural soft power of the annual German-American Volksfest in Berlin, they did offer a level of connection that perhaps more closely reflected Ashadevi Aryanayakam’s intention when she challenged Shriver on the spiritual values of the young Americans he hoped to send to her country. Unlike India, however, Americans and Berliners, while they attempted to bridge cultural, social, and language barriers, possessed a common moral heritage in Judeo-Christian theology. The traditional Christmas season offered Army Berlin, like its fellow USAREUR units in West Germany, abundant opportunities to combine civic virtue, faith, and even secular interactions which were intended to foster the Good Neighbors, soft power message.

Army Berlin’s Christmas Good Neighbor Operations

Christmas season offered Army Berlin an additional opportunity to create bridging networks, beginning with formal structures that might foster longer term connections between individual Berliners and American soldiers. The early programs in the first years of the reformed Army Berlin in the wall period remained similar to their predecessors practice. These early events, known as “Operation Good Cheer,” were promoted by Army Berlin’s command but
held at the local unit level, focused on their assigned partner communities in Berlin. The host units invited families to their mess facilities, or if possible, used one of Army Berlin’s club facilities. Serving a Christmas meal, singing carols, and a visit by Santa Claus with toys for the children were normal practices.\(^{84}\)

However, with its new German-American Committee in place, the possibility to shift the program in a new direction which would reverse the hosting role was proposed. Again the domain of the Recreation sub-committee, the July, 1965 meeting notes indicate that, instead of units hosting families in their unit areas, “the possibility of having an Open House whereby German families who would like to entertain American soldiers at Christmas would visit and meet them beforehand was discussed.”\(^{85}\) The records available for the German-American Recreation sub-committee in the collection do not mention the change in the program after this date. It is clear from later records that Army Berlin did adapt the program to reverse the host and invitation process as an attempt to integrate its soldiers into the Berliner community directly and in a very personal and culturally relevant method.

The revised program, known as “Christmas Cheer,” appeared in the available records again in the 1980s, in which it had evolved into a rather complex attempt to engage Army Berlin’s soldiers into the community. “Christmas Cheer” demonstrated a hierarchical network, operated out of Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Office, which included regulations indicative of the Cold War concerns of espionage. Both Mission Berlin and the West Berlin Polizei were involved in conducting security clearances of Berliner families as they assisted Army Berlin in its efforts to place soldiers in private homes over the holiday season.

\(^{84}\) “Chickamaugan’s Unit Hosts Eight Families,” *The Berlin Observer*, January 5, 1962, Berlin Observer Collection, USAMHI.

\(^{85}\) “Resume of 6 July Meeting of the Recreation Sub-Committee, Neukoelln Morrus Youth Center,” box 29, Office of the U.S. Commander, Berlin, Information Division, Community Relations Branch, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
In an After Action Report on the 1987 “Christmas Cheer” program, Army Berlin’s Community Relations Office summarized the results and made recommendations for the program in the future. The program was administered by this office and accepted Berliner applications by telephone or written request, with a deadline for acceptance that allowed the Community Relations Office to match soldiers interested in the program with suitable families. The matching process was based upon a series of personal questions which each prospective participant, German and American, responded to. The assumptions Army Berlin operated under about personal and cultural differences between the German and American participants are also exhibited in the questionnaires and requirements of the willing participants.

On the German side of the questionnaire, basic identifying information, address, phone, age, marital status, and dependent information was required. Additionally, the Berliner could provide their hobbies and interests, how many soldiers and what gender they may wish to host. The host also indicated whether they would provide transportation for the soldier to their home, or alternatively, give public transportation information. The choice of the date, either Christmas Eve, Christmas day, or an alternative date, was stipulated by the German family, with both parties agreement. The Berliner also self-assessed their level of English proficiency and whether they required a soldier that could speak and understand basic German, and if they would allow smoking in their home. The only other requirement of the Berliner was to attend an introductory meeting at one of Army Berlin’s clubs, where they would have the chance to meet their soldier or soldiers and decide if they wished to continue their involvement.
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One other important detail, however, was that security concerns still warranted background investigations of every family, which required a hard application deadline. In the case of Christmas in 1987, the final date listed was November 30, 1987. This period allowed Mission Berlin’s Public Safety Office, working with the intelligence services of the West Berlin Polizei, the time to conduct background checks on families to ascertain if there were any known risks related to the family. This included the existence of relatives connected to the East German State Security Service (STASI), or if members of the family had any particular criminal or subversive past. This deadline presented difficulties for Germans who submitted late, and in its review, Army Berlin’s Community Relations office recommended removing Mission Berlin from the process in the future, considering its involvement additionally obstructive. For “Christmas Cheer” in 1987, a total of 145 German families cleared the security to participate, (although several late entrants were cleared by Army Berlin itself).88

However, in the case of the American soldiers the decision to volunteer to be guests in German family homes imposed a considerably more involved preparatory process. Before meeting their German hosts at the mandatory introductory meeting, the soldiers, through their battalion commands, were required to be screened based upon their own discipline histories in their unit. While maximized participation was a priority for Army Berlin, there were of course individual soldiers who, in the judgment of their commanders, may not be suitable as instruments of Good Neighbor soft power projection, and this discretion was made at the battalion level.

In its post-Christmas report, Army Berlin’s Community Relations office noted that the completed participation rate by the volunteer soldiers was very high, with only five soldiers physically absent from their assigned invitation to share Christmas with a German family. This
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figure excluded a small number of Christmas dinners that were cancelled due to an excused illness on the part of the soldier, or a last minute cancellation by the German family. In nearly all of these cases, the German family offered to extend their invitation beyond the holiday window, to honor their commitment. However, in the case of the five no-show volunteer soldiers, their failure to meet their commitment did not go unnoticed.

In a separate Public Affairs Fact Sheet on issues related to the 1987 “Christmas Cheer program,” Lieutenant Colonel Gary A. Oedewalt summarized this particular problem: “This year there were five soldier no-shows (the same as last year). We are coordinating with the battalions to determine the reasons and the appropriate follow-up actions necessary.” It is not clear in the available records what remedies were applied to the non-compliant soldiers, but it is likely that the soldier’s company or battery commanders were informed of their lapse in promotion of the Good Neighbors mission. The risk to Army Berlin’s soft power strength in this case, while not quantifiable, may be assumed to be relatively low. However, for the disappointed families, it was not Army Berlin’s finest hour. Army Berlin’s Community Relations office had to hope that with these families and their own network, the United States, through the unit, had accumulated a sufficient reservoir of generalized reciprocal thin trust to assuage the offense.

*Army Berlin’s Smart Power Answer to Soviet Hard Power*

The repetitive efforts of Army Berlin at all levels following the erection of the Berlin Wall were immensely valuable in projecting smart power through a series of innovative associative behaviors. Beginning with its voluntary establishment of the German-American Committee, a network through which Army Berlin sought to integrate itself more fully into West
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Berlin’s social and political structures, it gained valuable social capital benefits. The commanders of Army Berlin demonstrated that they understood the limits of their hard power influence, and acted as street-level policymakers representing America’s interests in the city. They sought to patiently engage in issues that their opponent across the wall, the Soviet Union, had not weighed relative to its own exercise of power.

Unlike Army Berlin, which appreciated its limits and strengths, the Soviets had not considered the strength of cooperative behaviors, or soft power, as a local priority. An Army Berlin memorandum assessed a February, 1991 meeting comprised of British, French, American, and West German military leaders. The West German armed forces were newly arrived in the city legally as a result of the reunification and end of occupation. Bundeswehr Colonel Jung informed the group, the new “Bundeswehr Liaison Cell,” that the Soviet military forces “now have a Public Affairs Office.”

The existence of a Soviet Public Affairs Office after the reunification vote for Germany in 1990 might appear ironic in the history of Army Berlin as it was reorganized after the erection of the wall. The leadership of Army Berlin had recognized in that crucial policy selection period that, beyond their role as Cold Warriors in their primary and most important mission in providing security for West Berlin, their ability to impact the social, cultural, and political realities of West Berlin were also valuable to the national policy of the United States.

The employment of American culture, social, and political behaviors as foreign policy weapons through acts of civic virtue and both formal and informal networks which represented Good Neighbors to Berliners meets Nye’s requirements in any configuration. Most importantly, Army Berlin’s command possessed the capability to exercise soft power nearly three decades

90 “Liaison Cell Memorandum Thru Chief of Staff for Commanding General, Subject: Bundeswehr Liaison Meeting 20 Feb 91,” box 3, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
before Nye developed his power theories. Now, as the city was joyfully reunified, the benefits of
thirty years of smart power began to appear quickly, and along with these positive developments,
Army Berlin faced new challenges.
CONCLUSION. ASSESSING SMART POWER: ARMY BERLIN'S LEGACY

Following the unexpected opening of the Berlin Wall on November 9, 1989, Army Berlin’s behaviors remained in alignment with its decades-long Cold War practices. Unsure of the future political and military environment, the unit continued training in the city for a mission that evaporated with the political reforms that paved the way for full German reunification. Beginning with the March 18, 1990 Volkshammer elections in East Germany, Army Berlin’s role as Cold Warriors and protectors of West Berlin and its viability was soon consigned to history and memory.¹

The succession of internal political and diplomatic changes in Germany, as well as its relationship to the Allies in the former West Germany, also had a direct impact on Army Berlin. With the signature of the “Two plus Four” Agreement (officially the “Treaty on the Final Settlement With Respect to Germany”) on August 12, 1990, the beginning steps in removing Army Berlin’s special status as an occupation force were in place. Its position in West Berlin was now governed by that treaty, particularly Article 5, which authorized the German government to request that Army Berlin remain in the city for the period in which the Soviets were still in East Germany and the city of Berlin. A particular condition of the article stated that “the number of troops and the amount of equipment of all non-German armed forces stationed in Berlin will not be greater than at the time of signature of the present treaty.”²

² “Treaty on the Final Settlement With Respect to Germany,” box 4, PAO Files, Folder labeled “Policy and Precedent,” Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
Army Berlin began its own process of reformation, as determined by its command chain in Europe and America. With its primary hard power missions effectively irrelevant, the force needed to quickly transform itself from a geographically-limited combat force, the U.S. Army’s contemporary experts in Urban Operations, into a functioning, deployable unit that could find a role in the post-Cold War U.S. Army. In United States Army, Berlin’s Historical report for the combined years of 1991 and 1992, the changes are summarized in the following statement:

The irony for the brigade was that the end of the cold war meant added, and more various demands, to prepare for contingency operations. At the same time, the probability of becoming engaged in conflict increased. Scenarios based on such cases as Somalia and Yugoslavia had to be prepared for and had much more probability of becoming reality than any Soviet-GDR attack on West Berlin.3

The unit, reformed into the structure of a Light Infantry reserve force for the European theater, gave up its 32 M-1A1 Abrams Main Battle Tanks during the conversion, as well as all of its tracked vehicles.4 These essential systems, which had been the source of some considerable tensions in the city during the Cold War due to safety, noise, and maneuver training damage to West Berlin, were not the only major weapons systems which disappeared from Berlin. Army Berlin’s artillery unit saw its nine M-109 Self-Propelled 155 millimeter guns, the only permanent artillery the Allies possessed in the city, replaced by eight smaller, lighter, air-portable towed 105 millimeter Howitzers.5

The Berlin Brigade, now positioned as a deployable operational force, required significant training to match up with the existing AirLand Battle doctrine that had evolved in the 1980s focused on defeating the Soviets in a potential war in Europe. Its first practical introduction to the doctrine occurred in June of 1991, when the full Brigade was rotated to
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Hohenfels to train at the Combined Maneuver Training Center (CMTC), “focusing on defeat of a heavy mechanized adversary force.” According to the official history, the Berlin Brigade was put on a fast-paced training schedule in order to prepare it for AirLand Battle capabilities: “Unlike the normal USAREUR Brigade, which goes to Hohenfels every 12 to 18 months, the Brigade went there 3 more times in 1991-92- an uncommonly strenuous schedule.”

These changes required a continued training pace that, in some cases, puzzled their Berliner neighbors, who retained the concept of Army Berlin as a static hard power force and an increasingly unnecessary one at that. The external challenges from the East Germans and the Soviets had either already collapsed or were quickly reformed to integrate Allied practices into the normal routines of the former East Germany. The critical Allied rights of the occupation, presence, access, and viability, reemphasized by President Kennedy in response to the construction of the Berlin Wall, were no longer tests of American will. The change in Germany’s sovereign status required that diplomatic and military negotiations between the Allies and the Soviets were now subordinated to the Federal Republic of Germany’s control while stationed on its soil.

Back in West Berlin, the contested issues of the use of ranges which would soon revert back to German control continued between the Berliners and their American neighbors. Noise developed by helicopters, armor, and particularly environmental damage connected to the training space controlled by the Americans became tests of the commitment of the force in leaving Berlin as Good Neighbors. In a July 20, 1993, Berliner Morgenpost story, Jack O. Bennett, an American pilot who was a member of the Berlin Airlift and had retired in West Berlin, complained about the use of helicopters by Army Berlin: “On June 16th and 17th, U.S.

6 Ibid., 14.
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Army helicopters maneuvered at a height of 50 meters above Wilmersdorf and Kudamm." As a newly-trained Light Infantry unit, the use of helicopters for rapid movement is a required skill, and even as the Berlin Brigade’s footprint was being reduced in the city, the critical training continued.

As the final drawdown process continued, the properties that had been used for training were bound by agreement to revert to German control. The issue of hazardous waste and specifically lead remediation from the earthen range walls which absorbed the rounds passing through targets was central to the discussion. In an April, 1994 meeting between Army Berlin officials and the State Forestry Office, discussions on the removal of potentially contaminated dirt at Keerans Range dominated the agenda. The example of remediation outcomes at Rose Range - where the tonnage of lead removed from the shooting bays’ sand backstops was discussed - provided the German bureaucratic representatives with evidence of the significance of the task. These processes were repeated at every site in the city as they were returned to German control, and in no area was this more contested than in the return of the prime housing units that were being vacated by the families of the significantly smaller force.

In Army Berlin’s consolidated historical report for the years 1991 and 1992, the details of the process through which property was returned to the Oberfinanzdirektion, the German government’s finance office in Bonn, was described. This federal agency held the rights to the majority of the developed properties in Berlin, and from the viewpoint of Army Berlin authorities, the Bonn agency did not appear willing to cooperate with the local authorities, the Senat in Berlin. The historical report notes that much of the housing that had been returned in
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9 “Minutes of Forestry Meeting Among DPTMS, PAO, and State Forestry Office at the State Forestry Office, 11 April 1994,” box 5, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
the first two years to German control remained unoccupied, even though there was a housing shortage in the local market, leaving many new arrivals in the city living in temporary arrangements. This was particularly true regarding additional refugees who had come to Berlin from the east, as well as eager Germans from the west hoping to take advantage of the new access and business opportunities in the city.

For Army Berlin, the return of its developed administrative and housing complexes appeared to uncover a rift between the local Berlin leadership’s vision and that of Bonn. Reflecting back to its own history as an occupation force beginning after World War II, Army Berlin assessed the new power relationships forming in the city in that context: “On the whole, however, the Bonn authorities were behaving toward the West Berliners like an advance guard of a future occupation that could prove much less friendly than that of the tripartite agencies.”

This summation itself, however, relies upon the longer history of Army Berlin’s actions to disparage Bonn’s newfound role in the city. The earlier shift in Army Berlin’s use of American power which intentionally relinquished some forms of coercive behaviors in favor of diplomatic or soft power, particularly in the relational power practices, colored this post-Cold War historical narrative. The commanders of Army Berlin in the early period of the Berlin Wall from 1961 to 1963 struggled with the same authority challenges that the Bonn government now faced in 1991: the selection of the right balance of power between federal and Berlin’s local officials.

This section of Army Berlin’s Historical report included reference to the Bonn authority’s strategy of blaming the Americans for leaving the apartment complexes in uninhabitable
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conditions that required reconditioning, and closed with a particularly “unfriendly” assessment of
the Oberfinanzdirektion’s actions. The command history notes that “This claim, in fact, was
quite far from the truth, but it is a good example of a pervasive readiness of German authorities
to evoke old prejudices, rooted in the smug dichotomy many Germans have constructed between
the superior, cultivated German and the half literate, uncouth American.”

This difficulty on
the diplomatic side of the changing relationship was not the only instance of Germans exercising
their newfound authority in the city.

The Bundeswehr, which for the first time was authorized with a legal presence in Berlin,
were now technically the governing military command, and all Allied troops which remained in
the city were under the ostensible control of its commander. The period during which the
Soviets remained on German soil was a particularly delicate time for Army Berlin, as the
commander of the Bundeswehr in the city and his liaison officers to the western Allies were
particularly restrictive in their approval of contact with the Soviets. In addition to requiring
approval for any contact between Army Berlin and the Soviets, the Germans required that it be
attended by a delegated Bundeswehr officer. According to the historical report, contact with
the Allies was actively sought by the Soviets but hindered by the Germans, who also required the
Bundeswehr set protocols for all meetings.

One particular policy which the newly unified German nation expected its western Allies’
to practice was a strategy of the deliberate military-diplomatic degradation of the Soviets
involved in meetings in which the former adversaries attempted to cooperate on issues of
withdrawal and stability. For any approved meeting, the Soviets were required to provide the

\[\text{\footnotesize 11 Ibid.}\
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rank of the highest officer in attendance prior to the planned meeting. The Allies, under Bundeswehr control, were expected to restrict their ranking officer to at least one corresponding grade below the Soviet senior officer. The Americans estimated that it was better policy to honor the strong wishes of the Germans (their historic allies and the sovereign host nation) and agreed to the intended insult to the Soviets. For their part, the British refused to allow the Germans to dictate their choice of attending officer, and generally ignored the German rule.\textsuperscript{14} The irony in the situation, that the Bundeswehr dictated American military-diplomatic street-level implementation of foreign policy as they interacted with the Soviets, is apparent.

Army Berlin’s Good Neighbors role, concurrently practiced with its primary role as Cold Warriors to achieve smart power in the city over the course of the Berlin Wall’s life, continued in the city for the remainder of its posting. Unlike the Cold War period, where the two roles and the exercise of both hard and soft power often appeared more balanced to Berliners, the Good Neighbors role increasingly became the test of German-American relationships in the city.

The German-American Committee, the formal network constructed to serve American interests and provide West Berlin’s municipal leadership with the opportunity to exercise more relational power in its interactions with Army Berlin, had faced the uncertainty of the pre-unification period. Interestingly, in the first full meeting following the opening of the Berlin Wall in November, 1989, the members of the committee conducted the meeting without any recorded reference to the event, and remained focused on continued German-American relations. The Berlin Brigade commander, Major General Sydney Shachnow, asked the German members for their frank assessment of Army Berlin’s historical and current efforts as Good Neighbors in the city. Referring to the organized programs that had occurred in the past and the current

\textsuperscript{14} Ibid., 16-17.
activities, he inquired “if the Americans were being too pushy with their programs and if they were actually accomplishing what they had set out to accomplish.”15

The response from the members of the committee was broadly that the Americans were not being “too pushy,” but that some of the programs might benefit from a different approach. The issue of the different opinions of the younger generations was raised by Mayor Barthel, who stated that “the programs must be from a new angle because the younger generation of Berliners no longer feels obliged to the American Forces for their presence in Berlin.”16 Supporting Barthel’s view, Mayor Frank Beilka stated that “the younger generation did not experience the Air Lift or the post-war help plans.”17 After discussions on upcoming events and minor issues, the meeting closed. The routine practices of the committee were well-entrenched, and even the monumental opening of the Berlin Wall did not intrude upon the network’s purpose.

One of the most successful long-term formal practices of Army Berlin in promoting positive relations between the individual units in the city was the practice of assigning “partnership units” to the districts. These were long-standing institutional connections and challenged the units to interact in their districts as Good Neighbors, a behavior through which they became a support to the district and its residents. The importance of these associations, mandated by Army Berlin, became apparent in discussions during the October, 1990 German-American Committee meeting. In the period between the opening of the wall and the October 3, 1990 official unification of East Germany with the Federal Republic, the notification for the redeployment of the 4th Battalion, 502nd Infantry Regiment to the United States was forwarded to Army Berlin.

15 “Minutes of the German-American Committee Meeting, 16 FEB 90,” box 31, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
16 Ibid.
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The reaction of the district mayors to the news indicated the importance they placed on the program, and their level of esteem credited to the units which had been matched with their districts for so long. Schöneberg District Mayor Rüdiger Jakesch (CDU), whose community would lose the 4th Battalion, responded with trepidation to MG Shachnow’s statement that the entire Berlin Brigade would serve as the district’s new partner once the order to return the 4th Battalion to the United States was enacted. Jakesch wished to know the timing of the 4th Battalion’s removal, so his district could “have time to improve its relationship with its ‘new partner’ the Berlin Brigade.”

SPD member Frank Bielka, Neukölln’s District Mayor, appeared more alarmed than Jakesch, even though his district was not yet losing its partnership. Jakesch proclaimed that “Such a change would be very difficult. The district of Neukölln wouldn’t want to have to decide to give up the one or the other partnership unit after so many close years with the units. In any case Neukölln would like to keep its contact with both partnership units.”

Attempting to find a solution to the District Mayor’s sense of impending loss, Air Force Colonel Joseph Sellman, Deputy Commander of Tempelhof Central Airport, noted that the Bundeswehr would shortly be sending its own troops into the city in accordance with the new “Stationing Agreements.” After he mentioned the possibility that the districts might consider asking the Bundeswehr to provide units as partners, the response was unequivocal. Mayor Bielka stated:

that this is not the role of the German-American committee. For the future, German-American relations should be supported under any circumstances, and, if necessary, beyond the Charter of the Committee. Perhaps this could be institutionalized so that German-American friendship would continue to exist in this historical relationship, especially for Berlin.

18 “Minutes of the German-American Committee Meeting, 12 October 1990, Rathaus Kreuzberg,” box 31, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
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Jurgen Klemann (CDU), Zehlendorf’s District Mayor and a veteran member of the committee, registered his thoughts on the topic:

The Bundeswehr isn’t party to the German-American Committee and is not a subject for this committee. It is very important to Mr. Klemann that the committee make the effort to maintain the long-standing close friendship with Americans-it shouldn’t be slapped shut like a used book after 45 years.21

While the German-American Committee itself did not design the partnership concept, the district mayors had clearly considered it part of the German-American Committee’s function to monitor and set preferences on the issue in their relational power structure with Army Berlin. The command itself contributed to this impression through its regular interactions with these civic leaders in the American sector. When issues in a district arose, either in the formal or informal discussions between Army Berlin’s command staff, the units assigned as partners were often directed to offer their assistance, beginning with volunteers and, when necessary, considering it part of their duty day.

A summary “Memorandum for Record” filed in the PAO office assessed the Community Relations Office activities during the 1992 Volksfest and made recommendations for the next festival, anticipated for the summer of 1993. The role of American soldiers in their interactions with the children was once again at the center of the discussions, as they had been nearly from the beginning of the occupation period. For the three separate District Days at the festival, the Community Relations Office managed children’s parties, which “ran without hitches.”22 Particularly successful were the organized games, which “quickly enabled children and soldiers
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22 “Memorandum for Record: Subject, Volksfest 1992 After Action Report, Community Relations Activities,” 18 August 1992, box 4, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
to meet together…Next year we will probably have to task soldiers to attend these events (both partnership evening and children’s days).”

The series of behaviors which Army Berlin’s command had promoted in the military community’s broad population of soldiers and their family members throughout the Cold War were still relevant in the city, even as it was clear that the unit would soon be removed from Berlin. The dual roles of Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors constituted the personification of an American foreign policy which retained the capability of inflicting significant damage on a Soviet assault on the city, while at the same time, Army Berlin presented a moral and legitimate image of America. Now, the Good Neighbors loss to both Germans and Americans became clear to both populations.

Over the course of its duty, Army Berlin developed its unique mission skills in Urban Operations and it exercised the Allied rights of presence and access, based upon the consensual nature of their establishment and precedent. As street-level implementers of American national policy, they recognized the threats to these crucial rights, first by the Soviets, and later by the East Germans. While not defined clearly as vital national interests by distant policymakers, Army Berlin’s defense of the broadest interpretations of their right of access in both forms was crucial to their ability to remain capable of success in its hard power and soft power missions. President Kennedy’s creative skills in demanding a right for West Berlin, the right of its viability, also required that Army Berlin itself was guaranteed its viability in the city. This could only be accomplished by aggressively exercising its rights and forcing the Soviets to acknowledge the validity of the standing agreements.
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In many examples of policy decision-making by Army Berlin the unit practiced estimation and selection behaviors that were effective in thwarting the Soviet strategies of incremental degradation of Allied rights. In extreme cases of threats to America’s image as a moral and legitimate power, exemplified by the 1962 death of Peter Fechter and the public outcry that followed, the command of Army Berlin rapidly assembled consensus among its Allies in order to regain its image as a viable protector.

In order to achieve a smart power policy outcome, Army Berlin reformed its soft power skills in fulfillment of the USAREUR-wide Good Neighbors role promoted under CINCUSAREUR Bruce C. Clarke during his tenure in the early 1960s. In the first year of the Berlin Wall’s existence, the unit’s command implemented a formal network, the German-American Committee, to form a permanent bridging network with the intention of improving relations with its Berliner neighbors. While this required a substantial amount of effort to achieve success in the first few years, the German-American Committee and its working subcommittees delivered social capital benefits of thick trust between the members and extended generalized reciprocal thin trust, a necessary component of an efficient and stable society.

For Berliners, the German-American Committee, designed by Army Berlin to serve its mission in the city, established itself as a functional method for the civic leaders to access Army Berlin’s resources for the benefit of their citizens. The changing dynamics of political power in the city required that Army Berlin make estimates and implement policy which prepared it for the future. By proactively releasing a very small amount of actual relational power to the German members of the committee in the early 1960s, it earned a different form of goodwill. It reserved its ultimate and legitimate use of its occupation rights, consciously choosing to accept short-term limitations of its power in order to preserve accumulated social capital. An example
of this behavior is Army Berlin’s regular refusal to enforce portions of the occupation ordinances which might serve to reflect poorly on American foreign policy.24

The use of the term Good Neighbors in Army Berlin as an affirmation of its soft power role was quite appropriate. The characterization of a neighbor, good or bad, is a subjective measure of moral behavior, defined in the cultural contexts of both American and German perceptions. The Good Neighbor concept may be significantly different in any single cultural context, and even more difficult to standardize between two groups. In the case of German and American relations, long historical, religious and cultural connections between the two nations were instrumental in making it possible for repeated interactions between individuals at all levels of Berlin’s society, ultimately designed to benefit American national policy.

In a letter addressed to the American Headquarters, Herr Detlev Klatt, a lifelong resident of Berlin, asked a particularly large favor of Army Berlin, as the public announcement of the end of Army Berlin in 1994 had been made:

When in Autumn 1994, the farewells for our American, British and French friends [take place] and friend you really have become after the war and the Blockade, could you then invite a former GI officially to these festivities? Please do not put away my letter yet! This person does not know about my letter and request….The former GI Gary Blake was one of the many soldiers who enjoyed Berlin and spent parts of his duty term at the wall…At the time when the wall was erected, he was at the border at Friedrichstraße for days on end, when I got to know him too. He and all the others stood guard there and in all of West Berlin for the freedom of the citizens of Berlin…when the wall came down, Mr. G. Blake called me in Berlin early in the morning, full of enthusiasm…so enthusiastic and happy were the people. Unfortunately, I am not a good and emotional writer of letters, and I do not speak English, but maybe my words are good enough for this. As a Berlin fireman, I had a few missions at the wall and the canal in Kreuzberg. A few times, Allied soldiers were also present, and I could experience the feelings and conflicts of the soldiers who were on duty then. Many [fire-fighting] missions were only made possible by the presence of the Allies.25

In his reply to Mr. Klatt, Army Berlin’s Public Affairs Officer, E. Russell Anderson, thanked him for his letter, but informed him that Army Berlin could not officially invite Mr. Blake, nor

24 For example, Allied Ordinance number 501, (material defamatory to any one of the three occupation authorities).
could it pay for his flight to Berlin, as Mr. Klatt had requested. Mr. Klatt had corresponded with Mr. Blake, a resident of Detroit, Michigan, for over 30 years since Blake left Company F, 40th Armor and West Berlin. Herr Klatt, who identified himself as a firefighter, expressed his memory of Mr. Blake, and importantly, he shared his moral judgment of the “Allied soldiers” he observed who exhibited “feelings and conflicts” in their duties.

Neither Klatt nor Blake possessed the selective education, skills and experience expected of the professionals in each of their respective national governments to make foreign policy decisions, or to implement diplomatic programs meant to create the conditions for peaceful resolutions of conflict. What they did share, apparently, was a personal connection based upon a formative series of events which shaped the modern history of Germany and the United States. At a time when the world appeared to rest on the knife’s edge of conflict in the nuclear age, their experience in a comparatively small part of Berlin as they each performed their professional duties to protect West Berliners made them lifelong Good Neighbors. In relation to Nye’s power theses, Gary Blake, Company F, 40th Armor, street-level implementer of U.S. foreign policy in the Cold War, epitomized smart power, once the concept is decoupled from the limits of Nye’s exclusion of the military as a soft power force.

The spirit of American idealism asserted by President Kennedy in his call for a new national program of international relations became the basis for a very successful American foreign policy institution, the Peace Corps, which at its core, projected a clear form of Nye’s soft power thesis. When Kennedy expanded upon his proposed program in his November 2, 1960 campaign speech, he particularly emphasized the purpose of the institution in the context of a

---

26 Translation of Correspondence, “PAO to Detlev Klatt,” 25 April 1994, box 11, Berlin Brigade Collection, USAMHI.
27 Ibid.
Cold War of ideas and deeds as a competition between the two global economic and political systems. Highlighting the role of Soviet and Chinese “missionaries for communism” who were being trained and sent forward into the underdeveloped world, Kennedy challenged both the American public and its political leaders with a question:

Where are we going to obtain the technicians needed to work with the peoples of underdeveloped lands outside the normal diplomatic channels—and by technicians I include engineers, doctors, teachers, agricultural experts, specialists in public law, labor, taxation, civil service—all the skills necessary to establish a viable economy, a stable government, and a decent standard of living?  

By applying John F. Kennedy’s goals for underdeveloped nations to possess a viable economy, stable government, and decent standard of living to West Berlin, the dilemma comes into focus. West Berlin’s right of viability, exemplified in his speech of July 25, 1961 where he insisted upon a right constructed in his own formulation and not consented to by the Soviet Union in any international agreement, required an increased American commitment.

The critical difference in the projection of this smart power policy between Berlin and his targeted Peace Corps recipients was a direct military threat to the city. With this reality, the only alternative to project American national interests and any form of power in the city was through a military unit which could practice international relations behaviors not traditionally associated with the hard power experts of American foreign policy. Army Berlin integrated its paradoxical roles of Cold Warriors and Good Neighbors into a sophisticated blend of hard and soft power behaviors which ultimately achieved American national interests through smart power policy.

---
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APPENDIX A. GENERAL ACRONYMS

APC            Armored Personnel Carrier
ARTEP       Army Readiness and Training Evaluation Program, (US)
BASC     Berlin Air Safety Center
BEC          Best Efforts Committee, United States Army, Berlin
BG       Brigadier General (US)
CDU    Christian Democratic Union (FRG)
CIA     Central Intelligence Agency (US)
CIC       Combat in Cities (US Army)
CID     Criminal Investigation Division (US Army)
CINCEUCOM  Commander in Chief, European Command
CINCEUR     Commander in Chief, Europe
CINCUSAREUR  Commander in Chief, United States Army, Europe
CINCUSEUR  Commander in Chief, United States Forces, Europe
CONUS     Continental United States
CoS-USCOB  Chief of Staff, United States Commander, Berlin
DEH-USAB  Department of Engineering & Housing, United States Army, Berlin
DM         Deutschmark (West Germany)
E5         Sergeant, enlisted rank (US Army)
EUCOM  European Command (US)
FORSCOM Forces Command, (US)
FRG Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany)
G1            Chief of Staff, Personnel (US Army)
G3       Chief of Staff, Operations (US Army)
GDR         Democratic Republic of Germany (East Germany)
GYA    German Youth Activity Program
HEAT     High Explosive Anti-Tank
HICOG     High Commission for Occupied Germany
KRO       Kreis Resident Offices (HICOG)
LN      Local national workers employed by U.S. Army, Berlin
LS     Labor Service German Nationals
LTC      Lieutenant Colonel (US)
LSO   Liaison and Security Offices (OMGUS)
MBT      Main Battle Tank
MG  Major General (US)
MILCOM U.S. Military Community, preceded by Command location name
MILPERCENEUR  Military Personnel Center for Europe (US Army)
MOUT Military Operations on Urban Terrain (US Army)
MP    Military Police
NATO North American Treaty Organization
NCA National Command Authority
NCOIC Non-commissioned Officer in Command
NSC National Security Council (US)
OIC Officer in Command
OMGUS   Office of the Military Government of the United States
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAO-USCOB</td>
<td>Public Affairs Office, United States Commander, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POE</td>
<td>Point of Embarcation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POI</td>
<td>Program of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quadripartite Agreement (Berlin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIAS</td>
<td>Radio in the American Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD</td>
<td>Reorganization Objective Army Division (US Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACEUR</td>
<td>Supreme Allied Commander, Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund (German Socialist Student League, West Germany)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Students for a Democratic Society (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITREP</td>
<td>Situation Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOFA</td>
<td>Status of Forces Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard Operating Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP5</td>
<td>Specialist 5, enlisted rank, (US Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Social Democratic Party (FRG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STASI</td>
<td>Ministry for State Security, (GDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRAC</td>
<td>Strategic Army Corps (US Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRADOC</td>
<td>Training and Doctrine Command, (US Army)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCMJ</td>
<td>Uniform Code of Military Justice (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO</td>
<td>Urban Operations (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAB</td>
<td>U.S. Army, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAREUR</td>
<td>United States Army, Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBER</td>
<td>United States Mission, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCINCEUR</td>
<td>Commander in Chief, United States Forces, Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCOB</td>
<td>United States Commander, Berlin (Major General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIA</td>
<td>United States Information Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOPOs</td>
<td>East German Volkspolizei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBP</td>
<td>West Berlin Polizei</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. U.S. MILITARY NOMENCLATURE

H-13  Helicopter, Observation, Sioux
H-19  Helicopter, Utility, Chickasaw
HU-1  Helicopter, Utility, Iroquois (early UH-1B version)
M-1   Battle Rifle, Garand, 30.06 cal.
M-1A1 Main Battle Tank, Abrams
M-2   Machine Gun, heavy, .50 cal.
M-14  Battle Rifle, 7.62mm
M-31  Grenade, rifle, High Explosive Anti-Tank (HEAT), 66mm
M-48A1 Main Battle Tank, Patton
M-56  Anti-Tank Gun, Self-Propelled, Scorpion, 90mm
M-59  Armored Personnel Carrier (APC)
M-60  Machine Gun, light, 7.62mm
M-60A1 Main Battle Tank (MBT)
M-67  Recoilless Rifle, 90mm
M-68  Main gun, Patton M-48A1 MBT, 105mm
M-79  Grenade launcher, 40mm
M-108 Self-Propelled Gun, Howitzer, 105mm (SPG)
M-109 Self-Propelled Gun, Howitzer, 155mm (SPG)
M-113 Armored Personnel Carrier (APC)
M-590 Anti-Personnel Canister, 90mm
UH-1B Helicopter, Utility, Iroquois (HU-1)
XM674 Canister, Riot Control, CS
XM675 Canister, Smoke