

Searching for Proper New Music: Jazz in Cold War Germany

Uta G. Poiger

Since the 1920s, American popular music has generated heated debates in Germany, with opponents and defenders fighting over styles ranging from jazz to rock 'n' roll to hip-hop. While the anti-Americanism evident in these battles has attracted considerable scholarly attention, we still know less about the ways in which forms of American music and culture have become part of the official self-representations of Germans. In this essay, I explore how one form, namely jazz, became increasingly acceptable in 1950s cold war Germany. Focusing on the understandings of culture, respectability, and race that made jazz largely uncontroversial, I examine the multivalent political meanings of U.S. culture abroad.

During the Weimar and Nazi years opponents of jazz described the music as overly sexualized, created by unrespectable African-Americans, and marketed by Jews. In the 1930s and 1940s the Nazis attempted to ban jazz and persecuted jazz fans, but, caught between their desire to realize a racist utopia and the need to keep the German population entertained, even the Nazis allowed some forms of swing on the airwaves. Many musicians and fans saw their support for the music as an apolitical act, although some on the left and very few on the right thought jazz to be compatible with their respective political causes.¹

After 1945, when jazz experienced a renaissance in both Germanies, jazz music remained in the political cross fires, this time of the cold war. Initially, East German authorities harassed jazz fans, while critics in West Germany publicly disdained them. Both sides were particularly worried about dancing jazz fans and jam sessions in the so-called hot clubs in East and West Germany. Such concerns were exacerbated when growing numbers of German rock 'n' roll fans began to dance to

the music of Bill Haley and Elvis Presley after 1956. By 1960, however, the West German minister of defense, Franz-Josef Strauß, declared jazz to be a music for the new West German army, and jazz could be widely heard on state-sponsored television and radio stations and in state-supported youth clubs. East German authorities, too, allowed some jazz concerts, although they continued to be more worried about American music than their West German counterparts. This changing place of jazz in the postwar German cultural landscape was linked to efforts in both states to newly define Germanness in the aftermath of national socialism and in the face of the cold war.²

Jazz in West Germany

Until the 1950s Europeans usually referred to all American popular music as jazz. In both Germanies it was only after 1955 that narrower definitions of “authentic” jazz as different from “lighter” popular hits—and especially from rock ‘n’ roll—gained widespread currency. In West Germany, radio host, writer, and producer Joachim Ernst Berendt became the most influential person to shape positive reevaluations of jazz. In East Germany, Reginald Rudolf, a social scientist, radio host, and writer, was the leading proponent of the music.

Berendt—in his West German radio broadcasts, publications, and lectures—defined jazz as a serious artistic and philosophical enterprise. He asserted emphatically that the popular hits broadcast on American and European radio stations or played at most concerts were not jazz. Authentic jazz, according to him, was not simply a dance music; it distinguished itself from popular hits through complex rhythmic variety, unique tones, and improvisation.³

Berendt sought to sanitize, desexualize, and decommercialize what he considered true jazz and proper jazz fan behavior. Thus he discredited those jazz fans who were dancing and romping around at jam sessions in postwar German jazz joints. His ideal jazz connoisseurs were at once antiauthoritarian and respectable. In 1953, for example, Berendt made a distinction between serious fans and the so-called Swing-Heinis—a term that the Nazis had likewise used in their persecutions of jazz fans. He described Swing-Heinis as youths with striped socks, shorter pants, and longer hair. Although he acknowledged that they stood in direct opposition to the soldier ideal, he did not like them. Rather, he urged serious, respectable (*seriöse*) jazz fans to teach these Swing-Heinis about the true meaning of jazz. In his validations of

jazz as noncommercial, antiauthoritarian music, Berendt thus relied on a certain gender conservatism.

This vision was also reflected in Berendt's treatment of different jazz styles. Not surprisingly, Berendt liked best the spartan, and less danceable, music of bebop and cool jazz. Bebop had been developed by black musicians such as Charlie Parker and Dizzy Gillespie in Harlem jazz clubs around 1945. Consciously turning their backs to their audience, the bebop musicians countered stereotypes of black performers, and their new styles made evaluations such as Berendt's possible. Perhaps it was not by chance that Berendt seemed to like cool jazz even better than bebop. Played by both black and white musicians, and combining "white" and "black" musical styles, cool jazz quickly became the symbol of successful racial integration. Berendt likened cool jazz to European classical music and claimed that, together with Stravinsky's music, cool represented an adequate understanding of the contemporary era. Berendt made jazz into a universalizing experience and stressed that jazz had gone beyond its African and African-American roots to gain appeal around the world.

In the aftermath of intense German nationalism and racism prior to 1945 and in the context of West German efforts to erect the Christian West as a cultural and political ideal in the first half of the 1950s, Berendt's stance was in many ways radical. He validated jazz as a serious artistic tradition and insisted that neither jazz nor African-American jazz musicians were primitive. But at the same time he made European music the standard against which the "progress" of jazz was to be judged. His validations focused, on the one hand, on improvisation, that is, the unmanipulated aspects of jazz, and, on the other hand, on the respectability of authentic jazz musicians and their audience. Berendt made jazz compatible with the bourgeois notion of (high) culture and with a bourgeois gender system.⁴

Berendt's ideas were attractive: his 1953 *Jazzbuch* sold 75,000 copies within months. Upon its publication, Berendt became the single most powerful jazz critic in West Germany, who also spread his ideas in radio broadcasts and lectures. By 1955 the new type of more intellectual jazz fans whom Berendt championed became widely visible in West Germany. For many of them Berendt's *Jazzbuch* became a bible.

At the same time other critics used Berendt's arguments to encourage respectable behavior among jazz musicians and fans. In March 1956 the West Berlin youth magazine *Blickpunkt* (published by the West Berlin association of public youth organizations) criticized the

behavior of Lionel Hampton and his audience at a Berlin concert. The audience had “no idea about jazz,” yet it was able to influence Hampton’s performance negatively. Hampton allegedly turned into a mere “showman” spurred on by the wishes of his noisy audience. Those who knew Hampton from records could, according to *Blickpunkt*, hardly enjoy his performance or the brass players of his “gang” who were rolling around on the stage. The “true enthusiast” did not get to see the “true Lionel Hampton,” whose music, according to the article, had almost as many nuances as chamber music. Exactly following Berendt’s logic, *Blickpunkt* asserted that Hampton drew his powerful style from his connection with Harlem, the “steamy Negro part of New York,” measured Hampton’s achievements against European music, and demanded restrained seriousness from his audience.⁵

In West Berlin the “respectable” fans organized in the newly founded New Jazz Circle Berlin, a club that held jazz concerts and regular lectures. Here the audience listened intently to recordings, which “jazz experts”—either guest speakers or club members—interpreted. The emphasis on respectability and the dedication to an intellectual experience of jazz actually discouraged lower-class and female jazz fans: 90 percent of the audience at lectures were male, and a majority came from the middle and upper classes.

It was in the context of youth riots and the adolescent consumption of rock ’n’ roll that these respectable jazz fans gained widespread attention after 1955. The West Berlin *Tagesspiegel* reported in 1957 on the respectable jazz fans who attended lectures of the New Jazz Circle Berlin in work or office clothes and who rarely wore jeans. The paper applauded that their behavior was far different from the disturbances that adolescent rowdies were causing in Berlin (and other East and West German cities) during the same period; according to the paper, one could hardly imagine that others of their age would roar, jump on benches, and make loud noise with bells during public “so-called jazz concerts.”⁶

In these years the lines between jazz and rock ’n’ roll were still fluid in the minds of most Germans, but people like Berendt and members of the New Jazz Circle Berlin stepped up their efforts to divorce jazz from commercial dance music and stressed that rock ’n’ roll was not jazz and that jazz fans were respectable, engaged members of society.⁷ Indeed, “true” jazz increasingly seemed a remedy against youthful unruliness. More and more voices argued that jazz associations directed adolescent protest into appropriate channels and that their work was therefore worthy of state support.⁸ West German bureau-

crats began to follow these suggestions. In 1956–57 city officials in West Berlin put on ten jazz lectures and one jazz concert as part of their youth protection efforts.⁹ Such state-sponsored events marked the growing acceptance of jazz in West Germany.

Jazz in East Germany

The positive redefinition of jazz in West Germany happened against the background of the suppression of jazz in East Germany. Around 1950, East German authorities, following their Soviet counterparts, had started an outright campaign against jazz, and jazz remained highly controversial in the following years. Not surprisingly, jazz fans in East Germany found it more difficult than West German fans to pursue their interests. Frequently, they smuggled records and Western publications on jazz into the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and listened to Western radio stations.¹⁰ Yet some East German voices existed that sought to make jazz officially acceptable, the most outspoken of which was Reginald Rudolf.

From 1952 to 1957 Rudolf, a member of the East German Socialist Unity Party (SED), published articles and gave lectures, where he indicted what he called “unauthentic” jazz and urged officials to support the proliferation of “authentic” jazz. His definitions were somewhat inconsistent, but he usually praised blues, Dixieland, and spirituals as authentic and rejected bebop and other forms of modern jazz.¹¹

Rudolf’s efforts on behalf of jazz were somewhat successful, as long as he located his arguments within the official cultural doctrine of the East German SED. In March 1951 the SED’s Central Committee had called for a search for an authentic German national culture. East German officials denounced all cultural expressions that put more stress on form than content; such art allegedly lost its humanist and democratic character and was characteristic of the imperialism of late capitalist systems, particularly the United States. Considerably earlier than the New Left in the West, East German officials followed Soviet propaganda in labeling U.S. culture a tool of imperialism. Like their Soviet counterparts, East German officials leveled accusations of “decadence,” “cosmopolitanism,” and “formalism” against, for example, the literature of Kafka, against abstract painting, and also against undesirable music, such as jazz.¹² In distinguishing between good authentic jazz, on the one hand, and commercial dance music and modern jazz, on the other, Rudolf employed this same language. For example, he indicted swing music and the bebop of Charlie Parker as

decadent. At the same time that he derided certain aspects of jazz, Rudorf stressed that African-American folk music, including some forms of jazz such as blues and Dixieland, could fruitfully stimulate the development of a new “clean” German dance music.¹³

In his rejections of musical forms such as swing and boogie, Rudorf linked the absence of male and female respectability to threats against proper German national identity. “The ecstatic jumps of the deplorable brushheads and their *Amizonen*,” quipped Rudorf, “are at their worst when the orchestra plays louder, when a saxophone begins to squeak in a vulgar way or when shrill trumpet solos ring.” By identifying male jazz fans merely by their bouffant hairstyles and speaking of them, derogatorily, as “brushheads” (*Bürstenköpfe*), Rudorf associated them with fashion and thus with femininity. Furthermore, playing with the words “Amazons,” “Amis” (Americans), and “American Zone,” Rudorf portrayed Americanized German women as sexual aggressors and as masculinized. (“*Amizonen*” was a term Germans used to describe women who had sexual relations with U.S. soldiers.)¹⁴ Rudorf thus warned against the dangers of popular jazz in terms that connected a proper Germanness to respectable gender mores.

In his promotion of blues and Dixieland, Rudorf proposed that authentic jazz could help to counter the dangerous effects of American commercial music in East Germany and elsewhere. Just as East Germans could learn from the lively folk music of the Soviet Union and the other people’s republics, so too, Rudorf suggested, could East Germans learn from authentic jazz.¹⁵

Rudorf’s validation of jazz, like Berendt’s in West Germany, rested on distinguishing authentic from commercial music and on separating authentic jazz from any associations with decadence or unbridled sexuality. Yet in spite of similarities in their logic, Berendt and Rudorf came to different conclusions. In contrast to Berendt and many of the West German jazz associations that found bebop and modern jazz most valuable, Rudorf rejected such forms of jazz as decadent. Secretly, however, Rudorf applauded modern jazz in letters to his acquaintance Siegfried Schmidt in Halle.¹⁶

Rudorf’s use of official terminology allowed him to carve a space for jazz in East Germany, and it contributed to the confusion in both his own efforts and official responses to him. Within his framework of distinguishing authentic from commercial and modern “formalist” jazz, Rudorf was able to broaden the range of officially acceptable tunes, and in 1955 he briefly gained official recognition for an association of mostly male Leipzig jazz fans.¹⁷ But in spite of Rudorf’s efforts,

many East German officials continued to be suspicious of *all* jazz and *all* jazz fans.

Because GDR officials positioned themselves as champions of civil rights in the United States and generally believed in the revolutionary potential of the authentic folk music of the oppressed, their attacks on jazz required that jazz be denied the status of authentic African-American music. One official, Ludwig Richard Müller, declared that it did not matter whether jazz contained elements of “Negro folk music”; rather, it mattered to what ends jazz was being used. Another official, Georg Knepler, director of the Berlin Music Academy, stressed that East German composers and musicians greatly admired both the cultural creativity of African-Americans and the fight for equal rights against the barbarian racial policies of the ruling class in the United States. Indeed, in order to prove that he was not a racist, Knepler acclaimed the work of African-American actor and singer Paul Robeson, who during these years, because of his involvement in the U.S. Communist Party, was fighting to retain his U.S. citizenship. At the height of Soviet attacks in jazz, Robeson himself had published an article directed against jazz in the major Soviet music journal in 1949. In words that Rudolf had picked up in a 1952 article on jazz, Robeson argued that spirituals and blues were the only true Negro music in the United States. Commercial jazz, whether played by whites or African-Americans, “prostituted and ruthlessly perverted the genuine expressions of folk life.” Knepler followed Robeson in refuting Rudolf’s thesis that jazz was the music of the Negro proletariat in the American South. Blues and spirituals—which Robeson had sung—were indeed true folk music, according to Knepler, but jazz was not. Both Müller and Knepler supported this rejection of jazz with references to its sexualizing effects. Knepler spoke of the marks that brothels and gangster hangouts had left on jazz, while Müller was especially worried about the “public display of sexual drives” among jazz fans who danced.¹⁸

In critiquing *all* jazz, both Knepler and Müller employed a vocabulary similar to Rudolf’s rejections of commercial jazz. Elements of “decadence,” lamented Knepler, had intruded into the so-called true jazz. In jazz the “exuberance” of “Negro dances” turned into “hysteria,” intense expressiveness “degenerated” into empty clownery. Müller bemoaned the attempts of composers and musicians to satisfy the tastes of “Swing-Heinis” through “sexual groans” and unacceptable “decadent” dances.

The racist undertones of these attacks came to the surface when

Müller repeated SED leader Walter Ulbricht's words that the "'ape culture' [*Affenkultur*] of decadent jazz" had to be countered with a new, healthy German dance culture. And using anti-Semitic vocabulary, officials indicted Rudolf and jazz fans in Germany and abroad as followers of "cosmopolitan" dance music and "internationalism." They found their suspicions confirmed when the Leipzig jazz club did not endorse East German rearmament, and in May 1955 they dissolved the group.¹⁹

Cold War Conflicts

The back and forth between Rudolf and other jazz fans and East German authorities continued. In times of greater leniency—that is, after the June 1953 uprising and in the aftermath of Khrushchev's attacks on Stalinism in 1956—jazz fans were able to pursue their interests more openly and even with state support. Rudolf, however, stretched the limits too far when he organized jazz concerts in Protestant churches and gave lectures in West Germany. In 1957 he was arrested and convicted for slandering the Freie Deutsche Jugend (FDJ) and the SED and for having used jazz as a cover for political crimes.²⁰

On the other side of the Iron Curtain, press and officials in West Germany and the United States were watching closely what was happening in East Germany.²¹ The suppression of jazz in East Germany and other countries of the Warsaw Pact made jazz into an attractive messenger for American and West German democracy. Many of the West German jazz clubs, such as the New Jazz Circle Berlin, met in American cultural centers. After many requests from the field and positive press reports about respectable European fans, jazz became an official part of the cultural programs that the United States Information Agency and the State Department sponsored after 1956, but not without major complaints from Southern segregationists.²²

West Germans, for their part, used jazz against youthful rebelliousness at home and to set themselves apart from the Nazi past and the cold war enemies to the East. This multiple function of jazz—as an alleged tamer of young rebels and as a representative of Western democracy—contributed to its astounding proliferation through books, festivals, radio, and television in West Germany in the second half of the 1950s.²³ In August 1958 West German defense minister Franz-Josef Strauß suggested that he too saw jazz positively and indeed as the appropriate music of the West German army: "the community-building powers" of jazz converged with the efforts of this new

army. He explicitly used jazz to show that West Germany and the West German army differed from both its German cold war enemy to the East and the Third Reich.²⁴ Officials in West Berlin successfully attracted young people to a state-sponsored youth club called Jazz-Saloon, and by 1964 the West German Goethe Institutes used West German jazz bands in their mission to portray German culture abroad.²⁵ In this logic, jazz came to symbolize the new pluralist, post-fascist, antitotalitarian society that West German politicians in the second half of the 1950s were increasingly espousing.

In East Germany, state officials continued to be more repressive. After a phase of confusion and leniency, they ultimately accepted only narrow concepts of “authentic negro music.” In the late 1950s, they allowed only spirituals and blues, and in this increasingly repressive climate, some jazz musicians and jazz club members, including Rudolf after finishing his prison term, left East for West Germany.²⁶ At the same time East German officials sought to suppress the “open” dancing associated with boogie and rock ‘n’ roll, and they continued to dissolve any independent clubs that jazz fans attempted to form.

For East and West German officials, who were trying to make a break with the racist German past, jazz likely had some attraction because of its roots in African-American culture and because it had been attacked by the Nazis (and perhaps also because many white American jazz musicians were Jewish, although that was never an explicit topic). In the context of a cold war pro-civil rights agenda designed to counter criticisms of the United States, many U.S. politicians likewise considered African-American musicians important figures in portraying the United States as a country that had overcome racism.²⁷ However, tolerance also had clear limits. Neither in Strauß’s promotion of jazz nor in the West Berlin Jazz-Saloon were the African-American roots of jazz a theme. Jazz, in order to be acceptable, clearly had to be deracialized and even “whitened.” And in the debates over jazz, both East and West Germans asserted visions of culture that rendered conservative gender mores and respectable Germanness interdependent. In both countries in the 1950s, jazz also needed to be desexualized before it could become respectable.

Nonetheless, important differences emerged: on the defensive against Western imports and commercial culture, East German authorities were far more repressive. In this context jazz fans and officials in East Germany continued to see jazz as a potential vehicle for political resistance, a possibility that West Germans had successfully contained. We know much about German hostilities toward

America and American popular culture, but my brief exploration shows how some forms of American culture became part of a cold war liberal West German self-presentation. By the 1960s the West German magazine *Twen* added an image of jazz similar to the promotion of the music to American whites in *Downbeat* and *Playboy*: jazz was associated with the leisure and pleasure of a masculinist culture that included pre- and extramarital sex for men.²⁸

This account of the changing reception of jazz in cold war Germany reveals the complex processes involved in the German reception of American culture. For 1950s German adolescents, jazz frequently felt transformative, as an act of rebellion against parents, dominant cultural norms, and remnants of the Nazi past. As jazz aficionados succeeded in making the music more respectable, jazz also was compatible with maintaining class or gender stratification and became attractive to U.S. and West German authorities. We still need to learn more about the interpretive horizons that U.S. and German jazz musicians have opened with changing musical forms, and at the same time we need to look carefully at the social and political contexts in which various forms have been received, rejected, and institutionalized.²⁹

Work on American culture abroad ideally needs to begin by paying attention to both sides in these transmissions, the United States and the receiving countries. American culture certainly has not been a uniform or unifying tool of U.S. imperialism. While jazz lost some of its controversial edge in the 1950s as West Germany became more liberal and as the U.S. government recognized the music as a legitimate cultural expression, the music continued to broadcast multiple messages. And changing forms of U.S. culture continue to generate lively and even acerbic discussions in both the United States and Germany. The processes by which national and subnational cultures have been shaped in mutual engagement, attraction, and opposition, often within highly asymmetrical power relations, remain an important focus for the analysis of all international interactions, including German-American encounters.³⁰ Thus it is crucial to recognize the diversity and contested character of cultures on both sides of the Atlantic and even to think beyond a strict German or U.S. focus in locating the contexts in which these contests happen. In the case of jazz these include, for example, developments in the Soviet Union or challenges to U.S. power by nonaligned states. With all this in mind, histories of U.S.-German cultural and political interactions promise to get only more complex.³¹

NOTES

1. On jazz in the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich, see especially Michael Kater, *Different Drummers: Jazz in the Culture of Nazi Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

2. For more extensive discussions of the postwar German reception of jazz, see Uta G. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), chaps. 1, 4, and epilogue, and “American Jazz in the German Cold War,” in *Music and German National Identity*, ed. Celia Applegate and Pamela Potter (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002), 218–33.

3. This discussion draws on the following studies by Joachim-Ernst Berendt: *Der Jazz: Eine zeitkritische Studie* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1950); “Zum Thema Jazz,” *Frankfurter Hefte* 7 (October 1952): 768–79; “Americana: Erlebnisse und Gedanken von einer US-Reise,” *Melos* 18 (March 1951): 78–82; “Für und wider den Jazz,” *Merkur* 7 (1953): 887–90; *Das Jazzbuch: Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Jazzmusik* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1953).

4. On the problems of constructing jazz as a universal experience and the challenges to this view, see Scott DeVeaux, “Constructing the Jazz Tradition: Jazz Historiography,” *Black American Literature Forum* 25 (fall 1991): 525–60; Ingrid Monson, “The Problem with White Hipness: Race, Gender, and Cultural Conceptions of Jazz Historical Discourse,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 48 (fall 1995): 396–422.

5. “Jazz,” *Blickpunkt*, March 1956.

6. “Jazz-Freunde ohne Klamauf,” *Tagesspiegel*, June 16, 1957.

7. See, for example, Joachim Ernst Berendt, “Haleys Musik ist kein Jazz,” *Die Welt*, July 21, 1958.

8. H. W. Corten, “Kann der Jazz unserer Jugend schaden?” *Die Welt*, July 21, 1957.

9. Minutes of the 28. Sitzung, Jugendwohlfahrtausschuss, Bezirksamt Kreuzberg, May 2, 1957, Landesarchiv Berlin, Kalkreuthstr (LAB), Rep. 206, Acc. 3070/3582.

10. See Reginald Rudolf, *Jazz in der Zone* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1964).

11. Reginald Rudolf (*sic*), “Für eine frohe, ausdrucksvolle Tanzmusik,” *Musik und Gesellschaft* 2 (August 1952): 247–52; Reginald Rudolf “Die Tanzmusik muß neue Wege gehen,” *Musik und Gesellschaft* 4, pt. 1 (February 1954): 51–56, pt. 2 (March 1954): 92–95. See also the autobiography by Reginald Rudolf, *Nie wieder links: Eine deutsche Reportage* (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1990).

12. See, for example, Günter Erbe, *Die verfeimte Moderne: Die Auseinandersetzung mit dem “Modernismus” in Kulturpolitik, Literaturwissenschaft und Literatur der DDR* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1993). On the repression of jazz in East Germany and in the Soviet Union, see also Michael Rauhut, *Beat in der Grauzone: DDR-Rock, 1964–1972—Politik und Alltag* (Berlin: Basisdruck, 1993); Rudolf, *Jazz in der Zone*; S. Frederick Starr, *Red and Hot: The Fate of Jazz in the Soviet*

Union, 1917–1980 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983); Timothy Ryback, *Rock around the Bloc: A History of Rock Music in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

13. Rudolf (*sic*), “Für eine frohe, ausdrucksvolle Tanzmusik”; Rudolf, “Die Tanzmusik.” For similar arguments, see Hermann Meyer, *Musik im Zeitgeschehen* (Berlin, 1952), quoted in Rauhut, *Beat in der Grauzone*, 19.

14. Rudolf, “Die Tanzmusik.”

15. Rudolf (*sic*), “Für eine frohe, ausdrucksvolle Tanzmusik”; Rudolf, “Die Tanzmusik.” See also Rudolf, *Jazz in der Zone*, 37–39; Horst Lange, *Jazz in Deutschland: Die deutsche Jazz-Chronik 1900–1960* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1966).

16. Rudolf, “Die Tanzmusik,” and *Jazz in der Zone*, 43–44.

17. See Rudolf and Lukasz, letter to the Zentralrat der FDJ, Kulturabteilung, April 12, 1955, JA-IzJ A392 (Institut für zeitgeschichtliche Jugendforschung—Jugendarchiv). My thanks to Raelynn Hillhouse for pointing me to this file. Copy of letter Thomas to Abteilung Kultur, Zentralrat der FDJ, May 10, 1955, JA-IzJ A392; Sekretariat, “Abschrift,” Leipzig, January 26, 1956, JA-IzJ A392; Lange, *Jazz in Deutschland*; Rudolf, *Jazz in der Zone*.

18. Ludwig Richard Müller, “Dekadenz und lebensfroher Neubeginn,” *Musik und Gesellschaft* 5 (April 1955): 114–17; Georg Knepler, “Jazz und die Volksmusik,” *Musik und Gesellschaft* 5 (June 1956): 181–83; Paul Robeson, “Pesni moega naroda,” *Sovetskaia muzyka* (July 1949), quoted in Starr, *Red and Hot*, 221–22.

19. Müller, “Dekadenz”; “Jazzdiskussion,” April 7, 1955, Berlin; copy of letter Thomas to Abteilung Kultur, Zentralrat der FDJ, 10 May 1955; Kurt Knoblauch, FDJ Bezirksleitung Leipzig, to FDJ-Zentralrat, August 3, 1955; Lamberz (FDJ-Zentralrat, Kultur) to Knoblauch, January 1, 1956; Rudolf, Lukasz, Thomas to Karl Namokel, FDJ Zentralrat, December 27, 1955, all JA-IzJ A392.

20. See Rudolf, *Jazz in der Zone*, 116–25; “Die Tätigkeit des Ministeriums für Kultur, insbesondere der HA Musik auf dem Gebiete des Jazz,” n.d., ca. September 1957, Barch P (Bundesarchiv Abteilungen Potsdam) DR1 Nr. 243; Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels*, chap. 4.

21. “Gefahr für den Stehgeiger,” *Der Spiegel*, October 26, 1955; “Zonen-Jazzexperte in Ungnade,” *Der Tag*, February 24, 1957; “Prügel für Jazzanhänger,” *SBZ-Archiv* 8, April 25, 1957; U.S. Mission Berlin, Despatch 983, May 7, 1957; RG 59, 762b.00/5–757; Despatch 388, December 16, 1957, RG 59, 762.00/12–1657; Despatch 489, January 31, 1958, RG 59, 762b.00/1–3158; Despatch 575, March 10, 1958, RG 59, 762.00/3–1058, National Archives (NA).

22. See Charles A. Thomson and Walter H. C. Leaves, *Cultural Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963), 123; Penny M. Von Eschen, “‘Satchmo Blows Up the World’: Jazz, Race, and Empire during the Cold War,” in “*Here, There, and Everywhere*”: *The Foreign Politics of American Popular Culture*, ed. Reinhold Wagnleitner and Elaine Tyler May (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2000), 163–78, 165.

23. See Horst Koegler, “Jazz—theoretisch,” *Der Monat* 12 (October 1959): 58–64. See also Kaspar Maase, *BRAVO Amerika: Erkundungen zur Jugendkultur der Bundesrepublik in den fünfziger Jahren* (Hamburg: Junius, 1992), 179–85.

24. “Bundeswehr pflegt reinen Jazz,” *Tagesspiegel*, August 8, 1958, quoted in

Rauhut, *Beat in der Grauzone*, 21; “Jazz-Begeisterung in der Truppe,” *Die Welt*, August 9, 1958.

25. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels*, chap. 4, epilogue.

26. See Rudorf, *Jazz in der Zone*.

27. Von Eschen, “‘Satchmo,’” 167.

28. For the United States, see Von Eschen, “‘Satchmo,’” 165.

29. For a similar approach, see Monson, “Problem with White Hipness,” and Von Eschen, “‘Satchmo.’”

30. Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler have made a similar point related to histories of empire. See “Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda,” in *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World*, ed. Cooper and Stoler (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 1–56.

31. See, for example, Von Eschen, “‘Satchmo’”; Gerd Gemünden, *Framed Visions: Popular Culture, Americanization, and the Contemporary German and Austrian Imagination* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998); Reinhold Wagnleitner, “The Empire of Fun, or Talkin’ Soviet Union Blues: The Sound of Freedom and U.S. Cultural Hegemony in Europe,” *Diplomatic History* 23 (summer 1999): 499–524.