Lisa Skwirblies

Performing the Politics of Non-Alignment in Cold War Germany[1]

Abstract

This article discusses the history of postcolonial student migration and the under-researched repertoire of decolonial protest performances in Cold War Germany. It shows how the recruitment of hundreds of African and Asian students in the mid-1950s to visit universities in the two Germanies led to political and performative interventions of the Global South students across the Iron Curtain and to political coalitions with the nascent West German student movement. From a specific theatre and performance studies approach, this article explores these decolonial protests through the lens of performance and argues for a new approach to protest culture, one that goes beyond static and reified conceptions and instead allows us to understand the immediate and material effects such protest techniques had for those protesting.

Keywords

Protest, performance, postcolonial student migration, decolonization

Author

Lisa Skwirblies is a theatre historian and currently a post doc researcher at the institute for theatre studies at the LMU Munich. Her research interests are theatre and performance historiography, postcolonial and decolonial theory, and the history of protest. She obtained her PhD from the University of Warwick in 2018 and held an EU Marie Curie COFUND fellowship between 2018 and 2020.

> "Around 1000 students from over 50 nations and 4 continents are currently studying at the Karl-Marx-University in Leipzig and make our city […] truly to a meeting point of the world. They have brought the spirit of the conference of Bandung with them and are a vivid expression of the generous politics that our German Democratic Republic follows in the area of international labor and the support for the colonial and recently independent countries." [2]
> "These students will be the political and intellectual leaders of tomorrow in their nations; the choice they will make between West and East for the path of Asia and Africa might also determine the future of Europe." [3]

In 1955, delegates from 29 countries met in Indonesia for the so-called Bandung Conference, from which the superpowers Russia and the United States were excluded, to discuss politics of anti-imperialism, non-alignment, and decolonization. The resolutions of the Bandung Conference took an important and unambiguous stance on the stage of world politics against colonialism and brought the existence of a third geopolitical position to the attention of the world. The repercussions of the conference, the so-called "Spirit of Bandung", were also felt in the two Germanies at the time, the state-socialist German Democratic Republic and the liberal-capitalist Federal Republic of Germany. Here, the spirit of Bandung had a quite specific meaning. Bereft of colonies of their own, the

conference of Bandung represented an extraordinary opening for the two Germanies to create new spheres of influence. As historian Quinn Slobodian posits, for East and West Germany, "a postcolonial world of nations was a diplomatic field that a world of empires was not" (Slobodian 2013, 645).

One way to establish such a diplomatic field was to actively recruit hundreds of African and Asian students in the mid-1950s to visit universities in the two Germanies. These students organized themselves across the Iron Curtain and intervened in the post-War German public spheres with anti-imperial and decolonial political protests, speeches, and performances, as well as with their own political interpretations of international socialism. A large number of these pan-African and pan-Asian student groups also forged political coalitions with the nascent West-German student movement and its political agendas. With anti-imperial and decolonial protest performances, such as sit-ins, teach-ins, hunger strikes, marches, and blockades, they introduced direct action to the post-war German public spheres and arguably politicized the emerging German student movement on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Employing Theatre and Performance Studies, this article explores these decolonial protests through the lens of performance. My argument is twofold: first, I argue that the presence of the Global South students in Cold War Germany challenges the dominant narrative of 1960s scholarship that European student movements looked mainly westwards, to the US, for insurgent inspiration (Klimke 2007; Höhn 2002). Second, I argue that their protest performances challenge the way performance as a critical lens has been used to analyse protest cultures. While most scholarship on 1960s protest culture has used performance to describe the symbolic and staged character of direct action (Schechner 1995; Klimke and Scharloth 2007), I argue that the direct action of the decolonial protests described in this article not only targeted governmental authority but also transformed those impacted by these structures in their subjectivity.

The article starts by briefly mapping the "performative turn" within 1960s scholarship and the alternative approach to performance that this article will employ. I then outline the motivations of both East and West Germany for recruiting students from the Global South in the mid-1950s and the ways in which the foreign students organized themselves in student organizations. Subsequently, I discuss two examples of political protests by the foreign student groups as well as the strategies the two German governments used to navigate and negotiate the political activities and public presence of these students.

The "Performative Turn" in 1960s scholarship

In their handbook on the cultural and media history of the student movement (2007), historians Martin Klimke and Joachim Scharloth (2007) propose a "performative turn" for the historiography of 1960s protest culture. By that, they mean that scholars should pay increased attention to the staged character of direct action in the 1960s. They build their argument on theatre historian Erika Fischer-Lichte's observation that 1960s society itself was deeply marked by a "performative turn". According to Fischer-Lichte this turn was "[…] realized in and sparked off a number of new forms of cultural performances such as spectacular demonstrations and marches, go-ins, sit-ins, teach-ins, happenings, interrupting the course of traditional cultural performances" (238). Every corner of social life was touched by this performative turn: "The new performative turn theatricalized economics, law, the arts, and everyday life. Theatre became a cultural model" (Fischer-Lichte 2005, 238). Her reading of the emergence of this performative turn as tied to the expansion of media technologies during the Cold War has informed much of the scholarship on 1960s protest culture. In the majority of the scholarship, direct action and protest are described as primarily symbolic actions and as deliberately staged for the media. Here, the protagonists of the protests are presented as spreading their message in the form of symbolic politics using tactical event stagings (Klimke and Scharloth 2007; Höhn 2002). This approach assumes that each direct action was at every point intended

for public viewing and takes for granted that those protesting must communicate with the media in order to be effective.

Critical of this narrow focus on performance's symbolic and communicative mode, theatre and performance scholar Michael Shane Boyle (2012) suggests a different approach. Building on Tracy C. Davis' definition of performance as "a tool for innovative exploration" that is attentive "to the implication of bodies and embodiedness" (Davis 2008, 1) and on Dwight Conquergood's definition of performance as a method of research (2002), Boyle suggests focusing on the analysis of direct action on the immediate and material effects such protest techniques had for those protesting, as well as for their transformative effects of subjectivity. He argues that the concept of performance allows us to move beyond static and reified conceptions of protest cultures and can help us to understand the effects such protest techniques have had for those protesting, namely their transformative effects on subjectivity. I concur with his assessment, as most of the witness accounts of the protests I have come across over the course of this research speak of how the experience of performing direct action has helped them to overcome alienated social relations and internalized hierarchies. More than a tool for staging, the performativity and embodiment of direct action helped the protestors to a form of "radical self-questioning" of their assumptions and conclusions about society. In other words, the very act of engaging in the performativity of political protest transforms the one who performs the act. This means understanding the one engaged in direct action not as preceding an expression but as being shaped by the performance of expression (Boyle 2012, 22). As Ulrike Meinhof, one of the iconic figures of the German New Left, declared in 1968, "the students are not rehearsing for a rebellion, they are engaging in resistance."[4]

As I will show in this article, these new forms of performative engagement in political protest in the public spheres of Cold War Germany derived not only from a deep engagement with revolutionary ideas from what was then called the "Third World", as much scholarship has so far insisted, but from the actual presence of students from the postcolonial world leading the way in Germany's early 1960s protest movement. It was the actual political collaboration between the international students and the nascent German student movement that introduced direct action as the favoured instrument of the 1960s "cultural revolution".

The Scramble for Foreign Students

Both German republics dedicated significant efforts to attracting so-called Afro-Asian students to either of the two blocs. From the mid-1950s onwards, the battle for Afro-Asian students fought by the two Germanies accelerated with every year. For the sake of comparison: in 1957, West German universities admitted 3,053 foreign students while East German universities admitted only 225. The numbers increased rapidly on both sides within only a few years. By 1960, West Germany had 9,282 foreign students and East Germany 1,342 (Slobodian, 646).[5]

The interest in students from the Global South in both German republics was clearly informed by the ambition to increase political and diplomatic influence on the postcolonial world. A letter from the GDR Secretary of Higher Education to the GDR Minister of People's Education in 1961 labelled "strictly confidential" exemplifies the role the foreign students played in the GDR's foreign policies: "The experience with students who already returned to their home countries (for instance, India and the United Arab Republic) proves that they are an important factor in increasing the international esteem of the GDR."[6] Similarly, a public relations campaign in West Germany in 1959, signed by a group of major West German politicians such as Willy Brandt, Heinrich Lübcke, Theodor Heuss and others stated: "These students will be the political and intellectual leaders of tomorrow in

their nations; the choice they will make between West and East for the path of Asia and Africa might also determine the future of Europe."[7]

The programme for students from the Global South was a crucial part of the West German development policy. Once West German authorities began to see development more as a cultural than an economic problem, education became a top priority in the 1960s. The first funds for international training and education in 1956 in the FGR amounted to 17 million DM and were dedicated to "maintaining cultural relations". As a result, the numbers of foreign students on West German campuses increased ninefold between 1951 and 1961, while the number of West German students only doubled (Slobodian 2012, 28). The situation was similar in the GDR. The foreign student study programme was seen as such an important factor in the foreign policy of the GDR that, in 1961, the Secretary for Higher Education suggested cutting the available places for German students considerably in order to offer a better quota for students from the Global South.[8]

Contrary to the situation in the FRG, the GDR emphasized the importance of the foreign students returning to their home countries. This was part of their understanding of international solidarity. The aim of the foreign student education programme in the GDR was to educate the future elites of the postcolonial countries and to avoid the "brain drain" that the West was allegedly supporting with their foreign student programmes. The return of the students to their home countries after completing their education in the GDR held obvious benefits for the East German authorities. The hope was that the returning students would advocate the GDR's political ideology and scientific development in the postcolonial world. Yet, instead of fulfilling their supposed roles as "agents of the project of national-economic development" (Slobodian 2012, 30), these foreign students evaded the containment strategies of West and East German authorities and vocally advocated their own political ideas about socialism, decolonization, and liberation.

Student organizations

With their politics of non-alignment, the Afro-Asian students challenged the binary Cold War rhetorics of both the GDR and the FRG, tested the boundaries of political tolerance of the two republics, and in many cases created diplomatic difficulties for their host countries. Both countries explicitly encouraged the foreign students to address the problems of their home countries in seminars and discussion rounds. However, they implicitly disallowed any position in between the blocs.

The students from the Global South organized themselves in national and international university groups (Hochschulgruppen). Almost every country was represented on West and East German campuses with their own student organization, such as the Afghan Student Union, the Egyptian Student Club, the Federation of Iranian Students, the Union of Sudanese Students etc. In 1961, West Germany had 237 foreign student organizations, while East Germany had 105 foreign student organizations in 1966 (Uladh 2005, 193). Besides the national student groups, students also established international student organizations: the Afro-Asian Student Union at the University of Göttingen [9] was established by Sayeed ur Rahman from India, Ghasan Al Akel from Syria and Kyaw Tha Tun from Burma in 1959; the African Student Union of Germany (ASUD) was founded in Munich in 1961 and became a single trans-German organization in the spirit of pan-Africanism.

Especially the East German authorities encouraged the development of national student organizations. Records from East German universities show that the national framework was also used to evaluate the academic performance of the students. Performance records of foreign students at the Technical University Dresden from 1975, for instance, describe Algerian students as "the worst students among the Arabic students, but with great engagement in the theories of Marxist-Leninist theories".[10] Students from Bangladesh are classed as "achievement-wise the strongest of all student groups" and the Egyptian

students are "good listeners" but "weak in active participations" during political discussions.[11]

While the national organizations seemed to cater to the containment strategies of East German authorities, umbrella organizations, such as the Afro-Asian Student Union or the pan-African student organization, did not. They were deemed "obstructive" to the work with the foreign students.[12] This dismissal might have been motivated by the fact that these student organizations operated across the Iron Curtain, i.e. not only as pan-Asian or pan-African organizations, but in the broader spirit of non-alignment, also as pan-German organizations. Since foreign students were allowed to travel between East and West Germany, even after the wall was built in 1961, they were able to organize across the Iron Curtain. Many foreign students studying in East Germany, moreover, made regular use of the nightlife in West Berlin and functioned as suppliers of West German consumer goods to their East German colleagues. As I will show in the following two examples, in resisting ideological patronage, the Global South students were in many cases the driving force behind student activism and political demonstrations on both sides of the Berlin wall. In the spirit of non-alignment, they challenged the bloc mentality of both German republics.

The Anti-Tshombe demonstrations in West Berlin

The demonstration against the visit of Congolese prime minister Moise Tshombe to West Berlin in 1964 was one of the first major public protests by politicized Global South students that reverberated in the public spheres of both German republics. The African Student Union and the Latin American Student League organized the Berlin demonstration together with socialist West German students. Tshombe hoped to use his visit to obtain more development investment from the West German government. For the demonstrating students, however, he was responsible for the massacre of thousands of Congolese in the battle of Kisangani. However, as historian Timothy Brown (2013) argues: "More than simply a protest against Tshombe's dismal human-rights records, it was a protest against the persistence of colonial domination in the Third World symbolized by Western elite's support of Tshombe" (23). The demonstration can thus be seen as targeting both local and global issues; it was a protest against West Berlin's involvement in Tshombe's policies as much as against colonialism, the Cold War, and anti-Communism.

Both East and West German newspapers described the dramaturgy of the demonstration in great detail.[13] When Tshombe arrived at the airport, he was greeted by a group of over a thousand students with placards saying "Murderer", "Freedom for the Congolese People", but also "Bonn=Enemy of the Congo; GDR= Friend of the Congo", which was highlighted by the East German newspapers and suggests that East German students or African students from East Germany also participated in the demonstrations. When the first tomatoes were thrown his way, Tshombe left the airport through a back door. Students also broke through the police barricades and continued linking arms and chanting "murderer" and "Tshombe out" as they marched towards city hall. This was a serious breach of the demonstration protocol as the protest had only been allowed by the Berlin police on condition that the protestors stayed in one place (and behind the barricades) and that it was a silent protest.

Fig. 1 Protesting students behind the barricades. Photograph: Landesarchiv Berlin.

Fig. 2 Protesting students on their way to city hall. Photograph: Landesarchiv Berlin.

At the city hall, the large number of protestors, their vociferous slogans and a rather disorganized police got the attention of the mayor of Berlin, Willy Brandt. He delayed his meeting with Tshombe in order to receive a delegation of the protesting students in his office. A representative of the African Student Union, the president of the Nigerian Students Association, an Algerian student, an Egyptian student, and two German members of the Socialist Student Union (SDS) convinced Brandt in a twenty-minute conversation of the negative consequences for West Germany's image in Africa this audience with Tshombe would have. As a result, Brandt cut his meeting with Tshombe short and assured the students that their demonstration would receive retroactive police approval (Slobodian 2012, 70).

Fig. 3 The delegation of students inside city hall before meeting mayor Willy Brandt. Photograph: Landesarchiv Berlin.

For the (West) German student movement, the anti-Tshombe demonstration was a watershed moment. Rudi Dutschke from the socialist West German student organization, and later the face of the German New Left, called it "the beginning of our cultural revolution".[14] For the first time, direct action was used as a successful protest technique. The anti-Tshombe demonstration was tame in comparison to what was to come in the following years. Yet, it marked a crucial moment in the protest repertoire of the New Left, since direct action was used for the first time as a protesting tool. The spontaneous violation of police orders by a large group of demonstrators had previously been unthinkable in postwar Germany. The anti-Tshombe demonstration had developed a protest dramaturgy against foreign dignitaries invited to West Germany that would recur repeatedly in 1960s-Germany, most famously in the protest against Shah Reza Pahlavi in June 1967 (Brown 2013, 24).

The anti-Tshombe demonstration is a pertinent example of Global South student demonstrations that impacted the German perception of the postcolonial world and

politicized German students to employ direct action. It shows that even before the now iconic anti-Vietnam war demonstrations by the German New Left in the late 1960s, students from the Global South had organized internationally coordinated waves of protests that targeted both their colonial and neocolonial governments and the local governments of the two German republics. The African students had introduced Dutschke and his German comrades to a repertoire of protest techniques (breaking the police line, building a human chain, storming City Hall) that would change their understanding of protest profoundly. As Dutschke noted retrospectively in his diary: "Our friends from the Third World jumped immediately into the breach; it was up to the Germans to follow."[15]

Crucially, Dutschke described the physical experience of spontaneously transgressing the rules of demonstration or "the fetishized game rules of formal democracy" as having had an impact on the "self-awareness" of the protestors that no reflection, discussion, or other forms of rational deliberation could have had.[16] The performance of disobedience through direct action not only targeted governmental authority but also transformed those impacted by these structures in their subjectivity, according to their self-assessment. It becomes clear from their own statements and the descriptions of eye witnesses, that in the case of the anti-Tshombe demonstration, direct action was not used to deliberately stage spectacular media images (as in "a media performance"), but applied spontaneously, and can be better understood as performance in the sense of "a method of research" (Conquergood 2002) into new forms of resistance against state authority.

Controlling Curious Communists

Interestingly, the West German media located the origin of the new protest techniques of the West German students in "the East", and more specifically in China. The protesting students were repeatedly labelled as "FU-Chinese", "Red Guards", or "Maoist Youth" (Brown 2013, 34). This is almost ironic, as the GDR faced in the same years growing problems with its actual Chinese students, who increasingly questioned and publicly challenged the line of Soviet socialism that the GDR followed. Whereas a vocal political attitude by foreign students was encouraged by the GDR authorities, this was the case only to the extent that their political expressions were in line with the party's socialist ideas. The following example shows how the GDR created "spaces of supervised freedom" (Slobodian 2013, 645), in which the political activities of the foreign students could be controlled and censored if necessary and highlights the occasionally drastic efforts that were taken to police their attitudes towards alternative interpretations of communism.

In 1960, the President of the Karl-Marx University Leipzig evaluated the education of foreign students in the GDR as follows:

> [w]e cannot leave it to chance, whether or not our foreign students feel at home and whether they see and understand the situation in the right way. We have to actively advertise the new and great things that are growing in our state. At the same time, it is our responsibility to avoid everything that alienates the students from the problems in their home countries during their stay. [17]

Rather than leaving it to chance, the foreign students were engaged in a carefully curated programme of political discussions about "Third World" matters, obligatory introductory courses in Marxism-Leninism, exposure to everyday GDR life in host families and coordinated sightseeing tours and cultural events. These excursions were often described by East German university authorities as "relevant to foreign policy" (außenpolitisch relevant) in the evaluation reports and also served to test the students' political-ideological attitudes in more casual settings.[18] The space of supervised freedom thus extended far

beyond the classroom. A lecturer from the Herder Institute (which ran the foreign student programme) summarized the alleged motto of the institute as: "The enemy is where we are not" (Uladh 2005, 197).

However, the supervision was less all-encompassing than the GDR authorities might have hoped. For one, they had little control over their international students' freedom of movement, manifest in their regular travels to West Berlin. During the mid-1960s, the GDR also increasingly lost a grip on the particular brand of socialism that it would have liked to see the students export back to their home countries. With the escalation of the political tensions between China and the Soviet Union in the 1960s – the so-called Sino-Soviet split - many of the Global South students became more vocal about alternative interpretations of socialism to the state-socialism of the GDR. This can be seen, for instance, in a political discussion that escalated at the Herder Institute in January 1963. The topic of the evening was "What are the tasks of the 6th party convention of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED)" and the main lecture stressed the principles of peaceful coexistence and the communist movement's commitment to fighting for peace. Following the lecture, a group of Chinese students hijacked the discussion with prepared contributions that challenged the foreign policy of the USSR, particularly the principle of peaceful coexistence, and defended China's position in the conflict over the border with India.[19] These incidents recurred in various political forums. The students also distributed material propagating Mao Zedong's political ideas in German translation on all GDR campuses or published them in so-called wall newspapers throughout the university.[20]

The authorities of the Karl-Marx University reacted promptly by prohibiting students from speaking about these matters publicly and distributing any material from China that had not been approved by the university.[21] The university deemed these questions to be party political rather classroom politics. The East German universities tried to regulate the contact between Chinese students and their colleagues, but other students had long been "infected". Outside of the classroom, the Chinese students continued to organize political discussions in the foreign student dormitories and supplied participants with records of Mao's speeches. Rather than blindly following SED socialism, many of the foreign students remained deeply influenced by the socialist principles of their home countries. In a report on the university year 1968, the Committee for Foreign Student Matters (KAS) complained that most students from Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America had devoted themselves "to the arsenal of Mao-ideology, the petty-bourgeois Western European student movements, and even the theories of Che Guevara."[22]

The Sino-Soviet split was as much about geopolitical struggles as it was about the sovereignty of defining and redefining socialism and communism as such. While East Germany depicted its relationship to the Soviet Union as one of "friendship", China refashioned it as one of colonizer and colonized (Slobodian 2016). The idea that peace should be the ultimate goal of the communist world system, as the GDR and the USSR advocated, was understood by China as counter-productive and harmful to the cause of liberating the still colonized countries through violent revolution. This narrative of "decolonization through revolution" and the belief that the Soviet communist idea of world peace accounted only for the realities in the Global North, resonated specifically with the African and Latin American students in the GDR.[23] They found the Chinese critique of the apparent bias of the peace doctrine confirmed in the conflicts of their home countries. The Cuban Missile Crisis, the Bay of Pigs invasion, or the ongoing interventions of the Global North in the funding of political parties or leaders in African countries are just some of these examples. When the Union of African Students and Workers in the GDR (UASA) planned to discuss the Chinese position "on the East German failure to support revolutionary moments"[24] at a conference they had organized in 1961, the East Germany authorities postponed the conference three times. As an official from an East German technical university noted, a large percentage of the foreign students "tends to make undue generalizations in seeing GDR citizens as petty bourgeois (Spießer) people lacking revolutionary élan of any kind."[25] Yet, not only the foreign students but also the nascent

West German student movement and the East German youth showed a deep interest in Maoist thought. Delegates of the socialist student organization in West Berlin as well as hundreds of East German youths travelled regularly to the East German Chinese Embassy to acquire copies of Mao Zedong's Red Book and other publications.

The conflict with the Chinese students provokes a different reading of Cold War politics, one in which the GDR had to define and defend its interpretation of communism not only against Western democracy but also against Eastern Maoism. This example also shows that—contrary to the dominant script of Cold War historiography—conflicts were not exclusive to the binary opposition between communism and capitalism. Instead, the fight for the dominant interpretation of communism was a crucial battlefield for the countries on the other side of the Iron Curtain as well.

Conclusion

In this article, I have argued for a reevaluation of the role of students from the Global South in the political protest movements of the 1960s and challenged the tenacious myth of German Cold War protest culture that the nascent German student movement looked exclusively westwards for political inspiration. The concept of performance I used in this article has helped to show the transformative effects that the direct action of the decolonial protests had on those protesting and challenged the common idea that most protest forms are merely symbolic and staged for the media. Moreover, both examples, the demonstrations against Tshombe in West Berlin and the interventions of Chinese students in East Germany, testify to the presence of decolonization, liberation, and non-alignment as concepts available in public debates across the two Germanies during the 1950s and 1960s. The Afro-Asian students not only politicized the nascent German student movement into new forms of direct action but also challenged the bloc mentality of Cold War Germany with ideas of non-alignment. In confrontation with authorities and colleagues, they opened up political and ideological alternatives to both Western liberal capitalism and the state-based socialism of the East.

Endnotes

[1] This article has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under the Marie Sklodowska-Curie Grant Agreement No. 754388.

[2] University Archive Leipzig (UAL), DIB 034, Memo by the Vice Rector of the Karl-Marx-University Leipzig on the question of the foreign student study programme, „Zu Fragen des Ausländerstudiums", 25.4.1960.

[3] BArch/B136/3037, 18 December 1959.

[4] Meinhof, cit. in Boyle 18.

[5] Foreign students had been enrolled at East German universities as early as 1951. But the foreign student programme really took off with the founding of the Institute for Foreign Students (*Institut für Ausländerstudium*) at the Karl-Marx-University of Leipzig in 1956, which was later renamed the Herder Institute. In total, about 78,400 foreign students visited East German universities between 1951 and 1989 (Uladh 175).

[6] Bundesarchiv Berlin Lichterfelde DR 2/6663. "Streng vertraulich. Betr. Maßnahmen zur Erweiterung des Ausländerstudiums bis 1965", 23.5.1961, Schreiben des Staatssekretärs für Hochschul- und Fachschulwesen an das Ministerium für Volksbildung.

[7] BArch/B136/3037, 18 December 1959.

[8] Bundesarchiv Berlin Lichterfelde DR 2/6663. "Streng vertraulich. Betr. Maßnahmen zur Erweiterung des Ausländerstudiums bis 1965", 23.5.1961, Schreiben des Staatssekretärs für Hochschul- und Fachschulwesen an das Ministerium für Volksbildung.

[9] The student union successfully operates to this day and can be understood as a unique model of "implemented multiculturalism" at a time when Germans themselves were not ready to enter into intercultural dialogues (Berman 44).
[10] University Archive Dresden (UAD), „Bericht über Studenten an der TU Dresden aus nichtsozialistischen Ländern", 24. April 1975, File 003.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Cit. in Uladh 193.
[13] I follow here the accounts of the GDR newspaper *Neues Deutschland,* 19th December 1964 and the FRG newspaper *Berliner Morgenpost,* 21st December 1964.
[14] Uwe Bergmann, Rudi Dutschke, Wolfgang Lefèvre, and Bernd Rabehl, Rebellion der Studenten oder die neue Opposition (Hamburg: Rororo Aktuell, 1968), p. 63.
[15] Cit. in Slobodian 2012, p.73.
[16] Dutschke cit. in Boyle, p. 53.
[17] University Archive Leipzig (UAL), DIB 034, „Zu Fragen des Ausländerstudiums", 25.4.1960.
[18] UAL DIB 034, „Probleme der politisch-ideologischen Einflußnahme auf die ausländischen Aspiranten im Studienjahr 1964/65", 22.6.1965. This particular report, for instance, also describes where the students sat on the bus on the excursion, who sang what song on the bus and what they discussed during lunch etc.
[19] UAL DIB 034, "Auszug aus Bericht der SED-Parteiorganisation des Herder Instituts über Forum vom 9.1.1963 im Club des Herder Institutes". The report is marked "strictly confidential".
[20] UAL DIB 034, "Auszug aus Bericht der SED-Parteiorganisation des Herder Instituts über Forum vom 9.1.1963 im Club des Herder Institutes". The report is marked "strictly confidential".
[21] UAL DIB 034, "Bericht über die Aussprache mit zwei Vertretern der chinesischen Landsmannschaft in Leipzig", letter from the Vice Rector for junior scientists of the Karl-Marx University to the State Secretary for Higher Education, 26.2.1963.
[22] Cit. in Uladh 191, transl. by me.
[23] UAL Sektion ML 038, "Bericht zum Ausländerstudium", 25.1.1966.
[24] Cit. in Slobodia 2016, p.648.
[25] Ibid.

References

Berman, Nina. 1999. "Multiculturalism, Reintegration, and Beyond: the Afrikanisch-Asiatische Studentenförderung in Göttingen." *South Central Review*, Vol. 16 (2/3): 34-53.

Boyle, Michael Shane. 2012. "The Ambivalence of Resistance: West German Authoritarian Performance after the Age of Affluence". PhD dissertation, online https://scholarship.org/uc/item/2c73n9k4.

Brown, Timothy. 2013. *West Germany and the Global Sixties: The Anti-Authoritarian Revolt, 1962-1978*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conquergood, Dwight. 2002. "Performance Studies. Interventions and Radical Research." *The Drama Review*, Vol. 46 (2): 145-156.

Davis, Tracy C. 2008. "Introduction: The Pirouette, Detout, Revolution, Deflection, Deviation, Tack, and Yaw of the Performative Turn" in *The Cambridge Companion to Performance Studies*, ed. Tracy Davis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. 2005. *Theatre, Sacrifice, Ritual: Exploring Forms of Political Theatre*. London: Routledge.

Höhn, Maria. 2002. *GIs and Fräuleins: The German-American Encounter in 1950s West Germany*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Klimke, Martin. 2011. *The Other Alliance. Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Klimke, Martin and Joachim Scharloth. 2007. *1968: Handbuch zur Kultur-und Mediengeschichte der Studentenbewegung*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.

Slobodian, Quinn. 2016. "The Maoist Enemy: China's Challenge in 1960s East Germany". *Journal of Contemporary History*, Vol. 51 (3): 635-659.

— 2013. "Bandung in Divided Germany: Managing Non-Aligned Politics in East and West, 1955-63". *The Journal of Commonwealth History*, Vol. 41 (4): 644-662.
— 2012. *Foreign Front. Third World Politics in Sixties West Germany*. Durham: Duke University Press.
Uladh, Damian Mac Con. 2005. "'Studium bei Freunden?' Ausländische Studierende in der DDR bis 1970". In: *Ankunft – Alltag – Ausreise. Migration und interkulturelle Begegnung in der DDR Gesellschaft*, Christian Th. Müller Patrice G. Poutrus (eds.). Köln: Böhlau.