ESG
RECHERCHE

DOCUMENT DE TRAVAIL / WORKING PAPER

No. 2020-13

How Western Science Corrupts Class Consciousness

Till Düppe

Octobre 2020

ESG UQÀM
Département des sciences économiques
École des sciences de la gestion
Université du Québec à Montréal

How Western Science Corrupts Class Consciousness

Till Düppe, Université du Québec à Montréal

Document de travail No. 2020-13

Octobre 2020

Département des Sciences Économiques
Université du Québec à Montréal
Case postale 8888,
Succ. Centre-Ville
Montréal, (Québec), H3C 3P8, Canada
Courriel : brisson.lorraine@uqam.ca
Site web : http://economie.esg.uqam.ca

How Western Science Corrupts Class Consciousness

East Germany's Presence at IIASA

July 2020

Abstract: The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Laxenburg, Austria, was founded during the period of détente in 1972 to bring together scientists from East and West to research shared problems, and thus to build a "bridge" between the two opposed systems. The underlying image of knowledge was in stark contrast to the intellectual culture established in East Germany. This article reconstructs East Germany's role at IIASA. Even if participation was considered important for displaying East German science, I argue that its contribution was caught up in the precepts of the western scholar as a class enemy. Using the records of the party and the Stasi, I show this along the best documented case, the economist Harry Maier, who was one of the few social scientists who visited IIASA for two years between 1978 and 1980, and then, in 1986, used a conference visit to escape from East Germany.

Key-Words: scientific cooperation, political epistemology, IIASA, Harry Maier, Stasi.

How Western Science Corrupts Class Consciousness

East Germany's Presence at IIASA

> "The very confidential and personal atmosphere, and the generous scientific working conditions at IIASA, which are also characteristic of other scientific institutions in the non-socialist area (NSW), can be an immediate means of *political diversion*. They promote a growing lack of criticism towards previously existing enemy images and class convictions. In return, working conditions in the GDR and the connection between ideology and science are increasingly viewed critically."[1]

Introduction

When the Charter of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) was signed in October 1972, even before East Germany was recognized as a state by the United Nations, its membership was a real success of the policy of détente, or Brezhnev's "peace program", as it was called in the East. IIASA was a unique research centre that brought together researchers from the East and the West to solve, on eye-level and with equal rights, "global" problems like acid rain and "universal" problems like transportation or an aging society. Beyond the desire to build political bridges, the founding of the IIASA sprung from the idea that modern social sciences are alike on both sides of the Iron Curtain and thus could contribute to the policy of détente. IIASA manifested the shared belief in the modernization of society through a more scientific and

[1] Wolfgang Schirmer, "Erarbeitung einer politisch-operativen Bestandsanalyse der Wissenschaftsbeziehungen der AdW der DDR zum IIASA," 20.8.1988 (HA XVIII 2036: 20), emphasis added.

rational policy.[2] In contrast to the science race that dominated preceding decades, IIASA's Charta expressed the hope that "science and technology, if wisely directed, can benefit all mankind … (and) that international cooperation between national institutions promotes cooperation between nations and so the economic and social progress of people."[3] Previously called "economic cybernetics" in the East and, among others, "decision sciences" in the West, this current of knowledge was now called "systems analysis".[4]

For East Germany, the membership was a true novelty in international relations. The non-recognition policy and the exclusive mandate of West Germany was a major obstacle of the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States. It was only after Willy Brandt

[2] Of course, what was understood as political, social, science, and progress was negotiated rather than presumed, as Eglė Rindzevičiūtė in her book on IIASA, *The Power of Systems: How Policy Sciences Opened Up the Cold War World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2016).

[3] IIASA Charter (Laxenburg: IIASA, 1972, http://www.iiasa.ac.at/web/home/about/leadership/iiasacharter/charter.pdf, accessed 10 May 2020). The literature on IIASA consists of extensive studies on the political negotiations of its foundation (McDonald, A. (1998) 'Scientific Cooperation as a Bridge across the Cold War Divide: The Case of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA)', *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 866 (1): 55–83; Riska-Campbell, L., *Bridging East and West: The Establishment of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in the United States Foreign Policy of Bridge Building, 1964–1972* (Helsinki: Finnish Society of Science and Letters, 2011). There are also several participant accounts from the western perspectives (e.g. Levien, R. E., 'RAND, IIASA, and the Conduct of Systems Analysis', in A. C. Hughes and T. P. Hughes (eds.) *Systems, Experts, and Computers: The Systems Approach in Management and Engineering, World War II and After*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, (2000), 433–61). For further historical studies, see the works by Isabell Schrickel, e.g. "International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), " in Frank Reichherzer, Emmanül Droit, Jan Hansen (eds.), *Den Kalten Krieg vermessen: Über Reichweite und Alternativen einer binären Ordnungsvorstellung* (Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2018, 199–214); and the study by Duller (op. cit.). The most extensive research on the eastern perspective on IIASA is the book by Rindzevičiūtė, op. cit. However, it entails no reference to East Germany.

[4] For the importance of systems analysis in the West, see Paul Erickson, et al., *How Reason Almost Lost Its Mind: The Strange Career of Cold War Rationality* (Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press, 2013); and Hunter Heyck, *Age of System: Understanding the Development of Modern Social Science* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015). For the importance of economic cybernetics in the East, see Slava Gerovitch, *From Newspeak to Cyberspeak: A History of Soviet Cybernetics* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002); and Till Düppe and Ivan Boldyrev (eds.), *Economic Knowledge in Socialism* (Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2019). Comparing the military context of RAND and the global problem-solving context of IIASA, Matthias Duller argued for an intellectual mutation of systems analysis in IIASA ("Internationalization of Cold War systems analysis: RAND, IIASA and the institutional reasons for methodological change," *History of the Human Sciences*, 2016, 29 (4-5), 172–190: 173).

opened up to the East, and only under the condition that IIASA members were non-governmental institutions, that the IIASA Charter could be signed by both German states.[5] In fact, only two months later, in December 1972, the GDR and the FRG accepted each other as equal members in the United Nations. IIASA was a matter of national pride, and thus an occasion, comparable to sports, for "socialist science propaganda and the display of the performance capacity (*Leistungsfähigkeit*) of science in the GDR," as Karl Bichtler, the head of East Germany's committee for applied systems analysis, wrote.[6]

But IIASA was also a real challenge. By the early 1970s, East German academia was inhabited by a reclusive generation many of which had seen nothing else apart from East German academia. Spiritually and physically separated, the socialist intelligentsia had developed its own culture largely independent of the western sphere. For the case of Humboldt University in the early 1970s, Middel observed the "elimination of the international criteria of evaluating scientific performance".[7] In addition, the third university reform and the academy reform in the late 1960s subjected research to five year plans, damping individual initiative in science. Research was oriented towards the needs of the party bureaucracy and collective industry, an epistemic virtue worshiped as "praxis relevance". And the administration of science was dominated by the formal and hierarchical party roles professors usually held. After two decades of repeated battles on how to found knowledge on the doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, East Germany's science was

[5] The twelve founding members were Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the German Democratic Republic, Italy, Japan, Poland, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, to which was added Austria (1973), Hungary (1974), Sweden and Finland (both 1976), and the Netherlands (1977). East Germany was not invited at the first meeting of founding members in Sussex (see McDonald, op. cit., 1998).
[6] Report Bichtler, in DY 30 84541: 9.
[7] Middell, M. (2012) 'Die Humboldt Universität im DDR Wissenschaftssystem', in R. Vom Bruch and H.-E. Tenorth (eds), *Geschichte der Universität Unter den Linden. 1810–2010*, vol. 3. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 251-436, here 335.

intimately linked to the notion of "class consciousness". While bourgeois science is but the ideology of monopolistic power, socialism is an inherently scientific undertaking, a belief that was policed both by the "party groups" integrated in the academic system, as well as by the Ministry of State Security, or short the Stasi.[8] In the case of IIASA, two Stasi departments were in charge: department five of HA XVIII for "scientific, technical and social research," and department K of the infamous HV A (*Hauptverwaltung Aufklärung*) for the "use of legal relationships." While the former are one of the sources of the following reconstruction, the latter files were largely destroyed during the turmoil of 1989, the significance of which the reader will understand at the end of this article.[9]

While in East Germany, being a social scientist was to be a partisan scholar, being at IIASA meant to live the global politics of "peaceful coexistence", which was a rich and also festive lived experience. Geographically, IIASA was in the West, in a picturesque castle outside of Vienna, giving visits a sense of adventure and privilege to the otherwise isolated Eastern scientists.[10] All western literature was freely available. The use of funds was decided

[8] The notion of class consciousness was both rhetoric and belief. While as rhetoric it was required for any career, as belief it was not only fed by the study of Marx's text, but also fed by a strong conviction of this generation that only socialism can secure peace and was thus the right response to Nazism (see Till Düppe, "The Generation of the GDR: Economists at the Humboldt University of Berlin Caught Between Loyalty and Relevance", *History of the Human Sciences*, 30 (3), 2017: 50-85).

[9] In addition to interviews with time-witnesses, the present article draws from the Stasi archive *Bundesbeauftragte für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes der ehemaligen Deutschen Demokratischen Republik* (Karl-Liebknecht-Straße 31/33, 10178 Berlin, thereafter BStU, MfS), from the party archive *Stiftung Archiv der Parteien und Massenorganisationen der DDR im Bundesarchiv*, Finckensteinallee 63, 12205 Berlin, Postfach 450569, 12175 Berlin (thereafter SAPMO-BArch), as well as from the Harry Maier papers in the Bundesarchiv (N-2693).

[10] East Germany imposed upper limits of foreign income of IIASA salaries which partially compensated for the membership fees paid in foreign currency. This led to financial differences between eastern and western scholars (see Rindzevičiūtė, op. cit.:104). Yet, IIASA visitors could go shopping in the United Nations Center without paying customs, needed no Visa for Austria, and were pampered regarding all practical issues from housing to kindergarten by the local staff (see report, 17.11.1979, DY 30 84541). As Rindzevičiūtė argued for Soviet scholars: "Used to passing through innumerable bureaucratic hurdles and formalities, they experienced these free, spontaneous travels not only as a gust of personal freedom, but also as confirmation of their special status within the tightly controlled system." (op. cit, 2016, 106)

autonomously by research areas. And there was space for speculative visionary research, such as in the methodology area founded by George Dantzig.[11] Political discomfort was formally excluded as classified research and the use of confidential data was not allowed at IIASA, which is one of the reasons why IIASA never developed the same mystic aura as RAND did. For a long term visit, one had to be selected from the research director, such that intelligence services could not infiltrate non-scientific agents.

More importantly, the "carefully assembled internal culture of informality", as Rindzevičiūtė observed, rendered IIASA highly inclusive.[12] While curiosity among scholars was naturally great, the first research directors, Howard Raiffa and Roger Levien, created an atmosphere where everyone felt welcome. Being at IIASA was to take part in a "family".[13] Mutual respect, tolerance, and team collaboration created a relaxed atmosphere unknown in East German academia. As witnessed by several visitors, scholars could freely talk about politics in a non-judgemental fashion. Highlights were the joined international dinner parties, and the frequent celebrations of all sorts of national holidays. The IIASA experience was above all festive, which is a natural way to create "bridges" if not friendships between people. As an early long-term visitor from East Germany, engineer Lutz Blencke, reported:

> "The institute organizes a large number of events to pass one's leisure time and maintain personal contacts between employees. This includes institute-wide events such as dance evenings, balls, picnic excursions, children's afternoons, trips abroad at greatly reduced

[11] In 1975, IIASA's reputation was heightened through the joined Nobel Memorial Prize for Tjalling Koopmans and Leonid Kantorovich, both IIASA visitors in Dantzig's group, not only because Koopmans donated part of his prize to IIASA.
[12] Op. cit. : 125.
[13] Ibid.: 94 ff.

> prices, ski excursions, visits to the theater, women's meetings. The staff association also organizes a large number of parties. If you include personal invitations and counter-invitations, this makes up for a program that cannot be managed in terms of time or finances.[14]

This informality was in stark contrast to the formal behavioral rules East German scholars were put under by their travel directive. To give but one example:

> "The consultation takes place under the conditions of dense influence of the capitalist world. The members of the GDR delegation have a high level of political and professional responsibility with regard to their appearance, attitude and discipline ... All members of the GDR delegation are obliged to represent the politics of the party and the government consistently, objectively and in a well-founded manner."[15]

For East German scholars, this applied not only to general political discussions, but also to the actual research. As we read in another travel directive: "When reporting on your own research strategies, the information should be limited to the technical aspects without giving any insight into the research strategy of 1981-1985."[16] IIASA visitors were asked to represent East Germany's research priorities, to adopt predefined attitudes about specific topics and methodologies, and to display national achievements. All of this was watched by the Stasi that

[14] Blencke report 1979, DY 30 84541: 19-20. For more on informality, festivity, including Soviet drinking habits, and other strategies of establishing political inclusivity, see Rindzevičiūtė, op. cit, 102 ff.
[15] „Reisedirektive…", 1975 (MfS HA XVIII, 38388: 4). This was standard procedure for any travels to the West, but not for anyone from the West.
[16] Travel directive, 1.9.1981, Knop and Wölfling, 9th global modelling forum, 14.-18. 9. 1981 (HA XVIII 20020: 7).

required personal reports mostly about their own, East German, scholars, which seemed to be, in contrast to the ongoing rumours about spying at IIASA, the main role of the Stasi.[17]

How then did East German scholars manage this paradoxical situation between cooperative research and partisan scholarship? Did it force them into the role of the misfit at IIASA, or did it result in a sense of being compromised by one's own institutions back home?[18] The tension had to be dealt with by each visitor in their own way. But there is one well documented case that helps us spell out the clash of cultures, the case of Harry Maier. Without being representative, the case of Maier was an occasion that East Germany's social disposition towards scientific cooperation with the West manifest itself. Interweaving individual, institutional, national, and global history, his case shows to what extent East Germany's contribution was caught up in the precepts of the western scholar as a class enemy.

The Two Cultures

East Germany was slow in claiming its place at IIASA. Its first representative in the National Member Organizations meetings, and thus head of the Committee for Applied Systems Analysis at the Academy of Sciences, was the most known economist within the party apparatus, Helmut Koziolek, director institute of socialist governance of the Central Committee (CC). He was

[17] See the early meeting reports to the Stasi entailing commented lists of mostly East German scholars; "Treffbericht zur IIASA Reise 25.-29.8.1975", "Einschätzung des IMS Horn zur der KP", "Treffbericht, 26.9.75" (MfS HA XVIII 38388).

[18] Such as reported by Klaus Fuchs-Kittowski, reading a belated passport as an intended act to undermine his travel (personal conversation). This attitude is deeply anchored in this generation of East Germans, who grew up with the confrontation between party loyal Stalinists and those who aimed at a German way to socialism independent of the Soviet Union – a tension which, in their mind, was never resolved (see Till Düppe, op. cit, "Generation", 2017).

replaced in 1975 by the younger party-local economist Karl Bichtler from the Central Economics Institute at the Academy of Sciences.[19] First conference visitors were either young scholars mostly from engineering sciences, or established scientists in higher positions that could display East Germany's expertise.[20] But there was little influence on IIASA's research agenda. East German scientists played a minor role in the first flagship programs of IIASA, such as the energy project run by the nuclear physicist Wolf Häfele, or the famous first computer network between East and West, the IIASANET in 1977.[21]

Two to three long-term visitors were expected at the institute, however, the committee, as Bichtler complained, could never "assure the permanent and proportionate presence of the GDR at IIASA even approximately."[22] In East Germany, systems analysis had never developed into an

[19] For Koziolek, see his first IIASA conference contribution ("The Systems Approach to Solving National Economic Problems"), his report of the council meeting, November 1974 (DY 30 54540), and Helmut Müller-Enbergs et al., *Wer war wer in der DDR?* (Berlin: Ch. Links, 2010). For Bichtler, see his personal files in MfS AIM 3238-71; his committee meetings reports are all available (DY30 27231; DY 30 54540; DY 30 84541); Bichtler was 'horde leader' at the Hitler Youth, and then was trained at the Institute for Social Sciences at the CC. He was one of the main activists in the revisionism campaign against Behrens and Benary (see Till Düppe, "A Science Show Debate: How the Stasi Staged Revisionism," *Contemporary European History*, 2020). Maier's wife, Sigrid Maier, was the first assistant once Behrens was again allowed to run a research group in the political economy of socialism in 1960.

[20] This included economist Werner Kalweit, vice president of the Academy of Sciences, psychologist Friedhart Klix, biologist Samuel Mitja Rapaport, chemist Eberhard Leibnitz, economist Hans Mottek, then head of the commission for environmental research at the Academy of Sciences, the mathematician Manfred Peschel, and Erich Rübensam, president of the Academy of Agriculture. There were also visitors from the economic research institute of the state planning commission, such as Gerhard Köhler and Klaus Steinitz; but there was nobody from the party schools. One of the young visiting scholars was Klaus Fuchs-Kittowski. For him, IIASA opened a door of collaboration with, and travels to, John Hopkins University (see his travel report in DY 30 54540). Between 1975 and 1980 a total of 236 short-term visitors participated at conferences, mostly not from the social sciences (see the overview in DY 30 84541). Joined presence at IIASA hardly ever resulted in collaboration between the disciplines in East Germany.

[21] In 1981, Häfele became head of the atomic research centre in Jülich. For his project, see Isabell Schrickel, "Von Schmetterlingen und Atomreaktoren: Medien und Politiken der Resilienz am IIASA," *Behemoth*, 2014, 2, 5–25; IIASANET was designed by Alexander Butrimenko, Gennadji Dubrov, Vinton Cerf, and connected with data centres in in Moscow that were part of "Akademset"; see Rindzevičiūtė, op. cit.: 117 f.; Frank Dittmann, "Technik versus Konflikt: Wie Datennetze den Eisernen Vorhang durchdrangen," (*Osteuropa*, 59. (10), 2009: 101–119).

[22] Bichtler, „Stand und Probleme…", ca. 1980 (DY 30 84541: 16). First long-term stays were that of Konrad Grote (1975) who is later a protagonist Kristie Macrakis, *Seduced by Secrets: Inside the Stasi's*

encompassing paradigm for all disciplines as it did in the Soviet Union or in the United States. More than in other socialist countries, it was dominated by the official discourse of political economy. It flourished during a short time during Ulbricht's New Economic System of the 1960s, but since Honecker wished to demarcate himself from Ulbricht, enthusiasm about the value of cybernetics diminished. The constant fear of disclosing confidential data, and the difficulty of integrating IIASA activity in the fixed five-year plan did not help the search for apt candidates. There simply were not enough scholars who met the double criteria of sufficient quality and political reliability, as Bichtler repeatedly complained:

> "The GDR has insufficient cadre (*Kader*) of sufficient qualifications in the field of applied system analysis. As a result, the associated organizations (*Basisorganisationen*) of the committee had to face extraordinary problems to find scientists who are adequately qualified to work at IIASA, and at the same time meet the specific political and executive requirements associated with working at IIASA."[23]

The low participation notwithstanding, according to Bichtler, IIASA membership resulted in an import of expertise, such as an increased mathematization of the social sciences, and of new technologies, such as board computers in Berlin's S-Bahn trains to optimize energy use.[24]

Spy-Tech World (Cambridge University Press, 2008), Claus Riedel in the energy project (1976-1977), and the young engineer Lutz Blencke (1977-1978, see his report in DY 30 84541). Riedel used his IIASA visit to remain in the West, but no further documentation of his case was found.

[23] „Stand und Probleme der Mitarbeit der DDR im IIASA", ca. 1980, DY 30 84541: 15-16.

[24] Ibid. The research on ‚computer-controlled urban transportation' was carried out by Horst Strobel from the Higher School of Transportation in Dresden, who was member of the Council of IIASA's research area "Human Settlement and Services".

The first contribution from a social scientist came from Hans Knop, vice rector of the Higher School of Economics and head of the section socialist economy.[25] Knop visited IIASA between October 1974 and February 1976 as the head of the research group "management of large organizations" in the research area "management and technology". He also had contributed to the celebrated global modelling conference series hosted by IIASA that took up the Club of Rome reports.[26] For his work at IIASA, Knop received East Germany's Order of Merit (*vaterländischen Verdienstorden*) in 1977. Without any social scientist visiting IIASA in 1977, Harry Maier was then to replace Knop in 1978.

By the early 1970s, Maier was one of the most promising economists of his generation. Born in a German family in Crimea in 1934, he studied economics in the Higher School of Economics, where he met his future wife, and at Humboldt University. Inspired by Brecht, whose rehearsals he visited, Maier belonged to the first pioneering and enthusiast cohort of students of Marxist-Leninist political economy.[27] Just before starting university, in 1952, he became a member of the party as many other early dedicates to the socialist cause. Ever since, he held important party functions.[28] With the support of Fred Oelßner, he found his academic home at the

[25] See the documents of Knop's travel permission (MfS AP 24942-92: 51-54), and his HV A registration (see MfS HA XVIII 36675).
[26] This work was joint with Manfred Wölfling from Maier's group in the Academy of Sciences; for more on global modelling see Rindzevičiūtė, op. cit, 2016; see also travel directive and the travel reports on 9th global modelling forum, 1981, in HA XVIII 20020: 7-8; 10-14).
[27] His father, Klaus Prieb, a so-called "administrative German" (*Administrationsdeutsche*), fell victim of prosecution under Stalin in 1938; in 1943, Maier settled with his mother in Amsee in Hohensalza/Warthegau, and in 1946 in Berlin (see further details in a letter September 14, 1986, in N 2693-14). For more biographical background information, see Harry Maier's papers (N 2693-17, N 2693-4); for a list of his publications (N 2693-20); see also MfS HA XVIII 16682, MfS U 25-89, MfS HA XVIII AP 46049-92, and MfS 58363-92.
[28] At Higher School of Economics, he was organizer of the party group of the students (*Gruppenorganisator*), at Humboldt University in Berlin, he was secretary for the party group of the students; at the academy's economics institute, he was member of the party leadership between 1963 and 1964, party secretary of the party group between 1967 and 1969, and then until he left to IIASA member of the party committee of the Academy of Sciences (*Parteikreisleitung*).

Central Economics Institute at the Academy of Sciences, known as a social science refuge in the midst of natural sciences.[29] After a dissertation on a socialist critique of West Germany's Christian socialism, he moved into the political economy of socialism, and wrote his habilitation, jointly with Karl Bichtler, on the question of measuring labour intensity.[30]

Finding a measure for reducing abstract to simple labour put him on the track of the economics of education, which he pioneered in East Germany.[31] The topic of education, in turn, led him towards growth theory, which, after discussions at the institute about its bourgeois character, was called the theory of "intensive advanced reproduction."[32] He knew of the western literature from Solow, Bombach, to linear programming without himself using mathematical methods. In 1968, he became professor of economics, and head of the research group "factors and criteria of economic growth." Though his work remained conceptual and not technical, he was celebrated for his "constant search and use of modern research methods".[33] His openness for technical economics and western thought became manifest when he edited in 1968, jointly with Peter Hess, Oskar Lange's political economy of socialism. This, however, won him no praise, but

[29] For a history of the insitute until Honecker, see Helmut Steiner, „Das Akademie-Institut für Wirtschaftswissenschaften im Widerstreit wissenschaftlicher, ideologischer und politischer Auseinandersetzungen," *Sitzungsberichte der Leibniz-Sozietät*, 36 (2000), 89–124.
[30] For his PhD thesis, *Kritik der politökonomischen Verteidigung der Herrschaft des Monopolkapitals durch die katholische Soziallehre in Westdeutschland*, see Bundesarchiv N 2693-1; see also the book publication *Soziologie der Päpste: Lehre und Wirkung der katholischen Soziallehre* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1965). For his habilitation with Bichtler, *Die Messung des Arbeitsaufwandes als politökonomisches Problem*, see Bundesarchiv N 2693-1. See also the article of the same title in *Jahrbuch des Instituts für Wirtschaftswissenschaften*, 10 (1967): 77-106. Bichtler's support, as head of the committee for applied systems analysis, might have been instrumental for initiating Maier to IIASA.
[31] See „Bildungsökonomie: Gegenstand, Aufgaben, Probleme," Pädagogik, 9 (1964): 818-821; „Bildung als ökonomische Potenz", *Neues Deutschland*, 18.8.1965; *Bildung als ökonomische Potenz* (Akademie Verlag Berlin, 1967, and with Jürgen Wahse and Udo Ludwig, Dietz Verlag Berlin, 1972). Even in West Germany, in the early 1990s, he could publish the UTB textbook *Bildungsökonomie: Die Interdependenz von Bildungs- und Beschäftigungssystem* (Stuttgart: Schäffer Pöschel Verlag, 1994).
[32] See Harry Maier, Klaus Steinitz, G. Schilling (Hg. und Vorwort), *Zu Grundfragen der sozialistischen Wachstumstheorie* (Verlag Die Wirtschaft, 1968).
[33] MfS 58363-92: 59.

fierce critique from the party.[34] Nevertheless, in 1973, he became member of the national council of economic research. Known for being "energetic and goal-directed towards complete plan fulfillment," as one of his recommendation letters said, he received several national recognitions, such as the Friedrich-Engels Prize of the Academy of Sciences in 1975.[35] Once Oelßner retired, he might have hoped to become the head of the institute, but the party apparently did not trust the intellectual culture at the institute and put the scientifically unexperienced, and more party-loyal Wolfgang Heinrichs in place. Editing jointly a two volume book on economic growth, Heinrichs and Maier received the Banner of Labour in 1977.[36] Maier's career also suggests cooperation with the Stasi. Recruited in 1954, he indeed had a long-standing record of "operative cooperation" in HA VIII, as activities of informants were called.[37]

Like many others of his generation, Maier's career was made possible by the high demand of politically devoted *and* intellectually engaged political economists during the tumultuous Ulbricht era. As Middell commented about the structures that brought about scientists as different as Maier and Heinrichs:

> "The socialist intelligentsia now settled in that space, which it had itself brought about. A massive wave of hiring of professors between 1968 and 1972 related to the new university structures pushed that change further. The character of the traditional Ordinarius was not

[34] Oskar Lange, *Politische Ökonomie, Band 1 und 2, Herausgegeben und mit einem Vorwort von Peter Hess und Harry Maier* (Akademie Verlag Berlin, 1968). Ulbricht critiqued the book, and thus the translation, a critique that was forgotten as Honecker soon took over. Maier later reported that a ban from profession was in the air (see MfS 58363-92, as well as N-2693-19). Further witness was given by his wife who led the institute's party group at the time, and Udo Ludwig, who edited the mathematical chapters of the edition (personal conversations).
[35] Beurteilung Maier, 1982 (MfS U 25-89: 373).
[36] Harry Maier and Wolfgang Heinrichs (eds.), *Gesetzmässigkeiten der intensiv erweiterten Reproduktion bei der weiteren Gestaltung der entwickelten sozialistischen Gesellschaft*, 2 vol. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1976). Translated into Russian and Czech.
[37] See MfS U 25-89. His early reports are not available.

only institutionally, but also habitually marginalized – which did not exclude that individual representatives of the new Intelligentsia could fill this gap, and develop their own enthusiasm about bourgeois professorial behaviour, which as an exceptional phenomenon could even find approval."[38]

As one of such exceptional scholars, open for economic methods used in the West, Maier was the ideal candidate for IIASA. Being selected in 1978 as the head of the IIASA research group on innovation in the "management and technology" area was a real success for him and for the Academy of Sciences.[39]

Once settled in Laxenburg, he quickly made friends for example with Clopper Almon from University of Maryland, the West German economists Lothar Hübl from Hannover and Erhard Ulrich from the Institute for Occupational Research, but in particular with Häfele, who, like Maier, was an outspoken scholar and a *bon vivant*. But he also kept touch with the party as the party group organiser at the GDR embassy in Vienna, and was also registered for the Stasi section HA XX, AKG.[40] His research team had members from all around the world. They studied the influence of technology on growth in different cultural settings, inspired by the ideas of Schumpeter and Kondratiev, aiming at specific national policies, and focusing in particular on microelectronic technology and energy.[41] Though much of this research was informed by formal

[38] Middell, op. cit, 2012: 345.
[39] As Bichtler wrote in the protocol of the committee meeting of 1979: "From our point of view, the changes that have resulted from the meeting of the advisory committee on the research area 'Management and Technology' are remarkable, because there is now a good opportunity to influence the goal and content of research in a field by leading a research task, which is of great interest to the GDR" (meeting of the committee for applied systems analysis, 16.3.1979, in DY 30 84541: 4). Unfortunately, the detailed report Maier must have written about his stay is not available in the archives. But we do have his wife's witness who had joined him for the entire period.
[40] See MfS U 25-89. HA XX, AKG was headed by Comrade Lieutenant Colonel Buhl.
[41] Publications of this period include Heinz-Dieter Haustein and Harry Maier (1979). "Basic Improvement and Pseudo-Innovations and their Impact on efficiency", WP-79-96. Laxenburg, IIASA; Haustein, Heinz-

techniques, Maier himself contributed exclusively to qualitative institutional analysis. Heinz-Dieter Haustein, head of the research area "forecast and planning of science and technology" at the Higher School of Economics, joined the team in August 1979 at the recommendation of the British economist Rolfe Tomlinson. He stayed for two years, and jointly with Maier was highly productive in terms of research output. Back home, however, their work was hardly noted.[42] His IIASA research culminated in an edited book on innovation, jointly with Haustein and Jennifer Robinson, which was presented at the 1980 Economic World Congress in Mexico. He proudly was one of the five section heads of this conference.[43]

Apart from western life-style, Maier had learned the taste of research free of the constraints of the party bureaucracy. This experience, for him, was motivation for making a difference back home. Having displayed East Germany's scientific force, on coming back, it first seemed that he indeed would have the chance to do so. He received the order to write a conception for his own institute "for the study of scientific-technical innovation processes and the use of applied systems analysis" that would be the main source for further IIASA cadre. But this was not to happen. Two years after his return, in September 1982, Maier wrote to the president of the Academy of Sciences, Werner Scheler:

Dieter, Harry Maier, and J. Robinson. 1980. "Thinking about appropriate Technologies: Criteria for selecting appropriate technologies under different cultural, technical, and social conditions", *Proceedings of the IFAC Symposium*, Bari, Italy, 21-22 May 1979, in C. de Georgeo and Roveda (eds.). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

[42] As witnessed by Udo Ludwig, personal conversation. See also Haustein's short memoir, "Erlebnis Wissenschaft: Wirtschaftswissenschaft in Ost und West aus der Erfahrung eines Ökonomen," unpublished manuscript, August 2011, http://peter.fleissner.org/Transform/ HausteinErlebnisWissen_3.pdf, 29.5.2020.

[43] See Harry Maier, "Innovation and the Better Use of Human Resources", *Human Resources, Employment, and Development: Proceedings of the 6th World Congress of the International Economic Association held in Mexico City* (London, Basingstoke, 1983).

> "Please excuse me if I turn to you with a personal problem ... You have known me for several years and know that I am not one of those people who quickly resign or give up easily. However, the unpleasant, nerve-wracking and unproductive things that happened to me in the two years after my return from IIASA in Laxenburg, Vienna, exceeded what I thought was possible. It is in stark contrast to what I have experienced in more than two decades of work at the academy. Allow me to explain my problem to you in more detail."[44]

Reverse Culture Shock

To understand what happened to Maier after returning from IIASA, his experience must be put in the context of global and national politics. When Soviets invaded Afghanistan in December 1979, the summer Olympics 1980 in Moscow were boycotted, and Ronal Reagan was elected in January 1981, the policy of détente came to an end. Speculations about intelligence agencies at IIASA, always looming in the background, now prospered more than before.[45] East Germany's officials were perceptive to this change. Werner Scheler, the president of the Academy of Sciences, showed scepticism about the value of IIASA. Already in January 1981, he wrote to Kurt Hager:

[44] Maier to Scheler, 28.9.1982 (MfS HA XVIII 16682: 221-226).
[45] In April 1981, an Austrian newspaper reported that Gvishiani, president of IIASA, was the head of the European section of the KGB (*Die Presse*, 14.4.1981). Later, a former IIASA public relations agent wrote a spy novel, in which IIASA staff member are the source of inspiration; C.A. Posey, *Red Danube* (Toronto: Worldwide Library, 1988).

> "A number of problems arising from this membership cause me to ask you to what extent it is still necessary and sensible to maintain membership in IIASA. I would like to expressly state that such a need cannot be justified from a scientific and economic point of view. Effort and benefits are in no reasonable relation to each other. However, it must be borne in mind that accession took place for political, not primarily for scientific and economic reasons."[46]

Hager wrote to Oskar Fischer, minister of foreign affairs sharing Scheler's point of view. Fischer agreed, but withdrawal from IIASA would have to be coordinated with the Soviet Union.[47]

But the U.S. beat them to it. In fall 1981, as part of the sanctions against the Soviet Union, the U.S. announced the cancellation of its IIASA membership in 1983 and the subsequent forestallment of payment to the organization. The UK, under Thatcher, followed suit. Reason given was that a Norwegian intelligence caught a Soviet official red-handed taking U.S. documents from IIASA, though it is unclear why there should be confidential documents at IIASA. As a consequence, the Reagan administration deemed IIASA an illegitimate technology transfer from West to East.[48] Indeed, while negotiations about the foundation of IIASA might have been motivated by a fear that the Soviet Union was ahead in technology development, very

[46] Scheler to Hager, 9.1.1981 (DY30 27231: 1).
[47] Fischer to Hager, 6.2.1981 (DY30 27231: 5); Erich Mielke and Johannes Hörnig were in copy to this exchange.
[48] See the U.S. "report of a Study Mission to western Europe, November 4-13, 1981 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives", IIASA in Relations Between the United States and western Europe, 1982, U.S. Government Printing Office: 17; see also Bichtler's reports in DY30 27231; see also Rindzevičiūtė, op. cit., 2016: 123, and McDonald, op. cit.: 70). Though computers used IIASA were on the list of U.S. export embargo, the import of mere user knowledge would potentially apply to any visitor from the East.

soon, the reverse became clear. The more IIASA developed, the less the technological difference between East and West could be ignored at IIASA.[49]

Apart from all IIASA representatives, a lobby of several U.S. senators and scientists formed to promote IIASA's further existence. But this had no effect on GDR officials. In August 1982, the CC secretariat decided "to seize the favorable opportunity of the exit of the United States and Great Britain" and cease membership at IIASA. The secretariat's decisions repeated Scheler's notion that 'accession to IIASA took place for political reasons during the détente process', and that 'effort are not in proportion to benefits'.[50] Evidently, a sentence was missing between the two reasons that every secretary member agreed on: that IIASA was politically unwanted without the policy of détente.

Even if withdrawal was decided, it was not to happen. The US did resume membership, however, shifting funding institution from the National Academy of Sciences to a non governmental institution, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. The Soviets too recommitted, matching the significantly reduced funding amount of the US.[51] Even if Scheler repeatedly pushed further for withdrawal, in November 1984, also the CC secretariat decided that East Germany would remain member of IIASA.[52] As a consequence, Bichtler was replaced as IIASA representative by a scientist of higher political and scientific stature, the chemist and CC

[49] For the early fears, see Slava Gerovitch (2009), „Die Beherrschung der Welt: Die Kybernetik im Kalten Krieg," *Osteuropa – Kooperation trotz Konfrontation.* Wissenschaft und Technik im Kalten Krieg, 59 (10): 43–56). For East Germany, see Friedrich Naumann, "Vom Tastenfeld zum Mikrochip – Computerindustrie und Informatik im 'Schrittmaß' des Sozialismus," in *Naturwissenschaft und Technik in der DDR* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1997); Peter Solomon, *Die Geschichte der Mikroelektronik-Halbleiterindustrie in der DDR* (Dessau: Funkverlag Bernhard Hein, 2003).
[50] Vorlage für das Sekretariat des Zentralkomitees der SED, zugestimmt 10.8.1982 (MfS HA XVIII 21110: 48).
[51] Also in the Soviet Union, a high-level decision to withdraw has been made, but Gvishiani brought together party secretaries to ultimately convince Yuri Andropov, then head of the KGB, and in 1982 successor to Leonid Brezhnev (see McDonald, op. cit.: 71).
[52] See secretariat protocol, 16.11.1984 (DY 30 59383); for Scheler, see letter to Hager, 27.10.1983 (DY 3027231: 27).

candidate Wolfgang Schirmer. Also, the general bureaucratic control over IIASA increased.[53] Apart from the scientific council and the newly founded executive office at the Academy of Sciences, an inter-ministry council for applied systems analysis was created, in which members of ministries watch over the "practical relevance" of IIASA research. There was thus greater political control over IIASA, which apparently was considered too independent.

Scheler's scepticism might not have been known, but must have been felt in the negotiations between Werner Kalweit, the vice president of the Academy of Sciences, Heinrichs, the head of the economics institute, and Maier over his conception of his own IIASA-oriented institute.[54] In addition, there might have been personal differences between Heinrichs and Maier, who were two very different types of intellectual characters. Before Maier's return from IIASA, Heinrichs had put Klaus Steinitz in place of the deputy chair of the institute and head of the research group on growth, which increased tensions between Maier and Heinrichs, and ended the friendship between Maier and Steinitz.[55] When his conception of the institute was discussed in the colloquium of the social science section, his ambitious vision was considered 'soaring and unrealistic', and perceived as an expression of his individualist intellectualism.[56] Thus, for the five-year plan 1981-1985, Maier would be demoted from running his own institute to running a research area no longer located at the economics institute, but now at the *Institute for Theory, Organisation and History of Science* (ITW). Only two of his many assistants opted to join him,

[53] Schirmer was a chemist, head of the *Leuna-Werke*, head of a research group at the Academy of Sciences, professor at Humboldt University, and candidate of the CC – no comparison to the smaller authority of Bichtler; see Jan Wielgohs, "Schirmer, Wolfgang," *Wer war wer in der DDR?* (Ch. Links, Berlin, 2010); about the statute of the new committee, see "Ordnung…", 1.10.1985 (MFS HA XVIII 17656), regarding composition of the committee, see Schirmer to Scheler, 21.1.1985 (MfS HA XVIII 18295: 53).
[54] See „Aktennotiz über ein Kadergespräch", 9.3.1981 (MfS HA XVIII 16682).
[55] Personal conversation Steinitz.
[56] See MfS AP 58098-92: 37.

while the rest of the institute lost touch with Maier. He had to build up his research team from scratch. For Maier this was a great loss as he had considered the economics institute his academic home.[57]

In 1982, Maier became deputy chair of the ITW, and head of the research group "analysis and forecast of scientific and technical innovation processes", that counted after a while thirty-two scientists, seven of which professors. The group was part of the "interdisciplinary research program scientific-technical revolution, social progress and intellectual debate", which Maier jointly run with Günter Kröber, the chair of ITW.[58] Despite the disappointment, Maier was very engaged in the research area and program, in particular concerning the involvement of natural scientists in the social sciences, which was a novelty in the Academy of Sciences. In collaboration with IIASA, he organized a series of international conferences taking place in East Germany, at which younger scholars could connect mostly with West German researchers, and which increasingly evoked the suspicion of the Stasi, as Maier would witness later.[59] Knowing of

[57] "At the time, I was very reluctant to accept this suggestion. The proposal to found an institute for applied systems analysis at the AdW and to lead it was not at all attractive to me, as was apparently assumed. For one, I still was attached to my old institute, which I had been a member of for 24 years and where I was able to develop into a scientist under the guidance of my scientific teachers AM (academician) Fred Oelßner and AM Gunther Kohlmey. Also, from 1967, when I succeeded AM Gunter Kohlmey as head of the "political economy of socialism" department, I initiated, designed and directed a large part of the institute's work in the field of socialist reproduction theory. This has resulted in a large number of studies and publications ... which have decisively determined the profile of the institute and brought it prestige at home and abroad." Maier to Scheler, 28.9.1982 (MfS HA XVIII 16682: 222).

[58] *Analyse und Prognose wissenschaftlicher Neuerungsprozesse*, being part of the *interdisziplinäre Forschungsprogramm wissenschaftlich-technische Revolution, sozialer Fortschritt und geistige Auseinandersetzung* (see N 2693-17; MfS HA XVIII 16682: 115). For Günter Kröber, see Helmut Müller-Enbergs et al. *Wer war wer in der DDR?* (Berlin: Ch. Links Verlag, 2010).

[59] Western scholars were, among others, physicists Wolfgang Weidlich, Alfred Kleinknecht, and economists Wilhelm Krelle, Holger Rogner, and Walter Goldberg from Göteberg, another important western friend of Maier. "Flexible automation", 1982; "energy system strategies…" in 1983; in particular the large and successful conference on Kondratiev's "long waves" in growth theory in June 1985, was put under control by the Stasi (see CV in N 2693-4): see Tibor Vaska (ed.), *The Long-Wave Debate; Selected Papers from an IIASA International Meeting, Weimar, GDR, June 10-14, 1985* (Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1987). The 1985 conference was cancelled last minute by the Stasi, but since people were already on their way, it took place anyway (see letter 14.9.1986, in N-2693-14).

the problems at IIASA, in summer of 1982, he wished to travel to IIASA to prepare a book that, he hoped, would help refute the hypothesis of the west-east technology transfer. However, after his travel permission was denied, he wrote to Scheler as cited above. "On all travels that I have been able to carry out in more than two decades, as well as on my two-year stay at IIASA, there was not the slightest incident or doubt about my party-loyal appearance."[60] The letter worked: he was allowed to travel, the book was published, but his doubts about higher powers in the Academy's bureaucracy that work against him might have prospered.[61]

While Kröber approved of Maier's research, he would also note that "he hardly got involved as a deputy director of the institute. The rest of the institute only interested him to the extent that the work and results of other areas were of interest to his own work."[62] Thus, when it came to the new five-year plan for the period 1986-1990, Kröber alone remained head of the interdisciplinary research program, and Maier's research area was discontinued. He protested, getting his program reintegrated, but at the loss of his influence on its overall agenda. The chain of national awards that he received before his visit at IIASA, broke off. While in the early 1980s, many might have still expected that he would soon be elected member of the Academy of Sciences, the highest prestige of a scientist in East Germany, by the mid 1980s, this was no longer the case.

The tensions between Maier and the Academy of Sciences reached their peak after he returned from an IIASA trip in November 1985. At customs, Maier declared having a "personal computer" and "conference material". The personal computer, however, included additional parts such as a printer, data recorder, floppy disks, and tape cassettes, and the "conference material"

[60] Maier to Scheler, 28.9.1982 (MfS HA XVIII 16682: 225).
[61] Heinz-Dieter Haustein and Harry Maier, *Innovation and Efficiency: Strategies for a Turbulent World* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1985).
[62] Kröber, 3.4.1986, „Zur Einschätzung der möglichen Motive…" (MfS AP 58098-92: 38).

included the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *Herald Tribune*, and *the Times*, the import of which was forbidden. He was held at the airport for over twelve hours of questioning.[63] As the minutes of the interrogation say, he excused himself by saying he had gotten the computer with money he had saved up from his daily allowances in addition to financial help from a western colleague that he "offered" an edition of the Marx-Engels collection. He further brushed off the newspapers, claiming they were for work and that he would have access to them anyway. Maier was annoyed, as the minutes show:

> "During the entire procedure, Maier appeared arrogant and conceited towards the customs officer. Throughout the exchange, he threatened the controller with an official complaint and the resulting consequences for him. He was asked several times to contribute to the factual clarification of the procedure."[64]

Even if Maier signed the protocol that he regrets not having filled in the declaration in more detail, he added, "I would like to express my lack of understanding that I had such problems here today."[65]

Some weeks later, January 13, 1986, Maier was called for a discussion (*Aussprache*) with Kalweit, Kröber, and the ITW party secretary. The discussion was to determine if a disciplinary procedure would follow. Maier had to respond once more to the charges at customs, as well as to the fact that he informed neither Kalweit nor Kröber immediately after his return. "Prof. Kalweit demonstrated to Prof. Maier that his actions and behaviors are clearly to be seen as a disregard

[63] See Maier's CV in N 2693-4.
[64] MfS U 25-89: 23.
[65] MfS U 25-89: 26.

for valid legal norms, political misconduct and serious breach of discipline that are in gross contradiction to his special duties as travel cadre."[66] Maier emphasized his good intentions to advance his research and explained that he had not informed Kröber of the planned purchase before his travels, because he did not yet know if his savings were enough. On his return, he informed Schirmer and Herold, the head and the secretary of the committee for applied systems analysis, while Kröber was absent. Others were not in charge of IIASA travels.

> "In the subsequent discussion of his statement (*Stellungnahme*), Professor Maier was emphatically criticized … As a result of the disciplinary debate, Professor Maier took a self-critical position on his behavior and assured to consistently comply with legal standards and his obligations as a travel cadre in the future. Taking into account his comprehension and conclusions at the end of the debate, no disciplinary procedure was carried out … A disapprobation (*Missbilligung*) was declared to Comrade Professor Harry Maier for disregarding legal norms and violation of his duties."[67]

The disciplinary procedure would have involved a travel ban, which was unacceptable for Maier. After his next conference visit at IIASA, on March 27, Maier drew personal consequences, and took a plane to Cologne instead of Berlin. A simple but symbolic act: "treason of the republic" for the one, "political refugee" for the other part of Germany. He was hosted and supported by his IIASA friend Wolf Häfele in Jülich.

[66] "Notiz über eine Aussprache" (MfS AP 58098-92: 14).
[67] Ibid.: 14-15.

The Minutes of the Escape

That night night, Maier called his wife, who also worked at the economics institute, who in turn reported the next day to Kröber:

> "The reason given was that he had not gotten over the discussion with comrade Vice President Kalweit (about his offenses against customs regulations after his last trip to IIASA) … Comrade Sigrid Maier assured that he had not noticed any signs of an intended escape (*Republikflucht*) before his departure. She gave the impression of being stunned and horrified."[68]

The escape came as a shock to everyone, including the Stasi that immediately opened an operation (*operativer Vorgang*) nicknamed "OV Rechenberg". His wife's phone was tapped ("A measures"), his letters were read ("M measures"), and his office searched and sealed, all in the hypothesis that there was more than what he said first at the phone.[69] The stakes were high, considering that Maier himself knew the Stasi well, and was involved in the internal preparation of the XI party congress. Thus, the most plausible first explanation for the Stasi was that the Federal Intelligence Service (*Bundesnachrichtendienst*, BND) abducted Maier, and that he could be convinced to come back:

[68] Kröber, in DY30 27231: 35-36; see also MfS U 25-89: 4-5: "According to Maier's wife, in the almost daily phone calls he made with her after his decision not to return to the GDR, he repeatedly mentioned that he found the discussion with Vice President Kalweit to be degrading and humiliating, and that he was fed up with the gauntlet he had experienced at the Academy of Sciences." (MfS AP 58098-92: 36).
[69] See the arrest warrant (MfS U 25-89: 19). Maier had no knowledge of operative actions. "According to Comrade OSL (Hans) Buhl, HA XX, and Comrade Oberst Lange, department XV Berlin, this applies also to the period when Maier was taken over by the HV A."

> "It must be assumed that this is a targeted enemy measure to disrupt the preparations of the XI Party Congress. The operational approach was directed towards using all options for the recovery of Maier in the GDR. The wife was informed in several conversations that Maier could return to the GDR without having to expect sanctions. The efforts have so far been unsuccessful."[70]

Both Maier and his wife knew that major punishment awaited him upon return, in spite of what his wife was told to tell him at the phone. On Sunday, March 30, Maier confirmed in a fourth telephone conversation that he would not come back.

Some days after, Maier's official explanation came in a formal letter to Scheler resigning from the Academy of Sciences. He felt obliged to explain himself to the academy if anyone. Referring to the disappointment regarding the conception of his own institute, as well as to the humiliation of the discussion with Kalweit, he added:

> "I am in a phase of my life in which, based on my previous work, I believe that I can again make a contribution to the research on scientific and technical innovations and their socio-economic effects. To do this, however, I need working conditions that I believe are no longer available to me at the Academy of Sciences. With such considerations in mind, I decided to take this difficult step to end my employment at the GDR Academy of Sciences. The motives of my scientific work have remained unchanged. My loyalty to the GDR, as one of the two German states, remains unbroken. Also in my new field of

[70] MfS U 25-89: 19; "She influenced her husband in a way that was explained to her and tried to convince him to return." (ibid.)

> activity, I will try to advocate a coalition of reason and international understanding (*Verständigung*)."[71]

Maier's explanation that he left because of a trifle chicane at customs seemed too unlikely. Hence, not only the Stasi speculated about higher forces behind the escape, but also his closest collaborators at IIASA, most likely Haustein. At IIASA, "American and German nationals were actively gathering around Maier and (x), seeking contacts and starting targeted recruitment campaigns."[72] The problems Maier had with customs made him vulnerable for attempts of western intelligence to "blackmail" him. Haustein's following vowing remark that close his statement show how great was the perceived political pressure to distance oneself from Maier.

> "(Maier) is brutal and disregarding, but at the same time cleverly calculating; he has deceived his surroundings about his real attitude… I am a scientist with all my heart, but at the same time I know very well that all of our scientific work is built on sand if, at any point, the enemy acts against us ... Our ideological unity is the greatest force that no power of darkness can resist." [73]

In the economics department at Humboldt University, one informant reported about the perplexity, the general uncertainty in the entire field of economics, and the fear of future travel restrictions after Maier's escape. The disbelief in the reason Maier gave made them speculate:

[71] Maier to Scheler (MfS U 25-89: 67-68).
[72] „Information zur Republikflucht des Maier, Harry," 12.5.1986 (MFS HAXVIII 18669: 79).
[73] Ibid.

"The suspicion was expressed that Maier could either have worked for western intelligence or that the MfS had 'deposed' him."[74] Another informant who personally knew Maier reported:

> "Personally, I fear that he fell victim to political blackmail ... Harry Maier was very talkative, not to say gossipy and equally vain ... Maybe that he spoke so freely that this was held up to him in a concentrated manner, with the certainty that he had committed a criminal offense and that in such a context he decided to take this step."[75]

The Committee

To clarify matters, the Academy of Sciences drew up a committee that submitted its report April 10, about two weeks after Maier's escape. Kröber wrote the two central reports about the damages and motives of Maier's escape.[76]

The damage, according to Kröber, was primarily political: loss in reputation with a highly trusted scientist turned his back on the East German state. As if an act of self-shaming, Kröber listed Maier's accomplishments over several pages, including his party involvement since 1954, his career as an economist, and the prizes he received. By April 9, the anticipated political disgrace had come with the western newspaper. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* reported a

[74] "Information HA II on a discussion on 15.4.1986", IM at Humboldt University, 20.4.1986 (MfS HA XVIII 16682: 54).
[75] "Position…", former student colleague of Maier at HU (MfS HA XVIII 16682: 147-148).
[76] MfS AP 58098-92. Members were Claus Grote, executive director of the Academy of Sciences, Achim Sydow, deputy director of the social sciences, Jahn, head of the department analysis and control (AKG), Heene, head of the party district control commission, Kursawe, intelligence delegate of the president of the Academy of Sciences, and Hermann Herold, head of the scientific bureau for applied systems analysis.

"sensation before the party congress … Leading GDR economist remains in the West … The motives are not yet known … But for the SED, Harry Maier's escape is bitter and embarrassing in any case."[77] But that was about it, at first. Some notes in the daily press, forgotten the day after. For most economists in West Germany, if they read the article, it must have been the first time that they heard of the name Harry Maier.[78]

The scientific damage meant calling off many of Maier's planned publications, in particular those for the forthcoming party congress.[79] Also, his scientific positions at the Academy of Sciences, at IIASA, and at governmental programs had to be replaced. Some posts could be simply cancelled because there was no second Harry Maier: "Structure and content of his research area at the ITW were largely tailored to his person and his conceptual ideas."[80] The same applied to his IIASA position. This shows to what extent institutions were build around Maier as a person rather than him taking place in preconceived institutions – a typical feature of what was considered bourgeois intellectualism.

The informational damage was rather small. Yes, Maier had security clearance since 1977 ("VVS bound"), and knew of secret documents of the Academy and also of several ministries, such as the Ministry for Science and Technology, the Ministry for Higher and Technical Education, and the State Planning Commission. However, Maier seemed little interested in even viewing the documents he had clearance for. Some of the confidential documents, notably

[77] Hans Herbert Götz, FAZ: 14.
[78] A month after his escape, in May 1986, in an interview, Maier blamed the defeatism of Honecker's regime. "The GDR is plagued with the Ringelnatz syndrome" – Ringelnatz being a satirist from Saxony: "If I were so rich and powerful that I could change everything, I would leave everything as it is." (FAZ, 9.5.86) The Stasi took this as sign that Maier has ceased being Marxist-Leninist (see MfS HA II 46832).
[79] For the proceedings of the Weimar conference in 1985, co-edited with Haustein (op. cit.), the Stasi decided that Maier's text should be published since it helped discrediting him. "It is expected that the existing contradiction between theoretical knowledge and personal action will not serve his international reputation as a 'serious scientist'" (MfS HA II 49500).
[80] HA XVIII 20960: 19.

minutes of meetings he attended, were found unopened in his office. The informational damage was rather the soft knowledge about all sorts of informal practices in East Germany's central institutions:

> "The possible informational damage must therefore be measured according to the level of knowledge of confidential processes. It is difficult to assess it in detail … Maier's pronounced sociability brought him a large circle of friends and therefore lots of information about the economic and scientific development of the GDR."[81]

This soft knowledge found its way into a book that Maier wrote immediately after his escape, titled *Innovation or Stagnation: Conditions of Economic Reform in Socialist Countries*.[82] He added up his insider knowledge as an economist doing research for industry and the planning commission with personal anecdotes and his own theorizing about the party, industry, and academy, posing one question: What has to be done to link up East Germany's economy with the West? Why did the technological gap between East and West widen since the early 1970s?[83] The major mistake, according to Maier, was Honecker's "uninhibited wave of centralization of decision-making processes after the IX Party Congress."[84] The "decreasing rationality of economic activity ... due to the anonymity of the risk" inhibited innovation, he argued. The double bureaucracy of party and ministries leads into collective irresponsibility. *Combinates* are "industrial dinosaurs", lacking training of managers as in West Germany. He reclaimed Marx

[81] MfS AP 58098-92: 37. For a list of all confidential documents, see MfS HA XVIII 16682: 121-122. No confidential documents were missing.
[82] Harry Maier, *Innovation oder Stagnation: Bedingungen der Wirtschaftsreform in den sozialistischen Ländern* (Köln: Deutscher Instituts Verlag, 1987).
[83] Ibid.: 9.
[84] Ibid.: 21.

against the party intelligentsia in the Academy of the Social Science and the Institute for Marxism-Leninism. The alternative he proposed was a controlled market using the profit motive as engine for innovation, which he considers possible within existing socialism. Summing up his experience, he wrote:

> "The main reason for the insufficient relevance of innovation to research and development in the socialist countries lies in the current forms of organization and planning of science and technology, which in turn are fairly accurate reflections of the current planning and decision-making mechanism of the economic process in the socialist countries. ... There is a mechanistic egalitarian education concept, which is based on the idea that every average talented student is basically able to study everything."[85]

This clearly could be read as an internalization of the elitism at IIASA. Accordingly, the evaluation of the Stasi said that the book proves that Maier moved away from Marxism.[86]

Kröber's second report speculated about the motives of Maier's treason, which amounts to a revision of his past in the light of his escape.[87] Maier's statement of his own reasons had to be supplemented with deeper reasons since Maier directly blamed Kröber for his bureaucratic mocking. Kröber again listed Maier's entire career achievements, showing how much Maier

[85] Ibid.: 123, 149. Egalitarianism in education was a widely discussed topic at the time in East Germany, associated with the sociologist Manfred Lötsch.
[86] The book received positive reviews in West Germany. "So far, no one has described the difference in the atmosphere of discussion in the Soviet Union and in the GDR so precisely." (Hans Herbert Götz, "Das Sein verstimmt das Bewusstsein", *FAZ*, November 4, 1987); Adolf Wagner, "Textbook for Gorbachev", *Die Zeit*, 30.10, 1987; Wolfgang Stinglwagner, *Deutschland Archiv*, 11, 88; see also N 2693-7. For Stasi's reaction, see „Stellungnahme zu ‚*Innovation oder Stagnation*', MfS HA XVIII 25675, and HA XVIII 20960).
[87] Kröber, 3.4.1986, „Zur Einschätzung der möglichen Motive und Hintergründe der Republikflucht von Harry Maier" (MfS AP 58098-92: 36-40).

owes to the state, and how his escape revealed a deep lack of gratitude – gratitude being the key civil virtue of this generation of GDR citizens. And hand in hand with gratitude comes the capacity to accept criticism, the lack of it was the ultimate vice of those against the party line. "Maier generally only accepted his own conceptual ideas, and was unable to tolerate other opinions, especially those that were critical of him."[88] Thus, Kröber tried to whitewash his name with respect to the party authorities by pointing the finger on the anti-collectivist personality of Maier as cause of the increasing tensions at the Academy of Sciences, and ultimately of the treason.

> "All of the events mentioned were not of the type and weight that would explain or even justify an escape from the Republic. The fact of betrayal can only be explained if it is viewed against the background of Maier's personality structure, the dominant features of which were immense self-esteem, excessive vanity, boundless arrogance and pronounced subjectivism."[89]

Personality is of course not a given in socialism but the result of ideological education (*Erziehung*), such that Kröber's arguments could fall back on him as a supervisor. Thus, Kröber adds: "Educational measures, which began to being taken, apparently came too late to change something in his solidified personality structure."[90] All of this shows, as the final report says, that "the explanation in his letter to the president of the Academy of Sciences therefore lacks any foundation and is a further indication of his arrogance to claim special rights."[91]

[88] Ibid.: 38.
[89] Ibid.: 39.
[90] Ibid.: 42.
[91] Ibid.: 39.

The committee's report had to be evaluated and approved by department five of HA XVIII.[92] In the words of the Stasi officer, Kröber's analysis boiled down to the simple statement that "the main motive for his betrayal was that he increasingly turned away from Marxism-Leninism as the driving force of his actions."[93] By April 7, Maier was excluded from the party, by April 24 the Academy of Sciences declared publically Maier's treason, by May 16 Maier was convicted, and by October 8, "OV Rechenberg" was closed without further result. Gone is gone.

IIASA as Political Ideological Diversion

Though Maier was the only social scientist, there were many other scientists from the Academy of Sciences to use Western travel, to IIASA in particular, as a chance to escape to the West.[94] Numbers increased such that the Stasi noted a certain 'pull effect'. To prevent this, the political requirements increased to the extent that after Maier's escape there was no longer any long-term position from East Germany at IIASA. Nobody was left who could pass both the test of scientific quality of IIASA's director and the test of political trustworthiness of the Stasi, a fact that clearly speaks for the clash of the two cultures exemplified in this article.

[92] "The MfS forces employed in the working group - officers in special duty and reliable, knowledgeable IM - ensured from the outset an objective and politically clear examination of the acts of treason and their effects. The assessment can be approved." („Stellungnahme zur Einschätzung der Akademie", 21.4.86, MfS HA XVIII 16682).
[93] Ibid.: 34.
[94] Engineer Manfred Grauer used an IIASA visit in December 1986 to stay in West Germany (see HA SAA AU 9398/87). On other travels, in 1984 and 1985, around fifteen members of the Academy of Sciences escaped, another fifteen in 1986, twenty-two in 1987, forty-nine in 1988, and 108 in 1989 until they stopped counting. For a full list, see HA XVIII 18295: 63-82, as well as HA XX AKG 2721.

It was only after Maier's escape that the Stasi formulated an actual strategy for IIASA. Numerous Stasi documents illustrate the confrontation of the two intellectual cultures. To begin with, the party group of the Academy of Sciences analysed the escapes and asked regarding IIASA that the "specifics of this institute, its working and living conditions and the current objectives of research must be considered more thoroughly."[95] In its comparison of motives of escapes of academics, the report states as "subjective circumstance" Maier's "egocentric personality development, vanity, limitless arrogance, tremendous self-promotion, pronounced subjectivism, and excessive material interests."[96] But now emphasis was also given to the "objective circumstance" of the atmosphere at IIASA that causes the moral softening (*Aufweichung*) of the personality of IIASA visitors. They suspect systematic attempts of other intelligence agencies to use, or even create, this IIASA experience. This strategy was tagged with a technical Stasi term: *political-ideological diversion*. In other words, going to IIASA was put in the same subversive category as listening to heavy metal music.[97]

> "The working atmosphere at IIASA and the generous scientific working conditions had a definite influence on these acts of treason. Characterized as confidential and very personal ... this atmosphere works as a means of *political-ideological diversion*. It promotes a

[95] MfS HAXVIII 22725: 7, 8.
[96] Report party group, MfS HA XVIII, 21111: 102. Regarding "material interest", there is only one report that testifies of personal enrichment, saying that they "received NSW salaries from the institute in Laxenburg; Professor Haustein and Meier received the equivalent of State Secretaries or Ambassadors in non-socialist foreign states (NSW) ... Contrary to the GDR rule, where NSW salaries exceeding 1500 of the respective NSW currency are to be paid to the GDR embassy, they kept all the money for themselves and used it up." (MfS U 25-89: 85-86)
[97] See Roger Engelmann, „Politisch-ideologische Diversion", in Roger Engelmann, Bernd Florath, Walter Süß u. a. (Hrsg.): *Das MfS-Lexikon. Begriffe, Personen und Strukturen der Staatssicherheit der DDR*. (Berlin, Ch. Links Verlag, 2011, S. 67f).

> growing lack of criticism towards previously existing enemy images and class positions, and on the other hand extends critical attitudes towards the GDR."[98]

After the Academy's party group, it was then up to department five of HA XVIII to take a position regarding new "tasks that arise in the context of the development of the situation of international class struggle for the management of the GDR Academy of Sciences."[99] They demanded to better consider the subjective circumstances when selecting travel cadres to the West, including their career ambitions, and their chances of individual development. Also, they acknowledged that the informal working atmosphere does have unwanted effects.

> "The political-ideological and moral state of the international travel cadres as well as their image of the enemy has considerable weaknesses ... The ability to recognize classes is partially only theoretically developed ... There is often insufficient clarity in conveying a practical image of the enemy ... As a result, personality developments take place that result in the fact that the travel and foreign cadres do not, or no longer, meet the travel requirements … Insufficient political and ideological work is also evident in the cases where the policy of dialogue, developed in the interest of peacekeeping, causes illusory

[98] Report party group, MfS HA XVIII, 21111: 103, emphasis added. Of course, no intention of western intelligence could ever be proven. Nine former easter German scientists are listed for contact, but no action, with western intelligence (see "Zusammenfassende Übersicht über ehemalige DDR-Bürger, die nach vollendeten Verratshandlungen auf Grund vorliegender Hinweise in nachrichtendienstliche Aktivitäten des Gegners einzuordnen sind" (30.9.1987, HA XVIII 22725).The funding regime of East German scholars in West Germany, and in particular the treaty for scientific cooperation between the Federal Ministry for Science and Technology and the Council of Ministers of the GDR of September 1987, was read as an intention of PID – saying that the really important institutions, such as Max-Planck institute, are excluded from the cooperation. In fact, department AKG complaint about department 5 of HAXVIII that they too easily blame western intelligence for their own faults ("Stellungnahme HA XVIII", AKG, MfS HAXVIII 22725: 84-87).

[99] "Stellungnahme", HA XVIII, 5, 13.2.1987 (MfS HAXVIII 22725: 18).

> ideas that stand in the way of the necessary vigilance, nurtured by 'intelligence-specific ideologies' such as the unlimited exchange of information, convergence theory, and the consideration of the representative of the capitalist-imperialist system as a "colleague". In this context, it should be noted that a significant proportion of the NSW travel cadres have been in contact with certain NSW partners for many years, some of them regularly, such that their relationship has developed the character of friendships."[100]

Dialogue yes, but friendship no. And it is in this context that even the Stasi had to acknowledge *expressis verbis* what everyone knew already but was not supposed to speak out loud for the sake of 'scientific propaganda': that East Germany's technological development was lagging behind:

> "From findings on acts of treason, it becomes clear that disappointment and resignation among international travel cadres result from the insight and experiences that, despite the largely equal level of knowledge and basic research … of both systems, the implementation of this knowledge in new products and technologies / processes in imperialism is generally done faster."[101]

The topic then came up at the *Linientagung* of higher Stasi officials in March 1987, in a talk on the causes of treason by members of the scientific intelligentsia. But now, the cause was narrowed exclusively to the strategy of the class enemy. Imperialist intelligence aims at collecting information about East Germany's science, stealing their knowledge through skimming

[100] Ibid.: 19.
[101] Ibid.: 19.

(*Abschöpfung*), through exchange of scientists, and through inciting East Germany's scientists to defect.

> Comrade General, Comrade Officers … Today we can clearly say that these provocations to commit acts of treason are based, above all, on the immense intensification of the activities of our enemies within the framework of their long-term programs, which is still characterized by political-economic and military confrontation … Demagogic promises, lucrative job and salary offers as well as the promotion of the material conditions belonging to the imperialist lifestyle are attempted to persuade our scientists to commit treason ... These actions are carried out by the BND (Federal Intelligence Service) and the BAfV (Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution) with the political aim of proving a so-called intelligence crisis in the GDR." [102]

The Stasi officers overseeing the Academy of Sciences could not imagine anything beyond the idea that cooperation with western scientists was corrupting the minds of socialist scholars. Western science being a form of false consciousness, East Germany's contribution to IIASA was structurally undermined. And so, tensions between the Academy of Sciences (Schirmer and Scheler in particular) and IIASA (director Lee and later Pry) continued until the end of the East German state.[103]

---

[102] „Diskussionsbeitrag Linientagung", anonymous, 20.3.1987 (MfS HAXVIII1: 23-25).

[103] One remaining issue were membership fees that should preferably be paid in East German currency, e.g. by financing contractual research for IIASA in East Germany, so-called network contributions. Another issue was that IIASA's research agenda should fit the national interests of East Germany, hidden as a demand for "practical relevance". Yet another issue was that U.S. funding was increasingly substituted by corporate funding. Lee and Pry both recruited from General Electric, did everything to rebut the allegation of west-east technology transfer. This made Schirmer call IIASA an exploitation of "cheap labour" of socialist countries (in MfS HA XVIII 21110); for these discussions, see Schirmer's report, "zur

Integration in West Germany

What could Maier possibly do in West Germany, many might have asked themselves back in the East. As a scientist, he would be one among others, and as a Marxist he would be at the margin, even among Marxists who would not understand his betrayal of East Germany, some thought. Maier's ideas about West Germany were better informed, but still, without an offer at hand, a position as professor or economics was not obvious. In West Germany, there was no link between systems analysis and the political left, and at this point, not even with economics proper. Maier's intimate knowledge of East German bureaucracy, which he fled from, made him an ideal candidate for the so-called East Research Centres.[104] Having the reputation of being critical of socialist regimes, that was out of question for him. He wished to find a job as economist. The first information the Stasi kept track of are indeed pieces of evidence that show that Maier had difficulties finding a job. He tried without success in Kiel, in Cologne, and there were rumours that he even intended to become director of a Max-Planck institute.[105] But these reports might tell us more about the Stasi than about Maier. For it took only two months before he began, in June

Effektivität der Mitarbeit der DDR am IIASA", 1987 (MfS HAXVIII 15324), and „zum Stand und zu den Aufgaben der Erhöhung des Nutzeffektes der Mitarbeit der DDR am IIASA in Laxenburg", 15.3.1988 (MFS HA XVIII 17656: 69); see also the political-operative strategy of Leutnant Johannes Neuss, head of HA XVIII (HAXVIII 18553: 60 ff.). Neuss referred to an "Operation Matrix" directed against Häfele; see also the reports of later informal collaborators at IIASA, IMS "Henry Kraatz", IMS "Mathias Kessel", IMS "Anton" (ibid.).

[104] Such as the Institute for Society and Science at the University of Erlangen, which was considered anti-socialist propaganda by the party and the Stasi (see MfS XVIII 23244).

[105] "Aktennotiz", 14.4.1986 (MfS HA XVIII 16682: 50-51); see also "report", 2.5.1986 (Ibid.:75). As Maier continued working with Häfele, Schirmer complaint at a personal talk with IIASA director Lee that this would count as a illegitimate knowledge transfer from East to West („Grundsätzliche Fragen unseres Verhältnisses zum IIASA", January 1987 (MfS HA XVIII 21110-21: 441).

1986, working as a scientific collaborator at the Ifo Institute for Economic Research in Munich.[106]

Maier nevertheless searched for support and understanding from other East German expats in the so-called "working circle of former GDR scientists" that was founded in May 1987.[107] A loose discussion group of about five former East German scientists, the circle was founded out of "solidarity with colleagues who are new to West Germany and who have a hard time gaining a foothold here, and in turn, also with those who have difficulties over there because of a professional ban."[108] Being attached to Marxism to different degrees, they knew that the over-aged Honecker government will soon be replaced, and reform pressure from the Soviet Union would lead to political and economic reform. They thought of themselves as a mouthpiece for their eastern colleagues.

> "We want to openly express, what many think and want in the GDR, but cannot say without further ado, namely what appeals to the democratic renewal of the GDR … There is a real need for our colleagues from the GDR that we, who have the opportunity to express ourselves freely and know their problems, make this clear."[109]

[106] See his application to the director Karl Heinrich Oppenländer (May 26, 1986, N 2693-13).
[107] *Arbeitskreis ehemaliger DDR Wissenschaftler*. Other members were Wolfgang Seiffert, former professor of foreign law at the Academy of Political and Legal Sciences in Potsdam-Babelsberg and former consultant of Honecker, Franz Löser, philosopher from Humboldt University, Hermann von Berg, economic historian at Humboldt University (with a long Stasi history), and Edda Hanisch. The Stasi judged them enemies of the state. Visitors to West Germany were warned about them, and friends back in the East were observed if they were in touch with members of the circle. For Seiffert, there was „IM Klee" and „IM Steffenhagen", for Maier, there was „IM Modelle" and „Seemann" to understand his connections back to East Germany, including his family (see HA XVIII 20960).
[108] Interview with Seiffert, in DLF, 11.5.1987 (in HA XVIII 20960: 11).
[109] Ibid.: 3.

Being now free to express himself, Maier's writings may test the hypothesis that self-censorship was a motivation for his escape, or, as the Stasi argued, that he turned away from Marxism. However, comparing his writings before and after his escape, there is little that could not be inferred from his earlier writings. Apart from the book already mentioned on market reforms in East Germany, the highlight of his public intervention, was a series of newspaper articles as a commentator on perestroika, the fall of the regime, and the German reunification. Between 1986 and 1992, he published regularly long comments in *Die Zeit*. They exemplify well how his generation's mindset transformed from "reforming the GDR" (SED) to "rescuing the GDR" (PDS), to a critique of the new regime (Die Linke), all in the same terms but directed at different audiences in the changing arena of power.

The series begins with five long articles in November and December 1986 on the conditions of the success of Gorbachev's reforms.[110] In 1987 he commented that the struggle of power was a matter of "radicals" against "technocrats", the main obstacle in the GDR being Günter Mittag, "the emperor of all combinates".[111] In March and May 1989, he explained how the reforms in the Soviet Union could translate to East Germany, arguing, typically for his generation, that the economic relationship between the East and the West will determine what is possible in the political superstructure. And this, so Maier, depends on the development of technology-intensive production, such as microelectronic technology. However, there are no incentives of innovation as risk is communal. And as if commenting on his own career, he adds:

> "This (lack of innovation) only strengthened a process that has deep roots, namely the decades-long isolation of GDR science from the West. Since GDR researchers were

[110] Die Zeit, 1986: 46 (33-35), 47 (33-34), 48 (33-34), 49 (25-26), 50 (29-31).
[111] Die Zeit, 1987 (37, 38), 1988 (23).

prevented from taking part in the discussions of the international scientific community, they could not take up and respond to the impulses from there."[112]

Starting November 1989 until 1992, he then directed his voice against western reformers dismantling East Germany's economy.[113] He still asked how one could balance out the economic difference, but now blamed the mistakes made by the *Bundesbank* in April 1990, argued for a shift instead of a conversion (*Wechsel statt Wandel*), and critiqued the notion of East Germany's "ailing economy".[114] Observing also the dismantling of his former institutions of the Academy of Sciences and many East German economists, as if personally attacked, he protested again strongly, showing where his loyalties were.[115]

But the greatest difficulty of integrating in West Germany might have been the slow and frustrating family reunification. Beginning in summer 1986, his wife Sigrid Maier submitted ten times applications which were not filed because officially Maier could still return. She continued working at the academy's economics institute in constant fear of being surveyed by the Stasi through her close friends. In August 1987, worrying about his wife's health, Maier mobilized all political levels, and wrote to several provincial ministers, to Chancellor Helmut Kohl, to President Richard von Weizsäcker, as well as to Honecker.[116] In them, he revealed another reason

[112] Die Zeit, 1989, 11, „Klavierspielen mit Boxhandschuhen" (see also 12, „Perestrojka auf deutsch", 21, „Wenn in Moskau die Steine tanzen").
[113] Die Zeit, 1989, 44, October 27, „Hoffnung auf den Nach-Mittag".
[114] Die Zeit, 1989 (47, „Das Gefälle beseitigen"), 1990 (16, „Die Bundesbank auf dem Holzweg"), 39 („Wechsel statt Wandel"), 1991 (8, „Die Mär vom maroden Osten").
[115] Die Zeit, 1991, 24 („Gnadenlose Dampfwalze: Plädoyer für einen schonenderen Umbau der ehemaligen DDR-Forschung"), 1992, 44 („Verunsichert, lahmgelegt, abgewickelt").
[116] All letters can be found in N 2693-17. See also the written account of Sigrid Maier in N 2693-14. Weizsäcker had invited Maier to the Bergedorfer circle in preparation of Honecker's visit in September 1987.

for his escape, which so far he had not disclosed in order to protect his family. In his letter to Weizsäcker, he wrote:

> "I still would work in the GDR today if agents of the Ministry of State Security, department information (*Aufklärung*), had not forced me to do something, which I despise at heart and contradicts entirely for which I always stood up: the honest and trusting collaboration of scientists from East and West."[117]

In the letter to Honecker, copied to the letter to Weizsäcker, he elaborates the agency of the information department HV A:

> "When I acquired a personal computer (Commodore 64) that was urgently needed for research at the end of October 1985 in Vienna by saving my daily allowances, I was subjected to a ten-hour, non-stop and degrading interrogation at Schönefeld Airfield. This interrogation was continued in a stricter form with the Vice President of the GDR's Academy of Sciences, Professor Werner Kalweit ... However, only a few days later, agents from the Ministry of State Security, department information appeared, offering to save me from such inconvenience in the future if I were ready to take on tasks of their institution during my travels. At the same time, the MfS attempted to set up a special working group at the Institute for Theory, History and Organization of Science ... to use scientific contacts with western scientists for the purposes of this ministry."[118]

[117] Maier to Weizsäcker, August 11, 1987, in N 2693-17.
[118] Maier to Honecker, August 11, 1987, in N 2693-17.

Maier thus blamed the "attempt at blackmail" by the Stasi to use his "friendly-collegial relationships to scientists from western countries", which he felt "in contradiction with the conscience and ethos of a scientist".[119] He felt forced to leave East Germany. Only a short note in the investigative documents of the Stasi show that after the transferral from HA XX, AKG to the district section Berlin in May 1984, he was taken over by, in December 1985, by HV A, sector K (*Koordinierungsstelle*).[120] Thus, it is possible that the unfavorable events against Maier preceding his escape, such as the control of the conference in 1985, the interrogation at the airport, the discussion with Kalweit, and the discontinuation of his research area, were more than personal chicane and bad luck with bureaucracy but in fact orchestrated by the Stasi, say, in an operation of psychological manipulation (*Zersetzung*) to counteract the political-ideological diversion at IIASA. However, since the documents of HV A are destroyed, we do not know in detail. Fact is that all what is left in HA XVIII, in charge of the Academy of Sciences, shows *no* trace of the agency of HV A. The letter to Honecker is only available in Maier' personal papers, for which personal access had to be permitted by his wife. In other words, the special legal status of the Stasi archive (Bstu) in contrast to the party archive (SAPMO), in the case of Maier, creates a bias in favour of the Stasi. The order of narrative of the preceding article reflects this bias.

The letter to Honecker, shred in the party's bureaucratic machine, did not make a difference for Maier's family (nor did the famous lawyer Wolfgang Vogl). Only after president Weizsäcker made a personal plea to Honecker, in June 1988, his wife and his son could leave the

[119] Ibid. The same justification already circulated a year earlier in West Germany: first, in his application to Karl Heinrich Oppenländer at the Ifo (May 26, 1986, N 2693-13), then in an official plea against a refusal of the status of refugee category C (political refugee from the Soviet Zone) in July 1986 (N 2693-14), and was alluded to in an article in *Die Zeit*, November 7, 1986 (*Den Erpressern aus dem Weg gegangen*). Maier noted that by summer 1986 everyone in East Germany would know of this reason, for which, however, I have seen no evidence.
[120] See MfS U 25-89.

country. They joined him in Flensburg, where Maier had received a call as a professor and founding dean of the economics faculty of the new university.

Conclusion

The archival material documenting the case of Maier is rich, but might still be incomplete, as the contradicting information in his personal papers and the Stasi archive suggests. However, aim of the preceding narrative was not to present a final judgement on the motives of Maier's defection. What stands out regarding Maier's career is that, in contrast to what was claimed by the party apparatus, he might not have experienced any inner intellectual change, remaining true to the idea of a more democratic socialism from the beginning to the end of his career. Inspired by the post-Stalinist enlivening of the 'Thaw', he sought innovation in the economics of education during times of Ulbricht's New Economic Policy, wished to critically contribute to Honecker's regime with an economics of growth, got further inspiration for how to reform socialism through systems analysis from IIASA, struggled for the realization of his ideas during the flared up Cold War of the early 1980s, and even so after he left to West Germany when he tried to influence the path of perestroika. The intellectual development of Maier is the result of the different institutional contexts that he passed through, rather than any inner change that occurred to him when being exposed to western science. His class consciousness might have been matured, but it was never corrupted.

Thus, the lesson of the material presented concerns less Maier. Instead, I presented his case as an occasion for the underlying institutional structures of East German academia to show themselves. East Germany's membership at IIASA, in the early 1970s, was welcome as an

occasion to display the achievements of the German socialist state. Science propaganda appeared to be a shared motivation for both East German scholars and the party apparatus surrounding them, that is, the party groups and Stasi's department five of HA XVIII watching over the intelligentsia. The fact that the scientific ethos evoked by IIASA's agenda of peaceful coexistence was in contradiction with those implied by the controlling party apparatus, was the result of a learning process. At the end of the 1980s, the Academy's party group and the Stasi could not help but classifying scientific cooperation with the West as *political ideological diversion*. The awareness that the party apparatus itself created this conflict for the scientists by infusing suspicion into friendly relationships, by actively boycotting collaboration, and also by oppressing communication within Stasi departments themselves, had to be kept secret. The contribution of East Germany to IIASA's endeavour of bridge building through science was structurally undermined.