"Fellowships and What they Entailed." *A Transatlantic History of the Social Sciences: Robber Barons, the Third Reich and the Invention of Empirical Social Research*. Fleck, Christian. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011. 39–74. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849662932.ch-002>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 06:24 UTC.

Copyright © Christian Fleck 2011. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

2

FELLOWSHIPS AND WHAT THEY ENTAILED

Among the various activities pursued by American foundations, fellowship programmes may seem to be the least spectacular ones. Material support for gifted but needy students is no doubt an institution as old as the university itself. Traditionally, students were supported to help them finish their studies. What was new about the grants awarded by foundations is indicated by the very term ‘fellowships’, which soon became quite common, marking as it did the difference from ‘scholarships’ that were granted for educational purposes.

A NEW WAY TO SUPPORT JUNIOR SCIENTISTS

The idea of awarding one-year fellowships to university graduates was voiced, advocated and finally realized by one of the first American Nobel laureates, Robert Andrews Millikan (1868–1953). In 1923, Millikan was awarded the Nobel Prize in physics for his experimental proof of Einstein’s photoelectric equation. He won recognition for being one of the first scholars to excel in a new role in the scholar’s role set: along with a certain number of other science entrepreneurs who were indefatigable in their efforts to improve scientific infrastructure, he devoted himself to the organization of research. Besides his full professorship in Chicago, Millikan was one of the directors of the National Research Council (NRC) that had been established during the First World War, where he helped to develop anti-submarine devices. He also used his stay in Washington, DC to lobby for the creation of a grants programme designed to help junior scholars avoid the deficits of his own education (Millikan 1950). Millikan, whose political stance seems to have been a rather conservative one, later got involved in another new international scene, the League of Nations’ Committee on International Cooperation, and eventually helped co-found the California Institute of Technology (Caltech) in Pasadena. The grants-for-graduates project was rejected by the Carnegie Corporation,¹ but aroused the interest of the officers of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF). In 1919, the RF allotted half a million dollars (\$6.1 million in 2010) in total to the NRC to be spread over a five-year period.

In the years after the end of the First World War, the philanthropic activities of the Rockefeller family had become so diversified that the family members themselves and their advisors, for whom this used to be a side job, had already given up part of their influence in favour of salaried foundation officers. The turn towards the social sciences in one of the Rockefeller foundations in the 1920s was, thus, due to the commitment of junior officers who succeeded in getting the trustees' assent, rather than to any initiative of the founding family. The person who played an outstanding role in this was Beardsley Ruml.

A NEW DIRECTOR

Ruml, the grandson of a Czech immigrant, was born in the Midwest. After his undergraduate studies at Dartmouth College, one of the leading American 'liberal arts colleges', he studied psychology under James R. Angell (1869–1949) at the University of Chicago. He wrote his Ph.D. thesis on the reliability of psychological tests for measuring intellectual capacities. During the First World War, Ruml collaborated with Angell, John B. Watson and other psychologists at the War Department to develop a test to be used for recruiting military personnel. After the end of the war, he and some other members of the group set up the first private firm to offer psychological counselling for industry.

At age twenty-five, Ruml entered the world of philanthropic organizations as an assistant to Angell, who served for a short time as President of the Carnegie Corporation. At age twenty-seven, Ruml already was Director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM), a foundation of the Rockefeller family dedicated to the memory of the late wife of John D. Rockefeller, Sr. During its first years, the Memorial had sought to sponsor activities in domains bound up with the deceased's concern for the well-being of women and children. Accordingly, during the first four years, only 0.005 per cent of the budget was spent on scientific research (Bulmer and Bulmer 1981: 352). The analysis of the Memorial's archival material led the Bulmers to a conclusion that was not very flattering: 'The programme was lacking in clear direction and was undistinguishable' (Bulmer and Bulmer 1981: 353). With Ruml's appointment as a full-time director, this rapidly changed. Within a very short time, he transformed the smallest of the Rockefeller foundations (with a trust property of \$74 million, about \$1 billion in 2010) into the most important institution for the advancement of the social sciences not only in the United States, but in Europe as well. The eminent Robert M. Hutchins (1899–1977), long-term President of the University of Chicago, even referred to Ruml as 'the founding father of the social sciences in the USA', although this may give him a bit too much credit (Johnson 1945).

In 1928, before the merger of the Memorial and the RF, Ruml stepped down as director to engage in other activities. After a short interlude as Dean of the Division of Social Sciences at the University of Chicago, he returned to New York where he eventually became chairman of Macy's, the department store. During the New Deal, he served as Director of the New York Federal Reserve Bank and entered US financial history as the man who invented a new

method of collecting income taxes. 'Ruml's method of tackling problems is to sit in a chair and do nothing ... With his mind released from ordinary influence, he can command wider vistas of fact and theory than when methodically studying a subject,' one reads in an article about him entitled, significantly enough, 'National Idea Man' (Johnson 1945).

At barely 30, Ruml, with some flourish, submitted his ideas for the social sciences to the trustees of the Memorial:

All who work toward the general end of social welfare are embarrassed by the lack of knowledge which the social sciences must provide. It is as though engineers were at work without an adequate development in the sciences of physics and chemistry ... production from the universities is largely deductive and speculative, on the basis of second-hand observations, documentary evidence and anecdotal material. It is small wonder that the social engineer finds this social science abstract and remote, of little help to him in the solution of his problems.²

There was nothing new or original about this, but the way it was proclaimed sounded a new note of self-assurance of the social sciences. Ruml's experience as an army psychologist and industrial counsellor provided him a powerful rhetoric that was obviously convincing. His approach proved to be effective since the addressees of his memorandum, while they may not have believed him, did nothing to prevent him from putting his plans into action, either.

Although Ruml did his best to achieve a balance of power between the social sciences and the hard sciences, there was no evidence for him to rely on in his dealings with the patrons that could substantiate his claim of equal economic utility for both science realms. The new 'realistic' social sciences – for a long time this was the qualifying adjective that firmly pointed out the kind of social sciences they had in mind – were not geared to boosting productivity and, ultimately, profit.

In contrast to the dealings with the trustees, where the motto of the RF – 'the well-being of mankind throughout the world' – was frequently evoked in some paraphrase or other, communication within the Foundation and with external scholars much more strongly relied on properly scientific arguments: the fellowships were to serve the advancement of the best and prevent junior faculty members from abandoning research because of their teaching load (Mitchell 1926).

NEW FIELDS FOR INTERNATIONALISM

While detailed reasons had been given to the trustees of the Foundation in favour of the social sciences as a field of funding activities by 1922, few words had been devoted to the innovation that was perhaps more spectacular, i.e. awarding fellowships to foreigners with the explicit aim of improving conditions in their home countries. This seems odd since it clearly contrasted with the localist tradition of philanthropist donations and, thus, should have required an explicit rationale. One explanation might be that for the RF, it

could have been subsumed under its Christian missionary activities, mainly represented by its extensive China programme (Ninkovich 1984). On the other hand, its activities to combat epidemics were driven by an internal logic to look beyond the borders of the United States.

The decisive factor seems to have been the attitude of American intellectuals who were interested in international affairs. In the early 1920s, the general feeling among them led to the creation of another initiative. Immediately after the signing of the ceasefire that marked the end of the First World War, two influential trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Elihu Root, former Secretary of State under Theodore Roosevelt, and Nicholas M. Butler, President of Columbia University and later Nobel Peace Prize laureate, suggested founding an organization dedicated to the promotion of international understanding. US intervention in the First World War, they argued, had been driven by moral rather than nationalist or imperialist reasons, and this commitment was now to be continued.

At the same time, European intellectuals were fighting over whom to blame, and to what degree, for the war, and what could be done to foster or stem social revolution – depending on one's convictions. Throughout all these turbulences in and around Europe, the small number of Americans who were interested in foreign affairs cultivated a paternalist attitude towards European issues that had emerged from the war. First, foundations like those of Rockefeller and Carnegie had provided the old continent with humanitarian aid; then the United States had also helped on the military level; and now they wanted the role of peacemaker. With an enthusiasm that, given the former isolationism, might seem compensatory, this small group began to advocate international commitment. This, however, spectacularly failed when in 1920 both houses of the United States Congress voted down President – and former professor of political science – Woodrow Wilson's motion that the United States join the League of Nations.

Refusing defeat, the losers began to build the institutions outside the sphere of influence of the political establishment. The Institute of International Education (IIE), an initiative of Root and Butler, developed a remarkable exchange programme for foreign university students and professors, inviting them to the United States to study the inner workings of the new world power. The direction of the new institute was in the hands of Stephen Duggan, one of the most active liberal internationalists among the American university professors. IIE funding was ensured by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

At the time, Americans doubtlessly felt superior to Europeans in many ways and wished to demonstrate that this feeling of superiority was culturally as well as politically well founded. But even though they wished to be admired, they were not quite sure of the admirers' free will to do so. Pilgrimages to the Mecca of Western civilization were not yet undertaken on the pilgrims' own initiative and expense, but on invitation. Rather than simple generosity, this was primarily a manifestation of a lack of self-assurance on the part of the young nation.

The scholars who came as refugees from the Nazis after 1933 directly benefited from the internationalist spirit of their American colleagues that had emerged more than a decade previously, as well as from the institutions this spirit had sparked, because institutions like the IIE were the core element of the relief organizations for emigrants.

AID TO EUROPEANS AND TO THE NEW SOCIAL SCIENCES

In 1924, the Memorial's Executive Committee authorized the funding of its first fellowships for social scientists. The sums dedicated to sponsoring European and American social research were roughly the same – about half a million dollars (\$6.2 million in 2010) each, over a five-year period.³ Once the programme was authorized, issues of implementation had to be discussed.⁴ Experiences previously gained in other Rockefeller philanthropic institutions were drawn upon, with the result that funds, for instance, were allocated over a longer period of time, and to self-governed committees. In strict analogy to the procedure relied on for NRC fellowships in the natural sciences, the Social Science Research Council (cf. Fisher 1993) was established, and charged with the selection of fellowship candidates.

In preparation for the fellowships to be granted to Europeans, Guy Stanton Ford, a historian who at the time was a Memorial officer, charged two professors and colleagues of his to go to Europe and look for candidates. These were John J. Coss, philosopher at Columbia University, and Frank Aydelotte, pedagogue and President of Swarthmore College and, later, of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. Nominees-to-be were, primarily, economists, sociologists and political scientists, but eligibility also extended to historians, psychologists and anthropologists: 'Nominations may also be made in the case of a man or woman of very unusual qualifications in philosophy, geography, law and education, when the specific subject of study bears immediately on the principal subjects mentioned above.'⁵ Thus, the disciplinary field for the recruitment of fellows was staked out for years to come. It is noteworthy that in doing so, the Memorial anticipated an internal differentiation and external delimitation of the social sciences which, actually, was instituted only much later.⁶ The focus on the three core disciplines of economics, sociology and political science decisively influenced the development of the social sciences.⁷

However, the choice of disciplines is rather less of a surprise than the list of the countries to be included in the programme. On their very first exploratory trip, the professors not only visited the states which, along with the United States, were among the victors of the recent world war, but also those that had been enemy countries, such as Germany and Austria.

'Inductive' research, as defined by the Memorial, was also the decisive criterion for the support dedicated to research projects. Ruml and company were of the opinion that this style of research was still far from dominant in the United States. On the contrary, financial support for American institutions was also framed to help develop this type of empirical research.

This initial setting of priorities may well have been what ultimately won over the senior Rockefeller trustees who had for such a long time hesitated to (re-) enter the field of social research. To solicit their approval, Ruml used strong words which today seem to reveal a rather naive view of the potential of the social sciences. However, simple but strong beliefs may sometimes be necessary to get something new under way: 'Social knowledge is not a substitute for social righteousness; but unless we are ready to admit that the situation is utterly hopeless, we must believe that knowledge is a far greater aid to righteousness than is ignorance.'⁸

In the hands of 'competent technicians', the gain in knowledge would lead to 'substantial control'; it should perhaps be noted that at the time, 'social control' was understood to be the self-regulation, without state control, of the society (Janowitz 1975).

EUROPEAN ADVISORS

Since the Memorial did not want to take on the task of selecting the European fellows itself, nor to rely on applications, local advisors were appointed and, in the following years, acted as its representatives in the countries chosen. In this, the traditional reluctance to cooperate with foreign governments that was characteristic of American foundations played as strong a part as the positive experience of working with the NRC. Avoiding publicity as much as possible was a way of keeping Europeans' animosities against American donors at bay and, thus, from counteracting the plan. This procedure quickly resulted in nominations and clear responsibilities.

Initially, responsibility for the quality of the holders of fellowships lay exclusively with the respective representatives or, in the case of Germany and Britain, with a committee of only a few members. This again was due to previous experiences gained in the United States where, rather than entrust the funds for fellowships to the heads of departments, selections had from early on been left to the discretion of independent advisors (Kohler 1991).

In France, this representative was Charles Rist (1874–1955), Professor of Political Economics at the University of Paris. In Austria it was Alfred Francis Pribram (1859–1942), Professor of Medieval and Modern History. In Czechoslovakia there were two representatives: Alfred Amonn (1883–1962), economist at the German University of Prague, for the German-speaking candidates, and Joseph Macek (1887–1972), Professor of Economical Theory at the Hohe Handelsschule and, later, the Technical University of Prague, for those who spoke Czech.

The Vienna and Prague advisors eventually ceased to fulfil their functions, although it was at different times and for different reasons. Amonn left for a three-year stay as a visiting professor in Tokyo, an appointment Ludwig von Mises had previously turned down. On his return from the Far East, he accepted a professorship at the University of Berne, where he became Rector in 1949/50. In 1926, due to his long absence abroad, Amonn was replaced as a RF representative by Franz Xaver Weiss (1885–1956), economist at the Prague

German University. The three other advisors were victims of the political situation: Pribram was dismissed from his Vienna chair in 1938 and managed to escape to Britain with the help of RF officers. Macek, who for a certain time had also been a Member of Parliament, emigrated to the United States after the communists took over in 1949 and, in spite of his advanced age, was appointed Full Professor at the University of Pittsburgh. Weiss had to leave Prague in 1939 for Britain where he lived as a freelance author until his death (Hagemann and Krohn 1999a: 737–8).

The German committee included the following members:

- Friedrich Schmidt-Ott (1860–1956), jurist, collaborator of Friedrich Althoff, Prussian politician committed to cultural and educational issues, and co-founder of the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft (known today as the Max Planck Society). Between 1917 and 1918, he was the last Royal Prussian Minister of Cultural Affairs, and in the Weimar Republic he was one of the leading founding fathers of the Notgemeinschaft der Deutschen Wissenschaft (Association for the Emergency Funding of German Science), acting as its President between 1930 and 1934. Between 1920 and 1945, he also was a member of the supervisory board of the IG Farben conglomerate.
- Paul Fridolin Kehr (1860–1944), full professor at the universities of Marburg and Göttingen, director of the Prussian Historical Institute in Rome since 1903, General Director of the Prussian State Archives in Berlin between 1915 and 1926, the year of his retirement, as well as Director of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for German History and President of the Central Board of Management of the Monumenta Germaniae Historica.
- Albrecht Mendelssohn-Bartholdy (1874–1936), grandson of the composer, full professor of Civil and Foreign Law and Comparative Law at Leipzig and Würzburg and, from 1929, at the University of Hamburg; from 1925 also acting as an arbitrator at the Hague Court of Arbitration and as a German delegate to the League of Nations. He was forced to emigrate in 1934.
- Hermann Oncken (1869–1945), historian, full professor at Giessen, Heidelberg and Munich, and, from 1927, at the Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität at Berlin. In 1905/06 he was exchange professor at Chicago, and during his time in Berlin was also a member of the Historical Committee of the Reich.
- Hermann Schumacher (1869–1952), born in South America, several times abroad for extended educational journeys in his early years, which also led him to the United States. After full professorships at Kiel and Bonn, he became full professor for Political Science at the University of Berlin. He was the first Kaiser-Wilhelm (Visiting-) Professor to teach at Columbia University at New York and had himself referred to as the ‘German editor of the 16-volume “Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences” that is being published’.⁹
- Acting as the Secretary: historian Dr August Wilhelm Fehling, who had graduated from the University of Rostock and whose main job was that of a ‘referent’ for the Notgemeinschaft.

Apart from Kehr and Oncken, all the Committee members had been to the US.¹⁰ They held key positions in the German science system and were highly respected. All members of the Committee were more or less involved in German politics. This was particularly obvious in the controversy about war guilt. As early as in 1915, Schmidt-Ott, a lifelong monarchist, had participated, along with Oncken, Schumacher, Otto Hintze and Friedrich Meinecke, in the publication of what he called a 'factual scientific account entitled "Germany and the World War"' (Schmidt-Ott 1952: 143). After 1933, the national conservatives among the members of the Committee parted company. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy was among the first victims of Nazi anti-Jewish policies. Others tried to come to terms with the new rulers, as Heiber has shown, using Schumacher as an example (Heiber 1991: 343). Schmidt-Ott lost his function as President of the Notgemeinschaft, but remained otherwise unmolested. Oncken became the object, after one of his lectures, of attacks by his former student, Walter Frank, and subsequently had to retire against his will.¹¹

In the present context, the political involvements of the members of the German Committee are of less interest than their preferences in terms of a policy for science. They were not young any more, and in spite of their transatlantic experience they did not really seem predestined as proponents of the new 'American' social sciences. Kehr and Oncken were traditional historians, and Schumacher was explicitly hostile to the theory of political economics. Mendelssohn-Bartholdy was the only one who advocated a more open attitude towards recent scientific developments.

In Britain, historian James R.M. Butler was nominated as an advisor and charged with setting up the committee that was to support him. In the beginning, however, the committee was not very active.¹² It was not until 1931 that the list included six more members:

- James R.M. Butler (1889–1975) was the son of the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, where he himself was schooled and, after the First World War, acted as a tutor to the future King George VI. In the 1920s, Butler stood as a Member of Parliament for Cambridge University; his views were those of an independent liberal. At the same time, he held a lectureship in history at Trinity College and, in 1947, was appointed Regius Professor of Modern History. Butler primarily distinguished himself as a military historian and as one of the chief editors of a forty-one-volume *British Military History*, to which he contributed two volumes on the first half of the Second World War. He was knighted in 1958. An obituary reads: 'He never married, and his college and university always stood first in his interests and affections' (*Dictionary of National Biography* 1986: 114).
- Alexander Morris Carr-Saunders (1886–1966) attended the elite school of Eton and read zoology at Magdalen College, Oxford. He then turned to biometrics, which he studied under Karl Pearson, and became the Secretary of the Eugenics Education Society. After the First World War, he worked as a demonstrator for zoology in Oxford, but soon became interested in demographic studies which ultimately earned him the appointment to the first Charles Booth Chair in Social

Sciences in Liverpool. In 1937, he succeeded William Beveridge as Director of the London School of Economics, and held that appointment until 1965. He was knighted in 1946.

- Henry Clay (1883–1945) had graduated from Oxford and worked in private welfare organizations and as a lecturer in adult education. As a result of this activity, he wrote an introduction to political economics for the general reader. In 1922, he was appointed Stanley Jevons Professor of Political Economics at the University of Manchester, but later changed to hold a chair of social economics. In 1930, he became involved with Bank of England work; he was critical of John Maynard Keynes's economic ideas. In the late 1930s, he contributed to the establishment of the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, where for twelve years he was in a leading position. In 1944 he became head of Nuffield College in Oxford, created with a donation by Lord Nuffield and dedicated to the advancement of the social sciences. He was knighted in 1946. Clay's political outlook was that of a nineteenth-century liberal.
- Charles Samuel Myers (1873–1946) read physiology at Cambridge and as a young man participated in an anthropological expedition. Later he turned to experimental psychology. In the early 1920s, he went to London where he founded the National Institute of Industrial Psychology and the *British Journal of Psychology*. Myers gained international recognition as a psychologist and was also active in Jewish philanthropic concerns.
- Josiah Charles Stamp (1880–1941) left school after compulsory education and joined the civil service as a boy clerk in the Inland Revenue Department. He acquired knowledge in political economics by private reading, published articles in economic journals and studied economics as an external student. Stamp quit the civil service to start a second career as a manager, first in the Imperial Chemical Industries and later in a railroad company. In 1928, he was appointed a director of the Bank of England and for many years was a member of the steering committee of the London School of Economics (LSE). He became Baron Stamp of Shortlands in 1938, and died during German bombing in April 1941.
- John Leofric Stocks (1882–1937) graduated from Oxford and became Professor of Philosophy at the University of Manchester in 1924. His philosophical publications are concerned with ancient philosophy and moral theology. In 1935, he stood as an unsuccessful Labour candidate.
- Arthur Keith (1866–1955) began his academic career as a surgeon, but soon turned to anthropology and as a proponent of Darwinist ideas got involved in a contemporary dispute about the dating of the age of *homo sapiens*. In 1913 he became President of the Royal Anthropological Institute for four years, and after that Professor of Physiology at the Royal Institution. Assuming leading positions in the British Association for the Advancement of Science, the Royal Society, and as Rector of the University of Aberdeen, he was an honoured and influential representative of British science, and was knighted in 1921.

- From the start, economist Noel F. Hall (1902–83) had been appointed Secretary to the Committee, for which he was paid £400 per year by the RF.¹³

The British Committee differed in its composition from its German counterpart in several respects. In addition to members of the traditional British upper class, there was at least one social climber. The constitution of the members of the British Advisory Committee was not exclusively centred on the academic world but more clearly included elements of civic society, and it also represents a broader political spectrum than the German mandarin Committee did. The scientific disciplines represented by the British advisors are closer to the RF preference for the so-called inductive approach than those of the very traditionalist German historians and political scientists.

The small group of RF advisors very aptly illustrates the national scientific styles that prevailed in Europe at the time. Johan Galtung's ironical division of the world of science into the four parts of Saxonic, Teutonic, Gallic and Nipponic styles, however, is too broad to be able to account for the subtle distinctions that can be shown even among the German-speaking professors (Galtung 1981). A minority of the members of the German Committee belonged to the group of German scholars that have been described as modernists by Fritz Ringer (Ringer 1983). Two of them – Schumacher and Oncken – are explicitly mentioned in his study. By contrast, Schmidt-Ott, the most influential one in terms of science policies, is rarely referred to in the historical literature. The German advisors were Teutonic in two respects: first, in their strong affinity not only to the German national state, but also to its autocratic interpretation, and second, in their allergic reaction to the RF officers' democratic egalitarianism.

THE FIRST EUROPEAN FELLOWS

Potential fellows were required to be college or university graduates and to 'have given evidence of exceptional intellectual distinction and capacity to do original research'.¹⁴ They received a one-year fellowship of \$1,800 (\$22,000 in 2010), and the Memorial provided the travel costs and tuition fees. In the first year, there was an English language course of three or four months at the LSE for those fellows who did not speak English.¹⁵ A certain amount of thought was dedicated to the issue of whether or not spouses or family should be included in the fellowship. In the end, the Foundation decided on a very restrictive ruling: spouses and other family were to stay at home because they would keep the fellows from achieving the 'fullest realization of their fellowship opportunity'. This ruling was repeatedly discussed among RF officers as well as with the fellows. In later years, enforcement does not seem to have been very strict – with the minimum requirement, however, that spouses spoke English.¹⁶

The first sixteen¹⁷ fellows, who later were commonly called Rockefeller fellows, came from only four of the five countries in question. The German Committee appears to have been unable to agree on a candidate. Table 2.1 shows some details of this cohort, their origin, their education prior to the fellowship and the subjects they intended to work on during their fellowship.

Table 2.1 European Fellows 1924-5

Name (country, year of birth)	Religion	Status	Graduation year	Grade	University	Discipline	Research topic (duration)	Place to study	In 1950 active as
Blackwood, Beatrice (UK, 1889)	Presbyterian	Single	1920	MA	Oxford	Anthropology	Interracial correlation of mental and physical characters of women (3 years)	Princeton, Minnesota, Santa Fe, Yale	Lecturer in Ethnology, Oxford
Bossavy, Marthe L. (Fr, 1894)	N/A	Single	1916	Agrégé	Paris	Sociology	Education of immigrant children in USA, Americanization methods (2 years)	N/A	In convent
Brown, Sybil C. (UK, 1899)	Protestant	N/A	N/A	BA	London	Sociology	Children's courts, probation systems, industrial and reformatory schools (3 years)	New York School of Social Work, Harvard	Tutor in Mental Health, LSE
Bühler, Charlotte (Aus, 1893)	Evangelical	Married	1918	Dr phil.	Munich	Psychology	Social development of children (1 year)	Teachers College Columbia	Asst. Prof. Clinical Psychology, Univ of Southern California
Duncan, George A. (Ire, 1902)	Presbyterian	Single	1923	LLB	Dublin	Economics	Rural industrialization (2 years, actually 1 year)	North Carolina	Prof. Polit. Economy, Dublin

(Continued)

Table 2.1 (Continued)

Name (country, year of birth)	Religion	Status	Graduation year	Grade	University	Discipline	Research topic (duration)	Place to study	In 1950 active as
Evans, A.D.Meurig (UK, 1902)	Protestant	Single	1923	BA	Cambridge	Law	International law: interpretation of treaties (2 years)	Harvard, Lyon	Liverpool
Ficek, Karel F. (Czech, 1903)	Catholic	Married during fellowship	1924	Handelsingenieur	Handelshochschule, Prague	Economics	Recent developments in business and industrial organization and their social implications (3 years)	Chicago, Harvard, LSE, Frankfurt	State Dept of Labor, Albany, New York
Finer, Herman (UK, 1898)	N/A	N/A	1923	DSc	London	Political Science	Comparative constitutional legislation (1 year)	USA, France, Germany, Italy	ILO, Montreal, CDN
Fritscher, Ludwig (Aus, 1890)	Catholic	Married, after selection	N/A	Dr.rer. pol.	Berlin	Economics	Correlation between agriculture and industry (1 year)	Washington, DC	Banker, Vienna
Grierson, John (UK, 1898)	Protestant	Single	1923	MA	Glasgow	Sociology	Immigration and social problems; influence of press and films on public opinion (2 years; 5 years)	Chicago, New York	Controller of Films for British Government, London
Jones, Idris D. (UK, 1899)	Church of England	Married	1924	BA	Oxford	Political Science	Law of nature in the Middle Ages (1 year)	Harvard	Died 1947

Philip, André (Fra, 1902)	Protestant	Married	1922	Jur. D	Sorbonne, Paris	Economics	Employee representation and industrial relations (2 years)	Columbia, Wisconsin	Chambre des Députés, Paris
Pollak, Heinrich (ČSR, 1899)	N/A	Single	1921	Dr jur.	German Univ Prague	Economics	Labour union organization, integration of industry (3 years)	Wisconsin, Harvard, Columbia, Brookings Institution	Commercial work in Prague
Salvesen, Harold K.(UK, 1897)	Presbyterian	Single	1923	BA	Oxford	Economics	Theory of international trade, banking and currency (1 year)	Harvard	Edinburgh
Teilhac, Ernest (Fra, 1901)	Catholic	N/A	1922	Jur. D	Bordeaux	Economics	Legal status of trusts, monetary situation of the US and financial theories of US economists (2 years)	Harvard, Columbia	Prof. Polit. Economy, Beirut
Voegelin, Erich (Aus, 1901)	Protestant	Single	1922	Dr.rer. pol.	Vienna	Political Science	General problems of government, theory of social organization, theory of law and government (3 years)	Columbia, Harvard, Paris	Prof. of Govt., Louisiana State Univ, Baton Rouge, LA

Source: The Rockefeller Foundation, Social Science Fellowship of the Rockefeller Foundation 1924–1932, Paris 1933, RG 1.2, Box 50, Folder 382, RAC, and Rockefeller Foundation 1951. Bühler and Finer were later given additional fellowships. Pollak is only mentioned in Kittredge's report, RF RG 1.2, box 50, folder 383, RAC.

The further careers of the fellows who benefited from the opportunity to do at least one year of research work (ten of them got a one-year renewal, and seven of them could even stay for three years),¹⁸ primarily in the United States, are informative with respect to national political and cultural particularities. Only just over half of the European fellows of the first cohort continued to do research work while the other half pursued career paths for which the fellowships had not been conceived.

Two of the Austrians, Charlotte Bühler and Erich Voegelin, gained fame far beyond the boundaries of their home country and their mother tongue, and certainly not only because they later were among those who had to flee from the Nazis. Voegelin's fellowship was renewed twice, and Bühler received a new 'Special Fellowship' in 1934/5; both were also among those who were granted further support by the Foundation. Bühler used her stay in the United States to familiarize herself with behaviourism. In the following one-and-a-half decades, she established an intense transatlantic exchange of ideas and people. In the early 1930s, Bühler was the contact, at the Psychological Institute of the University of Vienna, for junior RF fellows from other European countries who came to Austria to pursue their studies.

Voegelin, who was eight years her junior, developed his intellectual potential only after he had emigrated to the United States. Until 1938, he was one of the few members of the groups around Hans Kelsen, Othmar Spann and the Vienna school of economics who was also welcome in the enemy camps. A lecturer until 1935, and an associate professor after this, his role at the university was marginal.

The influence exercised by the other fellows who pursued a scholarly career remained more or less 'local' in comparison. Ernest Teilhac, for many years a university teacher in Beirut, published a book right after his stay in the United States on Jean-Baptiste Say and, later, a book on the pioneers of economic thought in nineteenth-century America, which was translated into English (Teilhac 1927; Teilhac 1928; Teilhac 1936). Herman Finer had published, even before taking up his fellowship, a study on how the French, German and American governments worked (Finer 1921), and continued to focus on American issues in a perspective of comparative political science. He later went to Canada and then to the United States where he held a professorship of political science at the University of Chicago. Anthropologist Beatrice Blackwood was highly respected among her colleagues for her work on Melanesia and Guinea. She was Curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford and taught at Oxford University. André Philip obtained his *agrégation* (the French type of permission to teach at a university, comparable to the German *Habilitation*, the importance of which is explored in Chapter Four) for political economics right after his return from the United States. Like some of his former fellows,¹⁹ he wrote a book (Philip 1927) and, later, published treatises on political economics. In the 1930s, he was a university professor in Lyon. After the German invasion, he joined the French Resistance and for a certain time was in exile in London. After the end of the Second World War, he was a

Socialist member of parliament and, several times, a minister. In the 1950s, he was appointed to a chair at the University of Paris. In spite of his long list of publications, he seems to have thought of himself as a politician rather than a scholar. At the time of his death in 1970, he was responsible for development issues at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Former priest Ludwig Fritscher turned to the private sector after his return, where he rose to become a member of the board of a large Vienna bank and president of the Vienna stock exchange during the Nazi period. The career of sociologist Marthe Bossavy, who had already obtained her *agrégation* before taking up her fellowship, took a somewhat unusual turn – she entered a convent on Long Island in 1928.

The first fellows, while not very precise in stating their research interests, invoked some more or less vague reference to the United States in most cases. The French economists, along with those fellows who wanted to study immigration problems, stand out by their rather clear-cut subjects. That Charlotte Bühler's subject exactly corresponded to one of the initial missions of the Memorial is doubtlessly not due to some strategic use of prior knowledge on her part; but the coincidence made it easier for her to be brought into contact with the right people.²⁰

Within the first cohort, response to the idea underlying the establishment of the programme – namely, providing Europeans with additional educational options – varied widely. Most of the British fellows evidently saw the fellowship as a way of enhancing one's education as a gentleman before engaging in the hard business of making money, rather than as a professional preparation for a career as a scientist. Still, some of them would choose the latter, after all.²¹

The proportion of female fellows in the first cohort was comparatively high²² – and they all were rather young or, at any rate, had just graduated.²³

THE FIRST AMERICAN FELLOWS

A comparison between the European and the American fellows, who received financial aid from the same organization but were selected by different bodies, will allow for a more precise view of the commonalities and the differences between the social sciences on both sides of the Atlantic. Members of the selection committee of the Social Science Research Council were, in the first year, political scientist Charles E. Merriam (1874–1953), University of Chicago, sociologist F. Stuart Chapin (1888–1974), University of Minnesota, and economist Wesley C. Mitchell (1874–1948), Columbia University (Mitchell 1926). On average, American fellows were four years senior to their European colleagues. The proportion of female fellows was somewhat smaller, but the age distribution was broader. Two of the Americans had been born abroad. Like their European counterparts, most of them had graduated two years earlier at the most, and on both sides a certain number of non-graduated candidates were awarded fellowships, as well. Seven Europeans, but only two Americans, were economists. No anthropologists and psychologists, whose professional associations were members of the SSRC, were included in this first-year cohort, in contrast to graduates

Table 2.2 American Fellows 1925–6

Name (country and year of birth)	Married	Graduated	Grade	University	Discipline	Position 1924	Research topic	Place of Study	In 1939	In 1950
Bernard, Luther Lee (USA, 1881)	1925	1910	Ph.D.	Chicago	Sociology	Prof. Uni. Minnesota	Development of social sc. in Argentina	Argentina	Prof., Washington Uni., St. Louis	Prof./lecturer, Penn State
Everett, Charles W. (USA, 1895)	1920	1931	Ph.D.	Columbia	English	Instr. Columbia Coll.	Bentham biography and edition	London	Asst. prof., Columbia	Prof. & head English, Columbia College
Gosnell, Harold F. (USA, 1896)	1928	1922	Ph.D.	Chicago	Political Sc.	Instr. Chicago	Voting behaviour in several European countries	UK, Fra, Ger, Bel	Assoc. prof., Uni. Chicago	US Government + adjunct prof., American Uni. Washington, DC
Hansen, Marcus L. (USA, 1892)	–	1924	Ph.D.	Harvard	History	Ass. prof. Smith	Immigrants	Ire, UK, Switz, Ger	Died 1938	
Harris, Joseph P. (USA, 1896)	1918	1923	Ph.D.	Chicago	Political Sc.	Instr. Wisconsin	Voter registration	USA	Prof., Northwestern Uni.	Prof., UC Berkeley
Jaffee, William (USA, 1898)	1948	1924	Dr en Droit	Paris	Jurisprudence	Tutor City College NY	Industrial Revolution in France	Fra	Assoc. prof., Northwestern Uni.	Assoc. prof., Northwestern Uni.
Knight, Edgar W. (USA, 1886)	1916	1913	Ph.D.	Columbia	Education	Superintendent of schools	Folk high schools in Scandinavia	Den, Swe, Fin	Prof., Uni. North Carolina	Prof., Uni. North Carolina

Kuznets, Simon S. (Russia, 1901)	1929	1926	Ph.D.	Columbia	Economics	Grad. student	Trends in econ. theory, cyclical fluctuations	NYC	Prof., Uni. Pennsylvania	Prof., Uni. Pennsylvania
Malmud, Rose S. (Bessarabia, 1899)	-	1923	MA	Teachers Coll Columbia	Education	Teacher in English	Literacy	NYC	Instr. Gymnasium Tel Aviv	Teacher, Brooklyn
Martin, Thomas P. (USA, 1887)	1917	1922	Ph.D.	Harvard	History	Assoc prof. Uni. Texas	Anglo-American relations	UK	Librarian Lib. of Congress	Librarian LC, visiting prof. Bloomington, IN
Metzger, Hutzel (USA, 1894)	1922	1926	Ph.D.	Minnesota	Agricul. Econ.	N. Dakota Agricult. College	Rural price developments	Minnesota	Pres. St Paul Bank, Minnesota	Pres. St Paul Bank, MN
Mowrer, Ernest R. (USA, 1895)	1924	1924	Ph.D.	Chicago	Sociology	Ass. prof. Ohio Wesleyan	Family disorg. as a socially inherited behaviour pattern	Chicago	Assoc. prof. Northwestern Uni.	Prof. Northwestern Uni.
Mudgett, Mildred D. (USA, 1888)	1916	1924	Ph.D.	Columbia	Social Legisla- tion & Statistics	Ass. prof. Uni. Minnesota	Legislation affecting pre-school child in Europe	UK, Fra, Ita, Scandinavia	Independent research	Independent research
Spero, Sterlin, (USA, 1896)	1921	1924	Ph.D.	Columbia	Political Sc.	Research fellow New School, NY	Negro in industry	NYC	Lecturer NYU	Assoc. prof NYU
Thomas, Dorothy Swaine (USA, 1899)	1935	1924	Ph.D.	LSE	Sociology	Res. ass. Fed Res Bank NY	Econ. factor in crime	NYC	Assoc. prof. Yale	Prof. Pennsylvanna since 1948

from specialties (pedagogy, law, English literature) that were not represented at the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). Nine American fellows were married when they took up the fellowship, but only three of the first European fellows were married at the time of their nomination (Table 2.2).

The main difference between the two groups is that the vast majority of the American fellows held a university position when they took up the fellowship, while this seems not to have been the case for most of the Europeans (however, for many fellows, we lack information on this point). Thus, the fellowship programme in the United States was from the very start in accordance with the idea of the sponsors, i.e. to facilitate beginning a career for junior social scientists:

A newly-fledged doctor, appointed to a junior position in one of our departments, is usually assigned a heavy teaching schedule, when he neither knows thoroughly the subjects he has to cover, nor knows how to teach. During the years when he would be most likely to make discoveries, he is kept exceedingly busy mastering new subjects, marking papers, acquiring class-room skill, and often eking out an inadequate salary by non-scientific work. That is a most effective system for discouraging research. (Mitchell 1926: 606)

Eight Europeans were ‘drop-outs’, so to speak, but only two Americans, both of them female (Rose Malmud, a teacher, and Mildred Mudgett, marginalized as a social worker), and two others rose to top positions at the margin and outside of the world of science, respectively: Thomas Martin as a collaborator of the world’s biggest library, the Library of Congress, and Hutzel Metzger as a manager in the emerging non-profit sector.

Completing this survey of the success of the first cohort of American fellows, there are Simon Kuznets, who was awarded one of the first Nobel Prizes for economics in 1971, and Dorothy Thomas, one of the leading demographers and sociologists of her country and the first woman to be elected President of the American Sociological Association. Furthermore, Luther L. Bernard and Harold F. Gosnell were prominent figures in their disciplines in their time.²⁴

The comparison between the two cohorts of social science fellows shows how advanced the United States was, in the mid-1920s, concerning the institutionalization of the social sciences and the professionalization of the way junior scientists were trained. This is further emphasized by the fact that the American fellows hardly ever had their fellowships renewed while this was often the case for those from Europe – probably also to prevent unemployment.²⁵

EUROPEAN EXTENSIONS

Even before there could be any conclusive experiences with the first fellowships, the Memorial extended its European programme to other countries. In the summer of 1925, another American professor, historian William E. Lingelbach (1871–62), was sent to Europe on a half-year exploratory journey. In the fall of the same year, as a result of his report and recommendations, the circle of national advisors, or representatives, was extended to Italy, the

Netherlands, Sweden, Norway and Denmark. In the following years, professors Luigi Einaudi (1874–1961), Torino, Johan Huizinga (1872–1945), Leiden, Gösta Bagge (1882–1951), Stockholm, Fredrik Stang (1867–1941), Oslo, and Hans V. Munch-Petersen (1869–1934), Copenhagen, were to various degrees involved in the development of the fellowship programme. They were about the same age as the advisors who had been previously nominated, and two of them later became very prominent: cultural historian Huizinga, for his reinterpretation of the late Middle Ages; and Italian economist Einaudi, in the 1930s, as a theorist and editor of a journal that received attention beyond Italian borders, and after 1945, due to a political career that culminated in his being elected President of the Italian Republic. In the 1920s, the advisors as well as other European scholars were invited to the United States, as Special Fellows, for stays of various lengths.

In the five years in which the Memorial was responsible for the fellowship programme, a total of 178 social scientists were selected. The largest group came from Great Britain (53),²⁶ followed by Germany (25), France (19), Czechoslovakia (14), Austria (12), the Netherlands (9), Italy (8), Australasia (6), Norway (5), the United States (4) and 12 other countries.

In the context of the later expulsion of Jewish scholars from the German Reich and from those parts of Europe over which it gained control, it may be of some interest that, for its internal evaluations, the RF also analysed the religious affiliation of their fellows. According to this analysis, 60 per cent were Protestants, 22 per cent were Roman Catholics and only 5 per cent were Jewish; 16 fellows provided no information on their religious affiliation, and one fellow declared himself to be an 'agnostic Jew'. The small number of Jews is most likely explained by the fact that this count covered religious rather than racial affiliation such as it was later invented by the Nazis.²⁷

A BRAIN DRAIN, INC.?

From the very beginning, the goal pursued by the Memorial officers had been to provide their fellows with the means to acquire additional expertise that would benefit their home countries. Enticement policies were neither advocated nor practised. However, return to the home country was a problem that kept worrying the Memorial, and later the RF. After two years, Ruml declared himself satisfied with the European programme, but had to admit that 'very few of the men have returned to their countries'.²⁸

Analysing the fellows' migration flows, three periods can be defined and documented with data, each of them governed by different marginals. The first period spans the years before 1933. During this period, most of the fellows were nominated by the national representatives. The following period covers the years till the outbreak of the Second World War, which was also the end of the European fellowship programme. During this period, the officers of the RF Paris Office, former fellows and other advisors became more and more influential. Therefore, these two periods provide an excellent basis for a comparison of selection procedures. The third period, then, covers the years from

the end of the Second World War until the 1960s, when the fellowship programme was discontinued.

The brain drain into the United States already started before the Nazis seized power. The Great Depression after 1929 may have played a certain role in this, but cannot explain the exodus of those Memorial fellows who left their country before 1929. Czechoslovakia, Sweden, Italy, Denmark and Poland had virtually no losses by migration before 1932. The reason why there was no such exodus despite the fact that these states boasted large numbers of nominations must be sought in their structural and cultural conditions. The young states of Czechoslovakia and Poland appear to have offered job opportunities for their social science elites just as the two Scandinavian states did. Italian fellows struck the RF officers as particularly attached to their home country. And apparently, Italian fascists did not drive out their intelligentsia.

The United States and Switzerland benefited from migration which, in the latter case, was oriented to the Geneva-based institutions around the League of Nations rather than the Swiss universities. The only genuine migration magnet was the United States with at least twenty-one fellows (or 5 per cent of all fellows) going there to stay even before 1932.

The countries that show definite migration losses can be divided into two subgroups. On the one hand, there are the peripheral nations of the Anglophone world, such as Australia, New Zealand and Canada, where there were no language barriers for those fellows who were willing to migrate. On the other hand, the great traditional science nations of Great Britain, Germany, France, and the two successor states of the Habsburg Empire, Austria and Hungary, had to cope with an exodus of thirty fellows, which amounts to one out of seven nominees from these countries.

Interpretations of the impact this 14 per cent migrant drain may have had on the leading European science nations should nevertheless not be pushed too far. In the following, we will show how the migration profile changed during the next period, in which the pull of the new centre of the global science system was amplified by the push of political and economic factors. Before this, however, we will provide a first comparison between the two groups of German-speaking fellows.

COMPARISON OF GERMAN-SPEAKING FELLOWS, I

Between 1924 and 1928, Pribram was the only representative in charge of the selection of Austrian fellows; later, he had to submit his proposals to the RF Paris Office, where they were acted upon in most cases. During the first five years he nominated four economists, four political scientists, one historian, one criminologist and one psychologist.²⁹ Pribram was comparatively misogynous: only two of the eleven nominees were women.

The German fellows who were selected by the mandarin Committee during the same period included thirteen economists, four sociologists, four historians, one political scientist, one anthropologist, one geographer and one psychologist. Only four of them were women.

Research topics as reported in the printed list of fellows are in general not very instructive. German economist Gertrud Beushagen, for instance, wanted to study the political organization of the English labour market and the problem of unemployment; Vienna criminologist Edgar Foltin was interested in the psychology of crime; and economist Andreas Predöhl wanted to analyse industrial centres and industrial development in the United States.³⁰ In spite of these rather frugal data, an attempt will be made to see if anyone, and if so who, lived up to the Memorial's expectations. Among the various criteria that were defined at various periods, there are three that can be put to the test by such data as exist. First, it should be possible, by considering entire career paths, to identify those fellows who rose to a leading position in their disciplines, or countries. To rule out idiosyncratic assessments, the opinions of competent members of the respective disciplines will be relied on as a complement to the views voiced by the RF officers. Inclusion in biographical directories and individual entries in encyclopedias provide something of a measure for the prestige accorded to potential candidates by competent members of their disciplines.³¹

Second, research topics pursued during the fellowship and subsequent publications should allow for an assessment of whether the fellow in question adopted the realistic, or inductive, style of research advocated by the Memorial.

Finally, the sponsor's satisfaction with a fellow's achievements can be used as a third criterion. Observations noted by the Foundation itself provide a kind of ranking of fellows during or after their research stay (there does not seem to have been a consistently applied system to determine the ranking, but nonetheless it provides a great insight into the RF's considerations). This is especially obvious in the positive case where the fellowship is the beginning of a more long-term cooperation with, i.e. support by, the RF.

The group of twenty-five German and twelve Austrian Memorial Fellows during this period included two Vienna economists, Oskar Morgenstern (reputation score 313) and Gottfried Haberler (reputation 316), who later enjoyed an unquestionable reputation as highly productive and innovative scholars in their field, while no such thing can be said for the thirteen German economists.

Among the political scientists, top ranking no doubt goes to Erich Voegelin (reputation 92) whose influence in the field of the theory of politics is, at any rate, superior to that of the other fellows from political science. Otto Vossler (reputation 11), who obtained his doctoral degree in Munich, and Erich Hula (reputation 10), born in Vienna and a former assistant of Hans Kelsen in Cologne, held professorships at important universities (Leipzig and Frankfurt and the Graduate Faculty of New School, respectively), but do not come near to Voegelin in terms of status. Vienna-born Peter Kuranda died very young, and Elisabeth Ephrussi-Waal's scientific career ended with her fellowship.³² None of the political scientists can be said to have adopted the new behaviourist style of research.

Among the sociologists, high achievement was shown by Rudolf Heberle (reputation 11) in the field to which he had already turned during his research

stay in the United States – regional mobility – and by Gerhard Mackenroth (reputation 5), who did not leave Europe during his two-year fellowship because ‘his German professor felt strongly that he should be on hand when the decision [on his *Habilitation*] was made’.³³ Mackenroth, whose English was excellent,³⁴ had studied under Gustav Cassel in Sweden, among others, and wanted to go to the United States for a third year to pursue his studies with Chicago economists Frank Knight and Jacob Viner. Nothing came of it because his application for a third year was rejected. Heberle’s and Mackenroth’s style of research was empirical, but not very advanced.

Fellows from disciplines that had been rated of secondary or tertiary importance by the Memorial were historians Alfred Vagts (reputation 112) and Dietrich Gerhard (reputation 28) and, from Austria, Friedrich Thalmann (reputation 0). At the time of their fellowships, they were projecting work on issues that can only be described as highly conventional. Gerhard, who had been nominated by the editors of the journal *Historische Zeitschrift*, planned to work on ‘England and Eastern Europe at the beginning of the Oriental question 1774–98’. Vagts, who came from Mendelssohn-Bartholdy’s institute and had already been to Yale as an exchange student in 1924/5, did research on the ‘Diplomatic relations between America and Germany between 1888 and 1906’, and Thalmann dedicated his fellowship to the issue of ‘Relations between Great Britain and Germany in the 19th century, with special consideration of naval construction in both countries’. While Gerhard and Vagts had to emigrate after 1933, Thalmann stayed in Vienna where he was awarded a ‘grant-in-aid’ by the RF as a follow-up measure subsequent to his fellowship. All three historians were far from approaching historiography in a social science perspective. Gerhard gained a certain influence in the field on his return from his American exile and was appointed Director of the Max-Planck-Institut für History. Vagts did not return from exile.

The further career of Charlotte Bühler has already been described above. After her escape to the United States, it took a long time for her to regain her leading position as the mother of humanist psychology.³⁵

Haberler and Morgenstern had definite leadership roles in their field, while Mackenroth, Predöhl (reputation 8), Gerhard and Vossler may even be credited with national leadership. But since assessments such as these are invariably biased, we will instead turn to the question of which of the fellows were deemed worthy of further support by the RF.

Interestingly, Haberler was not included in the group of those who were granted further aid, which may be due to the fact that after a short interlude at the League of Nations, he began teaching at Harvard University in 1936 and no longer needed support. Hula, by contrast, repeatedly needed help by the RF – and was granted aid to a satisfactory degree, first in Cologne and then on his way to exile. Morgenstern’s fellowship card reports an even longer cooperation with, and long-time material support by, the RF. During his activities as director of the Vienna Konjunkturforschungsinstitut (Institute for Business Cycle Research) he benefited from an institutional grant (see Chapter Three),

and after his escape from Vienna, his post at Princeton University was subsidized by an annual contribution of, initially, \$2,000 (\$30,000 in 2010) and, later, \$2,500 (\$36,000 in 2010). After the end of the Second World War, he was granted a number of smaller travel allowances by the RF.

Voegelin is another Austrian long-term recipient of grants-in-aid and refugee relief funds. In October 1933, a RF officer had a 'long talk with Voegelin' which resulted in the following rather disconcerting diary entry:

He has completed a two-volume History of Race Theory which is being published by a German firm, on the direct insistence of one of the high Nazi university professors. While the book is not orthodox in the Hitler sense it at least takes the race conception seriously as a political factor. It may lead to V[oegelin]'s being called to Germany. He would accept despite preference for Austria.³⁶

One year later, Voegelin's preferences had gained acceptance, and he submitted an empirical research project to the RF. Since he also referred to its empirical nature in the presence of another American visitor, the project was in all likelihood not conceived as such exclusively out of deference to the RF's well-known preference for 'inductive' research.³⁷ Voegelin wanted to study the 'social transformation which the war and the post-war situation has imposed on the City of Vienna'.³⁸

Still in Vienna, Voegelin had received a monthly \$50 (\$770 in 2010) for a total of twenty months, and after his escape to the United States he was included in the relief measures for refugees from Hitler and received generous aid. After his return to Europe he seems to have become accustomed, so to speak, to this regular flow of money. In November 1958, a RF officer who went to see him in Munich reports:

[Voegelin is to me not] a prepossessing person. He seems to think in devious and politicking terms as though the devious were the inevitable. Doubtless, too, he is not characterized by complete selflessness. Even so, his idea that the academic powers in Germany must be presented with a *fait accompli* which they will then undertake the support of may make sense if one is willing to run the risk.³⁹

One-and-a-half months later, the support of many years ended with the RF's refusal to subsidize the Munich Institute for Political Science that Voegelin was about to set up.

In continuing its support for Bühler, Hula, Morgenstern and Voegelin even after their fellowships terms had expired, the Memorial had focused on those Austrians among the German-speaking social scientists who had already benefited from privileged treatment. Three of these four could rely on further support after their escape to the United States, which highlights the close link between prior reputation and differential opportunities for establishment.

The German Memorial fellows also include refugees from Hitler, but not all of them belonged to the group of those who were supported by the RF. In the

case of anthropologist Paul Kirchhoff (reputation 0), for instance, the RF took an active interest for quite a time, but provided only short-term material support. Kirchhoff, who between 1928 and 1930 had used his fellowship to study anthropology under Alfred Kroeber, among others, had not returned to Germany after graduating but had tried to establish himself in Britain. Research stays in Africa and Australia were refused by the British authorities, which the RF files attribute to unfounded rumours about Kirchhoff's alleged link to the Communist party. Kirchhoff was subsequently awarded a small RF grant, beginning in October 1932, to finish a publication. When the grant ended, he and his wife subsisted on her earnings as a model. Later Kirchhoff tried to get a job in Paris, but failed for lack of funds. Despite the Polish anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski's intercession and the RF officers' explicit willingness to come to his aid, no further support was granted. After a temporary stay in New York in 1935, he resurfaced in Mexico where he had found work in a museum. Kirchhoff later managed to obtain an appointment to a university and excelled as an anthropologist of Mesoamerica – a term he is said to have coined.

Rudolf Heberle was similarly dependent on long-term aid. While still in Kiel, he was awarded a generous grant-in-aid of \$2,500 (\$38,600 in 2010). He had expected to be able to survive as a lecturer in Nazi Germany, forfeiting hopes of promotion, but to his surprise was nominated for a professorship by the University of Kiel. This did not come off since proof of his Aryan descent was required and it turned out that a great-grandmother of his had been Jewish. Still, he considered staying in Germany and cherished hopes of getting a position within the framework of the Four-Year Plan (the Nazi party's framework for invigorating industry and infrastructure). Heberle adaptation to the new situation continued to the point of joining the Nazi brownshirts (Sturmabteilung or SA), a step he tried to conceal after his emigration.⁴⁰ In the summer of 1937, thanks to a small RF grant, he arrived in New York. In the following year, again thanks to a RF subsidy, he started teaching at Louisiana State University.

Sociologist Clara Liepmann (reputation 0) escaped to the United States where she worked for a certain time as a research assistant at the Russell Sage Foundation. After the end of the Second World War, she and her husband returned to Germany. Hans Staehle (reputation 78) and Alfred Vagts are another two refugees whose fellowship cards report contacts, but no material support. While Staehle did not depend on this because he worked, first, in positions close to the League of Nations and, later, in the world of the United Nations Organization, Vagts confined himself to the role of a private scholar, with only a short interlude as a guest professor at Harvard in 1938/9 and a membership at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton (1939–42). As the son-in-law of the famous (and well-to-do) American historian Charles A. Beard, Vagts could afford to dispense with academic positions. Until old age, he devoted himself to his historical studies on international relations, international law and the military (Vagts 1979; Epstein 1993).

Money has the well-known advantage of providing a simple measure for value. By applying this measure to the group of German and Austrian fellows who were supported by the RF after their fellowships had ended, one can assess their importance as perceived by the various foundation officers. Morgenstern's case can be taken as an illustration that scholarly greatness is not to be had without material foundations. In March 1938, he happened to be abroad and decided to stay there. Since he was not Jewish but the son of an illegitimate daughter of the 'Hunderttagekaiser' (the 'Emperor of the 100-day rule'), Frederic III, survival in the Third Reich would presumably have been possible. But then, 'Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour' would never have been published – given that it was at Princeton where Morgenstern elaborated this founding manifesto of game theory, in collaboration with John von Neumann who in the 1920s had studied in Germany due to a grant by the International Education Board. The book was not published before 1944, and even then only because the RF subsidized the printing costs.⁴¹

While Vienna representative Pribram had succeeded in finding promising candidates beyond the boundaries of his own field – seven of the eleven nominees were appointed to professorships at renowned universities – the group of the first German fellows turned out to be just average with respect to their future scientific productivity as well as to the positions they could secure. Only ten of the German fellows obtained professorships. The reasons for their relative insignificance can be found in a diary entry by John Van Sickle concerning a conversation he had had with Schumpeter in London in the autumn of 1931, in which the latter complained at some length about the activities of the German Committee:

S[chumpeter] is frankly dissatisfied with the fellowship administration in Germany. He feels that there are so many factions, especially in Economics, and that the gaps between them are so great, that it is impossible for a German to be impartial. Specifically he alleges that Schumacher who represents Economics on the German Committee, is so bitter against Spiethoff, Schumpeter's colleague, that candidates from his camp have no chance with the Committee. He cited one recent example without mentioning the name. In general he feels that the school of Mathematical Economics which he represents and which is so strongly developed in the States, cannot get a hearing in Germany because the older economists do not understand it and cannot appreciate its significance.⁴²

In the same year, Morgenstern provided a further explanation for the difference between Germans and Austrians by pointing out to Tracy Kittredge that: 'a number of men who hesitated to accept fellowships for fear of losing their positions, are still where they were some years ago, while other men with less prospects at the time, but who had fellowships, have since been advanced to Professorships'.⁴³

In this perspective, the situation of the Austrian candidates who otherwise could not have hoped to get a university position seems to have given them a relative competitive edge over those who preferred the limited appeal of

domestic security to the uncertain promotional openings of university studies abroad. Resemblance to the pattern of 'economic backwardness', as identified by Alexander Gerschenkron (Gerschenkron 1962), is obvious – and not very surprising given that Gerschenkron was one of the collaborators, before 1938, of the Konjunkturforschungsinstitut (Institute for Business Cycle Research) directed by Morgenstern. (This is not to say that Morgenstern was at the origin of Gerschenkron's insights but that there was some family resemblance between their analytical tools.)

The German mandarin Committee was obviously not capable of, or not interested in, finding the best junior scientists and nominating them as candidates for a fellowship; instead, they were content with rewarding their clientele.

THE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMME IN THE SHADOW OF NAZISM

In 1929, the reorganization of the Rockefellers' philanthropic activities became effective, and the foundations that had been independent were united with the 'mother foundation'. Administration of the fellowship programme was now a direct responsibility of the five RF Divisions (Public Health, Medicine, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities)⁴⁴ or of its Paris-based European office. Although the advisors retained their functions until 1935 (in Great Britain and Germany until the end of 1936), decisions were, from 1935 onwards, increasingly made by the Paris RF officers.

RF policies in the European social science field were determined by two new officers: John V. Van Sickle, Assistant Director of the Social Sciences from the autumn of 1929, and Tracy Kittredge who was appointed his assistant two years later. Initially, Selskar M. Gunn, long-term officer at the Rockefeller foundations, had a strong say in the matter since between 1930 and 1932 he acted as the Associate Director for Europe of the Social Sciences Division.⁴⁵

Van Sickle was no longer young when he obtained his degree in economics from Harvard, but this was because the First World War had interrupted his education, which had started in his home state of Colorado. After the end of the war, he lived in Vienna for a couple of years, first as a collaborator of the American Un-Official Delegation of the Austrian Section of the Reparations Commission and then, for three years, as an advisor to the Austrian government. A result of his stay was his doctoral thesis on 'Direct Taxation in Austria', published in 1931 in the Harvard Economics Series. In the same year, he started teaching as an economist at the University of Michigan, which he left four years later to take up his RF position. He retained this function for the next ten years, initially in Europe. When his RF activities ended, Van Sickle settled in the American South where he taught as a professor of economics, first at Vanderbilt University and then at a smaller college.

Tracy Kittredge, who was one year his senior, had studied anthropology, history and political science at Oxford and had transferred – after a brief teaching spell and work as a statistician and archivist in the United States – to Europe where he worked first as an assistant to the General Director of the League of Red Cross Societies and, later, as its General Secretary. Besides his enthusiasm for

writing reports and detailed memoirs decked out with statistics, he evidently also possessed diplomatic skills. At any rate, he served the RF for ten years.

The transfer of decision-making power in matters of fellowships to these two Americans who were little known in Europe met with resistance from the former fellows. This minor controversy illustrates well the difference between the science cultures of the old continent and the New World. In identical letters, fellows and ex-fellows appealed to the President of the Foundation, voicing their belief that it was impossible for anyone 'who does not know (the candidates') relative value, who has not followed them in their past academic work, who has not tested their capacities for real and earnest study' to 'make a good choice'. Foundation officers, they argued, were unable to come to a 'comparative judgment upon all applicants', and their decisions risked being influenced by the 'too frequent rivalries unknown to the outside world'.

In his answer, RF President Max Mason,⁴⁶ refusing particularist concerns, wrote: 'It is the custom in all of the fellowship programs to secure complete and adequate opinions on any application which is received. The officials of the Foundation will ... endeavour to keep in close touch with the outstanding scholars in this field, and particularly with the past fellows of the Foundation.'⁴⁷

The group of those who had written from Europe included Austrian, French, Italian, Czech and Slovak fellows or ex-fellows, among them Morgenstern, Heberle and, interestingly, Mario Einaudi, the son of the Italian RF representative. Some of those who wrote were already full professors. What is remarkable about the letter is that its authors implicitly attribute their own nomination to the paternalist care of their elders rather than to their own achievements. The clientelism that predominated in continental European science prevented them from seeing themselves as winners in a fair competition. Was it a mere accident that there were no British fellows among the group of sceptics? Or was the fellows' massive protest also a reflection of the norms of a stratified, hierarchical world that knew neither fair play nor the idea that later would be described by the – initially ironical – term of meritocracy?

The RF officers tried to keep track of the success of their fellows, as shown by the diaries and fellowship cards that were so painstakingly updated. From time to time, they produced summary reports for their New York superiors. Given their audience, they may well have tended to overstate success rather than failure. In one of their reports, 'Social Science Fellowship Program in Europe – Rockefeller Foundation 1924–1938', different groups of countries are explicitly compared. For its author, presumably Kittredge, two aspects were important: academic success and migration.

In the British isles and the Commonwealth, which together had nominated the largest number of fellows, ex-fellows initially rather strongly tended to exit from academic life, a tendency which, however, had been stemmed since 1929. In the late 1930s, when the report was written, the picture had changed, with the vast majority of British ex-fellows having obtained positions at universities or non-university research institutions. For Britain and Ireland, the rate of academic success, i.e. of ex-fellows having obtained positions in universities or research

institutions, rose from 71 per cent between 1924 and 1933 to 81 per cent between 1934 and 1938.

In France, the situation was unsatisfactory during the first five years, since only one-third of the fellows succeeded in the academy. This was attributed to the system of *concours d'agrégation* which seems to have implied that anyone aspiring to a professorship had better stick to the 're-formulation of traditional knowledge, which in turn, it was argued, may explain why in the 'past generation' only a small number of French economists 'have enjoyed international reputation for their personal contribution to knowledge'. If the rate of academic success was meagre – 37 per cent – during the first five years, it rose to 64 per cent in the next five years and to 67 per cent between 1934 and 1938.

In the Scandinavian countries, the fellowship programmes turned out to be very satisfactory. Of the 59 fellows, 13 were professors by the time of the report, 16 others held other university teaching positions and 4 former fellows had positions abroad. Thus, the rate of academic success had risen from an initial 59 per cent (1924–28) to 76 per cent (1929–33) and, finally, 92 per cent (1934–8). The great majority of Scandinavian fellows were economists, among them two future Nobel laureates, Ragnar Frisch and Gunnar Myrdal.

For the Central European countries, only part of the analysis was done. The text is less detailed than the others but nevertheless includes contemporary qualitative assessments. In all three successor states of the Habsburg Empire, there had been a surplus supply of qualified individuals, but only four ex-fellows had managed to obtain a professorship: anthropologist Jirí Malý in Prague, political scientist Zdenek Peska in Bratislava, agrarian economist Jan Dokládál in Brno and economist Theodor Suranyi-Unger in Szeged.⁴⁸

One third of the fellows appointed from Central Europe are now established abroad, 17 in the USA and 7 in Europe. This large proportion of emigrants is due partly to the uncertainties of academic careers in these countries, and partly to political developments. Thus, for example, of 29 Austrian fellows, 16 are now abroad (of whom 12 had emigrated before the Anschluss) ... The individual capacities of these fellows are in many cases of such recognized distinction that many of them have had no difficulty in obtaining university or other appointments abroad.⁴⁹

The author of this report does not get around to the analysis, announced in the opening part of the report, of the German and the Italian fellows. We will try to at least partially make up for this by providing an analysis similar to the one presented for the Memorial fellows. But before doing so, we will address the issue of how the handing-over of power in Germany to the Nazis impacted the fellowship programme.

As early as in the spring of 1933, Van Sickle voiced concerns about the three main German RF confidants, Bernhard Harms, Ernst Jäckh and Alfred Weber, who had been dismissed from their functions.⁵⁰ The issue of whether the German advisory committee should remain in office was discussed at some length between the New York headquarters and the Paris Office. Change for reasons of age seemed to suggest itself, but was put off in order to avoid giving

the wrong signals. Furthermore, there was concern about the dramatically reduced opportunities for Jewish candidates to be nominated by the German committee. In his talks with Kittredge in January 1935, exiled former German advisory committee member Mendelssohn-Bartholdy advocated discontinuing the fellowship programme in favour of supporting ex-fellows who had fallen into disgrace in Germany or had left the country. In the spring of 1935, the RF finally decided to discontinue cooperation with Dr August Wilhelm Fehling, the Secretary of the German committee, by the start of the coming academic year. This did not mean that the allocation of fellowships also stopped, but the few individuals who were awarded fellowships after that were no longer in Germany when they were nominated.

COMPARISON OF GERMAN-SPEAKING FELLOWS, II

Between 1929 and 1941, all told, seventeen Austrian and fifty-three German social scientists were selected for a fellowship; three of the Germans were already in exile when they took up their fellowships: Albert O. Hirschman, Jakob Marschak and Svend Riemer. In the 1950 Directory, their countries of residence are correctly reported as the United States, England and Sweden, so they are most likely to have been classed accordingly in the internal analysis.

What immediately strikes one is the proportion of Austrians and Germans. If the high proportion of Austrians in the cohort of the Memorial fellows could be attributed to the fact that the RF Vienna representative, Pribram, showed more initiative than the German committee, this explanation is ruled out after 1929. There were now too many actors involved in the selection process to allow for the initiative of any one of them to be decisive.

The unequal distribution stands out even more clearly if, for the sake of comparison, the number of fellows is referred to the population from which they were recruited: students and faculties. In 1930, the 23 German universities had just under 100,000 students for about 5,000 faculty members. At the same time, Austria's three universities had about 15,000 students for almost 1,500 faculty members whose supervisory load was, thus, only half of what their German Reich colleagues had to shoulder.

Further information can be obtained by comparing the university sites in the German-language area to the proportion of fellows coming from them. Had the fellows been justified in raising the alarm about reorganization and the disempowerment of national advisors? Six German universities (among them Breslau, Göttingen and Münster) 'produced' no fellows at all, and the minor Austrian universities had hardly any effect on the overall picture. In the two periods between the two world wars that are considered in the present context, twenty-three future fellows had graduated from the University of Vienna. This was the largest number, by far, in the whole German-language area. Berlin was second with twelve future fellows, followed by Hamburg (eight) and Heidelberg, Jena, Kiel and Munich (seven each). The order does not reflect the distribution of students across universities.

In the years after 1929, the RF had partly revised their goals for their fellowship programme. Not least as a reaction to the Great Depression, new priorities for support were set that privileged research projects aiming at the 'stabilization of economic processes' and this priority was also, at least partially, binding for the fellowship programme. A second priority aimed at improving research on international relations. As a parallel to the setting of priorities, the policies initiated by Ruml, which aimed at the systematic advancement of social science research centres, were maintained until 1934. This also included awarding fellowships to a number of junior scholars. The third change concerned the 'maturity' of the persons eligible for a fellowship. Support for very young scholars who sometimes had not even graduated was discontinued because the new priority was to reach those who, in the case of Germany and Austria, could be described as '*Habilitanden*', i.e. as junior scholars preparing their qualification for a teaching career in higher education.

The mean age of 'ordinary' fellows was thirty-two years when they took up their fellowship, while their predecessors from the Memorial period had been four years younger, on average.⁵¹ Average time since their doctorate, which all fellows were supposed to have obtained, was seven years, in which some of them had taken their first steps towards an academic career or, like most Vienna fellows, had made do with marginal jobs or even, as noted on Gustav Seidler's fellowship card, had stayed 'at home' and had made a living by doing translations.

For the purpose of comparison, but also because the new RF officers did not differ from their predecessors in this point, the same three criteria for assessing the success of the fellowship programme shall be used for the period between 1929 and 1941. Who succeeded in obtaining a leading role on a disciplinary or national level? Had the 'new' style of doing research been learned or adopted? And did the RF look upon their achievements as justifying further support?

Among the economists, Fritz Machlup (reputation 389), Albert O. Hirschman (reputation 374) and Jakob Marschak (reputation 90) gained the highest reputation in their discipline, followed – at a considerable distance – by two Germans, Erich Schneider (reputation 29) and Friedrich A. Lutz (reputation 16), and two Austrians, Paul Rosenstein-Rodan (reputation 24) and Gerhard Tintner (reputation 22).⁵² All of them can be said to have fulfilled the second criterion, enriching economic research by their empirical and theoretical contributions. Was this also due to the fact that they all belonged to the group of those who were in exile during Nazi rule? No answer to this question even remotely meets the prerequisites for a causal explanation. Did creative individuals tend to be first in going into exile, or was the creative potential of the 'home-guard'⁵³ so deeply impaired by the system of bribery and terror established by the Nazis that it could not be regenerated after liberation from dictatorship? Were there (sub-)cultural commonalities among the productive social scientists who became outlaws at the will of the Nazis which they were not even conscious of, since they no longer wanted to be Jews? Or had, inversely, the experience of a liberal culture, a life in freedom, the friendly welcome by colleagues and other

conditions not only allowed them to enjoy the fact that they were still alive but also provided the necessary impulse for them to give full scope to their creative potential? Or was the relative marginality of the first years in exile, which for some of them became their second home country, an incentive to prove their worth to others or to strive even harder out of gratitude for this 'second chance' (Mosse 1991)? Regardless of which answer one would like to give to these questions, it is advisable to first gain some insight into the facts.

When it comes to international reputation, the person who is to be named first, and at a considerable distance from all the others, is Paul Lazarsfeld (reputation 959). Alexander von Schelting (reputation 0) seems to have little benefited, in a professional perspective, from his fellowship. But his situation was such that it certainly did not allow for the carefree leisure of a research stay. In June 1933, he was granted a fellowship which he was to take up in October of the same year. When he was about to leave, publication of the *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* (*Archive for Social Science and Social Policy*) of which he was the editor was halted. As a result, von Schelting asked for his fellowship to be postponed since he was indispensable at the Mohr Siebeck publishing house. In December 1933, Kittredge was informed that von Schelting's *Habilitation* was jeopardized because of Carl Brinkmann's negative attitude. In April of 1934, von Schelting reported to the RF that he would come to New York in autumn. On his arrival in New York, he had to see the dentist almost immediately and was diagnosed with suppurating teeth. The RF paid the considerable dental bill of \$225 (\$3,500 in 2010). During the remaining ten months of the year 1935, von Schelting journeyed across the United States, obviously in search of a job rather than as a learner. In Wisconsin, he became interested in the life of the farmers and workers, and would have liked to study this in more detail provided the Foundation would give him an opportunity to do so. Stacy May, Assistant Director of the Social Sciences Division of the RF in New York, and in charge of the American fellows, refused to renew the fellowship and recommended that von Schelting return to Germany and reapply for a new scholarship for 1936/7. Back in Germany, von Schelting again worked at the Siebeck publishing house and reapplied for a second fellowship year in February 1936, but only one month later informed Kittredge that his situation had drastically changed for the worse. His employer and sponsor Siebeck was suddenly deceased. His openness in his conversation with Kittredge did not pay off: 'Asks for assistance in obtaining position in U.S. or for a 2nd fellowship appointment (TBK [Kittredge] replied that RF would not grant 2nd fellowship).'

Had von Schelting failed to read, or forgotten, the application rules for fellowships? The return to the home country after the end of the fellowship was not only an important point with the Foundation but also conformed to US immigration rules. Fellows were regularly informed of this before they applied. Half a year later, von Schelting was back in New York, and the RF paid Columbia University a three-year salary subsidy subject to the provision, which was usual at the time, that Columbia was expected to subsequently employ him on a regular basis. A letter from another RF fellow, Arvid Brodersen

(reputation 5), to Joseph Willits, then head of the Social Sciences Division, informed the RF on the further course of von Schelting's life: he had returned to Europe in 1939, only to be stranded in Switzerland.⁵⁴ His focus had meanwhile shifted towards the history of ideas. For 1951–3, he was awarded a combined fellowship by the Humanities and the Social Sciences Divisions of the RF.

Among the political scientists of this cohort, Leo Strauss (reputation 249) is the only one to come near to Lazarsfeld, Machlup and co. The case of Strauss is instructive in more than one respect. Born of orthodox Jewish parents in provincial southern Germany, he studied philosophy under Ernst Cassirer in Hamburg and worked in a small non-university, the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (Academy for Jewish Studies) in Berlin, before taking up his fellowship. It is hard to find another fellow as contrary to Ruml's programme for the new social sciences and their practical relevance for the shaping of modern life. The fellowship he was awarded, as well as its one-year renewal, allowed him to leave Germany before power was handed over to the Nazis, and Strauss never returned. His tremendous success as the founder of conservative political theory in the United States did not come about until he was appointed to a professorship in Chicago in 1949. Until then, he had managed to stay alive thanks in no small part to repeated financial support by the RF, first in England, and from 1937 in New York.⁵⁵ The fact that a man of Strauss's philosophical stance was welcomed even by an institution such as the New School for Social Research in New York, which was deeply committed to the New Deal and to a liberal worldview, is one of the peculiarities of the period. Arguably, it cannot be understood unless one takes into account the mutual encouragement of immigrant solidarity, on the one hand, and the willingness to help, which sometimes changed to admiration, of the American intellectuals and their internationalist outlook in the New Deal period, on the other hand. More recently, Strauss has gained dubious posthumous celebrity since he was a mastermind for and a teacher of the ideologues of President George W. Bush. Unsurprisingly, his complex early years are not adequately appreciated in the many publications dedicated to his person and his work.

When it came to helping a brilliant man continue in his work, the RF officers more than once ignored their own principles. Their justification for this was given in a formulation by one of the legendary officers of one of the early Rockefeller foundations, Wicliffe Rose of the International Education Board; he termed it 'making the peaks higher' (Geiger 1986; Kohler 1978; Kohler 1991). However, the officers never went so far as to let their role as sponsors of the sciences be transformed into that of an uncompensated enticement or escape agent. Von Schelting and Strauss are only two cases out of a long series of former or current fellows who were supported only after they had managed to come to the United States on their own, or with the aid of some relief committee for refugees from the Nazis. What has been said with respect to Strauss is more or less true for two other German philosophers, as well: Karl Löwith (reputation 38) and Leo Kohn (reputation 5), whose research topics and later

works, while not that radically contrary to modernity and empirical social research, were not close to it, either.

As for the jurists, there is not much to say about them in the present context. The two Austrian political scientists, Josef Kunz (reputation 95), an expert in international law who would even at the time have to be characterized rather as an expert in international relations, and Joseph Fürth (reputation 15), jurist and co-founder of the Vienna 'Geistkreis' (the 'Mind Circle' of leading thinkers including Morgenstern and Voegelin), continued their careers after their flight rather on the sidelines of academia.

Siegfried F. Nadel (reputation 69) as well as Christoph Fürer-Haimendorf (reputation 15) had remarkable careers. They studied in London under Malinowski before pursuing field studies in Africa and India, respectively.⁵⁶ Nadel was definitely quicker than the conservative Fürer-Haimendorf to break away from the habits of thought of the Vienna teachers and their 'Kulturkreis' school doctrine. Both became professors at important universities (cf. Fürer-Haimendorf 1990; Spencer 2000).

As for the future cultural anthropologists, London certainly suggested itself as the place to go, but still the Eurocentrism of some of the German fellows is somewhat surprising. Only one out of two Germans in this cohort went to the United States to study or do research, in contrast to two out of three Austrians. That German economists wanted to study public finances in Italy, for example, was not necessarily due to any emulation on the individual level of the political affinity between the two politically converging dictatorships, as is shown by the tragic case of Gerhard Dobbert. Dobbert was arrested during his fellowship and committed suicide after his release. As for two other economists who went to Italy for their studies, Harold Fick and Woldemar Koch (both reputation 0), 'family resemblance' in politics is what seems to have motivated their choice of country. The same is most likely true for Hans Freyer's assistant Franz Haufe (reputation 0) who was drawn to Romania where he wanted to study the life and culture of the peasants under Demetre Gusti, later discredited because of his Nazi sympathies. At least eighteen Germans were found, according to RF information, to have held positions in Germany during the Third Reich and to have in most cases been able to keep them after the war had ended. The proportion of Austrians who survived dictatorship and war in the 'Volksgemeinschaft' (people's community) was one out of five and, thus, considerably lower. There was only one, if at all, among them who exposed himself as a Nazi partisan. And conversely there was no one equal to August Lösch (reputation 27), as an outright opponent to the Nazis, who died in 1945 from exhaustion due to repeated imprisonment.

With the political situation in Germany steadily deteriorating and the willingness of the RF to support German institutions and fellows similarly on the decline, measuring satisfaction with the work of the fellows in this cohort, as expressed by subsequent 'grants-in-aid', is not possible without certain reservations. Some of the emigrants who had received RF support have already been mentioned. Among those who had stayed in Germany, only economists

Table 2.3 Country of Residence, 1970, of RF Fellows, Nominated before 1941 and after 1947 (%)

Country of Origin before Second World War	Country of residence 1970						Total (n)
	G	A	Switz.	USA	Other EU	Rest of the World	
Germany	63			20	9	7	64
Austria		24		68	4	4	25
Switzerland			67	33			6
Others		6	6	65	18	6	17
Total	34	7	5	41	9	6	102
%	33	7	5	40	9	6	100

Source: Rockefeller Foundation 1951; Rockefeller Foundation 1972 (author's calculation).

Hermann Bente (reputation 2) and Leo Drescher (reputation 1), both associated with the Kiel Institut für Weltwirtschaft (Institute for the World Economics), received support between 1934 and 1936 (Drescher emigrated to the United States in 1939). After 1945, economists Walther Hoffmann (reputation 82), Friedrich Lutz (reputation 16), Erich Schneider (reputation 29) and historian Egmont Zechlin (reputation 19) received financial aid.

Three Austrians were granted RF subsidies before their emigration in order to complete the studies they had initiated during their fellowships: Leo Gross (reputation 82), Josef Kunz (95) and Paul Rosenstein-Rodan (24). Among those who were supported after the end of the war were criminologist Roland Grassberger (reputation 2) and Ernst John (reputation 0), one of the leading figures at the Vienna Wirtschaftsforschungsinstitut (Institute for Economic Research) at the time. Aid was also granted to Christoph Fürer-Haimendorf and Leo Gross. Paul Lazarsfeld's Radio Research Project, which will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter Five, was better endowed by far.

I do not know how to explain the small proportion of women in this cohort. The fact that there are only four women among the seventy fellows can therefore only be mentioned as such without elaboration.

The concern voiced by the former fellows in their letter to the President of the RF, i.e. that the elimination of national advisors would lead to unfavourable outcomes, was obviously unfounded. On the contrary, it was only when RF officers were increasingly involved in the selection of the fellows that outsiders such as Hirschman and Strauss seem to have stood a chance at all. Similarly, in the Austrian case, the former fellows seem to have had a positive influence on the quality of the nominees. As a procedure, applying impersonal criteria, on the one hand, and soliciting opinions on candidates by as many persons as possible, on the other hand, was clearly superior to the particularistic policies of the German mandarin Committee. A final overview of the fellows of the post-Second World War period may yield some further insights.

Table 2.3 (Continued)

Country of Origin after Second World War	Country of residence 1970						Total (n)
	G	A	Switz.	USA	Other EU	Rest of the World	
Germany	86			9		6	35
Austria		82		9		9	11
Switzerland	22		67			11	9
Others	17			17	33	33	6
Total	33	9	6	5	6	6	61
%	54	15	10	8	10	10	100

COMPARISON OF GERMAN-SPEAKING FELLOWS, III

One hundred and ninety-three individuals could be included in the following analysis; a few of them were awarded RF fellowships more than once (which will not be detailed in the following analysis). Gender proportions are massively one-sided: after the Second World War, only three female fellows (economists Eva Bossman and Elisabeth Liefmann-Keil, and sociologist Renate Mayntz) were selected, whereas in the interwar period, which was generally less favourable to female scientists, there had been nine female fellows.

In the prewar period, 23 per cent of all fellows came from Austria, 58 per cent from Germany and 4 per cent from Switzerland. In addition, there were 19 other fellows (14 per cent) who were classed with other countries but who had scientifically relevant links to Germany or Austria, either as students or graduates from a university, or because this was where their workplace was. In the postwar period, the number of Austrian fellows plummeted from 30 to 11, reducing the proportion of Austrians to 17 per cent. A contemporary observer and ex-fellow laconically diagnosed the Austria of the 1950s as having 'no brains, no initiative, no collaboration'.⁵⁷ While 'no brains' is not borne out by a detailed examination of the 11 RF fellows, it is certainly true that, in terms of reputation, the majority of Austrian postwar fellows did not come near their prewar compatriots (see Chapter Four).

The available data allow for some insights into the further careers of the fellows. Table 2.3 lists those who were alive in 1970 and whose place of residence was known to the RF. A comparison of the country of 'origin' and the country of 'residence' clearly shows that Switzerland had the same proportion of returns for both periods: two out of three fellows from Switzerland had returned to live there. For the two German-language countries, a quite different picture emerges: almost two out of three prewar fellows had returned to Germany, in contrast to only one out of four Austrians who had lived abroad for at least one year before the 'Anschluss'. Of the twenty-five Austrians on whom data are available, nineteen had become ex-Austrians. Whether an explanation

for this disproportionately large permanent emigration should be sought in the obvious push factor – i.e. the two dictatorships – or, rather, in the pull factors of the United States system of science remains an open question. A comparison with the eagerness bordering on localism with which Austrian postwar fellows came home (some of them even breaking off their stay prematurely to do so!) suggests that explanatory priority should be given to the immediate danger to which those who were undesirable on political or racial grounds were exposed. On the other hand, one might argue that the proportion of Jewish fellows was very small and that only few of the future fellows had been conspicuous for their political activism. Thus, considering that three-quarters of those prewar fellows from Austria who left the country for good cannot be characterized as cases of emigration due to immediate danger, explanations for this brain drain will have to be sought in the material and cultural conditions.

The European fellowship programme of the RF, both before and after the Second World War, provided openings in terms of further post-graduate studies for talented junior scientists, at a time when the Teutonic system of science offered particularly little institutional support. For the vast majority of them, these fellowships were probably what allowed them to remain in the field of science, in the first place.

All in all, the Memorial and RF fellowship programme was a great success. The selection procedures demonstrate that nomination by established committees clearly resulted in the selection of more mediocre fellows than nomination via the more complex procedure that was used after 1931. This latter procedure anticipated elements of the ‘peer review’ which proved, at least at the time, to be the better method. The foundation officers, disinterested in particularistic constraints, were able to spot a much larger number of promising candidates, and their strategy of seeking a variety of opinions turned out to be a much more effective means of evaluation. The comparison between the German and the Austrian postwar fellows, however, shows that even the best selection procedures will be ineffective when the pool from which one chooses is almost empty.