"In the Shadow of Nazi Rule: Two Generation Units of Social Scientists." *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. 111–164. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849662932.ch-004>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 01:52 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.

4

IN THE SHADOW OF NAZI RULE: TWO GENERATION UNITS OF SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

At the end of the first third of the twentieth century, German-language sociology suffered a dramatic caesura. For a long time, René König's dictum that after 1933 the discipline had been 'brought to a brutal standstill' (König 1958: 14) was accepted as the ultimate description of the impact of the Nazis' rise to power on sociology. Helmut Schelsky's contrary opinion, at the time, that 'it was our sociology itself that had run out of subject matter, the melodies had all been played through, the fronts were consolidating, and little evolutionary momentum was left within the discipline itself' (Schelsky 1959: 36), did not register. Decades later the debate resurfaced under the new heading of 'sociology in National Socialism' (Rammstedt 1985; Klingemann 1996). At the end of his life, König vehemently protested against what he felt to be an exculpation of Nazi sociologists (König 1987). The debate, fraught with polemics, criticism and counter-criticism, carried on for some time and ran dry without any consensus being reached. The present study is not aiming for consensus either, but proposes a new perspective. Analysing the career paths of the sociologists of the time may indeed shed new light on the repercussions of the year 1933 (or, for Austria, 1938).

First of all, a collective biography of German-speaking sociologists should identify the commonalities as well as the differences that marked this generation. Karl Mannheim's concept of *Generationseinheit* (generation unit) seems the adequate tool for drawing a comparison between those who emigrated and those who did not. In his essay 'The Problem of Generations' (Mannheim 1952), first published in 1928, Mannheim distinguished between generation, social location of a generation and generation unit. Given the 'similarity of location ... within a social whole', Mannheim came to the conclusion that a generation tends to show something like a 'characteristic mode of thought and experience' (Mannheim 1952: 291). Often, however, the similarity of location as such does not suffice as a basis for postulating a generational bond. For the latter to emerge, there must be something like a common destiny. Within a

generational bond constituted by certain political and historical facts, there may be contrasting generation units, differing in their way of coping with the same historical and political macro-event: ‘Youth experiencing the same concrete historical problems may be said to be part of the same actual generation; while those groups within the same actual generation which work up the material of their common experiences in different specific ways, constitute separate generation units’ (Mannheim 1952: 304). In the present case, the concept of separate generations clearly suggests itself.

Secondly, a comparison between two science cultures that can be identified in terms of nation states is also attempted here: situations in Germany and Austria were different, but the common language certainly made the inhabitants of these countries more similar to each other than to the inhabitants of other states. Table 4.1 gives a preliminary idea of these differences. While the number of universities and students is rather close to the base value of the population, the other ratios clearly differ. In Austria there were more university teachers, and the 1938 dismissal rate for Austria was slightly higher than the 1933 rate for Germany. There are remarkable differences in the last two cells, but one has allow for the fact that there have as yet been few – indeed, hardly any – contributions by Austrians to the editorial decisions of the publications (Hagemann and Krohn 1999a; Hagemann and Krohn 1999b; Smelser and Baltes 2001) used to estimate the figures.

Table 4.1 Ratios between Austria and Germany

For every 100 Germans account for ... Austrians	
Population (1930s)	10
Universities (1930s)	13
Students (1930s)	15
Teaching staff (1930s)	30
Dismissed professors (1933 and 1938, resp.)	34
Grantees of the Emergency Committee (1933–44)	20
Émigré Economists (1933–45)	43
Leading Social Scientists (20 th Century)	77

Sources: Population: Mitchell 1992. Universities, Students and Teaching staff: Titze 1987; Völlmecke 1979. Dismissed professors: for Germany – *A Crisis in the University World* 1935; for Austria – Archive of the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning 1938. Grantees of the Emergency Committee: Files of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars, New York Public Library, Rare Book and Manuscript Division, New York; Duggan and Drury 1948; émigré economists – Krohn and Hagemann 1999; leading social scientists – Smelser and Baltes 2001. Author’s calculations.

Third, to allow for the effects of the change of political regimes to show, and for individual career paths to be traced, a period spanning three decades from the mid-1920s to the mid-1950s was chosen for analysis here. The starting point is

early enough, with respect to the handing over of power to the Nazis, to allow us to establish the positions held before change set in, and the end is late enough, with respect to the time when most of the emigrants had left the German-language area, to allow us to reconstruct their careers after displacement. It furthermore enables us to account for the dangers faced by non-emigrants, such as military service and imprisonment, likely to have caused breaks in their careers.

Fourth, the following specifically concerns sociology. This is easier said than done, for while sociology as an intellectual project was not at all uncommon in the German-language area, it did not exist as a formal discipline, i.e. in an institutionalized form. One thus comes up against a number of difficulties when trying to establish the boundaries of sociology as a discipline-in-the-making. Doing so horizontally among the social sciences – delimiting sociology from other disciplines – is difficult since the latter were far from being clearly outlined. In the German-language area, the emergence of the ‘third science culture’ (Lepenies 1985) was different and slower than that of other countries. As for the date that marks the beginning of sociology as a scientific discipline, there is no consensus at all.

WHO IS A SOCIOLOGIST?

Right after the problem of how to delimit a discipline from its neighbours, there is the problem of whom to count among its members. Who makes up the very top of the status hierarchy is just as uncontroversial as the very bottom, the students. Full professors seldom become ignored, while the many graduates of a discipline are rarely given any more room in its history than is needed for some statistics. But what about those in between? Limiting investigations to sociologists with a university affiliation or, even more restrictively, to those who were actually qualified as lecturers or professors, would be too narrow a definition of the population, since it means excluding a number of scholars who today are definitely considered part of the history of sociology.

Nor does it help much to consult the ‘membership list’ of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie (DGS, German Sociological Association, Austrians included) to identify German-speaking sociologists in the first half of the twentieth century. The DGS existed from 1910, but since it conceived of itself as an association of notables, eligibility for membership was severely restricted. And since there is no other membership list of the proto-discipline, the only way to establish the population is to reconstruct it on the basis of contemporaneous classifications and later delimitations. This may be done by (a) relying on self-reports; (b) using an independent definition as a basis for a reconstruction of the group; (c) referring to similar attempts by others; or (d) relying on reports by contemporary or latter-day peers.

(a) Relying on Self-reports: Anyone Calling Him or Herself a Sociologist is a Sociologist

One way of defining sociology is to say that it is what sociologists do. So, as an analogy, one way to count the membership of this discipline may be to label as

sociologists all those who claim to be so. An excellent contemporaneous source for this is *Kürschners Deutscher Gelehrten Kalender*. Between 1926 and 1950, six issues were published of this 'Who's Who' of German-language scholars, and sociology is indeed included in the index of disciplines in the 1926 issue for the first time. A search of the indices of names in those six issues of the *Kürschners* results in a total of two hundred and seventy male and seven female (2 per cent) sociologists. Almost half of the names appear only once, one-fifth appear twice, and only thirty-five individuals (12 per cent) appear as often as four times or more within these twenty-five years. Several reasons may account for this marked discontinuity. Apart from the obvious – the exclusion of those scholars who had become undesirable for political reasons due to the change in regime – there is of course the natural mortality of the population, as well as the war-time death-toll (fifty-nine of those indexed had died by 1950, but for almost a hundred other individuals, no information on their year of death is provided). Another correlation that seems reasonably sound is the one between age and the frequency of appearances. The oldest subjects (those born before 1870) can be disregarded as well as the youngest (those born after 1901). In the three cohorts in between, the rate of those who appear up to three times in the *Kürschners* is 72 per cent for the oldest and 92 per cent for the youngest cohort.

For the 277 sociologists who had at least once wished to be reported, distribution over the six issues is curiously unbalanced. The highest frequency of sociology reported as a disciplinary affiliation is found in the 1935 issue; the lowest in 1950. The (multiple) disciplinary affiliations over a quarter of a century reflect a change in the position of sociology among the disciplines from which sociologists and also-sociologists (that is, those who reported sociology as one disciplinary affiliation among others) used to come: the three most frequently reported neighbour disciplines were economics (about one-fifth), philosophy (with an upward tendency, rising from one out of ten to one out of four reporting this discipline as their first affiliation) and law (with proportions fluctuating around 15 per cent). During these decades, German-language sociology was seen as part of the humanities, with its boundaries remaining unclear, because German economics was dominated by the Historical School and also conceived of itself as part of the humanities.

A contemporary source confirming this judgement is the *festschrift* (a book of articles honouring a colleague) presented 'in the name of German science' by Walter von Dyck and Adolf Harnack, among others, to Friedrich Schmidt-Ott in honour of his seventieth birthday in 1930 (Abb 1930). This memorial publication took the form of an outline of the achievements of German science in the preceding fifty years. Among the disciplines included, neither sociology nor economics are to be found, both being subsumed under the heading of *Staatswissenschaften* (political science), the achievements of which are portrayed by one of the members of the very committee that was charged with the selection of fellows for the Rockefeller Foundation (Chapter Two), Hermann Schumacher. While the latter believed that 'political economics is the core

element of *Staatswissenschaften*', he still felt *Staatswissenschaften* to be a quite adequate generic title for the discipline since in Germany 'economics were far from being just a matter of individuals but also a state responsibility'. In the more than twenty pages of his essay, sociology is mentioned only once, and even then only in passing:

Max Weber's peculiar role in *Staatswissenschaften* may perhaps be summed up by saying that in him, in a most precise way, the scientific aspirations of the time became a conscious endeavour. Deeply immersed in a number of individual tasks, he contemplated the question of what might be the real meaning and worth, in terms of knowledge, of scientific work in history, political economics, and sociology. [...] With considerable power, and often disconcerting boldness, he has extended his doctrine of '*verstehende* sociology,' primarily confined to rational action, to cover all domains of human community life, even religion and music (Schumacher 1930: 144).

Another remarkable finding is the near-total eclipse of psychology as an academic neighbour for, and origin of, also-sociologists. After the Second World War, the picture abruptly changed: now almost two in three sociologists included in the *Kürschners* report sociology as their first or only disciplinary affiliation, followed by philosophy (one in four).

Of the individuals reported in the *Kürschners*, 83 per cent were born in Germany, 12.5 per cent in Austria (both of them in their historical boundaries). 89 per cent had taken their doctoral degrees at German universities, as opposed to only 10 per cent at Austrian universities, suggesting an ongoing brain drain towards Germany during this period, which dates farther back than the period covered by the survey (three out of four doctorates had been taken before 1925). In all the *Kürschners* issued within the period surveyed, biographical articles include an entry specifying the place of residence for the qualifying date. These entries reveal a constant proportion of 80 per cent Germans, as opposed to 13 to 19 per cent of sociologists working in Austria; the remaining few reported a place of residence abroad. For obvious reasons, the 1940 issue of the *Kürschners* included only citizens of the Third Reich, with only three former Austrians with a Vienna address¹ who had wished to be included. In 1950, the proportion of Austrians is reduced to 10 per cent while the second largest group consists of scholars who lived in non-German-language countries. Of the latter, only two succeeded in reintegrating at a German university in the following years, but the fact that the others reported back, as it were, calls for closer examination. (These were Theodor Geiger, Hans Gerth, Gustav Gundlach, Rudolf Heberle, Paul Honigsheim, Ernest Manheim and Hellmut Plessner; not a single Austrian wished to be included in the first postwar *Kürschners*.)

The distribution of sociologists by status position (Table 4.2) shows a consistent proportion of a quarter to almost one-third holding the top academic career level of full professor; when the range is extended to include the highest-but-one level as well (*außerordentliche Professoren* [extraordinary professors], not including guest and honorary professors, emeriti and retired professors), the proportion of professors rises to almost 50 per cent before the handing-over of

Table 4.2 Sociologists in the *Kürschners*, by Status Positions (%)

Status Position	1926	1928	1931	1935	1940	1950
<i>o. Professor</i> (= Full Professor)	30	25	32	28	28	31
<i>ao. Professor</i> (= Associate Professor)	18	10	16	10	23	17
<i>Dozent</i> (= Lecturer)	25	17	17	18	15	14
Faculty, total	73	62	65	56	66	62
<i>Assistent</i> (= Assistant Professor)	0	1	1	2	6	7
Honorary-, Visiting-, Emeritus etc. Profs	2	6	8	14	17	14
Non-university occupations	25	41	27	28	11	17
N.	56	109	131	160	53	42

Sources: *Kürschners Deutscher Gelehrten-Kalender* 1925-. Author's calculations.

power to the Nazis. At the next lower level, the lecturers (*Dozenten*) show a steady increase in absolute numbers and a no less steady decrease in their share of the population. Between 1926 and 1935, however, the number of those who had qualified for an academic career (*Habilitation*) doubled. While the overall number of sociologists declined during the Nazi dictatorship, the rate of sociologists who were *habilitiert* steadily increased. Since the rate of those who are known to have emigrated was comparatively low in this group, the decrease must be attributed to the dwindling appeal of sociology during the Nazi period rather than to exile.²

(b) Reconstruction by Definition: You Are a Sociologist Because We Say So

Rather than relying on self-reports, another way to define a group is to rely on certain criteria that are simple and comprehensible. Given that the discipline under investigation was still in the making, so to speak, institutional criteria such as lists of university personnel are of little use, and reliance on information about graduates is impossible since there was no formal course of studies at the time. What seems uncontroversial, however, is to consider as members of a discipline-in-the-making all those who contributed to its corpus of literature. Thus, anyone having published at least one article or two reviews in one of the sociological journals between 1925 and 1955 shall be considered a member of the discipline. This assessment was initially based on all journals with a 'sociological' title or a review section with a specific sociological sub-section, all in all thirty-six journals,³ but the first analyses resulted in such a high number of authors that the field had to be narrowed down. The journal sample was thus restricted to include only the data of 197 individuals who up to the point of their possible emigration had worked exclusively in Austria, and of 68 individuals (or 26 per cent of this group) who up to the point of their possible emigration had worked in both Austria and Germany. The latter, being citizens of dual nationality, are a hybrid case with respect to their national culture. For the present study, anyone who had lived or studied in Austria for at least two years is considered an 'Austrian'. The criterion for inclusion in the

sample is, therefore, based not on arbitrary characteristics such as place of birth or nationality, but on institutional affiliation.⁴

A corollary of this narrowing down of the analysis to journal articles and reviews might be that scholars who only wrote books are under-represented. However, it seems rather unlikely that the subjects concerned should confine themselves to this sort of text. By taking contributions to a journal as a criterion and, thus, lowering the threshold for inclusion, only those authors are ruled out whose merits as a writer did not pass the test of an editor or publisher's scrutiny. Furthermore, one may suppose that, in the beginning, emigrants found it easier to write an article in the foreign language than to publish a book.

The sample does not include the highly productive and successful so-called 'second generation', those who had to emigrate in childhood or adolescence and had therefore not been exposed to the influence of Austrian tertiary educational institutions (all those included were born before 1920).⁵

The selection criteria were designed to allow for as little bias as possible in favour of either of the two sub-populations (emigrants and non-emigrants). The main selection criterion – journal articles that were labelled as sociological by their contemporaries, and reviews of another author's sociological work – is very broad, which means that individuals are included who, in a different perspective, would not have been counted as sociologists. I feel, however, that this flaw is defensible since it does in a way reflect the facts about the sociology of those years.⁶

Checking the list of individuals included in the journal sample one finds that a number of names are missing. Psychologists who had only published in psychological journals are systematically under-represented; the same is probably true for some representatives of modern history since there were no journals that specialized in modern history during the period surveyed and the more general historical journals were not included in our analysis. Apart from the systematic discrimination against these two disciplines, however, no further discrimination should have occurred.

A collective biography that is not confined to the members of the academic establishment, or the elite will soon come up against a number of limiting factors that can hardly be overcome. Missing entries in biographical reference works, contradictory information in different sources and similar adversities tend to reduce the scope of analysis more than one would wish for. As a case in point, retrieving information on social backgrounds turned out to be particularly difficult.

The journal sample includes 200 emigrants, 5 scholars who endured long-term imprisonment in Nazi concentration camps and thus were prevented from emigrating (although most of them had been imprisoned on political grounds, all of them, with the exception of Eugen Kogon, had to wear the star of David in the camps), and 59 who remained at home, including 16 individuals who had at least temporarily been suspended from their positions during Nazi rule, and some who had been in prison for a certain time. They were discriminated against as losers in the competition for the favours of Nazi leaders

(Othmar Spann and his followers) or because they had exposed themselves in the authoritarian regime in Austria before 1938.

The high number of emigrants cannot be accounted for unless one keeps in mind that they became professional social scientists only after their escape from Europe. But for the annexation of Austria by German troops, heartily welcomed by the Austrians in March 1938, most of these later sociologists are quite unlikely to have taken to sociology. In the mid-1950s, there were probably five university teachers in Austria who were engaged in sociology in the broadest sense, but almost ten times as many former Austrians in positions of a 'full professor' of sociology at American colleges and universities. Since in our journal analysis special care was taken to preclude preferential treatment of one of either group, one is reasonably justified in saying that the ratio of 1:3 'home-guards' to emigrants correctly mirrors the scale of the displacement of intellectual potential.

(c) Using Comparison: How Others Defined Sociology

In his doctoral thesis, Klemens Wittebur (Wittebur 1991) tried to come to a systematical identification of the group of sociologists in exile from Germany. He based his 'biographical cartography' on a very broad definition of sociology and used a multilevel criterion that covers the whole range from 'top' to 'bottom', from sociological chairs and inaugural dissertations to literary contributions. As a minimum condition for inclusion, candidates had to have graduated before emigrating and to have subsequently engaged in professional or literary work in Germany as sociologists in the broadest sense. Of course delimitations are easier among the high-level scholars than among those who were only included because their publications had been classified as sociological work. A certain amount of arbitrariness is unavoidable, but at least Wittebur went beyond high-level positions in his count of sociologists. He ends up with a total of 7 (or 5 per cent) female and 134 male sociologists. For obvious reasons, the 141 individuals reported by Wittebur also include 10 who may be counted as belonging to the group of emigrated Austrian sociologists.⁷

(d) Relying on Peer Judgement: Experts Nominate Sociologists

Another way of identifying the population of German-speaking sociologists is to refer to nominations by experts. The rules governing their choice may be quite restrictive, as is the case for the *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioural Sciences* (Smelser and Baltes 2001) which is limited to 140 all-time most important names, or rather liberal and inclusive, as is the case for a biographical reference work.

In the present context, a German publication called the *Internationales Soziologenlexikon* (ISL) (Bernsdorf and Knospe 1980–84) has the advantage that it was not compiled in a perspective of emigration research. Among the scholars included in the second edition, 292 were selected because they were born after 1850 and before 1920, and thus corresponded to the criterion of age used for the other samples. In spite of its cosmopolitan title, the ISL is more comprehensive than others in its charting of the German-speaking area. The sample obtained

from the ISL includes 275 male and 17 (6 per cent) female sociologists, 77 per cent of them German, 12 per cent Austrian, and 11 working in both or in other countries, primarily in Czechoslovakia; 122 individuals (42 per cent) of the sample are emigrants, with distinctly higher emigration rates for Austrians than for Germans (64 per cent and 39 per cent, respectively).

The comparatively smaller data set of German and Austrian Rockefeller fellows already referred to in Chapter Two was used as a supplementary source. For our purpose here, RF officers and advisers can be regarded as contemporary peers whose problem – unlike that of the latter-day peers who served as experts for the ISL and Smelser and Baltes's encyclopedia – was to find promising candidates. To a certain degree, this small sample counterbalances the age bias of all the retrospective selections. By 1941, eighty-three Germans, twenty-eight Austrians and eight scholars who could be assigned to both countries had been granted a fellowship by the Social Sciences Division of the Rockefeller Foundation (or its predecessor, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial), among them nine female scholars (8 per cent).

Due to their experience of life abroad, the former Rockefeller fellows and later emigrants can be viewed as a privileged group. After all, in 1950, of the seventy-one German and Austrian prewar fellows for whom some information is available on this point, thirty-two were in the United States, three in Great Britain, four in non-European countries and two in Switzerland. In contrast, only twenty-five (of forty-six) ex-fellows were back in Germany, and only five (of twenty-five) were back in Austria. The emigration rate (to non-German-language countries) for this group was 55 per cent (Rockefeller Foundation 1951).

Of the thirty-two individuals who had held Rockefeller fellowships between 1925 and 1941 and had later transferred to the United States, twenty had at some point taught as 'full professors' at universities or colleges (two each at Berkeley, Chicago, Princeton and UCLA), while of the twenty-seven former fellows who returned to Germany or Austria, nineteen Germans and only one Austrian were affiliated with institutions of tertiary education.

In 1972, the RF published another list of its former fellows. Of those sixty-one individuals who had taken up their fellowship before 1941, thirty lived in the United States, three in Great Britain and three in other countries (ten had died in the meantime). Twenty-four of them lived in Germany, and only one lived in Austria. The long-term emigration rate for Germany and Austria (excluding those who had died) was thus 41 per cent; the rate for Austria alone, however, was 95 per cent (Rockefeller Foundation 1972).

In the following analysis, data sets from different sources will be analysed as an aggregated set as well as, in certain cases, separately. All these samples together can be taken with reasonable certainty to provide an overview of the population of German-speaking sociologists in the 1930s and 1940s. Of course, there are a number of individuals who arguably belong to the population thus constituted but do not appear in any of these samples; since they were discovered quite accidentally, as it were, they will not be taken into account in the following.⁸ It would turn things upside down to say that between 1925

and 1955, roughly speaking, there were 823 sociologists, male and female, in the German-language area. It is correct, however, to say that the population from which sociologists could be sampled – according to criteria that would have to be justified in each case – was at least that large.

For validating the five samples, another data set can be used. This is the reconstruction by David Vampola, Fritz Ringer and Philip Seidel in the *Göttinger Hochschullehrer-Untersuchung* (Göttingen Survey of University Teachers) that provides individual data of more than 13,000 German university teachers across all disciplines between 1864 and 1938. (As suggested by Ringer, this study is cited as the VRS [Vampola Ringer Seidel] Sample.)⁹ The VRS Sample includes 51 social scientists who also figure in the Wittebur sample (36 per cent of all those included there), and 108 social scientists who figure in the ISL sample (or 37 per cent of this group of sociologists). That there is only a partial overlap is due to the fact that while the Göttingen study did a complete survey for each qualifying date, there were only nine such dates (Ringer 1993).

ELEMENTS OF A COLLECTIVE BIOGRAPHICAL PORTRAIT OF GERMAN-SPEAKING SOCIOLOGISTS

A first comparative analysis of the five samples, or of the aggregate data set for which they provided the basis, is shown in Table 4.3. The proportion of female sociologists is highest in the journal sample (ten per cent), which can be explained by the fact that inclusion in this sample was based on the existence of publication in German- or English-language journals. Emigrated female scholars obviously met with favourable conditions in the United States, whereas the sample in which inclusion was most strongly oriented to Central European institutional conditions (*Kürschners*) is also the one that most strongly reflected discrimination against women. The markedly higher rate of female Rockefeller fellows (9 per cent), however, clearly shows that in the academic universe of the time, female scholars worth supporting could well be found.

Table 4.3 Overview of the Samples

	Kürschners	Wittebur	ISL	RF	Journals	Total
Women (%)	2	5	6	8	10	7
Emigrants (%)	33	100	42	64	75	58
Austrians (%)	13	0	12	24	74	29
Double Citizens (%)	5	7	11	7	26	9
Year of Birth (Median)	1886	1897	1899	1901	1900	1898
Cases	277	141	292	119	265	826

Note: The difference of 268 between the sum of all five samples and the number of cases in the overall data set (826) results from elimination of double entries.

Sources: *Kürschners Deutscher Gelehrten-Kalender* 1925–; Wittebur 1991; Bernsdorf and Knospe 1980–84. Author's calculations.

The minute female share in sociology before the mid-1950s must be seen in the context of the development of women's access to higher education. By the mid-1920s, the rate of female students was 13 per cent for Germany and 15 per cent for Austria. The rates for other European countries were hardly higher, with the exception of Switzerland where women were allowed university access early on, while the rate of female students in the United States was 37 per cent even then. In 1950, the rate of female students was 21 per cent for Austria and 20 per cent for Germany.

The situation in Vienna in the interwar period was, if not exactly supportive of women, at least less prone to discrimination than elsewhere. It is a sociological truism that role models are of extraordinary importance to members of a group that wants to gain access to social areas previously closed to them. In this context, it is instructive that Charlotte Bühler, herself one of these role models, investigated the importance of heroic models for the project of biographical identity in her psychological lifespan research. Legends, however, are much less easy to circumscribe than true role models. While the latter show those who try to emulate them how to perform the role they are interested in, the former are as often as not idyllic figures and, while no doubt admirable, of little help when it comes to the next steps to be taken on one's way to unknown life-worlds.

Now, 'Frau Professor', as Charlotte Bühler was reverently addressed, was not the only female role model in Vienna. One of her predecessors, a legend already in the interwar period, was Eugenie Schwarzwald. In title-happy Vienna, she was addressed as 'Fraudoktor' and signed her name with 'FrDr'. A German philologist and graduate from Zurich University, she had founded a *Gymnasium* for girls in Vienna as early as at the times of the emperor. Until 1938, this school was something like an institutionalized role model for girls, its guiding principles quoted as follows by one of its former students: 'Here, girls were to learn everything that made up the knowledge of men and, at the same time, remain gentle, modest, girlish, housewifely' (Spiel 1989: 56). Many a later female student of the University of Vienna had been to this reform school, among them Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Hedda Bolgar and Lucie Stein-Varga, whose names figure in the journal sample.

A third female role model in Vienna was Käthe Leichter. Given that women were denied access to the University of Vienna at the time, she had taken her doctoral degree at Heidelberg. In the early 1920s, Leichter rejected an offer from Carl Grünberg to accompany him to Frankfurt to work at the newly opened Institut für Sozialforschung, since she had been offered a post as head of the new Department for Women's Affairs with the Vienna Arbeiterkammer (Chamber of Labour). A social democrat, her interest was in opening up a way for young women who lacked formal education to gain the kind of freedom such education would offer. Among the collaborators on her *Handbuch der Frauenarbeit* (Handbook of Female Labour; Leichter 1930) were a number of young women who rose to the political elite of postwar social democracy after being lucky enough to survive the Nazi dictatorship.

While the Vienna of 1930 offered at least some women-friendly niches, another variable is more difficult to establish with any certainty. By the definition of the Nuremberg Laws, Bühler, Leichter and Schwarzwald were Jewish. Leichter was murdered in 1942 on these grounds (Fleck and Berger 2000: 89). Schwarzwald managed to escape to Switzerland, in spite of her advanced age, where she died in 1940, and Charlotte Bühler was spared Gestapo treatment in the days of the *Anschluss* only because she happened to be abroad. What is much less clear is whether any of these three saw herself as Jewish before this civilizational caesura: Leichter had seceded from the Israelitische Kultusgemeinde in 1921 (Fleck and Berger 2000), Charlotte Bühler was of Protestant denomination, and Schwarzwald, while documented as being of 'mosaischen' (Jewish) faith, declared herself to be 'frankly anti-Semitic' (Schwarzwald and Deichmann 1988: 229).

These three women did not belong to any Jewish intellectual milieu, or whatever labels may have been in circulation. Moreover, there definitely was no such thing as a Jewish milieu, neither in fact nor in spirit. In Vienna as elsewhere, Jews congregated as Jews in the synagogues, and it is highly unlikely that what was being discussed in the synagogue had anything to do with the subjects for which the Jewish intellectual milieu was famous. Most of the fans of the soccer club Hakoah would have been Jewish, but there is no tradition telling us whether the players developed any specifically Jewish style. While with soccer – in spite of its having been discovered as a worthy object of cultural studies – nobody to my knowledge has ever ventured to see anything Jewish in the way the Hakoans kicked their ball, countless authors indulge in just these kind of questions as soon as they turn to the loftier products of intellectual life.

While there is no doubt as to the questions that need to be asked here, the same cannot be said for the validity of the answers that are currently given. To start with the simplest ones, is it true that there was a disproportionate share of Jews in certain intellectual domains? Is it, furthermore, true that these domains were among the innovative ones with respect to scientific discourse? Finally, is it true that certain intellectual products are clearly marked by Jewish thought, or at least show a stronger family likeness to the latter, as compared to the Christian worldview? While such questions can be more or less clearly put, no answer will ever be found since their very form is counterfactual.

In contrast, questions which aim to establish whether the share of Jews was larger in certain professions or scientific domains than in others seem more promising. But even here, while it seems quite likely that German philology or mechanical engineering were courses of study or fields of professional activity that were comparatively rarely chosen by Jews, one cannot entirely, and not even approximately, be sure of this. We know nothing about this because it has never been investigated, and even if attempts had been made, no satisfactory results would have been obtained since we simply do not have any data to go by. For whatever the answer might be, it cannot start out from the end of the causal chain by pointing out, for instance, that among those evicted by the Nazis in 1933 and 1938, respectively, the share of professors of German

philology was minute. It may well be that Jews who were interested in this discipline were at any rate prevented from reaching top positions, or that many Jews, aware of the discrimination that reigned in the field, chose to opt for their second favourite discipline in the first place. And, to make things still more complicated, aversion to Jewish candidates in German philology need not have been more intense than in, let's say, political economics or psychology. A lack of Jewish professors in a particular discipline may simply have been the result of the longevity of some professors. Where there are no vacancies, there also is no need to discriminate against those who are undesirable.

The term discrimination may be used when an individual is deprived of something because of his or her membership in a certain group, as measured by commonly shared normative standards. Cases in point are the many restrictions faced by blacks in the American South under segregation, or, more recently, the impossibility for a homosexual to become the leader of a Christian-conservative party. Though the term discrimination might also be used when members of a specific group are under-represented in certain professions or institutions, such as women among university professors, one feels uneasy with the idea that a prerequisite for reaching gender democracy should be a balanced rate, for example, of male and female prison inmates. This uneasiness can be transformed into a rational argument by pointing out that the term discrimination should only be used where groups are kept from obtaining something they want or, to say it even more philosophically, where someone is prevented from the pursuit of his or her happiness (with imprisonment counting as a pursuit of happiness only where it provides an escape from even more miserable conditions of life).

However, since this is discrimination by statistical means, so to speak – statistical because the proportion of group members among the excluded exceeds the proportion of group members in the waiting queue – not every member of the group discriminated against may refer to it in order to boost his or her individual demand for promotion to a desired position if the latter is bound up with certain requirements in terms of competencies, as is the case for professorships but not for seats on a bus.

Jon Elster (Elster 1983; Elster 1984) has pointed out that people who think they are denied access to something coveted and auspicious may accommodate, as in the fable of the fox and the sour grapes, by describing as undesirable that which is out of their reach. For example, we know that the non-admission of Jewish students to the duelling fraternities, which started by the end of the nineteenth century (Jarausch 1984), led only a minority of the excluded to respond by founding duelling fraternities of their own. Most male Jewish students are likely to have resorted to a sour-grapes strategy, whose byproduct in terms of cultural history was that they were quicker than their duelling colleagues to abandon the feudal idea of honour for a more universalistic idea.¹⁰

Evidence of discrimination in appointment policies is hard to find, and for a rather profane reason. At the time, appointments to professorships were not initiated by launching a job advertisement but by charging some members of

the faculty in question with gathering information on who might be eligible. For someone engaged in the history of science, this pre- (and, by the way, also post-) modern procedure has the disagreeable side-effect that appointment processes simply remained undocumented.

This deplorable lack of documents is not confined to the level of scientific micro-environments; it holds for official statistics as well. For Austria, which at the time was not yet called Austria, the 1910 census is the last one to include data on the rates of Jews in certain professions (cf. Rozenblit 1983). For the period that is of interest here – the subsequent years up to the seizure of power by the Nazis – no reliable statistics are available. Resorting to simple extrapolation can be ruled out for a number of reasons: as the monarchy was disintegrating, its populations (among them a particularly large share of Jews) were swept up in large-scale migration. In addition, the end of the monarchy was accompanied by a profound structural change within professional groups, with the result that Jewish professionals, mainly lawyers, doctors, engineers, architects and journalists, now faced competition with those who had themselves left or been dismissed from civil service positions or could no longer count on such positions as a career for their sons. Jewish fortunes, probably no less than non-Jewish fortunes, had been ruined by the First World War and the inflation years. But above all, Vienna Jews still sought to assimilate, so that even if there had been any official statistics, the proportions of Jews reported in them would not have mirrored actual social facts, especially with respect to those professional groups from which most university students were likely to come. If the Jewish lower-middle class was hit as hard by economic problems as the rest of the population, their children suffered from it no less than the non-Jewish population. The result would have been a decrease in the proportion of students from this social stratum, and the proportion of university students who did not complete their studies would very likely have risen as well as the proportion of those who, rather than stick to risky career aspirations that required long-term preparation, turned to career paths that promised short-term income maintenance. Evidence for all this is provided by individual cases, and there is no reason not to assume, with due caution, a more general trend.

Lacking official statistics, one has to make do with estimations. The proportion of Jews in the professions can be obtained by comparing the occupational statistics of three censuses. In Austria, two such censuses were taken in 1934 and 1951, and one was taken in May 1939 as part of the census of the German Reich, new territories included. The diminishing numbers of the working population between 1934 and 1939 are revealing since there is every reason to believe that those 'leaving' these occupations were those who had been labelled Jews by the Nazi race rulings and were, therefore, persecuted.

As an illustration, we may take the rather clearly defined (in terms of social statistics) professions of the *doctor*, the *lawyer* and the *journalist* (Fleck 2004). Estimations of the proportion of Jews in these professions before the *Anschluss* are a maximum of 15 per cent for doctors, a maximum of 60 per cent for lawyers

and probably one out of two journalists.¹¹ The picture obtained by comparing the various censuses clearly differs from the reports of contemporaries who were more or less unanimous in thinking that the proportion of Jewish doctors was higher. In any case, estimates suggesting that Jews made up about one-third of the members of the professions can be supposed to be quite realistic.

The information gap on the level of official statistics is matched by a corresponding gap on the level where one might attempt to find some data on the personal characteristics of the 823 sociologists. Even if they were registered in one of the reference books, these still provide little of the information one might wish for as a sociologist. Information that can be included in the most down-to-earth questionnaire and that respondents will usually not hesitate to answer is rare when one looks for it with respect to those who are long dead or, if still alive, far away. As for their ethno-religious or social backgrounds, the lack of data is almost total. The *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Émigrés 1933–1945* (Röder and Strauss 1980–83), the *Bibliographica Judaica* (Heuer 1981–96) and the *Handbuch österreichischer Autorinnen und Autoren jüdischer Herkunft 18. bis 20. Jahrhundert* (Handbook of Austrian Authors of Jewish Origin, 18th–20th centuries; Blumesberger 2002) provide reliable information on whether an individual was Jewish.¹² The criteria used are broader than those relying on current denominations but narrower than the historically significant trait of whether or not an individual could fall victim to the Nuremberg Laws on race. Data on their denomination (in most cases data from their university years) could be obtained for 30 per cent of the 823 sociologists. Thirty-nine individuals (or 16 per cent of those for whom data are available) belonged to the Jewish religious community. Two hundred and sixty-six individuals are reported as Jewish in a broader sense in the three reference works, with distinctly higher proportions among the Austrians than among the Germans: Austrians make up 29 per cent of the entire data set, 55 per cent of them being Jewish, whereas Germans make up 62 per cent of the entire data set while only 45 per cent of them are Jewish. Given the numbers referred to above of the presumed proportion of Jews among doctors, lawyers and journalists (ranging from 15 per cent to 60 per cent), a Jewish proportion of one-third to one-half among German-speaking sociologists seems plausible.

The proportions of *emigrants* strongly vary between the samples, but these differences are relatively easy to explain: Wittebur documents only established German scholars who later became emigrants. The criteria for the journal sample include American publications, the main host country for scholars escaping the Nazis. In other words, emigrants from Austria encompass an extraordinarily large number of individuals who 'became sociologists' only after their emigration. The large proportion of emigrants is, thus, not a consequence of some sampling bias, but a spectacular result. If Wittebur had used sources from the host countries, he would probably have come up with larger numbers, too. Since, on the other hand, our more fine-tuned screening does not discriminate against the 'home-guard', the high Austrian emigration rate

cannot be explained away, even though it should not be taken as an exact measure.

The Rockefeller sample also includes a high proportion of emigrants – and this, again, is not due to any bias. The reason is no doubt bound up with American institutional conditions where the gates of academic institutions were clearly open to refugees, a fact which even Wilhelm Bernsdorf and Horst Knospe were compelled to at least partially acknowledge by opening up the ISL for emigrants in 1984. That both editors did not set great store by gender equity is manifest in the fact that they readily included twice as many females who remained in their country than female emigrants, even though there is no reason to suppose that visibility for female scholars among their male colleagues was any easier to achieve in the Federal Republic or in Austria. A comparison between the two groups shows that the ISL seems to have ignored emigrated female sociologists until their visibility could no longer be denied.¹³ The fact that the various editions of the *Kürschners* report only slightly less than one-third of emigrants also suggests that most of the emigrants could make a name for themselves only after their emigration.

Variations in the shares of Austrians in the samples are less sizeable. The lack of Austrians in Wittebur has to do with the simple fact that he chose not to include all German-speaking sociologists in his sample; he only looked for sociologists who went into exile from Germany. The comparatively large number of Austrians among the RF fellows reflects a fact that has been repeatedly emphasized in the present context, namely that Austria produced an incomparably higher number of talents in those years. Due to their stay abroad (planned to be temporary) they could build larger social networks, the ‘weak ties’ (Granovetter 1973) of which could later be reactivated in more than one way.

Economist Oskar Morgenstern’s contacts to American economists, established during his fellowship stay in the mid-1920s and enhanced in the years to follow, resulted in an invitation to a half-year guest professorship at Princeton in 1938; that March, with little hesitation, he decided not to return to Vienna. Christoph Fürer-Haimendorf, a disciple of the Viennese ethnology, not only met his future wife during his fellowship stay in Britain but, through her, also came to realize his loathing for the Nazis:

Shortly before our wedding Hitler had occupied Austria, and Vienna was no longer the easy going city of my youth, where I had moved in cosmopolitan circles and my closest friends other than Austrians had been, Bulgarians, Poles, Hungarians, Greeks and other foreigners. I realized that neither Betty nor I would be happy in a country ruled by National Socialists. So we planned to leave as soon as possible for India and awaited further developments in Central Europe. (Fürer-Haimendorf 1990: 21)

Although Morgenstern and Fürer-Haimendorf may not have planned to leave their home country for good, it can be assumed in their cases, as well as in a number of others that are comparable, that they would certainly have gone abroad anyway at some point or other.

The German-language social scientists targeted in the present context belong to more than one *generation*; their years of birth span a period of seven decades. The various samples reflect different cohorts, as shown by their mean age: the *Kürschners* represents the oldest age groups, while all the other data sets focus on the younger ones. This is hardly surprising since the *Kürschners* is something like an ongoing chronicle of the personnel of academia which, after all, is dominated by the senior age groups. The differences in mean age between the samples clearly suggest that the emigrants belonged to the younger cohorts. This becomes quite manifest when the group of the emigrants is compared to the group that remained in their home countries: the mean difference in age between emigrants and the 'home-guard' across all samples is five years; in the journal sample, the mean difference is eleven years (*Kürschners*: three years; ISL: two years), and even among the Rockefeller fellows, a group that was quite homogeneous with respect to age, the mean difference of age between those who emigrated and those who did not is two years. If the great majority of emigrants in all samples were refugees from the Nazis, the difference in age as compared to the 'home-guard' should actually not be that large. It can therefore be assumed that the younger ones – provided the opportunity presented itself, and regardless of what other reasons they may have had for emigrating – were quicker to opt for emigration than the older ones.

A further differentiation among the population of German-language social scientists can be obtained by analysing the *places* from which they graduated (post-emigration grades excluded). In 1930, the number of sociologists taking their doctoral degree more or less corresponds, at most universities, to the proportion of the student population of the respective universities. These numbers, however, are lower in Munich and Bonn, and higher in Berlin, Heidelberg, Leipzig and Frankfurt. The four latter universities can be considered the hubs of social science training. With respect to Heidelberg, this is not at all surprising since this university, located in southwestern Germany, had a long-standing reputation as a stronghold of German social science; the strong presence of Frankfurt, however, is more of a surprise given the rather recent foundation of its university (in 1914), and particularly so when compared to Kiel which, while frequently pointed out in the literature as a university with a strong social science orientation, has only half as many students taking their doctoral degree there and being included in our samples. While the German social scientists grew up in a science culture with a federal structure, the Austrians were concentrated in the metropolis, Vienna.

The right-hand column of Table 4.4 shows the proportion of emigrants among those who took their doctoral degree at each of these universities. The university with the highest proportion of future emigrants among its graduates was the University of Frankfurt, where eight out of ten students who took their doctoral degree later went into exile, followed by Vienna and Heidelberg, where three-quarters of their respective 'sociological' graduates were lost to emigration. Assuming that Nazi persecution of Jews was the primary cause of emigration suggests that the proportion of Jews (or, more precisely, the

proportion of those who were predestined to fall victim to Nazi extinction policies) must have been particularly high at these three universities. By contrast, Berlin, which is often compared to Vienna in the literature, seems to have housed a lower proportion of Jewish students, since only 34 per cent of those who took their doctoral degree later emigrated – unless Jewish students in Berlin had felt more strongly attracted by other disciplines in the first place.

Table 4.4 Ratio of Students per University, 1930 (Selection); Graduations by Members of the Samples; Ratio of Graduations to Country, Emigrants per University

University	Ratio of Students 1930 (%)	Graduations by Members of the Samples	Ratio of Graduations to Country (%)	Emigrants (%)
Vienna		175	88	77
Berlin	13	63	16	38
Heidelberg	4	56	14	75
Leipzig	7	38	10	39
Frankfurt	4	28	7	89
Munich	9	24	6	50
Cologne	6	22	6	41
Bonn	6	20	5	25
Freiburg	4	20	5	60
Tübingen	3	16	4	19
Kiel	3	13	3	54
All German		399	100	
Total		621		

Source: Students 1930 from Titze 1995; all other calculations by the author.

Interwar Vienna boasted a particularly high density of individuals and influences that were decisive for the socialization of social scientists (and future emigrants): there was more than one female role model and there was a broad range of educational options which, while at first glance do not seem to have been of first-rate sociological relevance, clearly proved to be fertile ground for a variety of social science orientations. Vienna's ethnology – highly traditional and, given its 'Kulturkreis' doctrine, even quite isolated – produced S. F. Nadel, who was of eminent importance for social science in spite of his untimely death, and exported Fürer-Haimendorf and Robert Heine-Geldern, who carved out careers for themselves in London and Washington, DC, respectively. The Austrian School of Economics, one of the earliest groups of German-language social scientists with a cosmopolitan orientation, not only produced a large number of talents but also exported virtually all of them, among them arguably the largest number of non-Jewish scholars from all the scientific domains considered in this context – what remained of economics in Austria after 1938 was scientifically irrelevant. Hans Kelsen, who departed in anger from Vienna to Cologne in 1929, also left behind a group of followers who

somehow managed to keep their heads above water until the Nazis took control of Austria, but did not sacrifice their intellectual life: Erich Voegelin, Erich Hula, Josef Laurenz Kunz, Leo Gross and William Ebenstein all worked mainly in the field of political science after their emigration to the United States, a speciality they had not even come close to knowing in Vienna (Söllner 1996). The group associated with the philosophers of the Vienna Circle and the mathematicians around Karl Menger not only produced some eminent scholars (such as Kurt Gödel) who are not at issue here, but also some philosophers and mathematicians such as Gustav Bergmann, Rudolf Carnap, Herbert Feigl and Menger himself, who later dealt with questions of a philosophy of the social sciences. Moreover, there were the psychologists mentioned above who, with few exceptions, distinguished themselves by combining their training in academic psychology (under the Böhlers) with an interest in psychoanalysis.

What was the situation of those German social scientists who ended up as emigrants? Except for Berlin, no Vienna-like clusters of outstanding individuals seem to have existed. According to René König, who had studied in both cities (König 1984; König 1987), intellectual stimulation appears to have been less comprehensive and less appealing. There were hardly any sociologists at the University of Berlin, not in the sense that was current at the time, nor in any later sense. Each of the four *Kürschners* editions published between 1926 and 1935 presents the same names of Berlin-based sociologists, supplemented by a growing number of scholars without a university affiliation.

In the larger disciplinary context of what was not yet called sociology, Berlin had some proponents of gestalt psychology who, unlike the Böhlers in Vienna, were exclusively geared to their discipline. Berlin economics was controlled by staunch proponents of the Historical School who, due to their advanced age, were hardly practising anymore. There were no jurists with an interest in sociology, such as Kelsen, and ethnologist Richard Thurnwald was probably too often away on his expeditions – and, what is more, was only an associate professor – to have had a lasting influence on students. Berlin philosophy included a branch of neopositivism around Hans Reichenbach, but while this was obviously a potential force, it was just as obviously not exploited. The most innovative social science micro-environment was the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik (German Academy for Political Science), with many future emigrants among its members. Their orientation to the new empirical brand of social science, however, can be assumed to have occurred only after their enforced departure from Berlin (Söllner 1996). Significantly, the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums (Academy for Jewish Studies) where Leo Strauss worked between 1925 and 1932 was also an institution at the margins of the academic universe.¹⁴

The two other university sites known for their social science activities – Heidelberg and Frankfurt – are marked by an inverse asynchronicity of what was being done in the respective fields: while Heidelberg groaned under the oppressive weight of the great Max Weber, the two new Frankfurt institutions presumably did not exist long enough to develop a distinct profile. The Institut

für Sozialforschung (Institute of Social Research) had the additional handicap of preferring splendid isolation over the recruitment of students. In spite of Karl Mannheim, who contributed more to graduate output during his two-year stay in Frankfurt than Horkheimer (whose output in terms of doctorates was virtually zero throughout his first period of activity at the institute), the institute's overall 'productivity' on this measure was lower than that of Vienna, due to the very short time it was allowed to operate. That said, during their short Frankfurt intermezzo Mannheim and his assistant Norbert Elias also went a good way towards the integration of female students, albeit to a lesser degree than in the Vienna cases described above (Honegger 1990; Kettler and Meja 1993; Rubinstein 2000).

Displaced German social scientists' ties to their nation and culture seem to have been stronger than those of their Austrian counterparts, for they stuck to German as the colloquial language in their writings for much longer. One of the reasons for these marked differences is no doubt the way Jews experienced integration and assimilation in the Weimar Republic, as opposed to the Republic of Austria. The popular discourse of German-Jewish symbiosis can be taken to imply that German Jews wanted to be both German Jews and Jewish Germans. Their Jewish family background was marked by a strong identification with the German nation-state and, even more strongly, with German culture. That for many of them this proved to be their undoing after 1933 is a well-known fact. At any rate, there was no equivalent to this disposition among Vienna Jews.¹⁵ Since at the time there was no such thing as an Austrian national consciousness (in terms of a self identity oriented to a nation-state framework) Vienna Jews could of course identify with German culture and recite Goethe, Schiller and Heine as well as the rest of their German contemporaries, but did not see this as a basis for building pride in Austria. To the young social scientists, old imperial Austria was, if not exactly hated, alien in many ways; the new Austria was identified, by those on the Left no less than by those on the Right, with the hypertrophic metropolis of Vienna, for which the former planned a Red future while the latter mourned for her faded glory. The rest of Austria was mountains and lakes, good for hiking trips and summer holidays.

The 'Vienna hydrocephalus', as the by then oversized capital for an under-sized republic was characterized at the time (and is so sometimes even today), was not only the European city – after Warsaw and Budapest (cf. Karady 1999: 33) – with the highest *proportion* of Jewish inhabitants, but this Jewish population was presumably also 'educationally advantaged', as this would later be called, or at any rate eager to be educated. This was true for the offspring of Jewish migrants from Eastern Europe as well as for those of well-established Jewish citizens. What else was there for them to do, after all, but to invest what remained of their melting economic capital in educational capital? In this, the key factor was probably not so much the hope for a 'return of investment' but the sheer lack of alternatives. Prolonged studies were one response to this, an extreme case in point being Bruno Bettelheim who spent the years between 1923 and 1937 studying philosophy and art history as a sideline to

his activities as a businessman. Others, too, can be said to have dedicated their early adulthood to the pursuit, at a rather leisurely pace, of scientific study, either as a sideline to a more or less reputable occupation, or in place of it. Alfred Schütz was a banker and, as such, lucky enough to dispose of a source of income that allowed him to pursue his interests as a philosopher and sociologist in his leisure time, which after all resulted in his *Phenomenology of the Social World*. Alexander Gerschenkron was surely not idle in the ten years between his doctoral degree and his emigration, but even his grandson was unable to find out, in his minute reconstruction of his grandfather's biography, what he actually did in those years (Dawidoff 2002). As for Hans Zeisel, we at least know that after graduating he earned his living first as a law clerk and then as a lawyer, and in his spare time engaged in political work, covered sports for the *Arbeiter Zeitung* (Workers' Daily) and engaged in further education in the social sciences.

These observations are confirmed by an analysis of the occupations of 350 Austrian emigrants (professional politicians not included). One out of five of these future emigrants had not yet finished their education, only one in five had to give up a university position, and almost one in seven reported journalist or writer as a profession. There were of course some Austrians who not only entered service as a journalist, but actually made a name for themselves in this line. Still, in terms of numbers they were no more than a handful (Gustav Stolper and Karl Polanyi being the best known among them). Both job titles are of almost as undetermined a nature as that of university student. Among the future emigrants, the estimated proportion of those whose occupational position was similarly transitory, or easy to abandon, amounts to almost 50 per cent. In opting for emigration, they could thus hope for a more promising future with respect to occupational security, in exchange for a poorly endowed present (Pinter and Scherke 1995). In Germany, where emigrated journalists such as Gustav Stolper, Siegfried Kracauer or Hans Gerth actually had to abandon a standing that was not as easy to give up as an occupation that served as a kind of social alibi, this seems to have been different.

For the VRS sample, Fritz Ringer attempted to analyse the social backgrounds of German professors. To this end, he used a four-level stratification scheme: university graduates, professionals, teachers in upper secondary school and upper-level civil servants were classified as the 'educated upper middle class' – the mandarins, in his terminology; industrialists and managers made up the 'economic upper middle class'; employees and intermediary civil servants were the 'non-educated lower middle class'; and small businessmen, shopkeepers and the like were categorized as the 'economic lower middle class' (Ringer 1993). In order to be able to compare our data with Ringer's findings on the occupations of the fathers of those professors whose first appointment to a German university occurred between 1864 and 1938, his classification was largely adopted (with fathers with a military occupation added as an additional category). The results, insofar as they can be supposed to reflect anything of social reality, suggest that the background of the social scientists in our sample is more clearly

Figure 4.1 Comparison of the Social Background of German and Austrian Social Scientists (%)

Note: Ringer: Professors of the social sciences, appointed between 1864 and 1938; Germans, Austrians and Double Citizens: our calculation, born between 1860 and 1918. Classification according to Ringer 1993, in per cent of the different samples.

Sources: Ringer: data set David Vampola, Fritz Ringer and Philip Seidel, *Rekonstruktion der Göttingen Hochschullehrer Untersuchung von 1956 (VRS)*; Ringer 1993. Germans, Austrians and Double Citizens: author's calculations.

‘economic upper middle class’ and ‘non-educated lower middle class’ than that of Ringer’s mandarins (Figure 4.1). While the proportion of fathers with commercial and blue-collar occupations is somewhat lower, the proportion of fathers belonging to the educated middle class is somewhat higher. The first generations of professional sociologists clearly had a more distinct educated and middle-class background than the social science professors studied by Ringer.¹⁶

Two limitations need to be pointed out, however: The historical period covered by Ringer’s sample is longer, and the focus is on individuals who succeeded in obtaining a professorship, while the historical period covered by the samples in the present study is shorter (and the median of the year of birth is 1880 for Ringer and 1898 for the samples analysed in the present study), and the population here includes also those who failed to obtain a university affiliation.

GERMAN VERSUS AUSTRIAN CAREER PATHS

Much more so than by any of these background variables, the everyday life of scholars is characterized by their striving for recognition. This is manifest in the struggle to have and maintain a position, on the one hand, and to gain a reputation, on the other. These are two key factors that need to be investigated in greater detail. I will first deal with the Teutonic situation in general, including

the changes this system had undergone since the nineteenth-century reforms. I will then examine the careers of the sociologists with a focus on how their life planning was informed by social opportunity structures, and finally explore the reputation gained by the population in question.

I will start out with some reflections on the German academic career model or, rather, on the absence of such a model. Max Weber, in his well-known dictum, characterized the career prospects of German junior scientists as a 'wild hazard' (Weber 2002: 477–8). Contemporaneous as well as later studies corroborate Weber's judgement by providing statistical evidence and certain details of social history (cf. Eulenburg 1908; Ferber 1956; Schmeiser 1994, on whose writings I draw in the following). For Weber, the two most notable characteristics of the German model were the absence of both a specific course of studies and a universalistic framework for selection procedures, which made life difficult for those who, simply feeling an inner urge to do so, chose science as a profession. Selection procedures of a less imponderable nature would have allowed candidates to roughly calculate the risk they were taking; that there were no such procedures turned the choice of science as a 'profession' into a game of chance. This indeed was a structural flaw and, as such, is of greater importance than the fact that access to the academic teaching profession could be denied on the basis of particularistic considerations (irritating as that was not only to Weber).

Beginning in the early nineteenth century, the stages that led to professorship were clearly defined at German and (with some minor variations) Austrian universities. After 1820, the simple fact of having graduated no longer opened up the way to an academic career. A further dissertation had to be submitted and another examination had to be passed before one was 'habilitated' – literally, 'to have been made able' – for academic teaching. Once this '*Habilitation*' had been institutionalized, the doctoral degree alone was a sufficient qualification only for professions outside the university. For a long time, however, risk remained predictable in terms of the time it took candidates to complete the *Habilitation* process, only a couple of years to be dedicated to the writing of the second dissertation. The real uncertainty was not the time they would have to invest – and finance – but whether there would be a department willing to grant them access.

Until the second half of the twentieth century, there was no substantial increase in the time between graduation and *Habilitation*. In the 1850s and 1860s, the average time it took a professors-to-be at a German university to cross the hurdle of *Habilitation* was 2.8 years. This average rose to 4.6 years in the two decades around the turn of the nineteenth century, and to seven years between 1910 and 1930. After 1945, the average time for candidates to reach the stage even of an assistant professor had become at least eleven years.¹⁷ While prior to 1910 the average assistant professor had to shoulder this burden in his mere twenties (and even in the 1920s as a young man in his very early thirties), after the Second World War this status transition increasingly tended to coincide with another transition – that which would much later be called the 'midlife crisis'.¹⁸

In the nineteenth century, it took candidates seven to eight years, on average, to be made professors; between 1900 and the end of the First World War, this average rose to about ten years, and in the 1920s, there was another two-year rise (with differences between disciplines increasing over the decades). During the period analysed here, chances for obtaining a professorship deteriorated dramatically. While around 1900 the ratio of associate professors and lecturers to professors was 1.3:1, it kept increasing during the subsequent decades (1.5:1 in 1910; 1.7:1 in 1931). Ratios varied considerably between disciplines: they were highest in medical departments, where even in 1890 the ratio of candidates to professors was 2:1, and in the experimental sciences, with a ratio of 1.8:1, while ratios in the humanities remained relatively balanced during the whole period under examination, reaching 1.3:1 in as late as 1931. Conditions for professors-to-be were best in law departments where, during the whole period, there were fewer associate professors and lecturers (between 0.4 and 0.6) than full professors.

In the group of disciplines we are concerned with here, which have been classified as the social sciences by Ferber (1956) and, following him, Ringer (1993),¹⁹ the ratios of associate professors and lecturers to full professors are much higher than for all disciplines: in 1900, the ratio was 6:1; by 1910, 2.75:1. While in most disciplines the situation eased up around 1920, the ratio in the social sciences decreased to a mere 1.8:1, only to rise again to 2.3:1 by 1931.

While jurists and graduates of the humanities could bridge the waiting time for a chair in a more or less convenient way by practising as lawyers, practitioners or teachers in upper secondary schools, respectively, social scientists were much worse off. A habilitated lawyer or doctor could also content himself with remaining a lawyer or a doctor in case his ambitions for an academic career were foiled (and traditionally historians have had the alternative role of archivist), but for social scientists whose career ambitions turned out to be unrealizable, no comparable professional alternatives presented themselves. If *Habilitation* was unattainable, the loss of status was accompanied by a very real loss of social standing. The fact that so many chose to pursue this thorny path in spite of all this is probably due to the appeal of the intellectual field in which sociology emerged as a discipline. The promise of sociology's founding fathers that theirs was a method offering undreamed of insights into social life obviously found listeners who willingly opened their ears to this siren song, most likely because of some prior experience that prompted them to search for answers to existential questions. This sociology-in-the-making promised no income or jobs, but, if not redemption – for this, the future sociologists will have been too agnostic – at least the key to an understanding of novel facts.

We will now turn to the careers of German-speaking sociologists, complementing their collective biographical portrait with a further facet.

The age at which the members of all the samples in this analysis took their doctoral degree²⁰ remained more or less unchanged for more than six decades. The mean age rose from 25.2 years (for those born before 1870) to 27.5 years (for those born between 1881 and 1890), then dropped again even below its initial

value: the average age for those born in the first decade of the twentieth century to receive their doctoral degree was 24.7 years, with a substantial rise (to 28.3 years) only for the youngest cohort. The time between doctoral degree and *Habilitation* was 7.6 years for the oldest cohort (the Germans Georg Simmel, Werner Sombart, Ferdinand Tönnies, Alfred Vierkandt, Alfred and Max Weber, and the Austrians Eugen Ehrlich, Sigmund Freud, Wilhelm Jerusalem and Friedrich Wieser), and in the next cohorts, the preparation time needed to become an unsalaried lecturer was longer by no more than half a year; only for the youngest cohort was this stage of academic life uncommonly long, at 12.3 years. Germans and Austrians show some commonalities, but also considerable differences. In both countries, the oldest and the youngest cohorts differ from the relatively clear trend observed for the four middle cohorts: Germans were consistently faster at getting their doctoral degree while Austrians were faster (not only than their German colleagues but also members of the older cohorts) in crossing the hurdle of *Habilitation*. Only the time to reach top-level positions grew longer and longer in both countries (Figure 4.2).

Since even a general comparison of the two German-language countries reveals a number of substantial differences, two further dimensions should be considered that are likely to have had an impact on careers, the relevance of which in the present context is undeniable: a comparison between the 'home-guard' and (future) emigrants, and a comparison between those we know to be Jewish and the others (who no doubt include further Jews, and certainly further victims of the Nuremberg Laws). The following analysis covers only the four cohorts of those born between 1871 and 1910 and does not include the oldest and the youngest cohorts (Figure 4.3). The age for taking the doctoral degree primarily reflects the difference between Germans and Austrians; on closer examination, however, the most significant difference is that between German Jews and German non-Jews, while the fact of later emigration does not yet weigh in at the time of graduation.

One would expect discrimination against Jews to show primarily at the second career level, since the status transition of *Habilitation* seems more open to discrimination than the doctoral degree. Actually, however, future emigrants were significantly faster to cross this hurdle than those who would stay, while Jews in both countries had to wait somewhat longer for *Habilitation* than the non-Jewish candidates who would share their fate. Ironically, this finding echoes the feelings at the time of all those who were not favourably inclined towards Jews (not to mention the ruthless anti-Semites who were unlikely to let their attitude be determined by experience anyway). For instance, when the young Fritz Machlup felt ready for the *Habilitation* process at Vienna, he was told by professor of economics Ferdinand Degenfeld-Schonburg, who did the honours with him, that he could not support his request because, given that everyone knew Jews to be precocious, it would be unjust to the non-Jews.²¹ A differentiated examination of the career pace of the three groups suggests two conclusions: even before 1933 and 1938, respectively, future emigrants were faster in their careers than the future home-guard, and even

Figure 4.2 Mean Age at Promotion, *Habilitation* and Full Professor, by Birth Cohort and Country

those individuals who had to wait longer for an appointment as assistant professor because of their ascribed Jewishness were faster to overcome the first hurdles of the academic career than non-emigrants. As a result, future emigrants may have been perceived as more successful even before they emigrated, and it does not seem at all far-fetched to suppose that this perceived superiority stirred up the envy of those who were less successful, an envy to which the Nazi regime gave leeway by opening up new opportunities for discriminating action. For many of the future emigrants, the prospect of purposeful eviction (denunciations of academic competitors were endemic after 1933) combined with the fact that there was no need for them to fear competition when it came to intellectual potential, may have made it easier for them, from a subjective perspective, to leave the Teutonic science culture.

The mean age for being made a full professor is forty-six for all sociologists in all the data sets included in the present analysis. In other words, it took them almost two decades and, thus, significantly longer than German professors in general, to rise from the bottom entry hurdle, the doctoral degree, to the top rung of the academic career ladder. In the oldest cohort, nine out of ten of those who were habilitated were appointed to a chair at some point in their life while the remaining one-tenth had to be content with the status of an associate professor. In the next cohort (those born between 1871 and 1880), the success rate fell to 78 per cent, with all but two of the remaining individuals

Figure 4.2 *Continued*

Source: Author's calculations.

reaching at the second highest level. In the third cohort, the proportion of those who obtaining a full professorship was further reduced to 71 per cent, while one-fifth had to be content with the rank of assistant professor and seven remained stuck on the level of unsalaried lecturer. For two of the latter, we know that it was politics that ruined their careers: polyhistorian Otto Neurath, habilitated for economics in Heidelberg, not only lost his position as an lecturer there because of his participation in the short-lived Munich Soviet Republic (Münchener Räterepublik) but was henceforward perceived as a communist by the bourgeois public, a label which, as is often the case, was a misnomer but stuck anyway.²² Oscar Ewald ruined his prospects at Vienna by more peaceful means: a pronounced pacifist, he did not fit in any academic teaching position. Among the rest of those 'eternal' unsalaried lecturers, economist Louise Sommer seems worth mentioning since in her case it was most likely gender discrimination that barred her from further promotion.

In the cohort born in the decade before 1900, already one out of three were failing to obtain a place in the academic sun: four in five succeeded in obtaining a chair while one out of seven were stuck as unsalaried lecturers or left the German university system. Those who failed to go farther than lectureship included the first scholars who became refugees from Nazi dictatorship: Rudolf Heberle, Felix Kaufmann, Josef L. Kunz and Jakob Marschak.

Figure 4.3 Mean Age at Promotion and *Habilitation*, by Country, Status as Emigrants and Ethno-religious Affiliation, Birth Cohorts 1871-1910

Note: In parentheses absolute numbers of those holding Promotion/*Habilitation* for each group; 16 non-émigré Jews and 9 deceased before 1933 and 1938 respectively are excluded.

Source: Author's calculations.

For those born in the first decade of the twentieth century, reaching the professorial level was somewhat easier: due to a decline in the number of positions of associate professor, three out of four of them succeeded in being appointed to a chair. This cohort, however, includes the largest number of lecturers who got stuck at this level. A full third of them opted for emigration, where they succeeded in establishing themselves in the academic domain, provided they did not die prematurely. The war generation that came next again differs considerably from the more general picture: the cohort was smaller in number than that of the founding generation, which improved the chances for each of its members to spend old age as an emeritus, just as their fortunate elders had done. In this cohort, most of those who reached professorship came to be junior scientists under Nazi rule, such as Werner Conze and Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann, or were student soldiers, such as Friedrich Tenbruck and Ernst Topitsch.

STRUCTURES OF OPPORTUNITY FOR NEW OCCUPATIONS

In a formal perspective, the development of the sociological personnel in Germany and Austria seems to be the very model of cyclic surplus production. The cohorts entering the scene at the peak of this cycle realize the lack of opportunities and respond by engaging in intensified competition or by exiting from the field. Both attitudes act as a deterrent for the next cohorts, thus reducing the number of candidates. This phenomenon can also be

described in terms of a collective inertia of ambition building. What does this mean? If science is seen as a field for exercising a profession, it is immediately evident that an interest in any such profession will, as a rule, emerge in specific phases of life; someone who is already well established in a profession is rather unlikely to seriously consider engaging in a different career, and the more rigid the rules that govern access to the profession, the less he or she will be inclined to change. Professional reorientation among academics in German-language countries is a historically rather recent phenomenon.

New professions rarely emerge on the initiative of individual pioneers, but rather require a coalescing group of people pushing for the recognition and practice of the new profession. If, in addition, the exercise of the profession to be created hinges on the approval of senior personnel or on the allocation of funds or positions through channels that are more or less impervious to outside influence, the risk is even greater, and the number of co-combatants smaller. At any rate, given that the chances for success for the new (proto-) professional group depend to a considerable degree on their respectability in terms of numbers, the pioneers will be well advised to assemble a group of people around – and, with respect to age, ‘below’ – them who share their occupational goals. But recruiting this group takes time, and with the group growing larger, its youngest members almost inevitably see their chances for advancement compromised. On the other hand, it also takes time, and an accumulation of experience, for the group to realize that the new professional option has meanwhile become blocked, and for this insight to spread.

The institution of the unsalaried lecturer can serve to illustrate this inertia of ambition building. Between 1873 and 1931, the number of unsalaried lecturers at German universities tripled while the number of professors doubled, a situation that since the days of Thomas Malthus (1766–1834) gives rise to uneasiness. Growing numbers of professorships are a necessary stimulus for ambition building among the next cohorts. Stagnating numbers at the top level tend to reduce the attractiveness of the field in any profession, while growth, as a rule, results in growing numbers of candidates. If, in addition, the cycle of replacement spans many years (in the period under investigation, a professor used to stay in place for about a quarter of a century), the youngest cohorts will necessarily see their ambitions frustrated.

While this is pure speculation, it nevertheless seems defensible in the present context if a tentative link is established between the widespread anti-Semitic and Nazi-friendly attitudes among German and Austrian junior academics in their frustrated hopes for advancement in the interwar period. In this perspective, all those eloquent laments over the difficult situation in the ‘Systemzeit’ (the Weimar Republic) suggest an unequivocal undercurrent of defamation aimed at the holders of positions that had turned out to be out of reach under the rule of law. A forced reduction of the pool of the holders of and candidates for these positions, in contrast, could open up the structurally barred horizons of advancement.²³ Those who obtained a university position during the Nazi period could hope to keep it for a quarter of a century, so is it just a historical

accident that they were themselves, at the end of their careers, confronted with yet another generation of rebels who attempted, now under constitutional rule, to get rid of a thousand years of stuffiness beneath academic gowns? It should be noted in passing that with some of these old men – senior by status and, by now, also by age – the response to the new challengers was rather emphatic.²⁴

In any world it is mainly the young who look for something new and feel attracted to it. If a fairly satisfactory and secure professional position can only be obtained after a prolonged time lag, support from like-minded individuals is needed for candidates to seriously consider engaging in this arduous and uncertain path at all. However, the longer the preparation period, the smaller the number of initially shared ideas that will survive. In this respect, the Nazi seizure of power in German and Austrian universities was arguably more of a revolutionary event than the sinking in of sociological thought in the minds of the younger generation of the German educated middle-class.

For a new field of intellectual activity – as sociology around 1900 undoubtedly was – to emerge and translate into the professional ambitions of the younger generations, a number of intermediate stages have to be passed. If what is at stake really is a new science, the influence of academic teachers, intellectual discourse and the social networks, without whose action the appeal of these new options would never have crystallized in the first place, never act just on individuals, but necessarily on cohorts of such individuals. However, if the size of a group can be seen as a precondition for their discourse to gain cognitive density, the appeal of novelty tends to result in future bottlenecks that will constrain the opportunities for professional activities in the very field for which recognition was the object of the struggle.

There are two ways out of this quandary: increasing the number of professional positions, or invading and redefining other fields. The expansion of sociological university positions in the late 1960s and early 1970s in Germany, as elsewhere, can be taken as an example of successful establishment by expansion; the invasion by ethnogenacists and folklorists of the positions vacated by evicted sociologists after 1933 is an example of the second alternative. If neither of these options – expansion or invasion – is available, a large number of the initial protagonists is left stranded, as it were, and has to consider professional reorientation. A case in point is the group of founding members of the Wiener Soziologische Gesellschaft (Vienna Sociological Society) who failed to obtain university positions as sociologists in Austria either before 1914 or after 1918. Some turned to completely different activities: Karl Renner, Julius Ofner and Michael Hainisch remained, or became, politicians; Rudolf Eisler, Rudolf Goldscheid and Rose Mayreder remained, or became, writers; still others returned to their own traditional disciplines (e.g. jurists Josef Redlich and Hans Kelsen, historian Ludo Moritz Hartmann). As a side-effect, Austrian universities in the First Republic completely lacked the continuity in academic personnel that is usually a result of mentor-disciple relations. In the 1920s, Vienna students who were in any way interested in sociology had to look for mentors at places other than the ruins of the Wiener Soziologische Gesellschaft.

In Hans Zeisel's 'History of Sociography', published as an appendix to *Marienthal: The Sociography of an Unemployed Community* (Lazarsfeld-Jahoda and Zeisel 1933) and obviously written with the aim of establishing an intellectual genealogy for his own work, the few Austrian contributions that might have been cited—for instance Ehrlich's ethnographical '*Rechtstatsachenforschung*' (research into legal facts) – are simply ignored, probably because Zeisel was not even aware of them. After 1945, the sociological achievements of the inter-war period met with a similar and even more drastic fate. They were unknown entities, and came to be known only through the works of others who exploited them. This is true for the Viennese sociology of knowledge as represented by Wilhelm Jerusalem and his (prematurely deceased) follower Ernst Grünwald, as well as for the methodological writings of Felix Kaufmann and, of course, for Alfred Schütz and *Marienthal*. They all arrived late, by way of detours and even then usually damaged in transit, at the places where they ultimately surfaced (cf. Lepenies 2006: 76–92).

The Teutonic university, due to the long transitional phase it imposed on its candidates for professorship, was particularly impervious to innovation, since new disciplines could emerge only when they could boast rapid success or were supported by protagonists with a lot of staying power and attractive alternatives to fall back on. For sociology, none of these favourable conditions can be said to have existed. Moreover, the economic basis that had throughout the nineteenth century provided the material underpinnings for the emergence of new disciplines or new candidates for high-level positions in existing disciplines, was in a shambles in the first third of the twentieth century. As private wealth evaporated as a result of the large-scale destruction of the First World War and postwar inflation, the '*Rentnerintellektuelle*' (private-income intellectual; Weber 1923: 173) disappeared from the scene.

This situation, already difficult enough, was further complicated when appointments ceased to be based on universalistic criteria, making it hard, and finally impossible, for Jews and other political undesirables to become professors. The menace of ostracism on the grounds of some ascribed characteristics seems to have kept a certain number of potential candidates from envisaging *Habilitation* at all. They dropped out even before coming up against the prejudices of the mandarins. In this respect, situations in Germany and Austria clearly differ. While German Jews succeeded in taking the hurdle of *Habilitation* until 1933, conditions for Austrian Jews were less favourable. For a small number of them, the short spring following the foundation of the Republic – glorified as the 'Austrian Revolution' – provided opportunities for advancement (Max Adler was habilitated during this period, Wilhelm Jerusalem was appointed professor shortly before he died), but the list of those who were somewhat younger but no less eligible for *Habilitation* is much longer: Alfred Schütz, Walther Eckstein, Edgar Zilsel and Karl Polanyi, all born before 1900, might well have tried to qualify but for their stigmatization as '*Ungerade*' (odd ones).²⁵

This overview of the development of academic career prospects at German and Austrian universities highlights facts that the actors themselves were no doubt

roughly aware of at the time. Barred career horizons, particularistic selection criteria and the necessity of long-term reliance on other sources of income are conditions that are unlikely to have gone unnoticed, particularly by social scientists. But of course neither the contemporaries nor those judging from historical distance could tell to what degree these conditions acted as an instrument of selectivity by keeping potential candidates from considering an academic career at all. In this respect, the forced-migration policies pursued by the Nazi dictatorship allow for a number of significant insights, since the pressure to seek refuge abroad also opened up new opportunities for an academic career.

The deficiencies of the Teutonic academic career model, which made themselves felt in all disciplines, were multiplied in those cases where ascribed characteristics became effective reason for exclusion. In view of the onset of social science emigration in 1933 and 1938, respectively, it can be argued that the disadvantage of having not been successful in one's country of origin turned out to be an advantage because, after emigration, the level of aspiration was lower and social decline was thus subjectively less strongly felt, if felt at all. The Teutonic lone wolves lived by the dictate that their own activities and their entire personality²⁶ had to be attuned to the expectations of higher-status individuals who needed to be courted as future supervisors of their doctoral degree and, later, their *Habilitation*. In contrast, the task faced by academic neo-immigrants was to come to terms with the American world of 'teamwork' among individualists and to tend to their market value (i.e. to produce publications regularly and frequently) while cooperating, at least temporarily, with other projects.

OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURES AND INDIVIDUAL LIFE PLANNING

What remains is the question of whether, and how, the new opportunity structures came to be reflected in individual life projects, how the more general expectations concerning professional opportunities translated into short-term life-planning routines, and which aspiration levels emerged with respect to the endowment, material and other factors of professional positions. Here, however, we come up against a definite lack of sources, which by the way is an astonishing fact in itself. Hardly any other status transition that has been institutionalized some place or another has been given so little attention. Very few people have written about the process of completing their inaugural dissertation in memoirs, and virtually none of those who failed to complete it have said a word.²⁷ We seem to be better informed about the Ashanti way of coping with status transitions than about those of our own ancestors and the members of our own tribe (for the Anglo-American science culture, see Becher 1989). Periods of latency within academic careers are themselves a case of socially expected duration, a concept first proposed by Robert K. Merton (Merton 1949), albeit without reference to scholars. Merton distinguishes between 'expected duration' and 'actual duration' since the specific attitudes of the members of a social group are informed by, among other things, their expectations in terms of duration. In a later elaboration of the concept of socially expected durations (SEDs), Merton

extends the scope of this concept of socially binding or culturally informed expectations beyond 'temporal durations' (Merton 1984). The expectations inherent in various types of social structures thus include phenomena such as the 'lame duck' pattern in American politics, limited or unlimited prison terms, durations of illness, limited durations of public appointments, academic or other tenure positions, teacher-student relationships in the sciences, status sequences and guidelines for succession in organizational management, and other status positions with an inherent temporal structuring.

Merton argues that the very omnipresence of SEDs may have contributed to sociologists' long neglect of them, a criticism which for him is also self-criticism. In the present context, reference to the long neglect of SEDs is important insofar as it can be assumed that the theoretical ignorance goes along with a practical ignorance in everyday life. In other words: something that seems unworthy of our attention as sociologists and, therefore, will not be analysed any time soon, is likely to be equally unworthy of our attention as actors in everyday life. The question, then, is how this is reflected in the attitudes of displaced scholars. In their attempt to gain a foothold in the foreign culture they arguably paid little attention to everyday routines they took for granted. In extreme cases, their European habituation to biographical waiting periods, perceived as something quite natural, may have led them to more or less ignore, in their work plans, the American norm of rapid presentation of samples of one's work. Of course, the repertoire of attitudes that was theirs from European times was radically challenged by the very circumstances that determined their lives. The necessity of unearthing a means of subsistence did not allow for choosiness. But we may well assume that focusing on the necessity of securing some kind of job or support prevented them from modifying habits that were at the very core of their socialization.

Some clues to an answer to this question are provided by sources such as letters dealing with research projects and work plans and, perhaps, the time needed to execute them; exposés submitted to aid committees in view of obtaining support; and the records of foundation boards or refugee committees dealing with the evaluation of candidates. The records of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars (EC) are a rich case in point.

In May 1938, forty-five-year-old outside lecturer for modern history Friedrich Engel-Jánosi, who was still in Vienna at the time, wrote to a colleague in the United States:

it is impossible for me to continue my scientific work (in Vienna). Accordingly to this I am writing to you to ask if there would be any possibility of my obtaining a position in European history at your university or if this would be impossible ... If an ordinary professorship would be out of question I would be very much interested in obtaining a research assistantship, research fellowship, or any other position that would enable me to continue my scientific work.²⁸

Engel-Jánosi soon abandoned the unrealistic hope for a professorship, but thanks to a donation by an Austrian count and the active recommendation of

his brother-in-law who lived in New York, Engel-Jánosi was made a research associate at Johns Hopkins University. He arrived in New York in April 1940 from England, where he had been living since the year before. He ignored the well-intentioned advice to shorten his name, but very soon managed to find a platform for one of his research subjects (Lord Acton) in some American and British journals. While he was still in his 'trail year' (as it was dubbed by one of the more peripheral figures involved, John Whyte, in 1938), which was made possible by a private donation, he found a job at another East Coast university. Here, subsidizing was no longer necessary: a recommendation letter states that he was 'a good Catholic (Jewish is only racial) and a fine representative of the best Austrian type' (Ernst Barker, 27 March 1940). Thus, the Catholic University in Washington, DC became Engel-Jánosi's address of many years. What contributed to his relatively uncomplicated establishment, besides his large network of personal contacts and his fitting into a (admittedly narrow) segment of the American academic world, was no doubt the fact that he rapidly engaged in English-language publication activities. At any rate, Kent Roberts Greenfield of the Johns Hopkins University history department found his 'record of activities' remarkable and wrote that 'his articles in English have been published as rapidly as possible, and once they have appeared should improve his chances of establishing himself in this country' (18 February 1941).

Edgar Zilsel's writing activities in his Vienna period, where he was teaching adult education classes, mainly consisted of the approximately forty reviews he wrote for the journal *Die Naturwissenschaften* (The Natural Sciences); in the two decades between his doctoral thesis and his emigration he published only a short polemical pamphlet on the religion of genius in 1918 (Zilsel 1990) and, in 1926, one large monograph on the emergence of the social character of the modern scientist (Zilsel 1926). A second volume was announced, but failed to materialize in the twelve years to come. After his escape to New York, Zilsel clearly kept working on the project but at the same time, contrary to his Vienna attitude, began to publish partial results of his studies, no doubt also because there was no other way for him to have his EC aid renewed. His suicide in 1944 may well have been prompted in part by his failure to integrate these pieces into a single comprehensive monograph.

Paul Neurath was thirty when he arrived in New York in the early summer of 1941. After Austria's *Anschluss* in 1938, he had spent several months as a prisoner in the concentration camps of Dachau and Buchenwald. After regaining his freedom, he emigrated to Sweden where he worked as a metalworker. With a good bit of luck, he obtained a visa to the United States just in time to be on one of the last ships to cross the Atlantic. In Vienna, Neurath had completed seven years of law studies by taking his doctoral degree a few weeks before the Nazi invasion. In New York, he seized the opportunity to finally study sociology. In spite of his lack of experience in the field, his poor knowledge of English and having to work to support himself, he managed to complete his doctoral degree at Columbia University after two years of graduate studies. (Living on a

grant and jobs with Lazarsfeld's Bureau of Applied Social Research, Neurath was able to forego support from the EC or similar committees in aid of refugees.) Immediately after graduating, he started teaching statistics, first at the City College and later at Queens College. During his first two years in New York, Neurath was well aware that he had not much time to establish himself professionally in the way he wanted. He made optimal use of the opportunities he was offered. When the war ended, he was in a secure position and never for a moment considered returning to Europe (Neurath 2004).

These three cases show that refugees had to cope with very different adaptation problems. One of these problems was the time it took them to produce publications, and some of the newcomers seem to have been well aware of this. Since they all were novices in the United States academic field, those who were successful can be assumed to have learned about it from scratch, including those aspects which it took insiders such as Merton many years to realize in spite of their interest in the sociology of science.

This adaptation process is manifest also on a higher level of aggregation. A comparison of the career pace of those who pursued their careers exclusively in the Teutonic world with those who did so entirely or temporarily in the Anglo-Saxon world reveals significant differences not only between groups but also between the science cultures on either side of the Atlantic. For this comparison, the analysis was limited to those birth cohorts whose members were still in a position to complete further steps in their career in the 1930s and in the years that followed (those born between 1891 and 1920). Five groups can be distinguished: one group of 'home-guards' and four groups of emigrants. Among the emigrants, there were those whose stay in the United States was exile in the strictest sense (i.e. temporary), and those who stayed in the non-German-language area for good. Among those who returned to their home country, two subgroups can be distinguished: those who reached certain career levels in the Teutonic system before escaping from (or after returning to) their home country, and those who reached all of these levels during emigration. Similarly, the permanent emigrants can be subdivided into those who had already reached certain levels of their academic career before emigration and those who went through all of these stages as emigrants.

It has to be noted, however, that this analysis fails to take account of two important aspects. For the younger emigrants, it made sense to complete a second or sometimes even a third course of studies when arriving in the United States; access to scholarships was easier for young immigrants than access to university positions, and since many of the younger emigrants came to the United States prior to obtaining a European doctorate, continuing their studies was an obvious option. Since individuals who never held a university position are not included in the present analysis, the comparison is only between those who managed to obtain a university position at one of the three career levels in either the European or the United States system. A comparison of the mean age at which the members of all the five groups reached each of these three career levels is rather surprising (Figure 4.4).

Figure 4.4 Mean Age at Three Career Steps of those Born between 1891 and 1920

Note: Home-guard: sociologists who never left the German-speaking environment. Returned émigrés: sociologists who moved upwards either before or after their emigration to Germany or Austria. Returned émigrés, in emigration: sociologists who moved upwards during emigration but returned afterwards to a German-speaking environment. Émigrés, before emigration: sociologists who moved upwards in Germany or Austria before their emigration. Émigrés, in emigration: sociologists who moved upwards only in non-German speaking countries.

1st step: *Habilitation* or assistant professor. 2nd step: ao. (*außerordentlicher*)/extraordinarius) Professor or Associate Professor. 3rd step: o. (*ordentlicher*/ordinarius) Professor or Full Professor.

In parentheses number of scholars in the three career steps.

Source: Author's calculations.

Sociologists who would eventually emigrate, but were also successful in the Teutonic system before (or after) doing so, reached all three career levels before emigration at a mean age that was significantly lower than that of sociologists who stayed in, or returned to, their home countries. The comparison of the career paths of future emigrants with those of the home-guard is particularly revealing in this respect because it can be argued that both groups competed against each other under conditions that were comparable on the individual level. In the Teutonic system, the group of future emigrants faced a greater risk of being discriminated against. Nevertheless, they were faster in accessing

top-level university positions than those who blended in more easily with the Teutonic world of science.

The eviction of professors by the Nazis opened up career horizons for those who were not targeted, which may have prompted some of them to take advantage of the new political setup to start scheming against those they wished to have dismissed. But neither the extensive clearance of the market that resulted from Nazi eviction policies nor the purposeful rancour that was brought to bear in individual cases was able to lever out the inertia of the Teutonic science system. With respect to Teutonic SEDs, the career model remained effective even for those who aspired to fill the vacant positions. The mean age for the members of this generation unit to reach the professorial level was 47.2, while all three groups of displaced scholars who managed to reach top-level academic positions in emigration did so at a lower age. The significant delays faced by those who chose to return after emigration, on the other hand, are arguably due to the fact that, for them, advancement to the third level was possible only after their return. In other words, after 1945, the Teutonic system primarily attracted those who, given their age, were already at their zenith. In contrast, the comparison of the two groups who made a career for themselves exclusively as home-guards or permanent emigrants clearly shows that those who were forced to emigrate were by the same token propelled into a kind of career elevator that took them up to the top floor of the academic world faster than their peers who stayed at home.

However, a perspective that does not take into account the question of who could obtain which position at which age may provide a more adequate explanation for this disconcerting finding: in both the Anglo-Saxon and the Teutonic science systems, there was a preferred age for candidates to access each of the three career levels – and at each of these stages, the Teutonic window of opportunity was geared to an older age group than the Saxon one, which clearly preferred its candidates to be younger.

For female emigrants, American conditions were even more favourable since more than twice as many, as compared to female non-emigrants, reached the top level. The small number of cases (nine female emigrants and four female non-emigrants who reached the top level as full professors) does not allow for any far-reaching interpretations, but there is a definite finding concerning age: among those who reached the top level and on whom data are available, the mean age to be appointed full professor was fifty-one for female emigrants and fifty-seven for females who remained in their home countries; and female home-guards had to wait more than seven years longer, on average, than male home-guards to reach that level, and thus considerably longer than female emigrants whose waiting time was only five years more, on the average, than that of their male co-emigrants.

University chairs are positional assets: a position held by one individual cannot at the same time be held by any of his or her competitors. Since it can be reasonably assumed that in spite of all adversities, war-related and otherwise, no position at German or Austrian universities would have remained

vacant for long, the reality is that in the 1940s and 1950s, 150 chairs were available for and occupied by (also-) sociologists in the German-language area. Assuming, as a thought experiment, that no eviction of Jews and others had taken place, it is evident that the 126 sociologists who rose to be 'full professors' during emigration would have had to either compete with those others for the rare vacancies in Germany and Austria or, for some of them, to fall back on the sour-grapes strategy of renouncement.

GAINING, AND MEASURING, REPUTATION

In addition to his or her professional trajectory, a scholar's curriculum vitae usually includes information on academic productivity which, in the case of social scientists, mainly means publications. Teaching activities, consulting, participation in scientific organizations and the like played a minor role in the past and are therefore not taken into account in the present analysis. Besides the manifest function of publicizing one's own contributions to the advancement of knowledge – or, on a more modest scale, demonstrating one's own scientific productivity – publications also serve to build prestige. The tacit rules of good academic conduct stipulate that an author's esteem for the work of others is expressed by references to it in their own writing. An author who is not referred to in the work of others is either subject to dishonest exploitation or – arguably the more frequent case – has failed to contribute anything to the body of knowledge that others have deemed worth considering. The bad feelings of those whose achievements are ignored provide the breeding-ground for the suspicions that accompany the whole business of citing and being cited.

While the question of how to measure an author's productivity is basically uncontroversial, there is much less consensus on how to solve the issue of reputation. Things are further complicated when the aim is to come to a comparative rating of previous generations of sociologists. If the work and the influence of a single scholar are considered case by case, identifying their position in the status structure is easy, and one is free to turn to the more or less passionate task of declaring them under- or overrated, corresponding arguments supplied. If, however, the object of one's scrutiny is comparison within a group larger than the size of a local school, one first needs to identify the status and prestige order that prevails within this population before tackling the task of establishing comparative ratings for its individual members. Below the level of those who are the undisputed eminences of a discipline, establishing a distribution of prestige is far from easy. The prestige hierarchy among those of 'third-rate' and 'last-rate' renown is arguably much more controversial than the academic squabble about whom to count among its most eminent figures. The bulk of the population is as grey and monotonous among scholars as elsewhere.

In short, if the aim is to come to any statements concerning the scientific productivity of more than 800 sociologists, and to rank them in terms of who has gained more or less recognition for it, relying on relatively rough measures

is inevitable. One may well deplore the coarse-grained nature of the analysis, but for lack of better tools, so long as certain groups are not systematically underrated, we will have to make do with what is feasible.

To this end, the following questions have to be answered. Who belongs to the population to be studied? Which data should be used to establish the (primary and secondary) publications? And what is the best way to cope with the awkward problem of measuring the recognition gained by an individual author? In the present case, the group to be studied is circumscribed by the five samples that are supposed to represent to a satisfactory degree, as has been argued above, the entire population of German-speaking sociologists in the mid-twentieth century.

If the unit chosen for measuring reputation is the academic journal, one is at once confronted with all the familiar objections raised against citation analyses: citation cartels, short-lived preferences, the Matthew effect of self-reinforcing feedback, language barriers and much more. And who would deny that these biases do exist? The only thing that can, in turn, be held against these views and misgivings is that citation analyses might well be a way of verifying the very presumptions concerning any such biases. If preconceived ideas could be disproved, this would be an interesting result in itself. A second point could be that in the present case, the authors concerned started to publish and to be cited many decades ago, so what is attempted here is a kind of historical citation analysis. In former decades, the practice of citing and being cited was no doubt less biased by the idea that one's individual 'impact factor' has an influence on one's career opportunities. Regardless, establishing the productivity shown, and recognition gained, by a large number of authors is only feasible – or meaningful – if the procedure used can be expected to ensure approximate equality of opportunity for all those being considered in the analysis.

Another source to draw on for measuring reputation is provided by the institutionalized forms of recognition that an author may hope to gain. But since there is no Nobel Prize for sociologists, and considering that symbolic honours that are similarly recognized, such as being elected a member of an academy or awarded an honorary doctorate by some prestigious university, do not exist in any internationally comparable form, one must make do with some provisional measure. For this kind of second-best strategy, recognized standard works for the social sciences can be used to see how prominent a place certain authors are accorded and whether others are at least worth naming. The most widespread reference work for those who have sought to inform themselves of the state of social science research in the last three decades has been the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (Sills 1968) and its supplemental volumes (Sills 1979; Sills and Merton 1991). The recently published *International Encyclopedia of the Social & and Behavioural Sciences* (Smelser and Baltes 2001) provides an update that will fulfil the same function for the decades to come.

Since both encyclopedias use very different criteria to determine whether an author is included, a comparison is not easy. Still, what can be said is that

sixty-one sociologists from our five samples were granted a biographical article in Sills (Sills 1968; Sills 1979) and that fifteen of these even crossed the much higher hurdle of being included in the new encyclopedia as well (Smelser and Baltes limited the number of biographical articles to one hundred and fifty, while Sills's volumes each comprise more than eight hundred articles).²⁹ The only additional author to be included as late as 2002 is Norbert Elias, whose star was not yet shining brightly enough in the 1960s and 1970s. Using the even broader criterion of whether an author is referred to at all in one or both multivolumed works, the correspondence is even stronger (Pearson's correlation coefficient, based on a comparison of the number of references in the index of names, is 0.792).³⁰

In addition to the two encyclopedias, two further reference works concerned with sociologists were used: the *Internationales Soziologenlexikon* (Bernsdorf and Knospe 1980–84), already variously referred above, and the *Who's Who in Science: A Biographical Dictionary of Notable Scientists from Antiquity to the Present* (Debus 1968), whose selection of about 30,000 important persons bears the mark of the place where it was published, Chicago. The correspondence between these two publications is almost mutually exclusive (-.291), which makes both works exceedingly well suited for simultaneous use.

Information from all the four sources used for measuring the *recognition* gained by individual sociologists is summarized in an index³¹ whose top ranks are not much of a surprise: the top ten are Weber, Freud, Lewin, Simmel, Mannheim, Schumpeter, Lazarsfeld, Tönnies, Michels and Popper. The bottom ranks are taken up by those 65 per cent of sociologists from all our samples whose names do not turn up in any of the four sources. The entry rate is relatively higher in the ISL (33 per cent of the authors in the samples are referred to while the proportion in Debus's *Who's Who* is only 8 per cent), while eight out of ten sociologists were not deemed worth considering in either encyclopedia.

Since there is no citation index that reaches back far enough in time, and since I needed to minimize the risk that my assessment of scientific productivity and recognition by peers was biased while maximizing comparability across findings, I used the electronic full text journal database JSTOR.³² For the period surveyed, the JSTOR archive includes more than 100 so-called 'core journals' of various disciplines³³ from their first year of publication onwards, with selection criteria described as follows: '(1) the number of institutional subscribers a journal has; (2) citation analysis; (3) recommendations from experts in the field; (4) the length of time that the journal has been published'.³⁴ I used this service to find out how many articles had been published in these journals by any of the authors in the five samples, and how often these authors had been cited by others. JSTOR search routines allow the user to search for authors' names in the archived journals while limiting the search to certain types of texts (articles, abstracts, reviews, other texts such as professional communications, letters, etc.). Moreover, users can conduct full text searches for strings of any kind and, thus, find the names of persons and the frequencies of their appearance. I used this automatic search routine to do a kind of

citation analysis that slightly differs from its narrower SCI (Science Citation Index) and SSCI (Social Sciences Citation Index) models.³⁵

The following three measurements were conducted with the JSTOR electronic archive:

- *Visibility*, i.e. how often the name in question appears in one of the fields used for searching articles, reviews, reports, etc. Since the JSTOR search routine does not allow for a differentiation to be made between reviewer and the reviewed, this measure only shows how visible someone was for the scientific community.
- *Productivity*, measured by the total number of scientific articles published in any of the 117 journals.
- *Recognition*, i.e. the perception of the name and, thus, the works of an author by all other authors. This comes rather close to measuring an author's reception. It should be noted that 'citation' may just mean a book title, or even just an author's name, without any bibliographical reference.

In Table 4.5, first names are spelled out for the top ranks and are abbreviated for the lower ranks. The results of this analysis cannot be reported in a few sentences. Still, some explanations and interpretations seem warranted. First, there is the risk that names are being confused. For example, Austrian mathematician and philosopher Karl Menger may not actually be mistaken for his father, economist Carl Menger, but since the Karl/Carl spelling invites confusion, he cannot be clearly distinguished from him either. The same may have happened with frequent names like Kohn, Adler or Kaufmann.³⁶ The first approximately forty names in this table represent only 5 per cent of those whose appearance in JSTOR was checked. Among those who were counted but do not belong to the first forty names in either of the three columns are such well-known names as Hannah Arendt, Max Horkheimer, Karl Mannheim, Herbert Marcuse, Ludwig von Mises and Franz Oppenheimer. Given the database, it would be less surprising if authors who never stayed in the United States failed to appear. But this is true only for the younger ones, such as Helmut Plessner, Norbert Elias and René König; it is not true for the older ones who were included in one of our samples. Among the forty names with the highest recognition rates, there are eight German social scientists, namely Michels, Scheler, Simmel, Sombart, Tönnies, Troeltsch, Alfred Weber and Max Weber. In 1933, at the beginning of the period we are concerned with here, only four of them were still alive. Non-emigrants who enjoyed at least a certain degree of visibility are Carl Schmitt (rank 41 on the prestige scale), Otto Hintze (47), Alfred Verdross (67), Otto Brunner (73), Marianne Weber (74), Othmar Spann (76), Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann (80) and Konrad Lorenz (80).³⁷

The two 'leaders' in terms of visibility obtained their positions because they were among the busiest reviewers: 165 out of 239 hits for jurist and international organizations expert Josef L. Kunz are reviews; for Leo Gross, the proportion is even higher, with 169 out of 198. Both, however, also published numerous articles, which earned them ranks three and eight, respectively, in

Table 4.5 Visibility, Productivity and Recognition of Austrian and German Social Scientists

Rank	Visibility	Productivity	Recognition
1	Kunz, Josef L. (239)	Tietze, Christopher (67)	Weber, Max (1938)
2	Gross, Leo (198)	Moreno, Jacob L. (64)	Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (959)
3	Coser, Lewis A. (193)	Kunz, Josef L. (61)	Freud, Sigmund (818)
4	Kohn, Hans (179)	Machlup, Fritz (48)	Bendix, Reinhard (479)
5	Machlup, Fritz (135)	Haberler, Gottfried (40)	Deutsch, Karl W. (469)
6	Bendix, Reinhard (123)	Tintner, Gerhard (30)	Hayek, Friedrich A. (413)
7	Hoselitz, Bert F. (102)	Hirschman, Albert (28)	Machlup, Fritz (389)
8	Carnap, Rudolf (97)	Gross, Leo (27)	Simmel, Georg (385)
9	Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (90)	Bergmann, Gustav (26)	Hirschman, Albert (374)
10	Tintner, Gerhard (90)	Blau, Peter M. (26)	Blau, Peter M. (369)
11	Haberler, Gottfried (88)	Kohn, Robert (25)	Haberler, Gottfried (316)
12	Moreno, Jacob L. (88)	Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (25)	Morgenstern, Oskar (313)
13	Blau, Peter M. (85)	Gumbel, Emil J. (24)	Cassirer, Ernst (302)
14	Fürer-Haimendorf, Christoph (85)	Vagts, Alfred (22)	Carnap, Rudolf (289)
15	Hayek, Friedrich A. (84)	Schumpeter, Joseph A. (21)	Schumpeter, Joseph A. (257)
16	Bergmann, Gustav (82)	Marschak, Jacob (19)	Tietze, Christopher (254)
17	Gerschenkron, Alexander (80)	Simmel, Georg (19)	Strauss, Leo (249)
18	Vagts, Alfred (78)	Deutsch, Karl W. (18)	Gerschenkron, Alexander (239)
19	Deutsch, Karl W. (74)	Gerschenkron, Alexander (18)	Lewin, Kurt (236)
20	Manheim, Ernest (73)	Back, Kurt W. (17)	Coser, Lewis A. (215)
21	Tietze, Christopher (70)	Menger, Karl (17)	Adorno, Theodor W. (214)
22	Wolff, Kurt H. (69)	Bendix, Reinhard (15)	Popper, Karl (207)
23	Hirschman, Albert (68)	Colm, Gerhard (15)	Moreno, Jacob L. (194)
24	Streeten, Paul P. (65)	Ichheiser, Gustav (14)	Kelsen, Hans (189)
25	Back, Kurt W. (64)	Kaufmann, Felix (13)	Michels, Robert (184)
26	Schumpeter, Joseph A. (64)	Kelsen, Hans (13)	Sombart, Werner (179)
27	Colm, Gerhard (63)	Stolper, Wolfgang (13)	Back, Kurt W. (164)
28	Morgenstern, Oskar (63)	Kohn, Hans (12)	Scheler, Max (161)
29	Heberle, Rudolf (60)	Rierner, Svend (12)	Gumbel, Emil J. (160)
30	Landauer, Carl (60)	Schütz, Alfred (12)	Wolff, Kurt H. (146)
31	Cahnmann, Werner J. (57)	Staehle, Hans (12)	Jahoda, Marie (134)
32	Cassirer, Ernst (55)	Carnap, Rudolf (11)	Troeltsch, Ernst (133)
33	Speier, Hans (55)	Hayek, Friedrich A. (11)	Drucker, Peter F. (127)
34	Sturmthal, Adolf F. (55)	Lauterbach, Albert (11)	Vagts, Alfred (112)
35	Simmel, Georg (53)	Morgenstern, Oskar (11)	Hoselitz, Bert F. (110)
36	Ehrmann, Henry W. (50)	Pribram, Karl E. (11)	Schütz, Alfred (107)
37	Kelsen, Hans (50)	Hoselitz, Bert F. (10)	Weber, Alfred (107)
38	Redlich, Fritz (50)	Speier, Hans (10)	Tönnies, Ferdinand (103)
39	Stolper, Wolfgang (50)		Freud, Anna (103)

Notes: Women in bold; hits in parentheses; full name given only at the first place mentioned.

Source: JSTOR. Author's calculations.

the dimension of productivity. Hans Kohn also was a busy reviewer. Because of its multiple dimensions, visibility is not really helpful with respect to issues of productivity and recognition, although its correlation with the first of these dimensions is very high (.749). Its correlation with recognition is, in contrast, comparatively modest (.432).

Apart from limitations due to JSTOR's emphasis on American journals, the rank order of productivity reflects two characteristics of the database: First, the 117 journals that were in the JSTOR archive at the time of the survey clearly do not provide the same coverage for all the different social science disciplines. As a result, authors who published in demography, statistics and economics journals are more likely to make it to the top ranks.³⁸ Second, JSTOR seems to have privileged those disciplines which in the period analysed had already adopted journal publications as their primary means of communication. This is obviously a reason for demographer Christopher Tietze's premier rank, as well as for the squad of economists.

The most remarkable finding in the recognition rankings is the large proportion of Austrians among the highest scoring authors. While nobody will object to Sigmund Freud coming behind Max Weber among the most recognized authors, the fact that he is also clearly outdone by Paul F. Lazarsfeld is something of a surprise, as is the long list of other Austrians that follows. Disregarding cases of doubtful or mixed nationality such as Rudolf Carnap, Karl Deutsch, Kelsen, Moreno and Schumpeter, the first forty ranks are occupied by a majority of Austrians, even if one excludes authors such as Kurt Back, Peter Blau, Bert F. Hoselitz and Christopher Tietze who had emigrated at a very early age. Lewis A. Coser, Reinhard Bendix, Albert O. Hirschman and Kurt Wolff might be similarly excluded on account of their youthful age. The result is a more balanced distribution of Austrians and Germans, all of whom – with the exception of Theodor W. Adorno and Leo Strauss, who were also relatively young – had by the Nazi period reached an age where there was little left for them to do to further enhance their reputations during emigration. Thus, both Central European science cultures exported approximately the same number of younger scholars, but only Austria also contributed scholars who were slightly older when they went abroad, while German high-reputation emigrants had acquired their reputations before the Nazi era. In the next twenty ranks, there are the names of three German non-emigrants – Carl Schmitt (rank 41), Otto Hintze (47) and Werner Conze (64) – and nine German emigrants – Fritz Redlich (43), Karl Mannheim (45), Jakob Marschak (46), Hans Staehle (49), Hannah Arendt (52), Karl Loewenstein (58), Fritz Morstein Marx (60), Rose Laub Coser (63) and Herbert Marcuse (70). When Emil Lederer (68) and Martin Buber (69) are excluded because of their dual nationality, there again is a majority of Austrians in ranks 41 to 70.

Lazarsfeld's position in second place on the recognition scale can be explained by the fact that he published in a variety of domains and, as an authority on methodology, was probably more cited than read between his first citation in 1938 and the 1950s and 1960s. The same cannot be said of his student and

follower – and very much his junior – Peter M. Blau, who never established a school or published textbooks and manuals on methodology such as Lazarsfeld's much-referred-to *Language of Social Research* (Lazarsfeld and Rosenberg 1955). Blau's prominent position, just like that of Bendix, Deutsch, Coser and Wolff, is most likely due to a change in citation habits. Kurt H. Wolff's rank may further be attributed to his editorial activities, another factor that tends to boost reputation. Adorno, on the other hand, is a special case since his high rank is in all likelihood due to the fact that his name comes first among the four authors of *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno *et al.* 1950). No other author among the top seventy in this recognition ranking gives rise to comparable doubts as to his personal contribution to the reputation gained.

The high number of Vienna School economists – Hayek, Machlup, Haberler, Morgenstern and others who, such as Schumpeter or Gerschenkron, were not completely alien to this school of thought, is due to the pre-eminence of neo-classical economics, which also included authors such as Jakob Marschak. It should also be noted that especially those junior members of the Vienna School who emigrated to the United States were key figures in, and contributors to, the economic debate in the United States. The presence of Drucker, Hoselitz or Polanyi, who each had his own way of grappling with Vienna School thought, is indicative of the highly coherent culture of debate in the field of economics, arguably the first social science discipline to frame itself as a profession (Shils 1982). The pre-eminence of economics is again highlighted by the high ranks of German economists Marschak, Gerhard Colm, Wolfgang Stolper and Paul Steeten from the Kiel and Heidelberg schools. The comparatively lower ranks of other German economists must be seen in connection with the fact that *Social Research*, the journal of the New School for Social Research, was not included in JSTOR during the period covered by this analysis. Moreover, more emigrant German than emigrant Austrian economists were teaching at the New School (Krohn 1987). The relatively prominent position of Jacob L. Moreno can be similarly attributed to JSTOR's selection of journals, since his high values for productivity as well as visibility are arguably due to *Sociometry*, the journal he had founded and which was not 'officialized' until later.

Setting aside these interpretations of individual cases, the data can also be systematically analysed in view of the links between input in terms of publications and output in terms of recognition by peers. This is relatively easy in cases like that of Tietze, who not only published a lot but was obviously active in fields beyond demography as well, making him highly visible. Statistician Emil J. Gumbel is a similar case, if on a lower level. Both also arguably owe their prominence to the fact that almost all the journals dedicated to their specialities are included in JSTOR, which is not necessarily true for other disciplines.

Among the authors who published a considerable number of articles, which helped them to join the top forty ranks of productivity but earned them less recognition, there are methodologists Karl Menger (recognition rank 44) and Gustav Bergmann (182), social psychologist Gustav Ichheiser (96), econometrician Gerhard Tintner (108), economists Marschak (46), Staehle (49), Pribram (66),

Stolper (112), Lauterbach (119) and Cohn (170), and sociologists Hans Kohn (169), Hans Speier (211) and Svend Riemer (350). Whether this means that a certain number of contributions is a prerequisite for scoring on recognition is an open question.

The other perspective with respect to JSTOR content is no less instructive: among those authors who ranked highly on the dimension of recognition, there are more than a dozen whose visibility was obviously not based on articles published in JSTOR 'core journals'. Anna Freud, Sigmund Freud, Max Scheler, Ernst Troeltsch, Alfred Weber and Max Weber did not publish a single article in one of the journals covered by JSTOR, while only one text was found for each of Adorno, Marie Jahoda, Robert Michels and Werner Sombart. Similarly, Peter F. Drucker (four articles) and Ferdinand Tönnies (six) seem to owe their recognition primarily to the books they published.

In order to enhance the database and, thus, the validity of results, two further sources were tapped using two separate indices. For the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (IESS), editor David Sills had assembled an illustrious company of authors in the late 1960s to supply authoritative accounts of the fields they were experts in. It can be assumed that those who were deemed worthy of contributing to the encyclopedia had, of course, previously also published in the field. Therefore, the articles in the encyclopedia can be used to counterbalance the JSTOR journal bias. The combined index of publications consists of the logarithmic value of JSTOR publications (maximum value 4.2) and of an index + 1 for those forty authors who contributed at least one article to the IESS (among them eight non-emigrant German sociologists).

A second source was similarly consulted to balance JSTOR-based recognition scores: in 1991, Sills and Merton published another supplement to the IESS in which they compiled the most important quotations of social science world literature (Sills and Merton 1991). These standard quotations were selected with the help of an advisory body of more than two hundred social scientists. Forty-five authors that figure in one of our samples had the honour of being represented by one or more quotations (Freud comes first with forty-three quotations, Max Weber second with twenty-nine). Together, JSTOR and IESS results make up the citation index.

All three sub-indices were then added up to form an *overall reputation index*. The values of the publications index were weighted to boost the importance of personal contributions and to level out the otherwise overwhelming predominance of status.³⁹ Since both the citation and recognition indices are based on third-party judgements, it can be assumed that the decision to attribute prestige by including an author in a biographical or encyclopaedic reference work was not reached without consultation with advisors. Correlations between the three basic indices are 0.615 for the citation index and 0.27 for the recognition index, with the publication index as the point of reference; thus, compiling an overall index seems justified. Table 4.6 shows the top forty ranks in this reputation index.

Table 4.6 Index of Reputation: Twentieth-century German-Speaking Social Scientists (weighted)

Rank	Last Name	First Name	score
1	Lazarsfeld	Paul Felix	24.84
2	Simmel	Georg	23.22
3	Weber	Max	22.94
4	Schumpeter	Joseph Alois	22.33
5	Freud	Sigmund	20.99
6	Popper	Karl	20.17
7	Hayek	Friedrich A.	19.71
8	Blau	Peter M.	19.32
9	Lewin	Kurt	18.72
10	Bendix	Reinhard	18.63
11	Machlup	Fritz	18.19
12	Morgenstern	Oskar	18.04
13	Tietze	Christopher	16.95
14	Moreno	Jacob Levy	16.89
15	Tönnies	Ferdinand	16.77
16	Deutsch	Karl W.	16.11
17	Kelsen	Hans	16.05
18	Gershenkron	Alexander	15.66
19	Marschak	Jacob	15.47
20	Schütz	Alfred	15.43
21	Carnap	Rudolf	15.35
22	Adler	Alfred	15.23
23	Haberler	Gottfried	15.13
24	Mannheim	Karl	15.04
25	Cassirer	Ernst	14.98
26	Coser	Lewis A.	14.84
27	Gumbel	Emil Julius	14.43
28	Michels	Robert	14.01
29	Hirschman	Albert	13.97
30	Mises	Ludwig von	13.19
31	Back	Kurt W.	13.15
32	Tintner	Gerhard	12.99
33	Kunz	Josef L.	12.78
34	Münsterberg	Hugo	12.54
35	Adorno	Theodor W.	12.25
36	Strauss	Leo	12.18
37	Sombart	Werner	12.10
38	Nadel	S.F.	11.91
39	Zeisel	Hans	11.90
40	Redlich	Fritz	11.89

Source: Author's calculations.

Since, obviously, the rank occupied as a result of this measurement depends on the data and definitions used, no attempt whatsoever will be made in the present context to discuss the correct ranking of individual sociologists. A comparison with the recognition measurement based on the analysis of JSTOR citations reveals certain changes in ranking that are due to the overall index. Younger scholars such as Bendix and Deutsch have somewhat dropped in rank, while Peter Blau is the only one to have risen. The strong presence of economists in the JSTOR-based recognition ranking did not really diminish since they still occupy about a quarter of the top ranks, but due to the fact that citations from journals contribute less to the overall value, an internal regrouping has taken place. As a result, Schumpeter and Hayek are now the most important economists, both of whom also had the strongest impact beyond the boundaries of their original discipline. The only one who is comparable in this respect is much younger Albert O. Hirschman who, like all those who are still alive or recently deceased, was not included in the analysis of recognition in reference works. The pre-eminence of neoclassical economists, however, remains. Quantitatively, the sociologists are more strongly represented in the list and in the top ranks, followed by younger scholars, such as Blau and Bendix. A new name in the overall index is Karl Mannheim whose non-appearance among the JSTOR top forty is due to the archive's American bias. Representation of psychologists has improved, with Freud, Lewin, Moreno and Alfred Adler. Gestalt psychologists are largely absent from the five samples, and the Böhlers remained confined to the lower ranks, one reason no doubt being that they largely failed to establish themselves after emigration. Among the philosophers, Karl Popper's now considerably higher rank seems justified given his broad reception in the social sciences. Rudolf Carnap and Ernst Cassirer represent, as it were, philosophy of science and the classical school of philosophical thought. Representation of political theory and political science is relatively weak: Karl W. Deutsch and Hans Kelsen are found in the midfield and, lower still, Leo Strauss. Economic history is represented by Alexander Gerschenkron and Fritz Redlich, statistics once more by Emil Gumbel, demography by Christopher Tietze, and anthropology by S.F. Nadel.

What I feel to be more informative than this analysis geared to individuals, however, are the group properties brought to light by this table and, even more so, by a cross tabulation of index values with other variables that have already been used. Thus, one look at Table 4.6 reveals a striking absence of female scholars. Hannah Arendt, the first woman on the list, turns up at rank 42 and, thus, fails to make the top 40 by just two ranks; the next one is Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann at rank 58, followed by Anna Freud (64), Rose Laub Coser (92), Marie Jahoda (103) and Charlotte Bühler (147). What is evident from the low number of female names is also reflected by a comparison of means: 1.48 for female sociologists and 2.68 for males.

The comparison of reputation by birth cohorts and between Germany and Austria shows that the arguments put forward so far for individual cases also

apply to generations and to those who came from, or stayed in, the two countries. Again, there are an equal number of Austrians and Germans among the social scientists with top reputation; moreover, the aggregated index value of the Austrians (3.18) is higher, for all cohorts, than that of the Germans (2.1); and both are clearly topped by the aggregated index value of individuals with double nationality (3.89). Germans score higher than Austrians only in the oldest cohort. Here again, individuals with double nationality (aggregated index value 5.3) outdo their generational peers who worked only in one of the countries. Thus, the founder generation can be said to have also founded the reputation of German-language sociology, and this is not only due to the two outliers Weber and Freud.

The diagram (Figure 4.5) shows the median and the second and third quartile below and above it, respectively, as well as the lowest and the highest observed values that are no outliers (thin line). Because of the large number of cases without an index value, the presentation was limited to cases with at least a minimum of reputation (index value > 1.1). In the two oldest cohorts, the medians of the Germans are clearly above those of the Austrians. In contrast,

Figure 4.5 Index of Reputation, according to Birth Cohorts and Country

Notes: n = 343; bold bar: mean, the rectangle below the mean stands for the 2nd quartile, the rectangle above the mean for the 3rd quartile; only includes scholars with a calculated reputation >1,1.

Source: Author's calculations.

Austrians clearly come first in the three following cohorts (born between 1881 and 1910). Only in the youngest cohort is the picture again inversed. The Austrian 'home-guard' cannot keep up with the Germans.

If the population of German-speaking sociologists is organized by country and emigration status, with the comparison focused on the two generation units of emigrants and non-emigrants (excluding those who had died before 1933 and 1938, respectively), the groups are quite clearly outlined: emigrants from both countries of origin show a distinctly higher mean reputation value than 'home-guards'. Among the emigrants, former Austrians outdo former Germans (Figure 4.6).

Results of bivariate computations were somewhat surprising since they give grounds to the well-founded assumption that pre-Nazi discrimination against Jews was less strong than has so far been suggested in the literature. Of course, on the level of individuals, it is quite conceivable that people were discriminated against because they were Jewish. But on the level of group comparisons, no such pattern can be observed and, what is more, the findings almost suggest the contrary: there is no doubt that German and Austrian universities were

Figure 4.6 Index of Reputation, according to Migration Status and Country

Notes: $n = 320$; bold bar: mean, the rectangle below the mean stands for the 2nd quartile, the rectangle above the mean for the 3rd quartile; only includes scholars with a calculated reputation $>1,1$.

Source: Author's calculations.

restrictive with respect to junior scholars and imposed long waiting times, but among those who succeeded in crossing these hurdles, Jews were no less successful. The other remarkable result that contradicts the conventional view is even less challengeable: in the United States, those who had been forced to emigrate met with an extraordinarily open university system that was not only quite ready to admit them but also offered them career openings that were better by far than those available to the 'home-guards'.

CORRESPONDENCE ANALYSIS

To consolidate the analysis and, at the same time, to find a way to present the results more clearly, the data on the approximately 800 German-language social scientists of the early twentieth century who have been dealt with in this chapter were submitted to a multivariate analysis. To understand the results of the latter, no professional skills in statistical analysis are needed.⁴⁰ The so-called correspondence analysis can provide a graphical representation of the commonalities and the differences between groups. One has to keep in mind, however, that this procedure can show the combined effects of several variables, which is why it is called multivariate, and that the result is independent of the number of cases that are included in the analysis. The representation is done in a multidimensional space allowing for a four-step interpretation of the data. First, one can try to interpret the distribution on the horizontal and on the vertical axes with respect to content. Second, one can study the quadrants. Third, one can project the points that belong together in terms of content (the values of a variable) on one of the axes (or look at ordered pairs on an imaginary line that traverses the intersection) and, again, consider the points that are more close to each other as indicative of similarity and those that are more remote as indicative of dissimilarity. Fourth, one can 'spread' the angles that depart from the intersection of the two axes, with the points situated within the angle indicating similarity (the smaller the angle the higher the similarity between the traits included in it).

For better readability, not all of the variables taken into account in the analysis are shown in the following diagram.⁴¹ Figure 4.7 shows the comparison of all German and Austrian social scientists as well as those working in both countries, with an additional differentiation between the subgroups of emigrants and non-emigrants.

The horizontal line results from the contrast of Austrians versus Germans; social scientists who worked in both countries are in-between. Since the vertical line can be interpreted as the contrast of emigrants versus 'home-guards', the combination of these two traits (country and emigration status) results in the positioning of the two groups of emigrants and non-emigrants above and below, respectively, an axis, i.e. the diagonal running from the upper left-hand side to the lower right-hand side. The places where doctoral degrees were taken correspond to the difference between the two principal countries in our analysis: Austrian universities are on the left-hand side, German universities on the right-hand side. A projection of the six groups formed on the basis of

Correspondence Analysis Symmetric Graph: explained variance: Axis F1 and F2: 78.94%; horizontal axis F1: 57.77%, vertical axis: 21.17%. n = 676.

Notes: ♀ Female; ♂ Male; DC Émigrés: Dual Citizenship Émigrés; DC Homeguards: Dual Citizenship Non-Émigrés; Father's occupation (according to Ringer 1993): c1: educated upper middle class; c2: economic upper middle class; c3: economic lower middle class; c4: non-educated lower middle class; (added): Military; Denomination (Religion): Protestants, Catholics, Jews, no religion; Birth Cohorts: In decades, starting with 'c1870' born before 1870; Occupational career (four levels): Dr: Doctorate; Doz: *Habilitation*; aoP: *außerordentlicher*/extraordinarius professor or associate professor; oP: *ordentlicher*/ordinarius Professor or Full Professor; Career Pace: quick (x_qu), medium (x_m), slow (x_s); Reputation (in quintiles): 0 Rep: none at all; 2nd Rep; 3rd Rep: 2nd and 3rd quintile; 4th Rep: Rank 11 to 30; Top Rep: Top 10; Universities, where doctorate degrees have been acquired: Name of town (Graz, Innsbruck, etc.)

the traits of country and emigration status on the horizontal axis reveals that the major contrast is between Austrian emigrants and German non-emigrants. The vertical axis is an adequate representation of religion: A projection of the data on religion on the vertical axis results in the Jewish being in the highest position, followed by the agnostics and the Protestants, with Catholics in the lowest position.

161

that other factors intervene. Social scientists with a 'lower midfield' reputation can be easily characterized by the neighbouring point of German non-emigrants and by all the points that indicate career pace, while those with 'no' reputation as well as those with 'upper midfield' reputation are close to the centroid, which shows that these traits contribute little to an explanation of social space. The two top-reputation groups are close to the trait of 'Jewish' in the upper right-hand quadrant.

An analysis of the four quadrants reveals the similarities between the six groups. The upper right-hand quadrant includes two groups: Austrian emigrants and emigrants who had worked in both countries, both of which can be further characterized by two other traits – Jewish or non-denominational. Austrian non-emigrants are grouped in the lower right-hand quadrant and are further characterized by being Catholics. German non-emigrants and non-emigrants working in both countries include the highest number of social scientists who were 'habilitated' for an academic career and had even taken further career steps, while the factor of career pace does not particularly contribute to this.

The most remarkable finding brought to light by the correspondence analysis is a lack of correlations: neither social background nor gender nor age contribute to an explanation of the space in which the roughly 800 German-language social scientists can be located. In contrast, the traits that do contribute to an explanation are religion, the country where someone worked, and the contrast of home-guards and emigrants.

If the analysis is limited to the population of emigrated social scientists ($n=408$), the diagram brings to light some interesting connections. While the trait of Jewish/non-Jewish does not unequivocally differentiate between emigrants, the trait of home country does. Figure 4.8 shows that except for the contrast of Austrians versus Germans, the two main axes do not unequivocally correspond to specific variables. On the other hand, the four quadrants show some interesting combinations of traits. For the German Jewish emigrants in the upper-left quadrant, these traits are: above average number of remigrants (those who returned to Germany), support from refugee aid committees, pre-emigration positions as at most outside lecturers or associate professors, and membership primarily in the cohorts born between 1880 and 1899. For the German non-Jewish emigrants in the lower left quadrant, there are only two traits that further characterize them: the above average number who were full professors before emigration, and that (therefore) they did not engage in a second or third course of studies afterward.

Among the Austrian non-Jewish scholars in the upper-right quadrant, the number of those who took a second degree after emigration was above average, and their careers during emigration stopped at the level of an assistant professor (in the period analysed), though this may be due to the fact that they belonged to the youngest cohort (there are no career data for the post-1955 period). The Austrian Jewish emigrants in the lower right quadrant are characterized by the following traits: the number of female scholars was above average, they did not remigrate, they had at most taken a doctoral degree before emigration, and the

Figure 4.8 Émigré German-speaking Social Scientists in Comparison

Correspondence Analysis Symmetric Graph, explained variance: Axis F1 and F2: 90%; horizontal axis F1: 79%; vertical axis F2: 12%; $n = 408$.

Notes: ♀ Female; ♂ Male; G: Germans; A: Austrians; Birth Cohorts: In decades, starting with '<1870' born before 1870; Jews and Non-Jews: according to sources explained in text; Highest occupational status before emigration: pre E_Dr: Doctorate only; pre E_Habil: Privatdozent; pre E_ao Prof: außerordentlicher Professor; pre E_o Prof: Ordinarius; Additional Education after emigration: 2nd and 3rd study; no 2nd and 3rd study; Academic status after emigration (end of observation period: 1950s): Assist P only: highest status = Assistant professor; Associate as highest: Associate professor; full prof as highest: Full professor; EC Help: Grantee of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars; Remigrant: Returnee to Germany; No remigration: remained in USA, UK, etc.

positions attained thereafter (in the period analysed) were no higher than that of an associate professor, which in turn may have to do with the fact that they were somewhat older than the Austrian non-Jewish emigrants.

Two peculiarities of the features of this figure should be noted. On the one hand, reaching the status of full professor had little correlation to where on the field one ended up, which means that the chances of obtaining this position were equally distributed. On the other hand, the fact that the trait of being male is so close to the axes suggests that it did not contribute to the distribution.

Notwithstanding the deficiencies that could not be compensated for, the data used for these comparisons clearly suggest that the population of German-language social scientists working in the middle period of the last century showed more internal differentiation than what has previously been reported in the literature. The comparative perspective on Germans and Austrians, emigrants and non-emigrants, Jewish and non-Jewish individuals, and high-reputation and low-reputation scholars helps to demonstrate this internal differentiation more

clearly. The degree of pre-Nazi discrimination against Jews differed in the two German-language countries, but those who stayed at home not only gained less reputation, which can be explained by their being rooted in a single science culture, but were also inferior, all else being equal, when competing for career positions with the mostly Jewish future emigrants whenever their success was not due solely to discrimination against their rivals.