

This article was downloaded by: [KIM Hohenheim]

On: 11 December 2012, At: 08:14

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954
Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH,
UK



The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rejh20>

The modernisation of the Turkish University after 1933: The contributions of refugees from Nazism

Ragip Ege & Harald Hagemann

Version of record first published: 15 Nov 2012.

To cite this article: Ragip Ege & Harald Hagemann (2012): The modernisation of the Turkish University after 1933: The contributions of refugees from Nazism, The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought, 19:6, 944-975

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09672567.2012.735684>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

The modernisation of the Turkish University after 1933: The contributions of refugees from Nazism

Ragip Ege and Harald Hagemann

I. Introduction

This paper deals with two separate processes which coincided. The first is the abolition of the Ottoman university ‘*Darülfünun*’ (House of Knowledge) in July 1933 and the initiation of the Republican university system with the reopening of İstanbul University in August 1933. Second, some months prior to this, the Nazi regime in Germany had dismissed a large number of university teachers on racial or political grounds. The Turkish government invited a large group of these German-speaking scholars to İstanbul so that they might use the talents of these victims of racial and political persecution to benefit the academic endeavours of the new Turkish Republic. We first give an overview of the creation of the new university in the Turkish Republic and of the German academics who joined the University of İstanbul, and also those who became advisers to the Turkish government in Ankara. After a short discussion of the material and working conditions of these *émigré* scholars, we focus on the small but significant group of economists. The list includes not only prominent figures such as Fritz Neumark, Wilhelm Röpke and Alexander Rüstow, but also Gerhard Kessler, the agricultural economists Fritz Baade and Hans Wilbrandt and Alfred Isaac in management. Later, Josef Dobretsberger came from Austria after the *Anschluss* in 1938, and Umberto Ricci from Fascist Italy. Other

Address for correspondence

Ragip Ege, Bureau d’Economie Théorique et Appliquée (BETA-CNRS, Faculty of Economics and Management, University of Strasbourg, 67085 Strasbourg, France; e-mail: ege@unistra.fr

Harald Hagemann, Department of Economics, University of Hohenheim, 70593 Stuttgart, Germany; e-mail: harald.hagemann@uni-hohenheim.de

The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought

ISSN 0967-2567 print/ISSN 1469-5936 online © 2012 Taylor & Francis

<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals>

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09672567.2012.735684>

prominent scholars were the mathematician Richard von Mises, Ludwig's younger brother, the professor of law Ernst Hirsch and also Ernst Reuter, who became mayor of West Berlin after the end of WW II. Emphasis will be on the scientific contribution and activities of these refugee scholars. We will conclude with an assessment of their impact on the next generation of Turkish scholars, and on Turkish economy and society (legislation, fiscal and monetary policies and social policy), highlighting the benefits for the modernisation of the Turkish university system, as well as addressing problems of language and cultural alienation.

II. The development of the university system in the Ottoman Empire

The first attempt to create a university in the occidental sense in the Ottoman Empire dates back to 1845, when Sultan Abdülmecid (reign: 1839–1861), the architect of major reforms and modernisation initiatives (*Tanzimât*, reorganisations), visited the Law Court (*Meclis-i Vâlâ*) and asked for the creation of a 'Provisory Council' (*Meclis-i Muvakkat*) in order to bring about major reforms to the educational system (Tekeli 2010: 131).¹ The report of the Provisory Council recommended the introduction of a tripartite system: *subyan* schools (primary education); *rüşdiye* schools (secondary education) and *Dar-ül-fünun* (tertiary education). This was the first time that the foundation of a university under the name of *Dar-ül-fünun* was officially mentioned. *Dar-ül-fünun* signifies the House of 'fünun' (plural of 'fann' in Arabic, art, craft), the House of 'liberal arts'. But this initiative immediately provoked agitation and hostility in religious circles, especially in the religious schools (*Madrasa*). Theologians and scientists in the *Madrasas* exercised their power to prohibit the use of the term science ('*il'm*' in Arabic) in the title of the new institution, since they considered the

1 In the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, some engineering schools had already been established very much under French influence in order to modernise the army: these were the School of Geometers (*Hendeshâne*) founded by Comte de Bonneval in 1734, the School of Arsenal Mathematics (*Hendeshâne-i Bahr-i Hümayûn*) by Baron de Tott in 1773 which became the Naval Engineering School (*Mühendishâne-i Bahr-i Hümayûn*) in 1789 and the Engineering School for the Armed Forces (*Mühendishâne-i Berri-i Hümayun*) in 1795. These schools were later merged and became the basis of İstanbul Technical University, officially founded on 12 July 1944. One can also mention the field of medicine, where the first Superior School of Medicine and Surgery (*Tıbhâne-i Amire ve Cerrahhâne-i Mâmurê*) was founded in 1826. These institutions could be regarded as early precursors of an Ottoman/Turkish collaboration with European scholars in the development of a modern education system (Somel 2001: 20–3, Reisman 2006: 472, Tekeli 2010: 67–73).

noble practice of science to belong exclusively to their institutions. That is the reason why the modern university was called *Dar-ül-fünun*, the House of 'liberal arts', and not the House of science (Tekeli 2010: 132).

A new building was constructed. Two important institutions were created: *Dar-ül-Maârif* (in Arabic 'House of Education') in 1849 and *Encümen-i Dâniş* (in Persian 'Council of Knowledge or Science', Academy) in 1851. The mission of the latter was to determine the pedagogical programme and the textbooks corresponding to the teaching subjects selected (the great Austrian historian of the Ottoman Empire, Hammer, was a member of this Academy – Aynî 1927 [2010]: 9–12). In 1857, the Ministry of Public Education (*Maârif-i Umumîye Nezâretî*) was founded (Somel 2001: 8).

In 1867, Abdülaziz (reign 1861–1876) visited France during the *Exposition Universelle*, and in the same year, France presented to the Sultan a reform plan whose main objective was to unite all Muslims and non-Muslims in the Empire into one Ottoman nationality. Subjects would have equal rights and a mixed educational system, thereby counter-acting Russian influences which favoured fragmentation, particularly of the Orthodox part of the population, within the Ottoman Empire (Georgeon 1994: 17; Sakaoğlu 2003: 85). The spirit of the French proposals was also evident in the 'Regulation of Public Education' (*Maârif-i Umûmiye Nizamnâmesi*, RPE), a law for a more secular school system enforced in 1869 but applied effectively only after 1880 'and then with varying intensity, according to time and place' (Somel 2001: 84). The objectives of the RPE were the revision of the levels in the educational system. These now became *subyan* schools (primary level); *rüşdiye* schools (secondary level); *idadî* schools (preparatory schools; colleges); *sultânî* schools (lycées) and the *Darülfünun* in İstanbul. The text also envisaged the creation of *rüşdiye* schools for girls (Sakaoğlu 2003: 89–91).

The founding of *Darülfünun* met with difficulties and it experienced a series of setbacks (Tekeli 2007). The construction of a new building was completed only in 1868, when the university officially opened its doors. But two years later, for political reasons and under the pressure of conservative and religious circles, *Darülfünun* was closed. When the first modern college *Galatasaray* (*sultanî*) was created in 1868, some elements of the university were integrated into this institution as faculties of theology (*ilâhiyat*), medicine (*tıp*), law (*hukuk*) and literature (*edebiyat*). However, academic activities were also conducted in some other high schools, such as the '*Turuk-u Meâbin*' (the roads and the bridges; equivalent of the French '*les ponts et chaussées*'), in engineering or military schools and also in the schools of medicine. *Darülfünun* was re-opened on 20 February 1870 under the Prime Minister Ali Paşa, but then prohibition was renewed in 1871 on account of a controversial lecture by a professor who was supposed to have

asserted that ‘prophecy is an art’ (Aynî 1927 [2010]: 55; Tunçay and Özen 1984b: 7; Sakaoğlu 2003: 304).

As mentioned above, the RPE was introduced in the reign of Abdülhamid II (reign: 1876–1909). However, the focus of Abdülhamid II was on secondary schools, especially the *idâdî* schools (Fortna 2002, chapter 3). French influence, especially the teaching of French in the *sultânî* schools, was marked; but subsequent educational policy pursued a very precise ideological objective to increase the number of the state secondary schools in order to reduce the weight of non-Muslim and foreign schools in the Empire, to strengthen the religious sentiments of students and to reinforce their consciousness of belonging to an Islamic state. The Hamidian period in the school system appears to represent a systematic effort to develop nationalist conscience through religion. Any real concept of a university as understood in contemporary Europe is absent during the Hamidian period. Abdülhamid II supported the school of *Mülkiye* (Political Sciences) but only as an institution capable of supplying the Ottoman bureaucracy with competent civil servants.

Even though *Darülfünun* was officially re-opened in 1900, the will to create and develop a modern university system re-emerged only in the period of the Committee of Union and Progress (*İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti*, CUP), a vigorous political movement founded by the group of young Ottoman reformists called ‘Young Turks’, who declared the second Constitutional Monarchy (*Meşrutiyet*), in 1908 (Georgeon 1989: 569–76). The name of the institution was changed to *Darülfünun-u Osmanî* (the Ottoman *Darülfünun*). The first large-scale ‘clearing’ or ‘elimination’ (*tasfiye*) carried out in *Darülfünun* took place in 1909, when 158 professors and assistant professors of medicine (from a total of 185) were excluded from the university (Tunçay and Özen 1984b: 9; Bahadır 2007: 53). The Committee’s relationship with Germany strengthened progressively, especially at the military level. Enver Pascha, one of three Generals who dominated the CUP and the government, decided to take advantage of the modern German education system.

According to Tekeli (2010: 141), ‘even if it was not explicitly stated, the members of the CUP sought to develop a Humboldtian university’ for the Ottoman Empire. The Humboldtian conception of the university emphasises the research mission of the university alongside its educational mission. The university cannot limit itself to a mere transmission of existing knowledge; it must create new knowledge and contribute to the development of the nation, creating laboratories and using the experimental method. Furthermore, the idea of autonomy, scientifically (1919) as well as financially (1924), was recognised as an important element of the Humboldtian conception. In the academic year 1909–1910, under the

Ministry of Emrullah Efendi, a number of students were sent to Europe, especially to Germany, to pursue philosophical and pedagogical studies. Three of these students, İsmayil Hakkı Baltacıođlu, Cevat Dursunođlu and Halil Fikret Kanad, would play an important role in the reform of *Darülfünun*. The vision of the Humboldtian university had a particularly strong influence on these students. For example, Baltacıođlu went on to develop in his works the concepts of ‘pedagogy of production’ or ‘pedagogy of personality’. Baltacıođlu was appointed Rector (*emin*) of *Darülfünun* in 1923 (resigning in 1927 – after its abolition he was dismissed). On the other hand, Cevat Dursunođlu played a major role in the selection of German scholars who came to Turkey after 1933 and in the foundation of the Conservatory in Ankara (inviting Paul Hindemith and Carl Ebert). He became the Cultural Attaché in Berlin in 1933 (Tekeli 2010: 132–6, 151).

The orientation of the modern Turkish university system towards Germany was strengthened in 1915 when the government invited 20 German scholars to *Darülfünun*. The Germans were themselves interested in having greater influence on the Ottoman educational system. Dr. Franz Schmidt came to İstanbul on 1 March 1915 with the aim of creating an ‘Institute of German Education’. This was a modest forerunner of the later development in 1933 with which we deal below. Agreements with these foreign scholars included the condition that they learn the Turkish language as quickly as possible. In the meantime, the German professors taught in their own language with an interpreter to translate what they taught. But the result was ambiguous. Since the interpreters had no specialised knowledge of the relevant scientific field, their translation was often incomprehensible to the students, who became increasingly dissatisfied. On the other hand, the professors did not succeed in learning the Turkish language very quickly because of the very different structure of the Turkish language to that of Western European languages. The same problem emerged later in 1933. One must also bear in mind that there were tensions between Turkish and German professors because of the condescending attitude of many of the Germans to their Turkish counterparts, and because of the fact that they were paid more. The role played by some Turkish scholars as mere interpreters for German teachers also created difficulties.

In 1912, the *Darülfünun* was thoroughly reformed, and the curriculum remodelled. Five departments were established: theology, law, medicine; a department of *fünun*’ (the term *fann*’ is progressively used to designate mathematical and natural sciences) and literature (Bahadır 2007: 55). A French influence reappeared during the first decade following the foundation of the Republic in 1923, and from 1926 onwards, about 20 French scholars, particularly in medicine, literature and the sciences, came

to İstanbul and Ankara. All these scholars were given the title of professor in *Darülfünun* and in other high schools in Ankara, although some of them lacked doctorates (Dölen 2010a: 132–4).

III. Darülfünun attacked

At the beginning, the relations of *Darülfünun* with the young Republic, especially with the Ministry of Education, were reasonable, even good. Atatürk met the Rector (*Emin*) of *Darülfünun*, İsmayıl Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, and it was thought that their discussions went well.² In this constructive climate, the institution obtained its autonomy (*muhtariyet*) in 1924 (Dölen 2010a: 316–9). But during the early 1930s, the situation changed markedly.

Up until the early 1930s, the moderately liberal wing of leading Republicans shaped the economic policy of Turkey (Boratav 2003: 39–57). Atatürk's outlook was also economically liberal at this time. Indeed, the ultimate objective of all Republicans was the creation of a 'national economy' (*Nationalökonomie*, *Millî İktisat*) by transferring capital from non-Muslims or aliens into Muslim and Turkish hands. This national-liberal vision of the economy could also be seen in the principles adopted by the *İzmir İktisat Kongresi* (Economic Congress of İzmir) in 1923. The reference to *Nationalökonomie* has its roots in history as we will discuss below. But at the beginning of the Republic, the belief that this policy of national economy could be realised in a liberal context was widespread.

In the mean time, the dominant economic vision of Republicans altered quite significantly. Before the Great Depression, the vision of Republicans tended towards liberalism. But the evolution of international economic conditions shifted Republican economic policy towards protectionism and *Étatism* (see Boratav 2003: 59–79). From 1931 onwards, radical Republicans considered that increased state intervention in the economy was indispensable. Increasingly, 'state-financed, state-owned and state-run enterprises [emerged], in the beginning mainly in the field of industry and then in other fields as well' (Okyar 1965: 100). This development ran counter to liberal and protectionist views among the ranks of the sole political party, the Republican People's Party. In January 1936, an Industry Congress was held in Ankara organised by the National Economy and Saving Society (later the Turkish Economic Association), and this became a forum for opposition. The *Étatist* camp won this dispute. But this victory did not imply that the country had definitely opted for a collectivist or a

² For an account of the good relations between Atatürk and *Darülfünun* at the beginning of the Republic, see Dölen (2010a: 3–4, 95–107).

socialist economy. In fact ‘private enterprise as the main form of economic activity’ was never abandoned (ibid.). In 1932, Atatürk declared: ‘the principle of Étatism that we have chosen to follow is not in any way the same as Collectivism or Communism, which aims at removing all instruments of production and distribution from individuals, thus organizing society on a completely different basis and leaving no room for private and individual enterprise in the economic field’ (quoted by Okyar 1965: 101).

This governmental option for Étatist policies was supported by a monthly journal called *Kadro* (*staff, establishment, cadre*), published from 1932 onwards.³ Even if the real influence on Kemalist policy of the radical economic stance of *Kadro*’s writers was limited, their ideological opposition to liberalism did tend to discredit *Darülfünun*’s professors (*müderris*) who were seen as proponents of liberal positions. The examination of *Kadro*’s arguments concerning economic issues and liberalism provides a clear picture of the ideological context in which the institution of *Darülfünun* was at this time evaluated. It has to be remembered that supporters of the new Republic, and especially writers for *Kadro*, evaluated all Ottoman institutions with reference to a sacred concept: ‘*inkılap*’: revolution, radical reform. An attitude thought to be opposed to *inkılap*, or simply somewhat critical of its necessity and its beneficial character, was immediately condemned, and any institution accused of such thinking was doomed to abolition.

The writers for *Kadro*, as part of the ‘Young Turks’ movement and its political party ‘Committee of Union and Progress’, were also deeply influenced by the German tradition of *Nationalökonomie*.⁴ Some Ottoman intellectuals had already adopted an ‘historical’, i.e. protectionist, perspective in response to the unequal trading arrangements that the Ottoman Empire had been forced to accept in its economic relations with the more industrialised European countries. Initially, they had ignored the existence and the work of the German Historical School (GHS). Their economic vision and their conception of economic policy could be described as ‘a naïve version of the GHS viewpoint’ (Özveren 2002: 139). But progressively the ideas of Friedrich List and John Rae penetrated Ottoman intellectual life. A leading ideologist of the CUP, Ziya Gökalp, cited these writers as indicating the unique path which the Ottoman Empire should follow to achieve economic development (Gökalp 1923 [1970]: 80, 181–2). Apart from the historical inspiration of the *Kadro* movement, one must also remember its theoretical and practical proximity

3 See the important book on *Kadro* and its writers by Tekeli and İlkin (2003).

4 On the influence of *Nationalökonomie* – *Millî İktisat* – on later Ottoman intellectuals, see Toprak (1995) and Özveren (2002).

to the *Dependency School* (see Özveren 1996: 566, 570–1). Several decades before this tendency developed in Latin America, the ideas developed in the pages of *Kadro* reflected an understanding of the importance and complexity of the ‘centre-periphery’ relationship. The main objective of *Kadro* writers was to realise a transition from a ‘colonial economy’ (*Müstemleke iktisadiyatı*) (i.e. the late Ottoman empire) to a ‘national economy’ (*Millet iktisadiyatı*), that of the Young Republic (Şevket Süreyya 1933: 11). The aim was to establish a State Economy (*İktisat Devleti*). It should be emphasised that some of those writing for *Kadro* were former Marxists and communists. Progressively aware of what ‘periphery’ status involved, they were of the view that these societies were ‘classless societies’, and hence they appear as ‘nations without conflicts’ (*tezatsız millet*). In such societies, the State had to assume the initiative in stimulating and framing economic activities. Consequently, the establishment of the theoretical and doctrinal base of the *inkılâp* required an *avant-garde* entirely devoted to the good of the nation and to the superior interests of the State.

On the other hand, this complex ideological and doctrinal mix in the pages of *Kadro* – combining elements from the German Historical School, protectionism, Marxism, developed-underdeveloped conflicts, the will to overcome economic, technological, scientific dependency and the realisation of the conditions of a real economic independence – explains the anti-liberalism of *Kadro* (Dölen 2010b: 5–23). Their foe was liberalism, and their attitude was profoundly paternalistic. The reason for their hostility to *Darülfünun*’s professors was the supposed liberalism of the latter. As a *Kadro* writer argued: ‘If we pay attention, we observe that throughout the world liberalism is completely defeated, being liquidated’: ‘it is necessary to destroy all the concepts and all the institutions of liberalism, and necessarily its concept of *freedom*’ (Burhan Asaf 1933b: 26). Reformist forces were convinced that in Turkey, the advent of the revolution signified the death of liberalism. *Darülfünun*’s professors were thought to have been simply overtaken by this historical process. *Kadro* and other Republican newspapers as *Cumhuriyet* (Republic) accused them of consistently opposing the intervention of the state in economic life. They were suspected of being opposed to the higher interests of the nation, accused of never having sought to criticise the domination of the Ottoman economic life by foreign capital and its interests, having shown not the slightest sign of support for the revolution (*inkılâp*), or for the great economic, social, cultural and political transformation that the country underwent with the establishment of the new Republic. A violent controversy between one of the emblematic figures among the *Kadro* writers, Şevket Süreyya, and a *Darülfünun* professor of law, Ahmet Ağaoğlu, is very instructive. As a response to a lecture delivered by the latter in 1933 entitled ‘The State and the Individual’, Şevket

Süreyya wrote an extremely critical article accusing the professor of being a passive and superficial plagiarist of the ‘antinationalist’ ideas of Mehmet Cavit Bey, one of the leading theoreticians of liberal economics (and archenemy of socialism) among the Young Turks, and minister of finance in the ‘Committee of Union and Progress’ government of 1909 (Dumont and Georgeon 1989: 593; Tunçer 2010). The *Darülfünun* professor is accused of promoting the liberty and the egoism of the individual to the detriment of the state. Şevket Süreyya wrote that Ahmet Ağaoğlu, through his praise of the liberty and the autonomy of the individual, expressed only his dissatisfaction with and his hatred of the principle of ‘Revolutionarism (*inkılâpçılık*) and Étatism’. He who adopted such a principle should not be surprised that anyone unable to adapt themselves to the contemporary demands would become a victim of collective violence. It was asserted that ‘this kind of violence is the expression of a revolutionary sensibility’ (Şevket Süreyya 1933: 10), and so such violence could not be considered a crime. The position of Şevket Süreyya is clear: if *Darülfünun* were incapable of being the ‘reflection’ (*inikâs*, echo –*ibid.*: 7) of Étatist policy, it is condemned to perish. Professor Ağaoğlu was in fact an eminent specialist in constitutional law, and politically he was closer to Republican sentiment (drawing upon the French sociologist Durkheim and the legal specialist Duguit) than to liberalism; but this did not prevent his exclusion from the university after the abolition of *Darülfünun* (Erozan 2011a, b). Supporters of the new regime were convinced that the institutions of the country, and especially the highest academic institution, could have no other aim than serving the superior interests of the nation, i.e. the superior interests of the revolution. In the eyes of the new regime, the ultimate aim of scientific activity was the production of new knowledge for use in support of the revolution. One of the members of the *Kadro* group wrote: ‘He [the student] who is unable to pass the examination of the revolution (*inkılâp*) will fail in life’ (Burhan Asaf 1933a: 96).

On the other hand, the Republican press judged that ‘*Darülfünun*’s windows’ were irrevocably closed to all progress and enlightenment, to all attempts at change and transformation. The institution’s critics charged that it was dominated by the logic of routine and repetitiveness. Research activity was nonexistent, professors simply mechanically repeated their lectures without any interest, without any effort to keep abreast of academic developments, lacking any ambition to increase their knowledge. After its abolition, one of the assistant professors of the old university described the professors of economics as follows: ‘The teaching of the old economics was not based on *national* economy. Facts were analyzed from a cosmopolitan view, instead of the national one. Even this cosmopolitan conception merely repeated French textbooks and French authors. Once a professor

made an effort to introduce national events and data into his teaching. But even in this case the attempt remained superficial, and very far from the realities of the national life' (Muhlis Etem 1933: 46). The Republican press was full of references to Italy, Germany and Russia. Journalists observed that in the modern world, in all of these countries, the 'course of life' had necessitated profound reform, and consequently, the abolition of the old cosmopolitan institutions. Failing to adapt itself to this necessity, the young Turkish Republic would be condemned to perish. Consequently, the abolition of *Darülfünun* was thought to conform to historical logic and necessity.

How well-founded were these criticisms? We are not directly concerned with this question here, but there is some recent commentary on the abolition of *Darülfünun* which is sceptical of the objectivity of the arguments used in its justification. One significant fact might indicate the need for caution. At the same time that *Darülfünun* was being criticised for its academic value, a large Congress was held in Ankara, from 2 to 11 July 1932, organised by the powerful *Türk Tarih Kurumu* (Turkish Society of History), whose General Secretary was the future Minister of Education, Reşit Galip (see below). This Congress advanced the thesis that in ancient times, during a serious drought, the Turkish populations of central Asia emigrated westward, bringing civilisation to other populations as they moved. A professor from *Darülfünun* participating in the Congress, Zeki Velidi Togan, dared to criticise this thesis – not the argument concerning the diffusion of civilisation by Turkish populations, but simply the existence of the drought. He was immediately the object of violent and merciless criticism by the General Secretary. The professor was forced to resign the same day and then left Turkey for eight years (see *Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi 1932* [2010]: 368–89; Tunçay and Özen 1984a: 227–8). At that time, Burhan Asaf neatly summarised the conception of science shared by the supporters of the *inkılâp*: 'Darülfünun was created on the basis of the nineteenth century European conception of science. It was therefore the product of a liberal mentality relying on such principles as "science is pursued for science's sake (...) there cannot be any external intervention into science (...) and values (*kıymetler*) are values insofar as they are confirmed by life". As with cheques issued against a bank account, values are valid insofar as they have a counterpart in life. When the counterpart disappears, values become invalid at the counter of life without ceremony' (Burhan Asaf 1933b: 25–6). Science was henceforth 'invited' to serve the *inkılâp*.

It seems that the decision to abolish the university had been taken before any scientific justification of the necessity for abolition had been advanced. At the ideological level, the condemnation of *Darülfünun* seems to have preceded any justification of the condemnation. As we will see in the next

section with the report made by Albert Malche, it was obvious that the university needed reform, even to most of *Darülfünun*'s professors. For example, İsmayil Hakkı Baltacıoğlu, the Rector from 1923 to 1925, recognised that there was no institution in the country that did not need reform. Naturally, *Darülfünun* should likewise have been reformed; but seeking the radical progress of an institution on the basis of abstract wishes and principles and without taking account of its concrete historical realities is unrealistic (Bahadır 2007: 58). On the other hand, Dölen considers that the abolition of *Darülfünun* was not an 'act of reform' but obviously an 'act of revolution' (Dölen 2009: 29–32). Could *Darülfünun* have been reformed by a revolution? Or: Was there only the way for the revolution to reform *Darülfünun*? The question remains open.

IV. Malche's report, the abolition of *Darülfünun* and the foundation of the new university

It was decided by the Ministry of Education in 1931 to appoint a foreign expert to evaluate the university system in Turkey, and a budget of 10.000 lira was set aside. The Minister's adviser, Prof. Mehmet Emin Erişirgil, suggested that a Swiss expert be invited, saying that 'he knows many Swiss scholars and whoever was sent from Switzerland, he would make recommendations that would be taken seriously' (Tunçay and Özen 1984a: 226). In September 1931, the executive board of the Ministry decided to invite a Swiss Professor as an assessor for the Turkish university system, and an official request was sent to the Swiss government. Albert Malche, professor of education at the University of Geneva, was appointed by the Swiss authorities. Prof. Malche came to Turkey in January 1932 and met the Prime Minister İsmet İnönü and the minister of education Esat Sagay, being then officially nominated as the expert responsible for the preparation of a report on the Turkish University system, i.e. *Darülfünun*. Prof. Malche began work immediately, visiting the many Faculties, Departments and Laboratories of *Darülfünun*. His report was submitted to the Minister in early June 1932. His findings were not partisan or patronising, as some professors had feared, but were extremely perspicacious given the short period of time involved. The principal observations and recommendations of the report were the inadequacy of scientific publications⁵; the fact that because of the very low pay of the professors they

5 Typically, Malche did not make any definite proposals for research activities, which is interpreted by Tekeli (2010: 148) as indicating the weakness of research in *Darülfünun*.

were compelled to seek other employment in parallel; the methodological inadequacy of lectures and teaching; the lack of knowledge of foreign languages among students; the need for future teachers to be trained in foreign countries; the similarity between some courses in several faculties or departments (the absence of co-operation); the incompatibility between university autonomy and its dependence on the ministry. Malche said little in his report about the possible abolition of the *Darülfünun* and the dismissal of some academics. He explicitly states that he lacked sufficient time to get a clear and satisfactory idea of the performance of the academic staff, and he consequently refused to make any personal judgement on the professors and other academics. But on the other hand, Malche also made some positive recommendations, such as the translation of important scientific works into Turkish, or which teaching positions at the secondary level could be assigned to *Darülfünun*'s academics if they were dismissed (Malche 1932).

But the appointment of Dr. Reşit Galip as Minister of Education on 19 September 1932 accelerated the abolition of *Darülfünun*. The new Minister was an orthodox reformist, whose work on the 'Tribunals of Independence' (*İstiklâl Mahkemeleri*) and as General Secretary of the Turkish Society of History (*Türk Tarih Kurumu*), was appreciated by Atatürk. In fact, Atatürk entrusted the responsibility of *Darülfünun*'s abolition to Reşit Galip in the knowledge that he would not hesitate to take radical and unscrupulous decisions, such as mass dismissals and the abolition of the institution. The dates of the abolition of *Darülfünun* and the creation of the new University were decided by a vote of the National Assembly on 24 May 1933. The closing date was fixed as 31 July 1933, with the opening of the new University on 1 August 1933. But while the dissolution of the university had been decided, the Ministry had no plan for the restaffing of the new institution. An unexpected development provided a solution to the problem. On his return to Switzerland, Malche met Philipp Schwartz, a professor of pathology, through his friend Prof. Tschulok (a Russian refugee scholar in Switzerland after the Bolshevik revolution) who was the father-in-law of Schwartz (Neumark 1980: 13–4). Schwartz had been accused of communist activities following the Nazi seizure of power and suspended from his university. He travelled to his father-in-law in Switzerland and created an association to support and protect German academics abroad, the *Notgemeinschaft Deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland*. Malche informed Schwartz that the reformation of the Turkish university would create an important need for foreign scholars. Contact was made with Reşit Galip and the latter invited Malche and Schwartz to Turkey in early June 1933. Following a meeting with the Minister in Ankara on 6 June 1933,

Schwartz sent a telegraph to Switzerland: ‘not three but thirty’!⁶ According to Tunçay and Özen (1984a: 230, table), 157 academics out of a total of 240 were dismissed with the abolition of *Darülfünun* and replaced by foreign academics, principally by German-speaking academics. But the figures differ between sources (on this point see Dölen 2007: 128, footnote 52). Baltacıoğlu estimates that of 156 scholars 87 were dismissed, 100 posts were abolished and 66 scholars were integrated into the new institution.⁷

Table 1 presents the number of foreign Professors and Assistants who worked in the University of İstanbul between 1933 and 1973 (Dölen 2007: 130).

Unfortunately, we do not have any precise statistics concerning the number of foreign academics, particularly regarding assistants. We know that many professors came to İstanbul with assistants, and that the number of assistants was much higher than the number of professors.

To be nominated as a Doçent, a candidate had to have Turkish nationality. Consequently, the foreign assistants who accompanied their professors were not appointed to Doçent positions despite their competence. The prime aim of the Turkish authorities was the education of Turkish academics; foreign professors were imported to train future cadres of Turkish academics.

Table 1 Foreign Scholars at the University of İstanbul, 1933–1973

Faculties	German and Austrian professors	German and Austrian assistants	Other nationalities professors	Other nationalities assistants	Total professors	Total assistants
Medicine	21	48	1	1	22	49
Dental school	1	3	–	–	1	3
Sciences	15	16	15	2	30	18
Pharmacy	3	2	1	–	4	2
Literature	16	13	11	6	27	19
Law	4	–	1	–	5	–
Economics	6	–	1	–	7	–
Total	66	82	30	9	96	91

⁶ See also Schwartz (1995).

⁷ Baltacıoğlu (2007: 36). The list of *Darülfünun*’s teaching staff dismissed developed by Bahadır shows 92 names (Bahadır 2007: 81–4).

There were differences of salary: a foreign professor was paid 2.5 times more than a Turkish professor. A foreign laboratory assistant earned 1.5 times more than a Turkish one. This disparity caused serious tensions in the university, and the Rector was often forced to intervene to placate his staff, promising Turkish scholars an imminent increase of payments. The solution to this problem could have been to decrease the salaries of foreign academics (Dölen 2007: 129).

V. The modern Turkish university: a principal host institution for émigré scholars from Nazi Germany

The United States of America and Great Britain were the main countries where émigré scholars from Nazi Germany and later Austria finally took refuge (Hagemann 1997, 2011). In the first period after the Nazis' rise to power, Turkey played a very important role as a host country (Erichsen 1998). In the early twentieth century, Germany had partially displaced the international influence of France in diplomacy and culture, as indicated by the recruitment of 20 German professors to *Darülfünun* in 1915 (see above). In 1933, the dismissal of academics from German universities for racial and/or political reasons under the Restoration of Civil Service Act, promulgated by the National Socialists on 7 April 1933, combined with Atatürk's reform of Turkish universities to offer the unanticipated opportunity of recruiting a substantial number of first-class scholars to create a modern university system in the Turkish Republic. In a series of meetings between Minister Galip and Philipp Schwartz in the summer of 1933, 30 professors were appointed, and many other professors and research assistants were soon to follow. The highest percentage was in medicine, where about one-half of the directors at the newly founded institutes at the University of İstanbul and university clinics were refugees.⁸

But refugee scholars were also advancing Turkey's modernisation in other areas.⁹ Thus, the famous composer *Paul Hindemith*, who was dismissed from the Hochschule für Musik in Berlin, paid four extended visits to Turkey, founding the State Conservatory in Ankara in 1935 and reorganising musical study and performance in Turkey. Likewise, the theatre director *Karl Ebert* (who remained in Turkey and also founded and directed the Turkish State School of Opera and Drama from 1941 to 1947 before he left for the US to become head of the opera department at UCLA); *Ernst Praetorius* (who had been dismissed for racial reasons as the

8 For more detailed figures, see Widmann (1973) and Strauss (1983).

9 For a comprehensive treatment, see Reisman (2006).

Music Director of the German National Theatre in Berlin in 1933 and was a taxi driver before in 1935 emigrating to Turkey where he died in 1946 as the conductor of the Turkish Presidency's Symphonic Orchestra) and *Eduard Zuckmayer*.

Among the leading scientists was the well-known chemist *Fritz Arndt* (1885–1969), whose son *Heinz Wolfgang Arndt* (1915–2002) later became one of Australia's most prominent economists. Arndt, dismissed as University Professor at Breslau together with two German colleagues, had already established the first chemistry department in the Ottoman Empire during 1915–1918. He returned to Turkey in 1934 and was appointed professor of chemistry and Head of the Institute for Chemistry (*Kimya Enstitüsü*) at İstanbul University from 1934 to 1955, which he had co-founded during World War I. Arndt was a gifted linguist who had already taught and published in Turkish, although using the Arabic alphabet in the latter, during his initial stay in Constantinople. During his second period, Arndt pioneered research and education in the field of modern organic and inorganic chemistry in Turkey. He published many textbooks, which generally concluded with a listing of the relevant terms in Turkish, Ottoman Turkish, German and English.

Richard von Mises (1883–1953), the younger brother of Ludwig, had been the founding Director of the famous Institute of Applied Mathematics at the University of Berlin from 1919 to 1933. Mises, who also did scholarly work in philosophy (he was an active member of the Vienna Circle of logical positivists) and literature, brought applied mathematics as a university discipline to Turkey, where he was appointed Professor of Pure and Applied Mathematics at the University of İstanbul in 1933. Mises's outstanding assistant, and later wife, Hilda Geiringer, was appointed Professor of Mathematics at İstanbul University in 1934, where in subsequent years she applied probability theory to the basic principles of genetics. Mises, who had already done research in and taught aerodynamics while at the University of Straßburg 1909–1918 and had volunteered as a pilot in the Austro-Hungarian army in WW I, moved to the USA at the outbreak of WW II, where he became Professor of Aerodynamics and Applied Mathematics at Harvard University from 1944 to 1953.

The most important and influential figure in law was *Ernst Eduard Hirsch* (1902–1985). Dismissed for racial reasons as judge and Docent at the Goethe University in Frankfurt in spring 1933, he was appointed Full Professor of Commercial Law at the University of İstanbul shortly afterwards. From 1943 to 1952, Hirsch was a Professor of Philosophy, Sociology and Methodology of Law at the University of Ankara, before returning to Germany as a professor of law at the Free University of Berlin, where he soon became Rector. Hirsch worked for the Turkish Ministry of

Justice and had a strong influence on Turkish law and legislation in many areas, including commercial law, copyright legislation and the Turkish Autonomy law for the universities passed in 1946. Hirsch became a Turkish citizen in 1943 and kept his Turkish passport until his death. Hirsch, who had lost many relatives in Auschwitz, had intended to stay in Turkey. However, West Berlin's mayor, Ernst Reuter, persuaded Hirsch to come back to Germany. Hirsch's book *From the times of the emperor through the Weimar Republic into the country of Atatürk. An unseasonable autobiography* (Hirsch 1982) is one of the most illuminating reflections of the experiences of the emigré German scholars in Turkey.

Ernst Reuter (1889–1953), who in 1948–1949 became the first elected mayor of West Berlin and famous during the period of the Soviet blockade, himself had spent more than a decade in Turkish exile. Reuter was the only eminent German politician who emigrated to Turkey and who had an interesting background. As a Russian prisoner-of-war, he became a communist and in December 1917 was appointed by Lenin as the People's Commissar for the Wolga Republic. Once back in Germany, he was expelled from the Communist Party in 1922 and returned to the Social Democrats. In 1926, he became Senator for Traffic in Berlin, and in 1931, Mayor of Magdeburg. There the Nazis dismissed him in 1933 and sent him to concentration camps where he was seriously mistreated. With the support of English friends, he managed to leave Nazi Germany in 1935, and in the same year, he moved to Turkey, where he gave advice as a tax specialist to the Economics Ministry in Ankara. From 1938 to 1946, Reuter was Professor of Social Sciences at the Ankara Higher School of Administrative Sciences. With his outstanding skills as an organiser and all his past political experience as a reformer, Reuter combined theory and practice in an effective way. He taught city planning and environmental management, and many of his students later made a career in the government or in the administration of cities and other institutions. Reuter also worked for the Turkish Ministry of Transportation and became the architect of Turkey's modern urban public transportation system. Reuter was one of the few who learned Turkish fluently¹⁰ and was popular with the Turkish students and government, as well as being the *spiritus rector* of the German and Austrian expatriates. In November 1946, Reuter returned to Germany, where in June 1947 the Soviets vetoed his appointment to mayor of Berlin.

10 This also holds for his son Edzard who became CEO of Daimler from 1987 to 1995.

VI. The creation of the faculty of economics

Until the creation of an autonomous Faculty of Economics within the new university, the teaching of economics and of the social sciences was in the late Ottoman Empire and in the beginning of the Republic conducted in four different institutions: the School of Political Sciences (*Mülkiye*), the High School of Commerce (*Yüksek Ticaret Mektebi*; equivalent of French 'Haute Ecole Commerciale'), the Faculty of law (*Hukuk Fakültesi*, in *Darülfünun*) and the Technical High Schools (*Yüksek Teknik Mektepler*).¹¹ One must take into account the higher education institutions in Ankara, the new capital of the Republic. The administrative, social, commercial and industrial needs of the young Republic necessitated a minimal training for a future *élite* conversant with economic and sociological matters. In Ankara, three main institutions were created: the Faculty of Law, the School of Political Sciences and the Higher Institute of Agriculture (*Yüksek Ziraat Enstitüsü*). But the number of courses and teaching hours for economic instruction were extremely limited. In the first institution, only one course on the 'National Economy' was scheduled in the first and third years (all in all 6 hours per week). The School of Political Sciences (*Mülkiye*), which moved from İstanbul to Ankara in 1935, already had a long history, giving courses in 'Economics' (*İktisat*), 'Statistics', 'Finance' 'Sociology', 'History of Economic Doctrines' and 'Economic Geography' (*İktisadî Coğrafya*). But here as well, teaching hours were highly restricted (Findıkoğlu 1946: 60–2).

In İstanbul, we can list four institutions: the Faculty of Law, the High School of Commerce and Economics, the High School of Engineering (*Yüksek Mühendis Mektebi*) and the Faculty of Arts (*Edebiyat Fakültesi*). In the Faculty of Law, economic education was limited to a course on Economics (first and second year; 3 hours per week), a course on Finance (third year, 3 hours) and a course on the National Economy (third year, 2 hours). Until the creation of the Faculty of Economics, the High School of Commerce and Economics was the only specific institution where relatively sustained economic instruction took place. For example, courses such as '*Methal ve nazarî iktisat*' (Introduction to economics and theoretical economics), 'Economic History', 'Commercial Economics', 'Sociological Economics and its juridical organization', 'Economic Geography', etc., were included in the educational programme of the School. In the last two institutions, the teaching of economics was so marginal that they barely deserve mention (Findıkoğlu 1946: 62–5).

11 Concerning the history of the teaching of economics in the late Ottoman Empire and in the beginning of Republic, we refer to Findıkoğlu 1946 (especially pp. 59–126) and Çavdar 2004.

In 1933, three German economists, Neumark, Röpke and Kessler, were appointed professors in the Istanbul Faculty of Law and another German economist, Rüstow, in the Faculty of the Humanities.¹² For the first time, an 'Institute of Economics and Sociology' (*İktisat ve İctimaiyat Enstitüsü*) was created inside the Faculty of Law, and Neumark was nominated as the Director of this Institute. Here, some economic matters were taught besides sociology and law. It is interesting to see that, as in other continental European countries, economics was introduced into the law faculty and not, as in the Anglo-Saxon tradition, located in the philosophy faculty. But there was a great difference between law and economics, since 84% of the teaching was devoted to law and just 16% to economics and sociology. The students who were interested in economics were dissatisfied. In their 'Student Guide', they denounced this situation and argued that law was a very different matter by comparison with economics; the latter is an empirical science, while law is a dogmatic one. They believed that in such a context, there was no possibility of assimilating the specific methodology and point of view of economics: 'regarding the essentially dogmatic, abstract and inferential (*istidlâlî*) character of the method which governs law, the method of economics, as an empirical (experimental) social science, is a specific synthesis and combination of induction (*istikra*) and inference, observation (*müşahede*) and deduction (*ta'îlî*), experience and theory (*nazariye*). For several problems one is constrained to appeal to statistical methods. And the latter require frequently the use of advanced mathematics' (*İktisat Fakültesi Talebe Rehberi*, 1938, quoted by Fındıkoğlu 1946: 66; see also Dölen 2010c: 225–6). According to the 'Student Guide', it was high time that economics liberated itself from its parasite (*sığmı*) status under the wing of the law (Fındıkoğlu 1946: 67). Quoting an observation of Osman Nuri (*History of Education -Maarif Tarihi*), Fındıkoğlu notices that to a large extent the non-existence of an autonomous Faculty of Economics in *Darülfünun* was due to the dominance of the French tradition (ibid.: 69).

On the other hand, the motivation for the creation of this Institute was to promote research activity. This idea was very clearly expressed by Röpke and Neumark at the inauguration of the Institute in April 1934. The idea of the separation of Law and Economics and the necessity of the creation of an autonomous Faculty of Economics quickly gained ground. At the demand of the Minister, the President of the University, Cemil Bilsel, asked

¹² For more detailed information on the biographies as well as the works of Neumark, Kessler, Röpke and Rüstow, as well as on Baade, Dobretsberger, Isaac and Wilbrandt, see the contributions in Hagemann and Krohn (1999). See also Fındıkoğlu (1963), Tütengil (1963), Ülgener (1963) and Buhbe (1997).

Neumark to prepare a report in favour of the new Faculty. Neumark wrote a report of 16 pages in July 1936 under the title: 'A proposal for the creation of a Faculty of Economics in the University of İstanbul' (*İstanbul Üniversitesi'nde bir İktisat Fakültesinin ihdası hakkında teklif* – cf. Dölen 2010c: 228–31 and EK-6-43: 690–705). In his report, he developed the following arguments: the inadequate number of individuals who have any real idea of the economic sciences in Turkey; the fact that the new world will always need more economists; the inadequacy of the economic material taught in the Faculty of Law to meet this challenge; the necessity of creating an independent Faculty of Economics; and the necessity of integrating the Institute into this Faculty.

On the other hand, Neumark stated that the creation of this Faculty did not necessitate a large administrative staff: all that was needed was a secretary to the Dean, some other secretaries and a typewriter. We can see here Neumark's pragmatic approach; he sought to prevent an aspiration to excellence becoming the enemy of the practical and good. The new Faculty provided:

1. a chair of general economics and economic theory (Wilhelm Röpke, later Josef Dobretsberger and Umberto Ricci, Sabri Ülgener)
2. a chair of history of economics and economic doctrines (Şükrü Baban, Rüştü Adak)
3. a chair of general economic and financial theory (Fritz Neumark, Refii Şükrü Savla)
4. a chair of economic history and economic geography (Alexander Rüstow, Lûtfi Barkan)
5. a chair of public finance and financial laws (İbrahim Fazıl Pelin, Faik Ökte)
6. a chair of management (Alfred Isaac)
7. a chair of statistics and applied economics (Ömer Celâl Sarc, a former PhD student of Werner Sombart)
8. a chair of sociology and social politics (Gerhard Kessler, Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu, Orhan Tuna) (Fındıkoğlu 1946: 81–111).

In his report, Neumark placed emphasis on the question of the 'right of preference' (*rüşhan hakkı*). When the Faculty began to deliver diplomas, the government must take all necessary steps to recruit preferentially the graduates of the Faculty: 'The adoption of such a "preferential right" by the government will signify a relative "guarantee" of employment. Without such a guarantee it is obvious that one cannot expect that young people take the risk of specializing in economics'. Thanks to the creation of this Faculty the Republic will achieve 'the training of economists who will be

able to respond to the needs of the state and to private enterprises'. Neumark's report was sent to the Ministry in August 1936, and on 14 December 1936, the decision to create a Faculty of Economics was taken. The inauguration took place on 5 February 1937. During the ceremony, Kessler gave a speech where he said: 'If Economic policy works with goods, Social policy works with men'.

Among the Mayflower generation of economists, Röpke might be the best known internationally today, but Neumark and the somewhat forgotten Kessler had a much stronger and lasting impact in Turkey. *Wilhelm Röpke* (1899–1966), who became an outstanding representative of liberal conservatism after WW II and President of the *Mont Pèlerin Society* 1960–1962, was among the small group of émigré scholars who were neither dismissed for racial reasons, nor as activists of the political left. He came into conflict with the Nazis because of his liberal views, and in the autumn of 1933 accepted appointment to one of the most important chairs in economics at the University of İstanbul. However, Röpke felt culturally alienated at the Bosphorus, where he could not stand the noise and smell. Missing Central European culture and climate, and making no real effort to learn the Turkish language, Röpke moved to Switzerland in the autumn of 1937 to become Professor of International Economics at the *Institut Universitaire des Hautes Etudes Internationales* in Geneva, where he stayed until his death. In the spring of 1938, *Josef Dobretsberger* (1903–1970) succeeded Röpke in his chair at İstanbul University.¹³ Dobretsberger, who had been Social Minister in Austria in 1935–1936, was dismissed from his professorship at the University of Graz after the *Anschluss* in March 1938. In 1942, Dobretsberger moved further from İstanbul to Giza University in Cairo, from where he returned to Graz in 1946. In 1942, Dobretsberger was succeeded by the Italian economist *Umberto Ricci* (1879–1946), a classical liberal and excellent theorist who, as a fierce opponent of Mussolini, had been dismissed from his chair at the University of Rome as early as 1929. From 1929 to 1940, he taught at the University of Cairo and from 1942 to 1946 at the University of İstanbul. He died in Cairo on the way back to Rome, where the University had offered him his old chair.

Fritz Neumark (1900–1991) had as an economist undoubtedly the greatest and longest-lasting impact in Turkey, similarly to Ernst Hirsch in law. Being dismissed for racial reasons from Goethe University in Frankfurt in April, he became Professor of Economics at the University in İstanbul in September 1933, staying for 18 years. Neumark was among the very few German professors who were able to teach in Turkish after a short time

13 See Sayar (2007) for a closer examination of Dobretsberger's short Turkish period in the light of official documents.

without the support of a translator or mediator.¹⁴ He taught in many sub-disciplines of economics, but his main field was public finance. In contrast to the ‘archliberal’ Röpke,¹⁵ Neumark was more open to the ideas of Keynes’s *General Theory* and became a leading international representative of modern ‘fiscal policy’. This made him useful as an advisor to the Turkish government, especially in the major tax reform of 1950.¹⁶ In 1952, he returned to Germany, where he succeeded his old mentor Wilhelm Gerloff as Professor of Public Finance at the Goethe University in Frankfurt, where he was elected twice as Rector. At the Faculty of Economics in İstanbul, Neumark’s teachings on Keynes had a long-lasting impact (Sayar 1998).

Neumark’s great empathy for Turkey is well-expressed in his autobiographical *Refuge at the Bosphorus. German scholars, politicians and artists in emigration 1933–1953* (Neumark 1980). Among the several honorary doctorates Neumark received, the first was from the University of İstanbul in 1965. Two decades later, he accompanied in 1986 Richard von Weizsäcker, the President of the Federal Republic of Germany, on his state visit to Turkey. On that occasion, the University of İstanbul installed a memorial tablet to the German academics who made such a contribution to the foundation of a modern Turkish university.

One of Neumark’s greatest contributions was his role as the driving force in the foundation of the first scholarly journal in economics in Turkey. A considerable number of scientific studies on economic questions of the Ottoman Empire and the young Turkish Republic had been published, but all in the Turkish language. The *Revue de la Faculté des Sciences Economiques de l’Université d’İstanbul*, founded by the Faculty of Economics in October 1939, i.e. less than three years after the creation of the Faculty of Economics, had the explicit aim of opening up to, and catching up with, the existing level of international research. Wherever possible, the articles were translated into one or more European languages: French, English and/or German. Together with his Turkish colleagues Şükrü Baban – who initially had been an opponent of Atatürk’s modernisation policy and as a much older colleague had got his basic academic training in the French-speaking part of Switzerland – and the young economic historian Ömer Lütfi Barkan, Neumark formed the scientific committee of the new journal, which soon developed to a very reputable level. In the very first issue of the journal of October 1939, they clearly stated the aims of the journal as follows:

14 For example, see the report from an eyewitness Turkish student Kazgan (2009: 8).

15 See Neumark (1980: 75).

16 Concerning the old fiscal practices in Ottoman Empire see Kaya (2008: 270–2).

'The journal aims to be an instrument of publication of scientific works of all kinds for the members of the Faculty and to contribute to the knowledge of the institutions and the problems of the economic and social life of Turkey. But the journal does not confine itself to the study of Turkish issues; it also intends to contribute to the overall progress of our science, publishing theoretical research or general studies dealing with problems and facts of economic and social life of other countries. Only persons familiar with theory are able to fully understand the complex modern economic process and to appreciate the scope (impact) and the consequences of economic and social policy measures. The fact that nowadays the economic policy of most states, and also that of Turkey, is largely based on "meta-economic" considerations, and the fact that the liberal order is increasingly replaced by a more or less pronounced state system (étatisme), cannot question our observation. On the contrary, we believe that it is precisely the system of "direction" or "planning" of economic life, much more than the liberal system, which needs to rely on the serious knowledge of the concepts and the theoretical relationships of economic phenomena'.

It had been *Gerhard Kessler* (1883–1963) who as an enthusiastic lecturer at the University of Jena (1912–1927) had attracted the young student Fritz Neumark to economics.¹⁷ In 1933, they became colleagues at the University of İstanbul. As an anti-Nazi, Kessler was dismissed for political reasons from the University of Leipzig in April 1933, where he had been professor since 1927. As a young man, Kessler had been, together with Theodor Heuss, the first President of the Federal Republic of Germany 1949–1959, an assistant to Friedrich Naumann, the charismatic leader of the Liberal Party before WW I. In the Weimar Republic, he was an activist in the Social Democratic Party, fighting for democracy and defending the young Republic against the nationalists and the rising Nazi movement. He was a member of the regional parliament in Saxony, and a candidate for Heuss's *Deutsche Staatspartei* in the *Reichstag* elections of March 1933 after Hitler was appointed German Chancellor. Kessler was imprisoned by the Nazis but liberated on the personal intervention of President Hindenburg. Shortly afterwards, he was able to emigrate to Turkey, and from 1933 to 1951, he was Professor of Social Policy and Labour Market Policy at the University of İstanbul. During that period, he published four major textbooks: *On Cooperatives (Kooperatifçilik)*, *An Introduction to Sociology (İçtimaiyata Başlangıç)*, *Social Policy (İçtimai Siyaset)* and *Economic History (İktisat Tarihi)*. While in Turkish exile, Kessler co-operated politically with Ernst Reuter. In contrast to a pure theoretician such as Ricci and trained in the tradition of the German Historical School, Kessler was strongly involved in practical matters: in 1946, he participated in the foundation of the first Turkish trade union together with his long-term assistant Orhan Tuna, who

¹⁷ See Neumark (1980: 77–8).

later wrote a moving obituary on Kessler's personality and his activity and work in Turkey (Tuna 1963).

Alexander Rüstow (1885–1963) had been advisor and managing director of the machine tool industry association from 1924 to 1933. Widely read, he also became the organising figure of the younger and more theoretically minded 'German Ricardians'. Rüstow got his first Professorship for Economic Geography and Economic History at the University of İstanbul. Although he remained there from 1933 to 1949, in contrast to Neumark, Kessler and Reuter he never learned the Turkish language and adapted to the culture, but instead existed in an ivory tower. While in İstanbul he wrote his opus magnum *Orbestimmung der Gegenwart* (Rüstow 1950–1957),¹⁸ which established Rüstow as a leading liberal thinker in post-WW II Germany, to which he returned in 1950 as the successor of Alfred Weber, Max's younger brother, in the chair of economics and the social sciences at the University of Heidelberg.

German émigré scholars not only first introduced public finance and administration, social policy or, as Hirsch did, Western law at the university level in Turkey, but also business economics and accounting. It was Alfred Isaac (1888–1956) who, at the initiative of Neumark and Kessler, got the first chair for management in Turkey in 1937. Isaac was an early representative of the new management science and, as Professor at the University for Economics and Commerce in Nuremberg since 1928, only the second Jewish holder of a chair in this field in Germany. In 1934, he had been dismissed from his chair as well as from his co-editorship of the *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft*. Isaac learned Turkish quite quickly and was a committed teacher who exerted a stronger influence more by his lectures and several textbooks on economic administration and insurance economics than by his research.

Although the group of émigré economists in Turkey was relatively small, they exerted a considerable influence on modernisation and reform policy in Turkey. Besides the scholars who were appointed by the University of İstanbul, this also holds for the two agricultural economists Fritz Baade and Hans Wilbrandt who, like Ernst Reuter, had Ankara as their home base.

Fritz Baade (1893–1974) was throughout his life active on the borderline of academics and politics. Since 1925, he had, together with Fritz (Perez) Naphtali (1888–1961) who emigrated to Palestine in 1933, been the co-director of the German trade union research department for economic policy. In 1928, Baade became founding director of the government institute for agricultural markets and in 1929, *Reichsgetreidekommissar*. As a

18 In 1980 Princeton University Press published a condensed English translation with the title *Freedom and Domination*.

member of the *Reichstag* for the SPD, he was co-architect of the *Woytinsky-Tarnow-Baade* plan, passed by the congress of the German trade unions in April 1932 to fight mass unemployment in the Great Depression. Dismissed from all these positions in March 1933, Baade became a working farmer in Brandenburg before emigrating to Turkey in 1935, where he stayed until 1946 as a practical reformer and advisor to the Turkish government on agricultural policy. Having been interned in Turkey at the end of the war, Baade spent two years in the US before returning in the spring of 1948 to Germany, where he was appointed Professor and Director of the Institute for World Economics in Kiel (until 1961). From 1949 to 1965, he also was a social democratic member of the *Bundestag*, the German parliament. During this period, he was responsible for the 1960 Report on Turkey for the Food and Agricultural Organization (Tütengil 1964).

Hans Wilbrandt (1903–1988), who had been dismissed by the Nazis in 1933, emigrated to Turkey in 1934 where he was likewise an advisor of the Turkish government on agricultural policy until the outbreak of WW II, when he became a trader in agricultural products. Wilbrandt, who had quickly absorbed the language, culture, and mentality of his host country, was also heavily engaged in the International Rescue and Relief Committee. He saved the lives of many refugees who had been persecuted by the Nazis. As a close friend of Helmut James Graf von Moltke, Wilbrandt had close contacts to the *Kreisau Circle*, one of the main resistance groups against Hitler. Thanks to Fritz Baade, Wilbrandt became a researcher at the Kiel Institute and made a late career as a Professor, first from 1956 at the Technical University in Berlin, and from 1963 in Göttingen, where he founded the Institute for Foreign Agriculture. In 1977, Wilbrandt was awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Ankara.

VII. Concluding remarks

From this preliminary appreciation of the impact of the émigré scholars after 1933, we believe that we have shown how important their contribution to the modernisation of the Turkish University was. At the point when the Turkish Republican authorities decided to overhaul the system of higher education and research in their country, the availability of a group of academics in Europe with a very high level of scientific training and with an impressive experience of research activity represented an unexpected opportunity (disregarding the tragic circumstances which made this situation possible). It should be recognised that Turkish authorities seized this opportunity with great skill and professionalism. The authoritarian, unscrupulous and resolute management of Reşit Galip as the head of the

Ministry of Education was without doubt a key factor for the success of this operation.¹⁹ Over a period of almost two decades, Turkey had the opportunity of benefiting from the potential of scientific and artistic abilities whose formation required many years of education, training and experience and the mobilisation of considerable national resources. Hence, the arrival and the scientific work of these foreign academics could be considered as positive externalities for the system of higher education in Turkey. Personalities like Neumark or Kessler represented inestimable forces of innovation, creation, realisation and production inside the new university, and for the intellectual and social life in the country. As we underlined above, the contribution of Neumark to the creation and to the continuity of a high level scientific review as '*İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*' (İlem 2007), or the contribution of Kessler to the first review of the world of work in Turkey by Ziyaeddin Fahri Findıkoğlu, called '*İş*' (*Labor*), were decisive scientific and social events. On the other hand, most of the refugees were keen to be useful to the scientific and intellectual life of Turkey since they were very grateful to the country which had taken them in with such warmth and hospitality in an extremely difficult period of their lives. This sentiment of a great debt owed to the country which received them boosted their efforts. The testimony of Neumark is very touching, since he considered Turkey a 'second Homeland' ('*ein zweites Vaterland*', Neumark 1980: 228). Hence, as regards the contribution of the academic refugees to the modernisation of the Turkish university we broadly share the general appreciation of the physicist Prof. Erdal İnönü when he states: 'The number of the scientific research articles published in Turkey in the fields of astronomy, mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, geology represent a continuous increasing trend after 1933. The publications of the first years were achieved essentially by German scholars (...) But progressively the number of the publications of invited academics decreases and those by local scholars increases. For example, in the field of physics, between 1933 and 1960, the productivity curve increased by a factor of two in 6.5 years. In other scientific fields the situation is the same. Today we know that the number of scientific articles published by Turkish researchers places them number 20 in the world. On the basis of this result I can assert calmly that from the research productivity point of view the invited German scientists' work, after the 1933 reform, responded to our expectations' (İnönü 2007: 88; see also Azrak 2007; Erichsen 2007).

19 It is also noteworthy in this context that the Turkish government did not give in to increasing pressure from the Nazis in the Scurla episode in 1939. See Grothusen (1987) as well as Şen and Halm (2007).

No doubt the impact of the refugee scholars was on the whole positive. However, some reservations must be made. Here, we share the appreciations of specialists as Dölen (2007, 2010c), Tunçay and Özen (1984a, b), Özen (1999), Bahadır (2007) or Baltacıoğlu (2008a, b, c). These authors estimate that the impact of the refugee scientists could have been much more successful if the reform had been prepared and implemented with less haste and more realism. We conclude our investigation of this 1933 Turkish university reform by presenting in broad outline the general evaluation of this experience after 10 years, by one of the best connoisseurs of the subject, E. Dölen (2010c: 408 f.).

- During this period the number of students greatly increased. But the number of teaching staff did not increase in step with the increase in the number of students, and consequently, teaching responsibilities and related tasks absorbed almost all the time of scholars, preventing them from more intensive research activities.
- Genuine scientific and pedagogic collaboration was not created between foreign and Turkish scholars. On the contrary, a kind of competitive relationship and rivalry appeared progressively between them. The great gap between salaries paid to foreign and Turkish scholars is another factor, and perhaps the most important one, which prevented the establishment of a climate of trust and respect between foreigners and locals. The fact that most of the German professors were Jewish provoked here and there some racist reactions which reinforced the confrontational climate, particularly in the field of medicine (see Bali 2004). On the other hand, the efforts in order to extend the stay of foreign scholars in Turkey were insufficient. Neumark stated that in spite of all the efforts of their Turkish colleagues, the government did not provide any reasonable solution to the problem faced by foreign professor regarding retirement (Neumark 1980: 229).
- The importance of the status of assistant professor was not recognised, and assistants were restricted to subordinate tasks and occupations. Consequently, most of the foreign professors did not respect the original contract that compelled them to contribute to the training of local scholars and researchers. They preferred to conduct their scientific research in collaboration with the foreign assistants they had brought with them, and not with young Turkish scholars. Therefore, the training of the docents in several faculties was insufficient. Another factor which should be considered in this context: the extremely low salaries paid to Turkish docents forced them very often to find another job outside the university.

- The 1933 reform suppressed the autonomy of the university and made it dependent on the Ministry of Education. In administrative matters, the university became an ordinary educational school. Consequently, the bureaucrats in the Ministry closely supervised teaching programmes and research activities. The suppression of the autonomy gravely restricted the innovative and creative potentiality of the university.

However, despite all these problems, there can be no doubt that the coming of the German émigré economists to Turkey in the Nazi period created a win-win situation. The Turkish reform of a modern university system was enormously accelerated by the support of foreign scholars. They contributed to the foundation and development of a modern academic infrastructure, not least by the writing of textbooks in the various subfields of economics that was part of their contract. Besides the foundation of the first scholarly journal in 1939, which raised the level of research publications significantly, the building up of a special library in economics, to which the timeless efforts and enthusiasm by Kessler was most important (Tuna 1963), also filled a vacuum.

There clearly was a great deal of emphasis in teaching and research in the İstanbul Faculty on history of economic thought, and economic and social history. However, it would be a misunderstanding to infer from this fact that the German Historical School was influential. Neumark had a sharp analytical mind and became a supporter of Keynesian fiscal policies. Ricci was a brilliant theoretician in the wake of Walras, Pareto and Pantaleoni, and Rüstow and Röpke were liberal economists. But the German economists did not use mathematics and employed hardly any diagrams in their teachings. Thus, Gülten Kazgan, who began her studies at İstanbul University in 1946 and later became the first female Professor of Economics and the leading economic historian in Turkey, notes in her memories that students had never seen any supply or demand curves during their studies, and that a deeper knowledge of a synthetic analytical economics only came with the translation of Samuelson's textbook in the 1960s (Kazgan 2009: 13–5).

It has to be kept in mind that Kazgan, who was educated at the American College for girls in İstanbul before she started to study at İstanbul Faculty, and later was at the University of Chicago in the 1950s, was strongly influenced by the Anglo-Saxon academic world, which in contemporary Turkey was very exceptional. In fact neither the French liberalism of *Darülfünun* nor the liberalism of economists such as Röpke and Rüstow had a comparable analytical dimension in the sense of modern mathematical economics along the lines of Walras-Edgeworth-Pareto-Hicks-Samuelson

et al. Furthermore, *Kadro's étatism*e fitted much better with the background of the Continental European tradition of *Staatswissenschaften* than with economics in the Anglo-Saxon tradition. *Darülfünun's* liberalism was as hostile or close to the analytical approach in economics as *Kadro* was. This observation can explain the fact that the teaching programme of economics in the new university excluded the analytical approach for several years, just as the *Ecole orthodoxe française* kept Walras and his analytical approach out of the French university (Zylberberg 1990).

There are many stories (see, e.g. Neumark 1980; Kazgan 2009) about the linguistic problems and barriers that still existed after more than a decade, and which severely reduced the time budgeted for the teaching programme. Whereas only very few foreign scholars were able to teach in Turkish fluently, others needed a translator, or, as with Kessler, taught in French. Writing and teaching in a foreign language was not a major problem for those *émigré* scholars who went to the US or Britain. Being far away from the international research frontier, and with the problems of cultural alienation, many *émigrés* had to face in Turkish exile, also helps explain why in contrast to those who emigrated to the Anglo-Saxon world, hardly anyone remained in Turkey beyond the early 1950s, despite the great hospitality of the Turks and the empathy of several *émigrés*, such as Neumark, Kessler or Reuter, for their host country.

Acknowledgement

The authors are grateful to Keith Tribe and two anonymous referees for their constructive comments.

Bibliography

- Aynî, Mehmet Ali (1927 [2007]). *Darülfünun Tarihi*. Hazırlayan Ayku Kazancıgil, Kitabevi – 308.
- Azrak, Ülkü (2007). 1933 Reform'unun Hukuk ve İktisat Fakültelerine Etkileri. In N.K. Aras, E. Dölen, and O. Bahadır (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi (1861–1961)*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, sıra 15, pp. 214–6.
- Bahadır, Osman (2007). 1933 Üniversitesi Reformu Niçin Yapıldı?. In N.K. Aras, E. Dölen, and O. Bahadır (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi (1861–1961)*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, sıra 15, pp. 52–85.
- Bali, Rifat N. (2004). Türkiye'ye sığınan Alman Yahudi Bilim Adamları Hakkında Bir Arşiv Belgesi ile Yunus Nadi-Ahmet Emin Yalman Tartışması. In R. Bali (Ed.), *Devletin Yahudileri ve "Öteki" Yahudi*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları, pp. 275–97.
- Baltacıoğlu, Ali (2007). 1933'te Atılanlar ve Devam Edenler. *Darülfünun Tasfiyesi, Tarih ve Toplum*, Kasım 167, pp. 34–43.

- Baltacıoğlu, Ali (2008a). Darülfünun'dan Üniversiteye (I) 1933 Reformuna Doğru, *Tarih ve Toplum*, Temmuz 175, pp. 78–85.
- Baltacıoğlu, Ali (2008b). Darülfünun'dan Üniversiteye (II) 1933 Üniversite Reformu, *Tarih ve Toplum*, Temmuz 175, pp. 40–7.
- Baltacıoğlu, Ali (2008c). Darülfünun'dan Üniversiteye (III) 1933 Üniversite Reformunun Sonrası, *Tarih ve Toplum*, Eylül 177, pp. 34–43.
- Birinci Türk Tarih Kongresi (1932 [2010]). *Konferanslar, Müzakere Zabıtları*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Boratav, Korkut (2003). *Türkiye İktisat Tarihi 1908–2002*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Buhbe, Matthes (1997). Die Emigration deutschsprachiger Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftler in die Türkei. In H. Hagemann (Ed.), *Zur deutschsprachigen wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Emigration nach 1933*. Marburg: Metropolis, pp. 411–36.
- Burhan Asaf [Belge] (1933a). Arkada kalan Darülfünun'un Başına Gelenler, *Kadro*, 18: 95–6.
- Burhan Asaf [Belge] (1933b). Cihan İçinde Türkiye: Üniversite'nin Manası, *Kadro*, 20: 24–8.
- Çavdar, Tevfik (2004). Türkiye'de Ekonomi Öğretiminin Ana Çizgileri. In L. Hilal Akgül and F. Aral (Eds.), *Zur Kazgan'a Armağan Türkiye Ekonomisi*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 79, pp. 229–46.
- Dölen, Emre (2007). İstanbul Darülfünun'da ve Üniversitesi'nde Yabancı Öğretim Elemanları. In N.K. Aras, E. Dölen, and O. Bahadır (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi (1861–1961)*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, sıra 15, pp. 89–162.
- Dölen, Emre (2009). *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi 1. Osmanlı Döneminde Darülfünun 1863–1922*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 271.
- Dölen, Emre (2010a). *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi 2. Cumhuriyet Döneminde Osmanlı Darülfünunu 1922–1933*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 276.
- Dölen, Emre (2010b). *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi 3. Darülfünun'dan Üniversiteye Geçiş. Tasfiye ve Yeni Kadrolar*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 277.
- Dölen, Emre (2010c). *Türkiye Üniversite Tarihi 4. İstanbul Üniversitesi 1933–1946*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 278.
- Dumont, Paul, and Georgeon, François (1989). La mort d'un empire (1908–1923). In R. Mantran (Ed.), *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*. Paris: Fayard, pp.577–647.
- Erichsen, Regine (1998). Türkei. In: C.-D. Krohn, P. von zur Mühlen, G. Paul and L. Winckler (Eds.), *Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration 1933–1945*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, pp. 426–34.
- Erichsen, Regine (2007). 1933–1944 Arasında Alman Bilim İnsanları: Türk Bilimine Katkıları ve Politik Koşulların Etkileri. In N.K. Aras, E. Dölen, and O. Bahadır (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi (1861–1961)*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, sıra 15, pp. 305–16.
- Erozan, Boğaç (2011a). Ahmet Ağaoğlu ve „Nizamlı Hürriyet”: Bir Cumhuriyetçi Yorum Denemesi. *Doğu Batı Düşünce Dergisi*, 57: 197–223.
- Erozan, Boğaç (2011b). Ahmet Ağaoğlu, Siyasal ve Entelektüel Bağlam. In Erozan Boğaç (Haz), *Ahmet Ağaoğlu ve Hukuk-i Esasiye Ders Notları (1926–1927)*. İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları, pp. 19–76.
- Fındıkoğlu, Fahri Z. (1946). *Türkiye'de İktisat Tedrisatı Tarihçesi ve İktisat Fakültesi Teşkilâtı*. İstanbul: İsmail Akgün Matbaası.
- Fındıkoğlu, Fahri Z. (1963). Türk Sosyolojiosinde İki Alman Sosyologu Prof. Kessler ve Prof. Rüstow. *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 23(3–4): 33–50.
- Fortna, Benjamin C. (2002). *Imperial Classroom. Islam, the State, and Education in the Late Ottoman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Georgeon, François (1989). Le dernier sursaut (1878–1908). In R. Mantran (Ed.), *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*. Paris: Fayard, pp. 523–76.
- Georgeon, François (1994). La formation des élites à la fin de l'Empire Ottoman: le cas de Galatasaray. *Revue du Monde Musulman et de la Méditerranée*, 72: 15–25.
- Gökalp, Ziya (1923 [1970]). *Türkçülüğün Esasları*. İstanbul: M.E.B. Devlet Kitapları.
- Grothusen, K.-D. (Ed.) (1987). *Der Scurla-Bericht. Bericht des Oberregierungsrates Dr. Herbert Scurla von der Auslandsabteilung des Reichserziehungsministeriums in Berlin über seine Dienstreise nach Ankara und İstanbul vom 11. -25. Mai 1939: Die Tätigkeit deutscher Hochschullehrer an türkischen wissenschaftlichen Hochschulen*. Frankfurt.
- Hagemann, Harald (Ed.) (1997). *Zur deutschsprachigen wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Emigration nach 1933*. Marburg: Metropolis.
- Hagemann, Harald (2011). European émigrés and the 'Americanization' of economics. *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 18(5): 643–71.
- Hagemann, Harald, and Krohn, Claus-Dieter (Eds.) (1999). *Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Emigration nach 1933*. 2 vols. Munich: K.G. Saur.
- Hirsch, Ernst E. (1982). *Aus des Kaisers Zeiten durch die Weimarer Republik in das Land Atatürks. Eine unzeitgemässe Autobiographie*. Munich: Schweitzer, transl. as *Anıların. Kayzer Dönemi Weimar Cumhuriyeti Atatürk Ülkesi*, by Fatma Suphi, Tübitak Popüler Bilim Kitapları (1997), 2000.
- İlem, Derya (2007). *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası Dizini (Cilt 1–56) (1939–2007)*. İstanbul: İşaret Yayınları.
- İnönü, Erdal (2007). İstanbul Üniversitesi'nin 1933 Reformu'ndan Sonraki Gelişmesi Üzerine Düşünceler. In N.K. Aras, E. Dölen, and O. Bahadır (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi (1861–1961)*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, sıra 15, pp. 87–8.
- İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası (Revue de la Faculté des Sciences Economiques de l'Université d'İstanbul), 1939 ff. "İş" Üç Aylık Ahlâk ve İçtimaiyat Mecmuası, Çıkarıcı Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu, 1934 ff.
- Kaya, Alp Yücel (2008). In the Hinterland of İzmir: Mid-nineteenth century traders facing a new type of fiscal practice. In S. Faroqui, G. Veinstein (Eds.), *Merchants in the Ottoman Empire*. Paris: Peeters, pp. 261–79.
- Kazgan, Gülten (2009). *Bir İktisatçının Tanıklıkları*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 282.
- Malche, Albert (1932). Prof. Dr. Albert Malche'm İstanbul Darülfünunu Hakkında Raporu. In N.K. Aras, E. Dölen, and O. Bahadır (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi (1861–1961)*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, 2007, sıra 15, pp. 352–99.
- Muhlis Etem [Ete] (1933). Bizde Kürsü İktisatçıları ve İktisat İlmi. *Kadro*, 23: 45–51.
- Neumark, Fritz (1980). *Zuflucht am Bosphorus: Deutsche Gelehrte, Politiker und Künstler in der Emigration 1933–1953*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht, transl. as *Boğaziçiye Sığınanlar. Türkiye'ye İltica Eden Alman İlim, Siyaset ve Sanat Adamları 1933–1953* by Bahadır Şefik Alp, İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Maliye Enstitüsü Yayını, 1982.
- Okyar, Osman (1965). The Concept of Etatism. *The Economic Journal*, 75(297):98–111.
- Özen, Haldun (1999). Türkiye Cumhuriyet'inde Yükseköğretim ve Üniversitenin 75 Yılı. In F. Gök (Ed.), *75 Yılda Eğitim*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları, pp. 263–81.
- Özveren, Eyüp (1996). The intellectual legacy of the *Kadro* movement in retrospect. *METU Studies in Development*, 23(4): 565–76.

- Özveren, Eyüp (2002). Ottoman economic thought and economic policy in transition. Rethinking the nineteenth century. In M. Psalidopoulos and M.E. Mata (Eds.), *Economic Thought and Policy in Less Developed Europe*. London: Routledge, pp.129–44.
- Reisman, Arnold (2006). *Turkey's Modernization*. Washington, DC: New Academia Publishing.
- Rüstow, Alexander (1950–57). *Ortsbestimmung der Gegenwart. Eine universalgeschichtliche Kulturkritik*. Vol. 1: Ursprung der Herrschaft (1950); Vol. 2 Weg der Freiheit (1952); Vol. 3 Herrschaft oder Freiheit (1957). Erlenbach, Zürich: Eugen Rentsch.
- Sakaoğlu, Necdet (2003). *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Eğitilm Tarihi*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları 33.
- Sayar, Ahmet Güner (1998). *Sabri F. Ülgener: Bir İktisatçının Entellektüel Protesisi*. İstanbul: Eren Yayınları.
- Sayar, Ahmet Güner (2007). *Dobretsberger Dosyası*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi, 36, pp. 1–14.
- Schwartz, Philipp (1995). *Notgemeinschaft. Zur Emigration deutscher Wissenschaftler nach 1933 in die Türkei*. Marburg: Metropolis; transl. as *Kader Birliği. Yurt dışındaki Alman Bilim Adamları Yardımlaşma Cemiyeti*, by Nagehan Alçı, Belge Yayınları, 2003.
- Şen, Faruk, Halm, Dirk (Eds.) (2007). *Exil unter Halbmond und Stern. Herbert Scurlas Bericht über die Tätigkeit deutscher Hochschullehrer in der Türkei während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*. Essen: Klartext, transl. as *Ayyıldız Altında Sürgün. Herbert Scurla'nın Nasyonal Sosyalizm Döneminde Türkiye'ye sığınan Alman Bilim Adamları Hakkında Yazdığı Rapor*, by Fatma Artunkal, İstanbul: Günizi Yayıncılık, 2008.
- Şevket Süreyya [Aydemir] (1933). Darülfünun İnkılâp Hassasiyeti ve Cavit Bey İktisatçılığı. *Kadro*, 14: 5–11.
- Somel, Selçuk Akşin (2001). *The Modernization of Public Education in the Ottoman Empire 1839–1908. Islamization, Autocracy and Discipline*. Leiden: Brill.
- Strauss, Herbert A. (1983). The Migration of Academic Intellectuals. In H.A. Strauss and W. Röder (Eds.), *International Dictionary of Central European Émigrés 1933–1945, Vol.II/ Part 1: A-K*. General. Munich and New York: K. G. Saur, pp. LXVII–LXXVII.
- Tekeli, İlhan (2007). Cumhuriyet Öncesinde Üniversite Kavramının Ortaya Çıkışı ve Gerçekleştirilmesinde Alınan Yol. In N.K. Aras, In E. Dölen and O. Bahadır (Eds.), *Türkiye'de Üniversite Anlayışının Gelişimi (1861–1961)*. Ankara: Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Yayınları, sıra 15, pp. 19–51.
- Tekeli, İlhan (2010). *Tarihsel Bağlamı İçinde Türkiye'de Yükseköğretimin ve YÖK'ün Tarihi*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Tekeli, İlhan, and İlkin, Selim (2003). *Kadrocuları ve Kadro'yu Anlamak*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları 134.
- Toprak, Zafer (1995). *Türkiye'de Ekonomi ve Toplum (1908–1950) Millî İktisat – Millî Burjuvazi*. İstanbul: Türkiye Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Tuna, Orhan (1963). Prof. Gerhard Kessler Şahsiyeti ve Eserleri. In *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, Cilt 23(3–4): 5–23*; Prof. Dr. Gerhard Kessler's Persönlichkeit und Werke, pp. 293–304.
- Tunçay, Mete, and Özen, Haldun (1984a). Bir Tek Parti Politikacısının Önlenemez Yükselişi ve Düşüşü. *Tarih ve Toplum*. Ekim Cilt.2, sayı 10, pp. 222–36.
- Tunçay, Mete, and Özen, Haldun (1984b). 1933 Tasfiyesinden Önce Darülfünun. In *Yapıt*, sayı 7 (Ekim – Kasım), pp. 5–28.
- Tunçer, Polat (2010). *İttihatçı Cavit Bey*. İstanbul : Yeditepe Yayınevi.
- Tütengil, Cavit Orhan (1963). Ord. Prof. Dr. G. Kessler'ın Sosyoloji Tarihimizdeki Yeri ve Türkiye'deki Yayınlarının Bibliyografyası. In *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, Cilt 23(3–4):51–66*; Professor Kessler's Place in Turkish History of Sociology and his Publications in Turkey, pp. 308–11.

- Tütengil, Cavit Orhan (1964). Türkiye'nin Sorunları ve Prof. Dr. Fritz Baade. *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 24(1-2): 109-19.
- Ülgener, Sabri F. (1963). Alexander Rüstow. *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası, Cilt*, 23(3-4): 24-32.
- Widmann, Horst (1973). *Exil und Bildungshilfe. Die deutschsprachige akademische Emigration in die Türkei nach 1933*. Bern and Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, transl. as *Atatürk ve Üniversite Reformu. (Almanca Konuşulan Ülkelerden 1933 Yılından Sonra Türkiye'ye Gelen Öğretim Üyeleri) Yaşamöyküleri – Çalışmaları – Etkileri*, by Aykut Kazancıgil and Serpil Bozkurt, İstanbul: Kabalcı (1999) 2000.
- Zylberberg, André (1990). *L'Economie mathématique en France 1870-1914*. Paris: Economica.

Abstract

The paper deals with the abolition of the Ottoman university and the reopening of Istanbul University in 1933, and the dismissal of many scientists in Nazi Germany. This allowed the Turkish government to invite a large group of these scholars to the benefit of the academic endeavours of the young Turkish Republic. The article gives an overview on the refugees from Nazism who came as experts and advisers to the Turkish government. It then focuses on the scientific contributions and activities of the small but significant group of economists and concludes with an assessment of their impact.

Keywords

Ottoman University (Darülfünun), Refugees from Nazism, Faculty of Economics at Istanbul University