Baltimore Teaches, Göttingen Learns: Cooperation, Competition, and the Research University

EMILY J. LEVINE

> Dominant cities did not dominate for ever; they replaced each other.
>
> —Fernand Braudel

"Under [Hadrian], professors were appointed to lecture in different places," the German-American political scientist Francis Lieber reflected wistfully in 1872, and "the traveling professor had a free passage on the emperor's ships, or on the vessels laden with grain. In our days of steamboats and railroads the traveling professor should be reinstated. Why could not the same person teach in New York and Strassburg?"[1] For the pioneering scholar of international law, the "traveling professor" represented a universalist promise for scholarship in an increasingly interconnected world.

Farsighted reformers at the end of the nineteenth century agreed with Lieber. The Congress of Arts and Science at the Louisiana Purchase Exhibition in 1904, which included such luminary visiting scholars as Max Weber and the mathematician Felix Klein, reflected this cooperative spirit. So did the German-American professor exchange that Columbia University president Nicholas Murray Butler and Prussian cultural reformer Friedrich Schmidt-Ott established the following year. Every year until the outbreak of the First World War, scholars of theology, chemistry, and political economy from Columbia University and Harvard University (and later Yale and

Research for this project was undertaken while I was a Postdoctoral Research Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation at the Free University of Berlin in 2012–2013. Thank you to Paul Nolte and Christiane Kuller for hosting and Ronny Grundig for your research support. I am grateful for the help of a number of archivists who located documents or photographs for me, including, in particular, Sandy Muhl (UAL), Birgit Schaper (ULB Bonn), Dietlind Willer (SUB Göttingen), and James Stimper (Johns Hopkins University). This work profited enormously from the helpful feedback of audiences at the Free University of Berlin, the University of Freiburg, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, the Triangle Intellectual History Seminar, and the Center for Advanced Studies at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich. I am also indebted to the very helpful suggestions and comments from Dirk Bönker, James Connolly, Eva Gilloi, Rüdiger Hachtmann, Michael Kimmage, Charlotte Lerg, Adam Nelson, Mary Nolan, Sylvia Paletschek, James J. Sheehan, and Kerry Wallach, and the incisive critique of three anonymous readers for the *AHR* as well as the journal's editors. A special thank you to Matthew Rascoff, whose admirable efforts in knowledge exchange have provided an invaluable touchstone for my developing this work. All translations from the German are mine unless otherwise noted.

[1] Lieber claimed to have first made this suggestion in 1846. Chester Squire Phinney, *Francis Lieber's Influence on American Thought and Some of His Unpublished Letters* (Philadelphia, 1918), 38.

FIGURE 1: Kaiser Wilhelm II and Empress Augusta Victoria visited the University of Berlin in 1914, on the occasion of the inaugural lectures by the new American exchange professors. bpk, Berlin / Art Resource NY.

Chicago) traveled to Berlin on year-long Theodore Roosevelt Professorships, while German scholars traveled to New York and Cambridge as Kaiser Wilhelm Professors. Schmidt-Ott later boasted that the professor exchange was a landmark in the history of international cultural cooperation.[2] Following his tenure as the Roosevelt Professor in Berlin, Yale University president Arthur Twining Hadley lauded the influence of the German graduate school on the development of the American research university.[3]

Yet despite this rhetoric of partnership, the German-American scholarly exchange also fostered feelings of competition. Following Hadley's warm reception in Berlin, the German political economist Adolph Wagner bemoaned, "Yesterday it was said that Bologna teaches; today it is said that Germania teaches; it may be that tomorrow it will be said that America teaches. In any event, we have reason to sum-

[2] Friedrich Schmidt-Ott, *Erlebtes und Erstrebtes, 1860–1950* (Wiesbaden, 1952), 107. For a history of the German-American professor exchange as the first major undertaking of state-initiated "cultural politics," see Bernhard vom Brocke, "Der deutsch-amerikanische Professorenaustausch: Preußische Wissenschaftspolitik, internationale Wissenschaftsbeziehungen und die Anfänge einer deutschen auswärtigen Kulturpolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg," *Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch* 31, no. 2 (1981): 128–182. For a more recent interpretation of "academic diplomacy" in the transatlantic context, see Thomas Adam and Charlotte A. Lerg, "Introductory Remarks," *Diplomacy on Campus: The Political Dimensions of Academic Exchange in the North Atlantic*, Special Issue, *Journal of Transatlantic Studies* 13, no. 4 (2015): 299–310, and the other essays in the issue.

[3] "The University of Berlin: President Hadley Relates His Impressions of German Student Life," *Yale Daily News*, no. 119 (March 2, 1908): 1. For the report of Hadley's speech, see *Yale Daily News*, no. 110 (February 20, 1908): 1–2. According to Schmidt-Ott, Nicholas Murray Butler had the idea of including university presidents in the exchange; Hadley went to Berlin as part of that initiative. *Erlebtes und Erstrebtes*, 110.

mon our forces so that it is not so."[4] Wagner's lament reflected an anxiety that arose in the first decade of the twentieth century from an uncomfortable awareness of the new pressures of economic and social utility facing the research university. As a German nationalist, Wagner did not shy from the language of Social Darwinism in imperial affairs, and he viewed the state of German scholarship as a leading indicator of the nation's economic and cultural fitness.[5] Falling behind could have grave consequences for Germany's standing in a globalizing world.

Motivated, perhaps, by contemporary versions of Wagner's anxiety, the history of the university is now receiving fresh attention among intellectual historians after years of relative neglect.[6] One engaging thread of this new scholarship presents professors as an extension of national, imperial, and colonial concerns.[7] This follows naturally from the histories of Europe and America, which demonstrate that conceptions of nationhood emerged in the increasingly global world of the late nineteenth century.[8] As tempting as it may be to superimpose notions of globalization, however, any history of the research university that takes the nation-state as the primary unit of analysis will miss this crucial fact: domestic as well as transnational forces produced the research university at the beginning of the twentieth century. Rather than purely supportive, as Hadley idealized, or fiercely cutthroat, as Wagner feared, knowledge exchange resulted in relationships that were both competitive and cooperative. The emergence of unexpected friends and foes in the pursuit of knowledge, within and across borders, challenges our standard notions of center and periphery.

[4] "Gestern hiess es: Bononia docet, heute: Germania docet. Es mag sein, dass es morgen heissen wird: America docet. Jedenfalls haben wir Grund, unsere Kräfte anzuspannen, dass es nicht so werde." Schmidt-Ott, *Erlebtes und Erstrebtes*, 111. Bononia was the Roman name for Bologna.

[5] The Historical School, of which Wagner was a leader, embodied a combined ideological commitment to both national liberalism and imperialism. Though he was like many "socialists of the chair" engaged in research and solutions to the "social problem," Wagner, who left the National Liberal Party for the Free Conservative Party, reflected a "harder, more severe strain." Abraham Ascher, "Professors as Propagandists: The Politics of the Kathedersozialisten," *Journal of Central European Affairs* 23, no. 3 (1963): 282–302, here 286, 295. Wagner was at his most expansionist when talking about Alsace and Lorraine, but scholarship played a role in his glorification of national power. See, for example, Adolph Wagner, "Die Entwicklung der europäischen Staatsterritorien und das Nationalitätsprinzip," *Preussische Jahrbücher* 19, no. 1 (1867): 540–579, especially 545–546.

[6] A new series on the history of the university has been approved at the University of Chicago Press, where my book in progress is also under contract. Anja Werner's study *The Transatlantic World of Higher Education: Americans at German Universities* (New York, 2013) reflects the renewed interest in the experience of Americans at German universities. Nonetheless, there are a number of classics in the field that still resonate for their analysis of the tension between the conditions required for academic advancement and those required for the advancement of knowledge. See, for example, Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, N.Y., 1968); and Lewis A. Coser, *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View* (1965; repr., New York, 1997), 281. Thanks to Paul Mendes-Flohr for this reference.

[7] See, for example, Valeska Huber, "International Agendas and Local Manifestations: Universities in Cairo, Beirut and Jerusalem after World War I," *Prospects: Quarterly Journal of Comparative Education* 45, no. 1 (2015): 77–93; and Tamson Pietsch, *Empire of Scholars: Universities, Networks and the British Academic World, 1850–1939* (Manchester, 2013).

[8] Following the lead of economic historians, this recent trend is typified by Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge, 2012); and Thomas Bender, ed., *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley, Calif., 2002). The research of economic historians shows that trade was at least as interconnected in 1900 as it is today. According to economic historians, the late nineteenth century experienced the first and possibly biggest globalization. Karl Gunnar Persson, *An Economic History of Europe: Knowledge, Institutions and Growth, 600 to the Present* (New York, 2010); Kevin H. O'Rourke and Jeffrey G. Williamson, "When Did Globalisation Begin?," *European Review of Economic History* 6, no. 1 (2002): 23–50; David Armitage, "Is There a Pre-History of Globalization?," in Deborah Cohen and Maura O'Connor, eds., *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (New York, 2004), 165–176.

Significant gaps persist in the scholarship on the university. While Laurence Veysey's classic study *The Emergence of the American University* was notable for its combination of intellectual and institutional history, as Veysey himself acknowledged, the work lacked a comparative element.[9] The sociology of knowledge, typified by Joseph Ben-David, who skillfully joined the Weberian, Mannheimian, and Mertonian schools of sociology, provided the missing comparative component, but his prolific body of work is built around fragmentary case studies.[10] Both contributions are essential but remain marginal to the concerns of modern history, in which higher education should be treated not on its own, but in the context of wider social, political, and cultural developments.[11] Historians of ideas, for their part, have investigated the shifting centers of intellectual life as emerging in seventeenth-century France and traveling to eighteenth-century England before departing for nineteenth-century Germany and arriving in twentieth-century America.[12] However, they have been more reticent about the university despite its evident contribution to mediating the cultural and linguistic exchanges that are the subject of recent transnational intellectual histories.[13]

[9] Laurence Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University* (Chicago, 1970). According to Veysey's own reckoning of his 1965 publication, "A major flaw in my book, as I now see it, is its failure to look at the university systems of other major countries (except briefly for Germany) alongside the American." Veysey, "The Emergence of the American University," *American Journal of Education* 90, no. 1 (1981): 103–106, here 105. With respect to the comparative element, Veysey observed that Joseph Ben-David's work was "vastly superior" to his own; ibid. Both Roger L. Geiger and Julie Reuben made significant attempts to revise Veysey, though their work remained largely within the American framework and concerned with the internal history of the university. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900–1940* (New York, 1986); Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago, 1996). The following titles helpfully connect the research university to the history of democracy and political culture: Andrew Jewett, *Science, Democracy, and the American University: From the Civil War to the Cold War* (Cambridge, 2014); and Christopher P. Loss, *Between Citizens and the State: The Politics of American Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton, N.J., 2012).

[10] Ben-David's insistence on structuralism and functionalism in his analysis, his avoidance of biography, and his attachment to a triumphalist history of both Great Britain and the United States require revision. Gregory Mann, "Institutional Dynamics of Scientific Change: Ben-David's Legacy," review of *Scientific Growth: Essays on the Social Organization and Ethos of Science* by Joseph Ben-David and Gad Freudenthal, *Social Studies of Science* 23, no. 4 (1993): 757–763.

[11] Disciplinary histories such as Suzanne L. Marchand's excellent *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Cambridge, 2009) make these connections, though Marchand tends to focus on the implications for the concept of race, and not on the institutions of higher education per se. However, studies of higher education on the whole remain the preserve of a more popular genre in which any historical treatment is the basis for either a critical discussion of current issues or a moral argument. See, for example, Andrew Delbanco, *College: What It Was, Is, and Should Be* (Princeton, N.J., 2012); Anthony T. Kronman, *Education's End: Why Our Colleges and Universities Have Given Up on the Meaning of Life* (New Haven, Conn., 2007); and Louis Menand, *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University* (New York, 2010).

[12] There have been few revisions to this thesis of center-periphery as developed by Ben-David. Carol A. Hess's account of Spanish modernism before the 1930s tries to write the Spanish back into this story; Hess, *Manuel de Falla and Modernism in Spain, 1898–1936* (Chicago, 2001), 47–48. Insofar as José Ortega y Gasset and Miguel de Unamuno believed that Spain was in decline in comparison to Germany, however, Ben-David's narrative still stands. Joseph Ben-David, *The Scientist's Role in Society: A Comparative Study* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1971).

[13] Although the essays in the collected volume *Global Intellectual History* (New York, 2013), edited by Samuel Moyn and Andrew Sartori, range in subject from colonial exploration to political economy, none considers the impact of global history on the organization of knowledge with respect to research and higher education. This is surprising since, as the editors admit, "some sort of explanation is needed for the mobility of concepts, one that neither the activities of personal intermediaries nor even the specific processes of linguistic translation can fully illuminate on their own." Moyn and Sartori, "Approaches to Global Intellectual History," ibid., 3–32, here 16.

By drawing on the history of education and the sociology of knowledge to reunite ideas with their institutions, we can see that knowledge exchange entailed the flow of not just academics and their scholarly contributions, but institutional models and administrative practices as well.[14] Moreover, not only did the institutional innovations of the research university flow from Germany to the United States, as the classic story of the American university emphasizes, but by 1905 they had begun to move in the reverse direction.[15] Integrating higher education into a wider historical context entails looking at the local—and not just national—levels at which universities embedded in cities promoted a combination of goals.[16] Consequently, the university's entanglement with outside economic and political forces contributes to our understanding of globalization, and yet also challenges any embrace of global history that obscures the local level.[17]

The history of the research university constituted a "knowledge race" between German and American reformers that underscores the intimate connection between localities and intellectual life; cities, states, and regions remained essential contexts for universities despite the nineteenth century's strong tendency toward nationalization. Thomas Bender and Daniel Rodgers have identified a concurrent rise of urbanization and globalization at the end of the nineteenth century.[18] Here we might recall

[14] More than two decades ago, Carl F. Kaestle offered a helpful perspective on how historians might use the methods of the social sciences to improve historical methodology. Kaestle, "Standards of Evidence in Historical Research: How Do We Know When We Know?," *History of Education Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (1992): 361–366. Such was the objective of many of the contributions in Konrad H. Jarausch, ed., *The Transformation of Higher Learning, 1860–1930: Expansion, Diversification, Social Opening, and Professionalization in England, Germany, Russia, and the United States* (Chicago, 1983), though they remained locked in comparative analyses and wedded to the modernization theory of that era. Jarausch, "Higher Education and Social Change: Some Comparative Perspectives," ibid., 9–36, here 11. The most recent examinations of the university either trend toward the institutional and synoptic, as in John Thelin and Derek Bok's works, or offer masterful but uncontextualized expositions of the university's intellectual roots, as in Chad Wellmon's and James Turner's works. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education* (Baltimore, 2006); Bok, *Higher Education in America* (Princeton, N.J., 2013); Wellmon, *Organizing Enlightenment: Information Overload and the Invention of the Modern Research University* (Baltimore, 2015); Turner, *Philology: The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities* (Princeton, N.J., 2014).

[15] Even specialists routinely date the beginning of American influence on German universities to after World War II. See, for example, Stefan Paulus, "The Americanization of Europe after 1945? The Case of the German Universities," *European Review of History–Revue européenne d'Histoire* 9, no. 2 (2002): 241–253.

[16] This article also draws on the "spatial" and "geographic" turn in the history of science, which has examined how specific locations contribute to the forming of scientific knowledge. See, for example, Diarmid A. Finnegan, "The Spatial Turn: Geographical Approaches in the History of Science," *Journal of the History of Biology* 41, no. 2 (2008): 369–388; and David N. Livingstone, "The Spaces of Knowledge: Contributions towards a Historical Geography of Science," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 13, no. 1 (1995): 5–34.

[17] Educational theorists and social scientists on both sides of the Atlantic are enthusiastically exploring the consequences of the current globalization of the university. This article is intended to complement and challenge that new work. See, for example, Philip G. Altbach, *Global Perspectives on Higher Education* (Baltimore, 2016); Jürgen Schriewer, ed., *Weltkultur und kulturelle Bedeutungswelten: Zur Globalisierung von Bildungsdiskursen, Eigene und fremde Welten*, 2 vols. (Frankfurt am Main, 2007); and Mitchell Stevens and Cynthia Miller-Idriss, *The Kaleidoscope: Universities and the Social Sciences in a Global Era* (Princeton, N.J., forthcoming).

[18] Bender and Rodgers remind us that in the global history of industrialization, the city is the primary unit of analysis. That Strasbourg and New York—as well as Leipzig, Berlin, and Cambridge—faced a similar set of social problems on a limited scale made possible the transnational exchange of urban policy experts and civil servants that we identify with the global age. Thomas Bender, *A Nation among Nations: America's Place in World History* (New York, 2006), 246; Daniel Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1998), 69, 112–155.

Bender's reminder that "national history . . . [is] made in and by histories that are both larger *and smaller* than the nation's."[19] A closer look at the Germans' concerns reveals that scholars who represented Germany abroad had other priorities than the fate of German scholarship alone: namely, their own local institutions. Both competition at home and competition abroad motivated Daniel Coit Gilman in 1876 when he laid out his inaugural vision for Johns Hopkins University on the example of Göttingen, and equally drove the cultural historian Karl Lamprecht's attempt thirty years later to bring the innovations of Columbia, Stanford, or Madison to Leipzig.[20] The inter-city and inter-institutional competition in both the American and German higher education systems in the nineteenth century did not simply disappear when international competition emerged.[21] The relationships among universities, still embedded in local contexts, became more convoluted in this transatlantic framework.

Just as Fernand Braudel once wrote of cities, not all universities were created equal.[22] And not all universities were as successful at integrating themselves into their urban surroundings.[23] Even if the recent trend in transatlantic history insists on "hybridity" in assessing knowledge exchange, the fact remains that partnerships were likely to be asymmetrical.[24] Information could flow in several directions, and models could be adopted from different systems. Placing Germany in conversation with India, or France with China, however, eclipses the role that the local played as the center of cultural transmission.[25] As "latecomer" empires eager to assert their place in

[19] Bender, *A Nation among Nations*, 3, emphasis added. As several critics of global and transnational approaches have observed, even the emphasis on the "transnational" accepts the nation as the primary building block of analysis. See, for example, Akira Iriye, "Internationalizing International History," in Bender, *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*, 47–62; and David Blackbourn, "Germany and the Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1820," *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute* 51 (Fall 2012): 9–21, here 10.

[20] Daniel Coit Gilman, "Inaugural Address," Johns Hopkins University, February 22, 1876, https://www.jhu.edu/about/history/gilman-address/.

[21] My work draws on Geiger's focus on competition and cooperation between American universities in the early part of the nineteenth century and connects it to such developments outside the university as the rise of the city and the global economy. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 2.

[22] "The reference to dominant cities should not lead us to think that the successes and strengths of these urban centres were always of the same type: in the course of their history, these cities were sometimes better or worse equipped for their task, and their differences or comparative failings, when looked at closely, oblige one to make some fairly fine distinctions of interpretation." Fernand Braudel, *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th–18th Century*, vol. 3: *The Perspective of the World*, trans. Siân Reynolds (Berkeley, Calif., 1992), 34.

[23] This contrast is evident in the city of New York, where the founders of New York University aimed to create an alternative to Columbia University, which was to be "of the city" and not just "in the city." Robert A. McCaughey, *Stand, Columbia: A History of Columbia University in the City of New York, 1754–2004* (New York, 2003), 208.

[24] The language of cultural export has evolved from the early histories of Americanization to embrace the concept of hybridization. Recent studies on Americanization award autonomy to the receivers of culture and emphasize their agency in adapting it to their needs. For an early account of Americanization, see Victoria de Grazia, *Irresistible Empire: America's Advance through Twentieth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass., 2006). For the German perspective on Americanization, see Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, *Wie westlich sind die Deutschen? Amerikanisierung und Westernisierung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1999); and Alf Lüdtke, Inge Marssolek, and Adelheid von Saldern, eds., *Amerikanisierung: Traum und Alptraum im Deutschland des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1996).

[25] Despite their globalizing of this paradigm, both Kris Manjapra and Timothy B. Weston seem to fall back on what Blackbourn calls "the nation as 'container.'" Manjapra, "Transnational Approaches to Global History: A View from the Study of German-Indian Entanglement," *German History* 32, no. 2 (2014): 274–293; Weston, "The Founding of the Imperial University and the Emergence of Chinese Modernity," in Rebecca E. Karl and Peter Zarrow, eds., *Rethinking the 1898 Reform Period: Political and*

the world, the United States and Germany provide fertile ground for an examination of these questions.[26] By moving cities to the center of our analysis, with a focus on scholarly reformers in Baltimore and New York and Göttingen and Leipzig, we can gain a sense not only of how ideas cross borders, but also of the multiple registers of this imperial moment.[27] Listening for these registers has consequences beyond the history of higher education: localities resisted and challenged the sweeping tendencies of nationalization and globalization. We would be well served by featuring these episodes more prominently in our general histories of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Europe and America.[28]

Opportunistic leaders found their institutions at the end of the nineteenth century on the cusp of structural changes in the organization of knowledge and the combined goals of teaching and learning, issues that often pitted national pride against urban loyalties. Surprisingly, those cities that were political centers were not always the best partners for transnational cultural exchange. Moreover, endorsing the national cause did not preclude promoting one's individual institution at home. National needs were often a pretext adopted by scientists to secure funding for their agendas and to enhance their standing.[29] Gilman and Lamprecht followed this pattern when they spoke with a different inflection depending on their audiences, local or international, scholarly or extra-university.

This story, then, also illuminates the rise of a new kind of scholarly manager, who

---

Cultural Change in Late Qing China (Cambridge, Mass., 2002), 99–123, here 122; Blackbourn, "Germany and the Birth of the Modern World," 10.

[26] Dirk Bönker's excellent study *Militarism in a Global Age: Naval Ambitions in Germany and the United States before World War I* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2012) is a good example of this growing literature on Germany and America in comparative and transnational perspective. See also David Ellwood, *The Shock of America: Europe and the Challenge of the Century* (Oxford, 2012); and Ragnhild Fiebig-von Hase, "The United States and Germany in the World Arena, 1900–1917," in Hans-Jürgen Schröder, ed., *Confrontation and Cooperation: Germany and the United States in the Era of World War I, 1900–1924* (Oxford, 1993), 33–68.

[27] The city is clearly central to Pietsch's *Empire of Scholars* and Huber's "International Agendas and Local Manifestations"; however, neither thematizes the category and its consequences for colonial and imperial history. See fn 7. The same could be said about Wellmon's analysis, in which he notes Wilhelm von Humboldt's observation that "only in Berlin" could the research university emerge, but does not speculate about its meaning for the history of the university. Wellmon, *Organizing Enlightenment*, 210, 218.

[28] Vanessa Ogle similarly warns against imposing our normative assumptions about globalization without accounting for flexibility, uneven development, and regional variety. See Ogle, *The Global Transformation of Time, 1870–1950* (Cambridge, Mass., 2015), especially the conclusion.

[29] I draw on Andrew Hull's argument that there is a scholarly misconception about British science that takes the discourse of national decline at face value rather than views the rhetoric as part of a long-term plan on the part of British scientists to promote their agendas. Hull, "War of Words: The Public Science of the British Scientific Community and the Origins of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, 1914–16," *British Journal for the History of Science* 32, no. 4 (1999): 461–481, especially 462–463. For a comparison of Great Britain and Germany, where this strategy was at work, with respect to both financing and professional advancement, see Marc Schalenberg, "Die Nation als strategischer Einsatz? Wissenschaftliche Geselligkeit und Wissenschaftspolitik in der Gesellschaft Deutscher Naturforscher und Ärzte und der British Association for the Advancement of Science im Vergleich," in Ralph Jessen and Jakob Vogel, eds., *Wissenschaft und Nation in der europäischen Geschichte* (Frankfurt, 2002), 41–58. On the French case, see Harry W. Paul, "The Issue of Decline in Nineteenth-Century French Science," *French Historical Studies* 7, no. 3 (1972): 416–450. With respect to its protean nature, the university was like the multinational corporation: "Underneath the façade of national interest . . . lay complex and unbalanced internal struggles for both economic power and moral authority." Alison Frank, "The Petroleum War of 1910: Standard Oil, Austria, and the Limits of the Multinational Corporation," *American Historical Review* 114, no. 1 (February 2009): 16–41, here 19.

viewed his own "cultural capital" as connected to his institution and used the language of nationalism and the methods of capitalism to promote his causes.[30] Scholars have become accustomed to speaking of the "export" of the German university.[31] However, this metaphor suggests that the university was a commodity, to be traded like any other. In fact, the transition to a global economy of ideas emerged unevenly from a series of questions that reformers posed at the beginning of the twentieth century: What did declining enrollments of visiting foreign students mean for an academic institution, the competitive edge of the city, or the preeminence of a nation? Did the loss of then-modest tuition really signal a risk to economic health? Or was there something more intangible—scholarly excellence or cultural prestige—at stake? And if so, to whom did those accolades belong? The continuing relevance of these questions and the ambivalence of the answers demonstrates that this inquiry has implications that extend beyond academia, beyond Germany and America, and beyond the early twentieth century.

In the early part of the nineteenth century, the undisputed center of intellectual life was understood to be Paris, to which authors and writers flocked to acquire "symbolic capital."[32] By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, that status had migrated to several German cities, and scholars accordingly followed from Baltimore, New York, and Tokyo to the urban hubs of *Wissenschaft* in Berlin, Göttingen, and Leipzig. Itinerant scholarly managers such as Gilman, however, understood a critical fact about the scholarly center—that status was precarious. The most ambitious of those travelers intended not only to be consecrated as top scholars and to enjoy that currency at home, but also to draw on the foreign models they accessed to turn their own communities into rival centers of knowledge. At the intersection of knowledge organization and the shifting dynamics of cities, peer institutions presented opportunities for both potential partners and competitors.

For most of the nineteenth century, as Adolph Wagner implied, Germany taught and others learned. In his classic study *German Romanticism and Its Institutions*, Theodore Ziolkowski described the German university that foreigners encountered in that century as the embodiment of a unified theory of knowledge that combined self-cultivation and specialization.[33] Even if subsequent scholars have debated whether this ideal preceded or followed the institutional reality, there is no doubt that the Humboldt model—named for the education reformer Wilhelm von Humboldt, who shaped and promoted it—cast a spell over visitors.[34] Matthew Arnold expressed in-

[30] Pierre Bourdieu famously extended our understanding of capital from the material to the cultural realm. My analysis further expands this concept to encompass institutions. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," in John G. Richardson, ed., *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (New York, 1986), 241–258. Thank you to Lloyd Kramer for this suggestion.

[31] Rainer Christoph Schwinges, ed., *Humboldt International: Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Basel, 2001); Marc Schalenberg, *Humboldt auf Reisen? Die Rezeption des "deutschen Universitätsmodells" in den französischen und britischen Reformdiskursen, 1810–1870* (Basel, 2003).

[32] Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, Mass., 2007), quote from 24.

[33] Theodore Ziolkowski, *German Romanticism and Its Institutions* (Princeton, N.J., 1990), chap. 5.

[34] According to Joseph Ben-David and Awraham Zloczower, the German ideals followed the institutionalization of the university. Ben-David and Zloczower, "Universities and Academic Systems in Modern Societies," *European Journal of Sociology* 3 (1962): 45–84, especially 48. Supporting this *post facto*

tense jealousy of the German university system, and the Japanese scholar Kuwata Kumazō encouraged Meiji-era reformations on the example of the German professors of the Historical School, including Wagner and Gustav Schmoller, with whom he had studied in Berlin.[35]

As for the Americans, George Ticknor complained in 1815 that the libraries in Germany made those in Cambridge, Massachusetts, seem "half a century behind"; he had only moderate success in persuading Thomas Jefferson to build a similar library at home.[36] Students' exuberant narratives about study abroad worried American professors as much for the potential insidious influence on the study of theology as for the pervasiveness of drinking and fraternities.[37] Such apprehensiveness may explain Gilman's caution about publicly invoking the German model in promoting graduate programs despite his dependence upon it. In the early adaptation of the German-style university, Americans saw Germany as a source of potentially threatening competition.[38]

Yet by the end of the nineteenth century, nearly ten thousand Americans not only had studied at German universities, but had also begun to rise through the ranks of their home institutions.[39] The young W. E. B. Du Bois was among them. The op-

argument, Sylvia Paletschek has revealed that Wilhelm Humboldt's main statement on the university ideal, *Über die innere und äußere Organisation der höheren wissenschaftlichen Anstalten in Berlin* (*On the Internal and External Organization of Higher Academic Institutions in Berlin*), was discovered only in the 1890s and not published until 1903. Paletschek, "The Invention of Humboldt and the Impact of National Socialism: The German University Idea in the First Half of the Twentieth Century," in Margit Szöllösi-Janze, ed., *Science in the Third Reich* (Oxford, 2001), 37–58.

[35] Matthew Arnold, *Higher Schools and Universities in Germany* (London, 1874), v–xvi, 49; Philip G. Altbach, *Comparative Higher Education: Research Trends and Bibliography* (London, 1979), 28; Altbach, "Twisted Roots: The Western Impact on Asian Higher Education," *Higher Education* 18, no. 1 (1989): 9–29. Kuwata founded the Shakai Seisaku Gakkai (Society for the Study of Social Policy) together with Kanai Noburu in 1896 on the example of the Verein für Sozialpolitik (Social Policy Association). Kenneth P. Pyle, "Advantages of Followership: German Economics and Japanese Bureaucrats, 1890–1925," *Journal of Japanese Studies* 1, no. 1 (1974): 127–164, here 145–146. On the translation of German political thought to Japan, in particular the *Reich* constitution, see Douglas R. Howland, *Translating the West: Language and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Honolulu, 2002).

[36] "George Ticknor on the Inadequacy of American Libraries" (1816), in Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, eds., *American Higher Education: A Documentary History*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1961), 1: 256. Ticknor's enthusiasm, however unsuccessful in his lifetime, anticipated major changes that would, by the close of that century, drastically alter America's system of higher education. Ticknor established graduate residents at Harvard, though the designation was initially limited to alumni of the college. Edward Delavan Perry, "The American University," in Nicholas Murray Butler, ed., *Monographs on Education in the United States*, 20 vols. (Albany, N.Y., 1904), 1: 251–318, here 283.

[37] The president of the University of Illinois expressed the concerns of many when he wrote that students would return from Germany with "un-American ideas, and perhaps loose habits." Andrew S. Draper, "The University Presidency," *Atlantic Monthly* 97 (1906): 34–43, here 40; also cited in Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, 78. The influence of Germans on religious education in America was, by the mid-1890s, a *fait accompli*. Younglae Kim, *Broken Knowledge: The Sway of the Scientific and Scholarly Ideal at Union Theological Seminary in New York, 1887–1926* (Lanham, Md., 1997), 49 n. 41. The Catholic University of America, founded in 1884, was also a German-style research university. Perry, "The American University," 259. For a challenge to the "secularization thesis" of the university that emphasizes the role of religion, see Jon H. Roberts and James Turner, *The Sacred and the Secular University* (Princeton, N.J., 2000), xi.

[38] The insecurity of Americans is best captured by a Yale professor who remarked, "no one can tell what an *American* university is." Perry, "The American University," 253, emphasis in the original. Gilman had to contend with such apprehensiveness among the local population in Baltimore, who worried that he would impose a foreign and ultra-intellectual institution on their city. Hugh Hawkins, *Pioneer: A History of the Johns Hopkins University, 1874–1889* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1960), 25.

[39] The influx began slowly, with only a handful enrolling in the 1830s to 1840s, but the number climbed to 400 students a year in the 1890s before ebbing after the turn of the century. Gabriele

portunity to spend several semesters doing graduate work at the University of Berlin helped Du Bois to convert his boyhood enthusiasm for Bismarck into scholarly cachet, improved professional opportunities, and institutional reform in the U.S.[40] Such experiences abroad were significant less because one returned "an idealist, devoted for the time to pure learning for learning's sake," than because one was "burning for a chance to help to build the American University."[41]

Historians have begun to identify the influence of these foreign experiences on the "transnational" lives of such thinkers as Du Bois and Kuwata in Berlin.[42] Kwame Anthony Appiah has recently traced an intriguing Teutonic "line of descent" in Du Bois's thought, showing that Herder was an inspiration for the *Volksgeist* in *The Souls of Black Folk*, and that there are residues of the Humboldt model in his devotion to humanist education.[43] However, Appiah's Du Bois provides an example of how the focus on the biographies of these individuals has neglected the wider transformations of which their lives were a part, including the profound impact these experiences had on the organization of knowledge and the transatlantic adaptation of the research university.[44]

That yearning most famously produced Johns Hopkins University in 1876, an institution that has become synonymous with the effort to supplement America's system of residential colleges with research universities on the German model.[45] In 1877

Lingelbach, "American Students at German Universities," in Thomas Adam, ed., *Germany and the Americas: Culture, Politics, and History* (Santa Barbara, Calif., 2005), 69–71. On occasion, Americans who had spent time in Germany were made professors regardless of whether they had been granted degrees. *Two Boston Brahmins in Goethe's Germany: The Travel Journals of Anna and George Ticknor*, ed. Thomas Adam and Gisela Mettele (Lanham, Md., 2009), 5.

[40] Du Bois, an extraordinary man in every other respect, was typical in his American collegiate affinity for Bismarck, who was the subject of his valedictory address at Fisk University. Like Kuwata, Du Bois studied with Adolph Wagner and Gustav Schmoller. For Du Bois's impressions of Germany, see Herbert Aptheker, ed., *The Correspondence of W.E.B. Du Bois*, vol. 1: *Selections, 1877–1934* (Boston, 1973), 20–28. See also Kenneth Barkin, "W. E. B. Du Bois and the Kaiserreich," *Central European History* 31, no. 3 (1998): 155–170, here 157, 161.

[41] Josiah Royce, "Present Ideals of American University Life," *Scribner's Magazine* 10 (September 1891): 376–388, here 383. Cited in part in Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, 129–130. This desire is borne out by the numbers, as Konrad Jarausch's research on the "American Colony" in Göttingen revealed: of the 128 Americans whose careers can be traced, not only did 79 become university professors, but 15 became university presidents. Jarausch, "American Students in Germany, 1815–1914: The Structure of German and US Matriculants at Göttingen University," in Henry Geitz, Jürgen Heideking, and Jurgen Herbst, eds., *German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917* (Cambridge, 1995), 195–211, here 210 n. 6.

[42] One could also add for the later period Susan Sontag in Paris, Angela Davis in Frankfurt, and Malcolm X at Oxford. See Stephen Tuck, "Malcolm X's Visit to Oxford University: U.S. Civil Rights, Black Britain, and the Special Relationship on Race," *American Historical Review* 118, no. 1 (February 2013): 76–103, as well as the other contributions to the *AHR* Forum in that issue titled "Transnational Lives in the Twentieth Century." See also Alice Kaplan, *Dreaming in French: The Paris Years of Jacqueline Bouvier Kennedy, Susan Sontag, and Angela Davis* (Chicago, 2012).

[43] Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Lines of Descent: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Emergence of Identity* (Cambridge, Mass., 2014), 10–11, 46, 69.

[44] The same critique could be made of William A. Koelsch's account of Freud and Jung at Clark, which the author admits "is perhaps more biographical than institutional . . . it may be that we have spent too much time arguing over the lines of influence of the event." Koelsch, *"Incredible Day-Dream": Freud and Jung at Clark, 1909*, Clarkson Lecture and Exhibition Catalog (Worcester, Mass., 1984), n.p.

[45] Hugh Hawkins's study solidified the story of the German influence on Gilman's founding of Hopkins, although he observed that "by stressing the inner life of the university, I have bypassed much of the story of the university's relations with city, state, and nation and much of its impact on other institutions." Hawkins, *Pioneer*, vii, chaps. 1–5. A good contrast in this respect is the Canadian system, which retained

the American philosopher Josiah Royce reported hearing professors at Johns Hopkins, one-fifth of whom had doctorates from Germany, speaking of Germany, rather than England, as "their mother-country."[46] During his tenure as the university's president, Daniel Coit Gilman invoked this tradition and solidified Johns Hopkins's reputation as "Göttingen at Baltimore," a success story of German-American scholarly transfer.[47] As the American historian of Germany Herbert Tuttle observed in 1883, it was foreseeable that a diploma from a German university would eventually become "almost a required condition" for "employment in American colleges."[48]

In the first decade of the twentieth century, however, the dynamics of the German-American educational exchange shifted. "Because American professors were now being awarded positions [*berufen*] in Germany," Butler observed, "it was not necessary for Americans as it was in an older time to seek out their university training in Germany."[49] That French scholarly reformers in this period were also turning to the U.S. after long emulating the Germans must have only emboldened Butler, who himself opted out of the German Ph.D.[50] By 1909, the transformation was complete: in a speech at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, that year, Sigmund Freud declared Clark to be the most European university in the world.[51] Notwithstanding Freud's enthusiasm, intellectual historians have argued that the German ideas of Ranke, Nietzsche, and Freud, too, took on an American inflection when they were transported across the Atlantic. Similarly, the German research university reflected the priorities, politics, and needs of its new contexts.[52] Yet

---

the English character of most of its universities in the same period. Roy Steven Turner, "Humboldt in North America? Reflections on the Research University and Its Historians," in Schwinges, *Humboldt International*, 289–312.

[46] Royce, "Present Ideals of American University Life," 383. Almost all of Hopkins's fifty professors in 1884 had studied at universities in Germany, and thirteen had received doctorates there. Jonathan R. Cole, *The Great American University: Its Rise to Preeminence, Its Indispensable National Role, and Why It Must Be Protected* (New York, 2009), 19.

[47] "Is there not in Baltimore a genius in mathematics, like Gauss, who at three years old corrected his father's arithmetic, [and] at eighteen entered the University of Göttingen where he made a discovery which had puzzled geometers 'from the days of Euclid'?" Gilman, "Inaugural Address." On the prevalence of this epithet, see Walter P. Metzger, *Academic Freedom in the Age of the University* (New York, 1969), 103. For the sociologist and science policy expert Cole, Johns Hopkins is a success story. Cole, *The Great American University*, 19–21.

[48] Herbert Tuttle, "Academic Socialism," *Atlantic Monthly* 52 (August 1883): 200–209, here 203.

[49] As recalled by Schmidt-Ott, *Erlebtes und Erstrebtes*, 110–111.

[50] Believing the German degree to be too onerous, Butler completed his Ph.D. at Columbia in 1884 in two years. Michael Rosenthal, *Nicholas Miraculous: The Amazing Career of the Redoubtable Dr. Nicholas Butler* (New York, 2006), 50. On the eve of their university reforms of 1890, the French looked increasingly to the Americans as their guide. Between 1878 and 1890, the *Revue internationale de l'enseignement* published thirty articles on German education and only five articles on America, while these statistics were nearly reversed in the years from 1891 to 1914. George Weisz, *The Emergence of Modern Universities in France, 1863–1914* (Princeton, N.J., 1983), 166 n. 6. According to Weisz, by the end of the nineteenth century, French academics were studying American institutions "with the same care they were lavishing on German universities" (166–167). Thanks to Jeremy Popkin for alerting me to this work.

[51] Sigmund Freud, *An Autobiographical Study*, ed. and trans. James Strachey (New York, 1952), 57–58.

[52] For the importation of nineteenth-century Rankean notions of the historical profession to America, see Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, 1988), 31. For the whitewashing of Nietzsche, see Jennifer Ratner-Rosenhagen, *American Nietzsche: A History of an Icon and His Ideas* (Chicago, 2012). For the mainstreaming of Freud's ideas, see Nathan G. Hale Jr., *The Rise and Crisis of Psychoanalysis in the United States: Freud*

shifting from lives to scholarly practices and institutions requires that we abandon our preoccupation with influence and "misunderstanding," which with respect to the university was intentionally reimagined as it traveled across the Atlantic.[53]

This process is best captured by the German term *Wissenstransfer*, often translated as "cultural transfer." There now exists a literature devoted not only to the traditional subjects of Americanization—Taylorism and Fordism—but also to rock 'n' roll, architecture, design, business organization, and militarism.[54] Transfer studies have tended to focus on culture and ideas, often to the exclusion of institutional exchanges concerning the organization of knowledge. Yet a broader understanding of *Wissenstransfer* and its corollary *Wissenschaftsgeschichte* must include the translation and adaptation of methods of structuring knowledge, ontologically and in human organizations embodied by the field of *Wissenschaftsgeschichte*.[55] Studies in the expansive history of science such as William Clark's illuminating *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* bring together the study of lives, ideas, and scholarly institutions in an analysis that connects the university to the wider transformation of modernization.[56]

In translating the German university to America—that is, by placing Clark's analysis in a transatlantic context—we can see how scholarly management practices, not just scholarship itself, became a critical element of exchange.[57] If one believes Max

and the Americans, 1917–1985 (Oxford, 1995). In each of these works, these German ideas emerged as more democratic and less intellectually complex in their American form.

[53] According to James T. Kloppenberg, "prevailing stereotypes of American thought poisoned the German reception of the most important philosophical development of this century, and it is only within the last two decades that efforts to correct this misunderstanding have begun." Kloppenberg, "The Reciprocal Visions of German and American Intellectuals: Beneath the Shifting Perceptions," in David E. Barclay and Elisabeth Glaser-Schmidt, eds., *Transatlantic Images and Perceptions: Germany and America since 1776* (Cambridge, 1997), 155–170, here 167. "Misunderstanding" was also the subject of Walter P. Metzger's classic work on the American adaptation of the German concept of academic freedom; whereas Germany emphasized both the freedom of teaching (*Lehrfreiheit*) and the freedom of learning (*Lernfreiheit*), Americans tended to emphasize only the former. Metzger, "The German Contribution to the American Theory of Academic Freedom," *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors* 41, no. 2 (1955): 214–230, here 217.

[54] For the earliest mention of the concept of "cultural transfer," see Michel Espagne, *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands* (Paris, 1999). For more recent surveys in the field, see Renate Mayntz, Friedhelm Neidhardt, Peter Weingart, and Ulrich Wengenroth, eds., *Wissensproduktion und Wissenstransfer: Wissen im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft, Politik und Öffentlichkeit* (Bielefeld, 2008). On the "cultural turn" in international relations, see Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht, "On the Diversity of Knowledge and the Community of Thought: Culture and International History," the introduction to Jessica C. E. Gienow-Hecht and Frank Schumacher, eds., *Culture and International History* (New York, 2003), 3–26. For studies of these specific fields, see Uta G. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany* (Berkeley, Calif., 2000); Wade Jacoby, *Imitation and Politics: Redesigning Modern Germany* (Ithaca, N.Y., 2000); and James C. Van Hook, *Rebuilding Germany*: *The Creation of the Social Market Economy, 1945–1957* (Cambridge, 2004). On the illuminating new work on business transfer, see Jonathan Zeitlin and Gary Herrigel, eds., *Americanization and Its Limits: Reworking US Technology and Management in Post-War Europe and Japan* (Oxford, 2004). Bönker's *Militarism in a Global Age* shows that cooperation was a feature of even most militarized fields in these countries. See fn. 26.

[55] Though *Wissenschaftsgeschichte* technically means "history of science," I refer to the broader school as practiced by Peter Burke, Lorraine Daston, Anthony Grafton, and Fritz Ringer, among others. On the border between sociology and intellectual and cultural history, this field increasingly focuses on the practices and institutions of scholarship from an interdisciplinary perspective.

[56] William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago, 2006).

[57] A growing literature exists on the incorporation of management culture in the university, a literature that moves beyond Clyde W. Barrow's Marxist analysis to focus on commercialization and corporatization.

Weber, who also proved to be a sharp critic of American higher education, then the Prussian culture minister, Friedrich Althoff, was the best embodiment—perhaps even the "ideal type"—of a scholarly manager.[58] Althoff achieved fame for doubling the higher education budget; promoting new disciplines, including cultural history in Leipzig; and emphasizing the disciplinary strengths of particular universities, such as mathematics at Göttingen. Under his leadership, the German university reached its apogee. But he was also notorious for maintaining tight control over resources through a loyal network of professors and the exchange of favors, and he was often the butt of jokes and caricatures that presented him as a boorish Prussian civil servant. Althoff, for his part, was said to have boasted, "I can buy professors and prostitutes on every street corner." Weber enjoyed quoting this line, though not without adding his own boast that he and other sociologists could not be bought.[59]

The frequent sparring between the scholarly manager Althoff and principled scholars such as Weber reflected a growing uneasiness with the market relevance of higher education—an uneasiness that was not limited to Germans and Americans.[60] For if the Americans were worthy of emulation, then they were also potential competition. Behind the façade of cooperation these exchanges represented, the Prussian Culture Ministry was already at work on a series of initiatives to ensure the preeminence of its academic institutions. When Althoff sent Weber and others to St. Louis on the occasion of the World's Fair, it was as much an attempt to size up the American competition as it was an effort to "promote Goethe in the world."[61] Scholarly managers such as Althoff vied to make their institutions the center of intellectual life, and their universities competed to be models of educational excellence. At the same time, they collaborated with other institutions in a process of competition and cooperation that might best be described with the economics term "co-opetition."[62] The exchange between Gilman and Felix Klein reveals the bilateral adoption of

---

However, despite overtures to historical perspectives, the examination of the period before World War I is cursory at best. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State: Corporate Liberalism and the Reconstruction of American Higher Education, 1894–1928* (Madison, Wis., 1990); Derek Bok, *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education* (Princeton, N.J., 2003); Christopher Newfield, *Ivy and Industry: Business and the Making of the American University, 1880–1980* (Durham, N.C., 2003).

[58] Here I follow Peter Burke's reading of Althoff in *A Social History of Knowledge*, vol. 2: *From the Encyclopédie to Wikipedia* (Cambridge, 2012), 228.

[59] According to Bernhard vom Brocke, Weber retold this story and often counted Ferdinand Tönnies, Georg Simmel, and himself as professors who were outside Althoff's reach. Vom Brocke, "Preußische Hochschulpolitik im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert: Kaiserreich und Weimarer Republik," in Werner Buchholz, ed., *Die Universitäts Greifswald und die deutsche Hochschullandschaft im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 2004), 27–56, here 48.

[60] Fears of inferiority in the cultural and scientific sphere echoed throughout Europe: Paul, "The Issue of Decline in Nineteenth-Century French Science"; Robert Wohl, *The Generation of 1914* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), 130–134.

[61] *Deutsche Rundschau*, April 1907, cited by Hugo Münsterberg, "Das Studium der Amerikaner an deutschen Universitäten" [July 23, 1908], Bl. 8, VI. HA Familienarchive und Nachlässe, Nachlass Schmidt-Ott 474, Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz [hereafter NL Schmidt-Ott]. Peter Paret has argued that with respect to art, the German Empire exhibited an "anxious imperialism" at the 1904 World's Fair in St. Louis. Paret, "Art and the National Image: The Conflict over Germany's Participation in the St. Louis Exposition," *Central European History* 11, no. 2 (1978): 173–183.

[62] Developed by game theorists, "co-opetition" could be useful for understanding the relationship between universities in both domestic and international contexts. Barry J. Nalebuff and Adam M. Brandenburger, *Co-opetition* (New York, 1997), 23–27.

FIGURE 2: Friedrich Althoff, "The Academic Owl." *Kladderadatsch* 58, no. 23 (June 4, 1905): 335. bpk, Berlin / Art Resource NY.

scholarly management and the ambivalent way in which the university was incorporated into the transatlantic economy.

Thanks largely to Gilman's pre-Hopkins efforts as director of the Sheffield Scientific School at Yale, in 1860 that university became the first American institution to offer graduate-level courses. There is no doubt that Germany was very much on Gilman's mind when, twelve years later, he consolidated the courses into a graduate school.[63] Concerns about German competition were crucial to his appeal to the Yale Corporation "to retain in this country many young men, and especially students of Science who now resort to German Universities." The payoff was quick: within a year, Yale had awarded twenty-three doctorates, more than 90 percent of the American total up to that time.[64] In the debates leading to the founding of Johns Hopkins, "Germany" served as a symbol in an argument between addressing global competition in higher education and continuing sources of domestic, inter-institutional rivalry.[65] By the 1870s, American university reformers perceived themselves to be competing with each other rather than with German universities. If Germany was a symbol of excellence, then the knowledge race among domestic institutions amounted to creating the best version of the German university in America.

Domestic competition created pressure to innovate; Gilman's changes at Yale, in particular, spurred Harvard's president, Charles Eliot, to take action. With regard to the German university model, he was initially known to have said that it would "suit the 150 young men who enter Freshman [at Harvard] every year, about as well as a barn-yard would suit a whale."[66] But when he saw the possibilities for German-style graduate schools in America, first at Yale and then at Hopkins, he quickly changed his mind. Nine years after Gilman's first initiatives at Yale, Eliot instituted a "University Course of Instruction," and gradually expanded eligibility to study for the A.M. [*Artium Magister*] degree. He consolidated these offerings into a graduate school in 1872, the same year as Yale.[67] That Harvard's first catalogue containing graduate courses appeared in 1875 is even more convincing with regard to the shifting sources of competition. In that year Gilman, now in Baltimore, invited Eliot to share his perspective on higher education with the new board of trustees of Hopkins,

[63] Perry, "The American University," 257, 253, 284.

[64] Cited by George Wilson Pierson, *Yale College: An Educational History, 1871–1921* (New Haven, Conn., 1952), 50.

[65] Here I reverse the common tendency to speak of "America" as an argument in identifying and accounting for "Americanization" in twentieth-century German cultural history. See, for example, Arnd Bauerkämper, "U.S. Foundations and Scientific Funding in West Germany, 1945 to the Mid-1970s," Rockefeller Archive Center Research Report, 2012, http://www.rockarch.org/publications/resrep/bauerkamper.pdf, 10.

[66] This observation appears in a letter Eliot wrote to his mother in October 1864 while he was touring Europe. Excerpted in Henry James, *Charles William Eliot: President of Harvard University, 1869–1909*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1930), 1: 136–137. During Eliot's epochal presidency, which lasted from 1869 to 1909, Harvard introduced a Summer School (1871) and opened the Arnold Arboretum (1872) and Radcliffe College (1879), but he remained skeptical of the graduate school. Edward I. Pitts, *The Profession of Philosophy in America* (University Park, Pa., 1979), 81.

[67] According to David L. Browman and Stephen Williams, Eliot's early efforts failed because they could not compete with the public lectures at Boston's Lowell Institute. Browman and Williams, *Anthropology at Harvard: A Biographical History, 1790–1940* (Cambridge, Mass., 2013), 185.

its future president, and an eager donor.[68] The record of that 1875 meeting suggests that Eliot's sluggishness in establishing a graduate school at Harvard may have opened the door for Johns Hopkins to build a research university *de novo*. Clearly thunderstruck by Gilman's ambition, Eliot, by the time he left, rightly saw the situation in a different light. Gilman was said to have boasted later that Hopkins was "often quoted *to* Pres. Eliot, & by him; & he has now announced that the chief topic of discussion in the Faculty next year is to be '*Grad*uate instruction.'"[69]

This domestic competition resulted in a complex relationship between locality, national aspirations, and civic pride. When the railroad magnate Johns Hopkins bequeathed $7 million to the university that bears his name and its hospital, it was a testament to the robustness of local philanthropy for the arts, culture, and scholarship, which also included George Peabody's generous endowment of the neighboring Peabody Institute. Yet Gilman strained to promote the advantages of Baltimore to attract the German-trained chemist and Harvard professor Oliver Wolcott Gibbs from Cambridge, citing the city's "attractive . . . climate, proximity to Washington, abundance of good society, & moderate scale of domestic expenditure."[70] Indeed, it was clear to most members of the board and to Gilman that if Johns Hopkins was going to become a nationally renowned institution, it would not do so by touting local attractions.[71] The classic works on Gilman have stressed the eclectic influences of his reforms, an overemphasis that misses the delicate balance he maintained between the reality of domestic competition and the prominent international model offered by Germany. Becoming the best German university in America was as much about rhetoric and positioning as it was about actual influence.[72]

To foster this image, Gilman promoted the German-style authenticity of Johns Hopkins by recruiting *echt* Germans to buttress his burgeoning institution's reputation.[73] In particular, he offered Felix Klein a position as the senior mathematics professor, which included responsibilities in lecturing and editing the new *Journal of*

[68] James Burrill Angell, president of the University of Michigan from 1871 to 1909, and Andrew Dickson White, president of Cornell University from 1867 to 1885, were also invited to share their reflections with the board. Princeton's James McCosh and Yale's Noah Porter spurned the invitation. Hugh D. Hawkins, "Three University Presidents Testify," *American Quarterly* 11, no. 2, pt. 1 (1959): 99–119, here 100–101; Hawkins, *Pioneer*, 9.

[69] Cited in Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, 96.

[70] Cited in Hawkins, *Pioneer*, 45.

[71] President of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad John Garrett broke with the board of trustees when they rejected his advice that Hopkins remain an institution with local goals. They made some concessions to the public, however, by instituting a public lecture series and Saturday classes for teachers. Ibid., 5; John Thomas Scharf, *History of Baltimore City and County, from the Earliest Period to the Present Day* (Philadelphia, 1881), 232.

[72] Hawkins observes that "the most noteworthy thing about [Gilman's] draft plan is how much it resembled the existing American universities and how little it incorporated any French, German, Scotch, or English ideas"; *Pioneer*, 37. Cordasco, in contrast, emphasizes that Gilman traveled to a number of countries, among them Ireland and Great Britain, in addition to Germany. Cordasco, *Daniel Coit Gilman and the Protean Ph.D.* (Leiden, 1960), 70. Gilman's admiration for not only the Germans but also the British and the French is evident in his articles for the *American Journal of Education*. Daniel C. Gilman, "Prussia, Saxony, and Austria: German Universities," *American Journal of Education* 1, no. 3 (1856): 402–404; Gilman, "Higher and Special Schools of Science and Literature in France," *American Journal of Education* 2, no. 1 (1856): 93–102. However, whether Gilman took nothing from these models (which I dispute) or was pluralistic in his approach (which is more likely) misses a central point: that those models were as significant in how they were presented as in how they were utilized.

[73] Hawkins's account of Gilman's trip to Europe emphasizes his connections and recruiting in Great Britain, which were as robust as his activities in Germany. However, that Gilman did not promote Johns

FIGURE 3: Daniel Coit Gilman, ca. 1875. Photograph by G. D. Morse. Ferdinand Hamburger University Archives, The Sheridan Libraries, Johns Hopkins University, #02037.

Mathematics. Klein's former mathematics students at Göttingen were among those who were well positioned at America's up-and-coming elite universities in the 1880s and were eager to persuade their mentor to take the position.[74] Despite Gilman's use

Hopkins as a *British* institution underscores the importance of perception as much as reality. Hawkins, *Pioneer*, 33–36.

[74] Interestingly, Klein's students still counted on their mentor to support the publication of their work abroad. Despite America's university reforms, scholarly publishing lagged. Germany's academic journals, including Klein's esteemed *Mathematische Annalen*, maintained their prestige. Budding scholars William

FIGURE 4: Arts and Science campus, Johns Hopkins University, ca. 1895. Ferdinand Hamburger Archives, The Sheridan Libraries, Johns Hopkins University, #04261.

of these former students as mediators, the cultural hurdles that Klein faced were great: he was not confident in English; he was wary of a move across the ocean; and he was concerned that Hopkins would not provide a pension for his wife in the event of his death.[75] Though he was tempted by the clear advantage that he "would have an influential journal at [his] disposal and lastly not so many hassles with faculty meetings and exam work as in Germany," Klein, not granted a shorter exploratory visit, ultimately declined the offer.[76]

Edward Story and Mary F. Winston sought Klein's help in getting their articles published in Germany. See Henry Burchard Fine to Felix Klein, August 31, 1886, Nr. 27, Bl. 1–2, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 9; William Edward Story to Felix Klein, March 26, 1892, Nr. 1203, Bl. 1–2, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 11; and Mary F. Winston to Felix Klein, November 28, 1896, Nr. 363/1, Bl. 46–47, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 12.363, Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen [hereafter SUB Göttingen].

[75] Arthur Cayley to Felix Klein, January 25, 1884, Nr. 3, Bl. 6–7; and Daniel Gilman to Klein, January 12, 1884, Nr. 6/1-6/2, Bl. 13–14, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 22 L: 7, SUB Göttingen. Klein's reservations about his linguistic skills appear to have been a common hindrance for German professors who were making the trip to America. Subsequently, the initial vision for the professor exchange was that each visiting professor would lecture in his mother tongue. See vom Brocke, "Der deutsch-amerikanische Professorenaustausch," 135. The pension for widows of scholars was a social security measure that had recently been instituted in Germany by Althoff and Schmidt-Ott and was the concern of at least one other prominent German scholar whom Gilman tried to recruit, Karl Brugman. Gilman to Brugman, February 14, 1884, Bl. 11, 2c 1860: Gilman, Daniel Coit, Handschriftenabteilung, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin.

[76] Paul Haupt to Felix Klein, January 4, 1884, 9/1–9/2, Bl. 17–18, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 22 L: 7, SUB Göttingen. Gilman said it was not worth it to them (i.e., economically) to extend him a shorter visit. Gilman to Felix Klein, August 1, 1884, Nr. 8, Bl. 16, ibid.

The correspondence between Klein and his former students reveals that, at least where teaching was concerned, the American university was already unmoored from its German example. According to one of those former students, Hopkins still lacked a coherent and "specific system" for the seminars: "There is the overarching opinion here that our university is still too young for firm rules to be beneficial." The advantage as this student saw it was that Klein would have "total freedom."[77] The disadvantage was that even if Hopkins would later be lauded for its contribution to graduate education in the U.S., and in particular its highly developed seminar system, at the time it seemed possible that the venture—the education "entrepreneurial" movement of its day—could fail.

Klein's skepticism regarding the American university experiment notwithstanding, Gilman was not wrong to see Klein as a partner for innovation. Having received his doctorate in Bonn when he was only nineteen, Klein had become a sensation in the field of mathematics for his groundbreaking research in geometry.[78] What likely caught Gilman's eye was less Klein's extraordinary mathematical abilities than his institutional prowess. When Gilman contacted Klein in 1893, Klein was forty-four and, like many mathematicians, well past his research prime. Yet remarkably, he had turned the well-known university town of Göttingen into a world-famous center for applied mathematics.[79] The success of this managerial achievement rested on his impressive relationships with both Althoff and the industrialist Henry Theodore von Böttinger.[80] Scholars of education have emphasized that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the idea of Germany stood in for "pure" science in debates concerning "rival conceptions of the higher learning."[81] However, it seems more likely that Klein's appeal to Gilman was his firsthand success in managing a German institution.

Klein's former student's revelation that few professors at Hopkins actually had a clear idea of the German seminar they intended to implement underscores the essential mistranslation at the heart of knowledge exchange. In the case of Hopkins, the American version of the German university incorporated some elements of the Ger-

[77] William Edward Story to Felix Klein, January 10, 1884, Nr. 10, Bl. 19–20, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 22 L: 7, SUB Göttingen.

[78] An appointment at Erlangen made him, at age twenty-three, one of the youngest professors in the field. Sooyoung Chang, *Academic Genealogy of Mathematicians* (Hackensack, N.J. 2011), 28.

[79] Following a nervous breakdown, allegedly experienced as a result of competition with Henri Poincaré, Klein's mathematical career was over by 1884. Klein's Berlin colleagues thought him "superficial and sometimes a charlatan" in these years; ibid. Klein also did stints in Munich and Leipzig, but his real contribution came in Göttingen, where he arrived in 1886, drawing on its historic strength in mathematics to build a center for applied mathematics that would later come to be associated with such giants as David Hilbert and Richard Courant. This storied school features prominently in the Mathematics Genealogy Project, http://genealogy.math.ndsu.nodak.edu/, an impressive online effort to catalogue the lineage of mathematics schools. The school was also the subject of an award-winning exhibition. Birgit Bergmann, Moritz Epple, and Ruti Ungar, eds., *Transcending Tradition: Jewish Mathematicians in German-Speaking Academic Culture* (Berlin, 2012), especially David E. Rowe and Erhard Scholz, "Göttingen," 56–78.

[80] This was an advantageous strategy, since the University of Göttingen was incorporated into the Prussian system in 1868 following the Austro-Prussian War. For the mutually beneficial relationship between Althoff and Klein, see Renate Tobies, "Zum Verhältnis von Felix Klein und Friedrich Althoff," in *Friedrich Althoff, 1839–1908: Beiträge zum 58. Berliner Wissenschaftshistorischen Kolloquium* (Berlin, 1990), 35–56.

[81] In this reading, Germany was often invoked by the "university movement" against older utilitarian notions of college as training for the civil service. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, 74.

man university and adapted others. The organization of faculties and formats for teaching were borrowed directly, but the American university departed significantly from the German model in the design of departments. The German *Lehrstuhl*, or professor's chair, was organized around one individual's expertise; the American academic department was organized around a discipline and included several chairs. The German graduate seminar was centered on a single charismatic master; its American equivalent emulated the German version, but "magnetism was too rare a trait to flourish wholesale," and the American seminar was comparatively tedious and less dynamic.[82] Such changes also mattered for structural reasons, for as Christian Fleck has argued, the American department "imposed cooperation and compromise among its members and ruled out individual free-rider behaviour, if nothing else because students, via tuition fees, acted as a regulative."[83] With funding tied to departments, American professors were compelled to work with their colleagues in a way that was not required of their German counterparts.

Given the inevitable alteration of the university in translation, it was difficult to tell the difference between those who actually drew on Germany as a source of *Wissenstransfer* and others who opportunistically evoked the German brand to distinguish an American university from the competition. For some American professors, the German mania was misguided: William James wrote derisively about the "Ph.D. Octopus" and the inappropriate application of European guidelines to American academic policies.[84] What is clear is that scholars began to view their institutions not only as part of what the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu calls one's *habitus*—their conditions of scholarly production—but also as tied to their scholarly reputations and potential for success.[85] Thus, fears concerning the uses and abuses of such "cultural capital" were present in the increasingly competitive dynamics of the scholarly world, in which a professor might be more likely to find his "calling" at an institution with more favorable terms.[86]

Concerns about the use of market practices to promote pure scholarship circulated in the highly anticipated founding in 1887 of Clark University, for which the psychologist G. Stanley Hall also tried unsuccessfully to recruit Klein, in 1889. Established as the first all-graduate institution in the United States, Clark benefited from the enthusiasm for the German research university in American education reform circles. Hall echoed Gilman when he lauded Klein for his academic management

[82] Hebert Baxter Adams, in particular, became known for his dramatic and entertaining, albeit superficial, rendition of the seminar. Ibid., 155, 157–158, quote from 158.

[83] Christian Fleck, *A Transatlantic History of the Social Sciences: Robber Barons, the Third Reich and the Invention of Empirical Social Research*, trans. Hella Beister (London, 2011), 22.

[84] William James, "The Ph.D. Octopus," *Harvard Monthly* 36 (March 1903): 1–9, here 8. Following this interpretation, American students went to Germany as much for the social capital that diplomas would bring as for higher learning. They carefully assessed which universities would permit them to take their degrees in the shortest amount of time, a practice that prompted one American scholar to express concern about Halle's "diploma mill" and to demand that there be more oversight of student exchange programs. Veysey, *The Emergence of the American University*, 131.

[85] Pierre Bourdieu, "The Genesis of the Concept of Habitus and Field," *Sociocriticism* 2, no. 2 (1985): 11–24, especially 12–14.

[86] According to Geiger, University of Michigan president James B. Angell made precisely this point, including his use of the German formulation "calling" (*Berufung*), which Geiger suggests was due to its novelty. However, the dissonance between vocation and avocation also underscores the ambivalence with which scholars received the encroachment of market dynamics in the university world. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge*, 11.

skills: "I have seen many men in several countries and in different departments of science, but no one who I believe could be more helpful to us in shaping its general policy of the new university."[87] Yet Hall feared that it might "look like advertising for us" if he permitted Klein a brief stay, and he urged him to consider joining the faculty permanently.[88] Attracting German professors was critical for both substance and image, and it is difficult, for historians as it was for contemporaries, to tell the difference. After all, Hall made a considerable contribution to the internationalization of psychoanalysis even if his efforts were motivated to some extent by his desire to promote his own institution.[89]

With respect to the fate of *Wissenstransfer*, it is revealing that Clark, possibly the purest version of the German-style research university on American soil—it did away with the undergraduate program altogether—had a checkered beginning at best. Hall persuaded many of Klein's former students, nearly the entire mathematics department at Hopkins, to join his new endeavor.[90] Other fields, including psychology, were equally strong, as exemplified by Freud's visit in 1909, when he received the only honorary degree of his career.[91] But due to a lack of funds and poor management, Clark's development was thwarted—it remained, as the historian Hermann von Holst famously remarked, "a torso of a university."[92] Klein's former student Oskar Bolza, who joined the department in 1889, complained in 1892 of the financial starvation of the faculty and reported that they had recently given President Hall a "lack of confidence" vote.[93] This disillusionment went hand in hand with the more wary eye with which Americans looked abroad after 1900.[94] And it brought new opportunities at home. William Rainey Harper, soon to be president of the newly founded University of Chicago, eagerly poached Bolza and others for this venture.[95]

Germans and Americans had different views of the vicissitudes of America's growing university system. According to Haupt, at the level of the institution, the strategy of *Wissenstransfer* that Gilman employed at Baltimore was successful. Writing to Klein in 1883 from Baltimore, he observed that "Johns Hopkins, with respect to its scholarly

[87] Stanley Hall to Felix Klein, March 30, 1889, 104, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 1B, SUB Göttingen.

[88] Stanley Hall to Felix Klein, n.d., 118, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 1B, SUB Göttingen.

[89] Clark was not impervious to the nuances of inter-institutional competition in the increasingly transatlantic framework. He was just less adept at it than his peers. According to Dorothy Ross, his interest in bringing Freud to Clark had as much to do with his competition with the Boston group as with his universalist commitment to science. Ross, *G. Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet* (Chicago, 1972), 387.

[90] Karen Hunger Parshall and David E. Rowe, "American Mathematics Comes of Age, 1875–1900," in Peter Duren, ed., *A Century of Mathematics in America, Part III* (Providence, R.I., 1989), 3–28, here 12.

[91] For an American perspective on this "day-dream," see Koelsch, *"Incredible Day-Dream,"* n.p.

[92] Hermann Edouard von Holst, "The Need of Universities in the United States," Convocation Address, University of Chicago, January 2, 1893, in *Quarterly Calendar of the University of Chicago* 2, no. 1 (May 1893): 3–9, here 6, cited in Perry, "The American University," 258.

[93] Oskar Bolza to Felix Klein, May 15, 1892, Nr. 189, Blatt 26–31, Cod. MS. F. Klein 8, SUB Göttingen.

[94] Perry, "The American University," 258. This is also Kloppenberg's argument, although I disagree with him that Du Bois is exemplary of this shift, since he clearly remained committed to German thought until the end of his life. Kloppenberg, "The Reciprocal Visions of German and American Intellectuals," 166. For Du Bois's continuing attachment to Germany, see his reflections on East Germany, which he visited in 1959, in *The Autobiography of W.E.B. Du Bois: A Soliloquy on Viewing My Life from the Last Decade of Its First Century* (New York, 1968), 23.

[95] Oskar Bolza to Felix Klein, January 15, 1889, Nr. 194/1–6, Bl. 39–44, Cod. MS. F. Klein 8, SUB Göttingen. Chang, *Academic Genealogy of Mathematicians*, 434.

seriousness and zeal [*Ernst und Eifer*], can certainly compete [*concurrieren*] with the German universities; the student body appears to me in fact more distinguished in many areas, more hardworking and more enthusiastic."[96] Klein's exchange with Haupt illustrates the shifting allegiances among the traveling German and American students and professors. Some, like Klein, found their time in the U.S. to be transformative: before his trip to the World's Fair in Chicago, Klein spoke of America as the "object of scholarly colonization," though he conceded that his visit "evidently signifies a change in this system." Klein's initial imperialist perspective was soon dwarfed by his desire to learn from American institutional advances. Writing on the eve of World War I, he reflected, "On my return I brought with me the firm belief that there existed the most urgent demand to establish a direct relationship of the organization of teaching to the prevailing needs of practical life, first and foremost to engineering, but then also to the pressing questions of a general education system."[97]

Back in Germany, Klein drew on his relationships with Althoff and Böttinger to bolster the triangular interdependence between science, industry, and the state. It was a robust partnership that was more American than German and led in 1898 to the founding of the Göttingen Association for the Promotion of Applied Physics and Mathematics, which remained the main center for aerodynamics in Germany through World War II.[98] So impressed was Klein with the integration of the applied sciences, including engineering and actuarial mathematics, in American universities such as MIT that he began a major lobbying effort at home to effect a similar union. A year later, largely due to his efforts, the technical schools were awarded the right to grant doctoral degrees—a huge feat for the applied sciences in Germany.[99]

Other Germans were less sure. On their 1904 trip to the U.S., which took them to Boston, Washington, D.C., Chicago, and Tuskegee, Marianne and Max Weber adopted a more sober view.[100] A visit with Booker T. Washington in Tuskegee left

[96] Paul Haupt to Felix Klein, January 4, 1884, 9/1–9/2, Bl. 17–18, NL Klein 22 L: 7 "Berufung nach Baltimore," SUB Göttingen.

[97] Klein to Althoff, October 11, 1893, draft, *Amerikareise*, Bl. 1–3, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 1 C, SUB Göttingen. Cited in part in Reinhard Siegmund-Schultze, "Felix Kleins Beziehungen zu den Vereinigten Staaten, die Anfänge deutsche auswärtiger Wissenschaftspolitik und die Reform um 1900," *Sudhoffs Archiv* 81, no. 1 (1997): 21–38, here 27. For the second quote, see Felix Klein, "Entwicklungsgang meiner Vorlesungen und Arbeiten" (1913), Bl. 4, Cod. Ms. F. Klein 22 L: 3, SUB Göttingen.

[98] A cartoon titled "The Image of the Göttingen Association for the Advancement of Applied Physics and Mathematics," inserted in an invitation circulated in 1908 for the association's tenth-anniversary meeting, captured this triangle pictorially: Klein represents scholarship, Böttinger stands in for the industrialists, and Althoff supervises this negotiation from above. Reproduced in Lewis Pyenson, "Mathematics, Education, and the Göttingen Approach to Physical Reality, 1890–1914," *Europa* 2 (1979): 91–127, here 118.

[99] For Klein's research in actuarial mathematics, a subject he encountered during his visit to the Chicago World's Fair and that he subsequently developed in Göttingen, see his letters to the New York Mutual Fund in Klein's Nachlass in the SUB Göttingen. On the role of the U.S. in Klein's institutional accomplishments in the field of applied mathematics, see Siegmund-Schultze, "Felix Kleins Beziehungen zu den Vereinigten Staaten," 34. Klein was less successful (and perhaps more ambivalent) on the case of co-education. Women would not be permitted to matriculate at Prussian universities until 1908, and Klein met resistance in 1893 when he advocated for women students. Ibid., 31.

[100] Marianne Weber describes the trip in colorful terms and reports that her husband ultimately declared that it was responsible for "a widening of my scholarly horizon (*and* improving my state of health)" even if he became more skeptical over time. Marianne Weber, *Max Weber: A Biography*, trans. and ed. Harry Zohn (New York, 1975), 304. The Webers' travel companion, the sociologist Ernst Troeltsch, was more uniformly critical, though his work would be influenced by American developments in psychology. See Hans Rollman, "'Meet Me in St. Louis': Troeltsch and Weber in America," in

Weber pondering the dynamics of race in economic and educational development.[101] A near-riot in Philadelphia's 30th Street Station between football fans from Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania prompted the Webers' early commentary on the perils of American intercollegiate sports.[102] Yet it was the corporatization of the university, the influence of private money on scholarship, and the commodification of education that presciently worried the German scholar. In a 1911 lecture titled "A Comparison between German and American Universities," which he delivered at the fourth annual *Hochschullehrertag* in Dresden, the sociologist expressed the fear shared by many German academics that German universities were being turned into American businesses.[103] According to Weber, "The powers which were available to the Prussian Ministry of Education were the most thorough imaginable, and the system through which these powers were exercised carried with it the danger of producing a new academic generation which no longer adhered to the old traditions of the German university. It was rather an approximation to an American type—not to the type of an American academic, but rather to the type of American who is active in the stock exchange."[104] Nonetheless, even the naysayer Weber admitted that the one value of this development was the domestic competition of the American system. That the city of Chicago had two universities and the state of Illinois yet another assured Weber that the United States had genuine academic freedom, something that Germany had nearly lost.[105]

Yet Weber missed a point that Americans already understood: competition and cooperation were two sides of the same coin. In a 1902 letter to German-born Harvard professor Kuno Francke, Eliot wrote that one of his professors had been awarded leave to help found the University of Chicago Law School on the Harvard model. He confided, "I hardly think that university cooperation can be carried farther than that."[106] Harvard's president was able to look beyond the threat of competition to see this new venture as a partnership—for the time being. For adaptation between Cambridge and Chicago, like that between Germany and America, was mutual. With the transition to a global framework typified by the World's Fairs, that coopetition would become even more convoluted, since Klein may have represented Germany abroad, and America may have come to symbolize innovation in Germany,

Hartmut Lehmann and Guenther Roth, eds., *Weber's Protestant Ethic: Origins, Evidence, Contexts* (Washington, D.C., 1992), 357–383, here 376.

[101] For a fascinating transnational history in which Weber's visit to America provides a key link, see Andrew Zimmerman's exposition of "the Tuskegee expedition," which "appears as a quilting point, stitching together and thus permanently transforming three powerful networks: German social science, New South race politics, and African cash cropping." Zimmerman, "A German Alabama in Africa: The Tuskegee Expedition to German Togo and the Transnational Origins of West African Cotton Growers," *American Historical Review* 110, no. 5 (December 2005): 1362–1398, here 1363.

[102] Weber, *Max Weber: A Biography*, chaps. 8–9.

[103] Max Weber, "Vergleich deutscher und amerikanischer Universitäten," in John Dreijmanis, ed., *Max Webers vollständige Schriften zu wissenschaftlichen und politischen Berufen* (Bremen, 2012), 122–129, here 128.

[104] Max Weber, "American and German Universities," in *Max Weber on Universities: The Power of the State and the Dignity of the Academic Calling in Imperial Germany*, trans. and ed. Edward Shils (Chicago, 1973), 23–30, quote from 27.

[105] Ibid., 25.

[106] Charles Eliot to Kuno Francke, April 25, 1902, Bl. 34, A I. Nr. 311/ 1 420, Nachlass Friedrich Theodor Althoff, VI. HA Familienarchive und Nachlässe, Geheimes Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz [hereafter NL Althoff].

but Klein used the insights he had gleaned in St. Louis to improve Göttingen's standing vis-à-vis Berlin.[107] In the globalizing world, the center and periphery were shifting. It was still clear that scholarly reformers could learn from one another, but who was the teacher and who the pupil was a matter of some contention, especially when localities and regions became bigger players than nation-states in this overseas knowledge exchange.[108]

IT WAS PERHAPS BECAUSE OF THE domineering influence of Althoff that Weber failed to recognize that Chicago-style intramural competition was a constitutive part of the German education system. For despite Althoff's attempts at centralization, Germany's scholarly organization developed an internal source of competition that was both inter-city and inter-institutional.[109] The funding system mastered by the Prussians and practiced in nearly all of the German states allocated resources to universities from a single source, effectively guaranteeing competition among cities and universities.[110] Adolf von Harnack, a theologian and the first president of the Kaiser Wilhelm Society, coined the uniquely German term *Wissenschaftspolitik* to describe the growing elite group of advisors who bridged the scholarly and political worlds. Emerging from the new conviction that science played an important role in a nation's profile, *Wissenschaftspolitik* often meant that decisions regarding finances and hiring at universities were the subject of complicated political negotiations. Weber, among others, believed that this comingling of politics and scholarship signified the downfall of scholarship's integrity.[111]

[107] At a time when the number of American students was decreasing in Germany overall, Klein had a stream of aspiring female American mathematicians in Göttingen. Indeed, his desire for female American students was motivated more by internationalization than by co-education. Siegmund-Schultze, "Felix Kleins Beziehungen zu den Vereinigten Staaten," 33.

[108] Insofar as the structure of the World's Fair in the United States pitted cities against one another, the fair itself accentuated this local and regional identity. "That a rivalry came to exist between them was evidenced by the attempt of the Chicagoans to out-do the Paris show of 1889, and the Parisians in 1900 to better the Columbian. Likewise the organisers both at Buffalo and St. Louis, accepting the inter-state rivalry, saw the preceding Paris show as the event to measure themselves by." Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851–1939* (Manchester, 1988), 130.

[109] According to Ben-David and Zloczower, this competition—which they argue developed despite the system's organization—was also the source of the system's productivity. "Universities and Academic Systems in Modern Societies," 50–53.

[110] By 1871, Prussia indirectly controlled the policies of more than half the German universities. Charles E. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany, 1700–1914* (Cambridge, 1980), 235–236. Sylvia Paletschek shows how Thuringia emulated Prussia's policies by favoring Jena at the expense of peripheral cities. Paletschek, "Eine deutsche Universität oder Provinz versus Metropole? Berlin, Tübingen und Freiburg vor 1914," in Rüdiger vom Bruch, ed., *Die Berliner Universität im Kontext der deutschen Universitätslandschaft nach 1800, um 1860 und um 1910* (Munich, 2010), 213–242. For a brief overview of competition in Germany's recent history, see Margit Szöllösi-Janze, "'Der Geist des Wettbewerbs ist aus der Flasche!' Der Exzellenzwettbewerb zwischen den deutschen Universitäten in historischer Perspektive," *Jahrbuch für Universitätsgeschichte* 14 (2011): 49–73.

[111] The founding by Schmoller in 1872 of the Verein für Sozialpolitik to sponsor research-initiated social reform was key to this development. Whether it actually had an impact on policy is a matter of some contention. Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Ronan Van Rossem compare the Verein to the Fabian Society in its contribution to the birth of public policy, whereas according to James J. Sheehan, "its direct influence on German politics was negligible." Rueschemeyer and Van Rossem,"The Verein für Sozialpolitik and the Fabian Society: A Study in the Sociology of Policy-Relevant Knowledge," in Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, eds., *States, Social Knowledge, and the Origins of Modern Social*

FIGURE 5: Felix Klein, photograph of portrait by Max Liebermann, 1912. SUB Göttingen, Sammlung Voit, F. Klein, Nr. 13.

But this traditional portrait of the Prussian octopus extending its tentacles into neighboring states has been countered by a new narrative among scholars that emphasizes federalism as a continuous feature of German history.[112] In the realm of higher education, potential partners and competitors differed depending on one's frame of reference. In the capital, it was not uncommon to hear reformers express the fear that American students might steal German trade secrets; consequently, the German-American professor exchange was the subject of much national controversy.[113] However, an altogether different portrait of competition and innovation emerges if we shift our gaze from Berlin to the cities on the periphery.[114] Whereas in Berlin the tension remained largely between national and international elements, in cities with strong local identities, an urban element predominated. Often attached to a regional identity that had roots in the Holy Roman Empire, the city remained a key element of cultural identity in nineteenth-century Germany despite political centralization.[115]

This was particularly true for the region of Saxony, which had long since lost the political luster of its "Augustan" golden age. Having been consigned to the political "losers of history," as Hartmut Zwahr wryly observes, "Saxony's splendor was henceforth based on its economy, its culture, the arts, and the inventive genius of its popu-

Policies (Princeton, N.J., 1996), 117–162, especially 122–124; Sheehan, *The Career of Lujo Brentano: A Study of Liberalism and Social Reform in Imperial Germany* (Chicago, 1966), here 5; see also 72. On Althoff's role in the development of *Wissenschaftspolitik*, see Bernhard vom Brocke, "Hochschul- und Wissenschaftspolitik in Preußen und im Deutschen Kaiserreich, 1882–1907: Das 'System Althoff,'" in Peter Baumgart, ed., *Bildungspolitik in Preußen zur Zeit des Kaiserreichs* (Stuttgart, 1980), 9–118, here 37, 104, 107. For the classic study on this term, see Lothar Burchardt, *Wissenschaftspolitik im Wilhelminischen Deutschland: Vorgeschichte, Gründung und Aufbau der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften* (Göttingen, 1975).

[112] In Abigail Green's sophisticated telling, this approach identifies *Reich* patriotism as a positive counterweight to the Prusso-centric history and federalism of the kind praised by Günter Grass in the postwar period, albeit well *avant la lettre*. Green, "The Federal Alternative? A New View of Modern German History," *The Historical Journal* 46, no. 1 (2003): 187–202. The German research university—both federal in Green's sense and global in knowledge exchange—further nuances this new narrative. In fact, federalism was an essential, albeit forgotten, feature of the university's competitive structure. Frank R. Pfetsch, *Zur Entwicklung der Wissenschaftspolitik in Deutschland, 1750–1914* (Berlin, 1974), chap. 2. Thanks to Dirk Bönker for alerting me to this reference.

[113] Incidentally, the British also raised concerns about the budding German-American partnership, which they worried was becoming a "cartel." Kuno Francke came to its defense with an "American perspective" in "Das Kartell zwischen deutschen und amerikanischen Universitäten: In amerikanischer Beleuchtung," *Der Tag*, *Erster Teil: Illustrierte Zeitung*, May 7, 1905, Bl. 190, 217, A I. Nr. 310, 419, NL Althoff. Such critiques prompted Adolf von Harnack to write a defense of the "large concerns" (*Grossbetrieb*) of science in the international context, "Vom Großbetrieb der Wissenschaft," *Preußische Jahrbücher* 2 (1905): 193–201.

[114] Here I draw somewhat on the notion of "peripheral cities" in urban history, though admittedly, as will become clear, each of these cities, Leipzig included, has its own unique set of networks and, subsequently, motivations. James J. Connolly, "Decentering Urban History: Peripheral Cities in the Modern World," *Journal of Urban History* 35, no. 1 (2008): 3–14.

[115] Regionalism as the source of cultural creativity had even more purchase in such free city-states as Hamburg, which was always proud of its connections with the United States and Great Britain. See Richard J. Evans, *Death in Hamburg: Society and Politics in the Cholera Years, 1830–1910* (London, 1990), 5–6. For the implications of Hamburg's tendency to look to the Atlantic world rather than Prussia on the intellectual world, see Emily J. Levine, "The Other Weimar: The Warburg Circle as Hamburg School," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 74, no. 2 (2013): 307–330. This pattern also extended to France, where until after World War I, regional loyalty remained "confined to the cultural arena, since from a political perspective, people had no desire to contest their loyalty to the French nation." Maurice Agulhon, "The Center and the Periphery," in Pierre Nora, ed., *Rethinking France: Les Lieux des Mémoire*, vol. 1: *The State* (Chicago, 2001), 53–79, here 66–67.

lation. These strengths were exhibited, for example, in Saxony's leading per capita rank in German patent registrations, in the formation of state-level as well as national lobby groups, in the campaigns for electoral rights, and in the great attraction of Leipzig University."[116] So esteemed was the university that when the German-trained American philologist James Morgan Hart was preparing a guide with practical suggestions for Americans considering studying abroad in 1874, Leipzig, by his estimation, had outstripped Berlin. "The aggregation of talent and culture is startling . . . [it] is the head-centre for the culture of the most productive nation of the present day. Only London, Paris and Berlin, I am persuaded, surpass it in the number of men of learning, while in proportion to its population—barely 100,000—it is without a peer."[117] From 1871 to 1910, that population swelled to 679,000, and given Saxony's illustrious premodern connections to the "New World," Leipzigers eagerly embraced the possibility of its identity as a cultural, if not a political, capital.

Politically peripheral but culturally robust, Saxony exemplifies the conflicting interests—local, regional, national, and international—that would emerge for universities in a global context.[118] Those scholars who traveled to the United States for the World's Fairs did so at Althoff's behest, and yet they also had their own agendas in mind. Althoff, for his part, was happy to sponsor their trips to promote the German nation and to offer monetary stipends to scholars to cultivate partners in states other than his own.[119] Resourceful scholars learned to tap these multiple environments for support and even play them against one another. As the Saxon-born historian Karl Lamprecht's career highlights, these "lower levels" of identification did not simply disappear with globalization; the negotiations only became more complicated.[120] A

[116] Hartmut Zwahr, "Foreword," in James Retallack, ed., *Saxony in German History: Culture, Society, and Politics, 1830–1933* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 2000), xiii–xvi, here xv. Based on the Prussian model, the Saxon university system also allocated funds to universities from a central source, and following Althoff's *Wissenschaftspolitik*, picked one city to promote as the center. The University of Leipzig, which was also one of the wealthier universities in that it, like Greifswald and Heidelberg, owned land, was well positioned in inter-city competition. James Morgan Hart, *German Universities: A Narrative of Personal Experience, Together with Recent Statistical Information, Practical Suggestions, and a Comparison of the German, English and American Systems of Higher Education* (New York, 1874), 377.

[117] Though the city had a population only one-eighth the size of Berlin's, the number of its matriculated students exceeded Berlin's by one thousand. Hart, *German Universities*, 373, 382. Hart may have been a bit off—according to Volker Berghahn's statistics, the population of Leipzig in 1871 was already 107,000—but the point still stands. Berghahn, *Imperial Germany, 1871–1914: Economy, Society, Culture, and Politics* (Providence, R.I., 1994), 312.

[118] The scholarly debate about whether regional identity "trickled up," as Celia Applegate famously argued, to promote nationalism, or whether it was co-opted by nationalists, as Alon Confino later claimed, is relevant to this discussion, but not in itself decisive, since we saw with the example of Hall's rhetoric above how, in the realm of scholarship, different elements of the project—local, national, or international—could be emphasized depending on the audience. Applegate, "Heimat and the Varieties of Regional History," *Central European History* 33, no. 1 (2000): 109–115; Confino, *The Nation as a Local Metaphor: Württemberg, Imperial Germany, and National Memory, 1871–1918* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1997). With respect to questions of nationalism and internationalism in a local setting, my treatment of the university runs parallel to Glenn Penny's reading of the museum, whose promoters he calls "worldly provincials." Penny, "Fashioning Local Identities in an Age of Nation-Building: Museums, Cosmopolitan Visions, and Intra-German Competition," *German History* 17, no. 4 (1999): 489–505, here 491–492.

[119] This was particularly the case for Saxony, since other than Munich and Heidelberg, Leipzig was the only university of consequence outside of Prussia. McClelland, *State, Society, and University in Germany*, 236.

[120] According to Jeffry M. Diefendorf, "In our advocacy of the transnational turn, we should avoid obscuring the real importance of the local, the regional, and—yes—the national in shaping urban history, especially with respect to the urban public sphere, modern design and planning, urban sites and activities

visionary iconoclast who found his place on the edge of the traditional academy, Lamprecht moved between his Institute for Cultural and Universal History and reform of the university as rector of the University of Leipzig in 1910–1911. He used his institute to establish the new field of cultural history. He was also highly influenced by a visit to the U.S. in 1904. Lamprecht's administrative career reveals an overlooked aspect of transatlantic *Wissenstransfer*: namely, he used American-inspired reform ideas to give Leipzig an advantage against Berlin.

To begin with, Lamprecht did not rebuff Althoff. A good relationship with the Prussian culture minister was essential to accomplishing his goals for Leipzig. As Roger Chickering has shown in his excellent biography of Lamprecht, it was because of his relationship with Althoff, which began in the fall of 1884, that Lamprecht, who received financial stipends from the Prussian Culture Ministry, was able to pursue his campaign to promote the field of cultural history.[121] Given that Lamprecht was embroiled in a public methodological controversy for much of his career, Althoff's patronage was even more important.[122] Viewed as insufficiently scholarly and too popular—flaws that were considered to be related—Lamprecht was unlikely to be granted a position in history, but supported in part by Althoff, he was able to pursue his work as a so-called extraordinary professor, a lecturer with lower ranking who nonetheless benefited from an official position at the university.[123] However, he did not rely on Althoff alone. Lamprecht secured money from the Culture Ministry in Saxony, and when Althoff was sluggish, he persuaded his childhood friend Chancellor Bernhard von Bülow to provide a grant of ten thousand marks in the name of the Kaiser.[124]

Lamprecht proved to be a consummate fundraiser. Long before Althoff came into the picture, he befriended the railroad and bank executive Gustav von Mevissen, whose patronage enabled him to pursue his *Habilitation* in Bonn. In exchange, Lamprecht assisted Mevissen in cataloguing his private library and promoting the Rhenish Historical Society.[125] Lamprecht's relationship with the businessman was an

---

of cultural production, as well as debates concerning heritage and postwar reconstruction." "Introduction: Transnationalism and the German City," in Jeffry M. Diefendorf and Janet Ward, eds., *Transnationalism and the German City* (New York, 2014), 1–10, here 2.

[121] Friedrich Althoff extended his "warmest greetings" to Lamprecht, August 14, 1884, S 2713 Korr. 3, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Bonn [hereafter ULB Bonn]; also cited in Roger Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht: A German Academic Life, 1856–1915* (Atlantic Highlands, N.J., 1993), 86. Matthias Middel's multivolume history on the institute considers the extra-university aspect of Lamprecht's career, which was less developed by Chickering. Middel, *Weltgeschichtsschreibung im Zeitalter der Verfachlichung und Professionalisierung: Das Leipziger Institut für Kultur- und Universalgeschichte, 1890–1990*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 2005), vol. 1: *Das Institut unter der Leitung Karl Lamprecht*s, 336–356. My work connects both of these studies to the transatlantic context and some new archival material in ULB Bonn.

[122] The *Methodenstreit* pitted Lamprecht's emphasis on regional and socioeconomic history against the traditional primacy of politics advocated by the Ranke school in Berlin. Lamprecht's primary antagonist, the historian Georg von Below, devoted much space in the pages of the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* to pointing out Lamprecht's errors and to discrediting cultural history. Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*, chap. 5.

[123] According to Chickering, "The expansion of the public audience whom Lamprecht proposed to address contrasted with the shrinking circle of historians with whom he carried on any meaningful exchange about the issues that dominated the controversy." Ibid., 193.

[124] Lamprecht to Althoff, September 20, 1908, B 108 Band 1, 818, NL Althoff; Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*, 352.

[125] For Lamprecht's promotion of his patron, see "Gustav von Mevissen als Förderer der Geschichtswissenschaft," *Nationalzeitung* 551 (1899); cited in Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*, 68–69. Much of the correspondence between Lamprecht and Mevissen has been damaged. I rely on Chickering's discussion of their relationship. Ibid., 70–79.

FIGURE 6: Karl Lamprecht sitting at his desk, 1900. ULB Bonn, Nachlass Lamprecht, S 2713: B: 5.

example of how he looked outside the state-funded university system for sources of support. In addition, the self-made industrialist philanthropists who won him over as he traveled through the U.S. on his *Amerikareise* in 1904 provided him with further affirmation of this alternative model.[126]

For Lamprecht, the United States no doubt held inherent scholarly interest for its relationship of economics to cultural life and the consequences of colonialism for history; the U.S. was equally responsive to his new cultural history.[127] However, as Germany had for Gilman, the U.S. also presented Lamprecht with a great opportu-

[126] For Herbert Schönebaum, Lamprecht's former student who also organized his archive, Mevissen and the trip to America were two of the most decisive influences on his career. Schönebaum, "Karl Lamprecht: Leben und Werk eines Kämpfes um die Geschichtswissenschaft, 1856–1915" (unpublished ms., 1956), 70–78, S 2714, ULB Bonn. A second copy exists in the Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig (Bibliotheca Albertina).

[127] In addition to his attendance at the World's Fair, Lamprecht delivered four lectures on cultural history at Columbia University, "Probleme der modernen Geschichtswissenschaft" (Problems in Modern History), and participated in that institution's 150th-anniversary celebrations at the invitation of President Butler. The lectures were later published in English in *What Is History? Five Lectures on the Modern Science of History* (New York, 1905). The American audience was impressed with Lamprecht—his cultural history spoke more to Americans than to Germans—and he was awarded an honorary degree. Schönebaum, "Karl Lamprecht: Leben und Werk," 73. For the reception of Lamprecht's cultural history in America and the subsequent development of the American "new history," see Hinrich C. Seeba, "Cultural History: An American Refuge for a German Idea," in Lynne Tatlock and Matt Erlin, eds., *German Culture in Nineteenth-Century America: Reception, Adaptation, Transformation* (Rochester, N.Y., 2005), 3–20.

nity to learn about scholarly management. He eagerly visited the "new institutions" on the West Coast, including the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford University, and the University of Denver, as well as the different models of higher education embodied by Johns Hopkins, Vassar College, and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, photographing them along the way. The most lasting impression made by all of these visits was the substantial role emerging for private sponsorship of scholarship. Over the coming years, Lamprecht would mull the question of how to get donors to sponsor not only buildings but also professorships.[128] The success of this kind of fundraising, he later remarked, depended entirely on the university president.[129] Apparently Lamprecht, too, was offered a large sum to remain in America. Though he seemed no more eager than Klein to accept the offer—"Now we Germans are not for sale [*unkaufbar*]"—he may have used it to prove his worth to his skeptical Leipzig colleagues.[130]

Back in Leipzig by November 1904, Lamprecht worked tirelessly not only on his volume of *German History*, which he told Althoff would promote the German cause abroad, but also individually, writing to Saxon businessmen who might, like Mevissen, feel compelled to support the scholarly endeavors of their regional system.[131] By 1908 he had raised close to forty thousand marks, secured a subsidy from Berlin, and obtained Dresden's commitment to support the remodeling of a new building in the center of town. However, donations of books and a building did not amount to a capital endowment, which would be necessary for the perpetuation of his institute.[132]

But in November 1910, the situation changed. Wilhelm II announced his intention to found the Kaiser Wilhelm Society, the first agenda of which would be a major institute devoted to chemistry. The Kaiser's allocation of 10 million marks in seed money provided a boost to Lamprecht's fundraising. He understood the urgency of the situation and was not above the use of scare tactics. "The Berlin action to develop research institutes means a serious danger for the University of Leipzig," he wrote to the Academic Senate.[133] If only reformers in Leipzig would use the terms of the Kaiser's announcement to their advantage: "Such a competition, yes, an outflanking of the University of Berlin, is arguably possible in the field of the humanities," Lamprecht wrote in a draft for an article in the *Leipziger Neuester Nachrichten*,

[128] Karl Lamprecht, *Americana: Reiseeindrücke, Betrachtungen, Geschichtliche Gesamtansicht* (Freiburg, 1906), 90. Otto Hötzsch echoed this observation. See "Amerikanische Eindrüke," Bl. 199, A I. Nr. 310, NL Althoff.

[129] Lamprecht, *Americana*, 91.

[130] Schönebaum recalls that Lamprecht wrote to a colleague in Leipzig that he had been offered $50,000 to remain, but he does not mention by whom. Though the sum seems unlikely, the recollection reveals Lamprecht's understanding of the growing capital of the American scene. Schönebaum, "Karl Lamprecht," 78. Lamprecht, like Ostwald, was likely sent to the U.S. because he was an outsider, not because he was revered. Wilhelm Ostwald, *Lebenslinien: Eine Selbstbiographie*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1926), 3: 388. Jung presents Freud as an outsider who might use Clark's invitation to boost his reputation in Europe. See Koelsch, "'Incredible Day-Dream,'" n.p.

[131] For letters to potential donors, see Forschungsinstitute- Verkehr mit Schenkgebern, S 2713 : UL : 10, ULB Bonn; and Lamprehct to the donors of the future Institute for Cultural and Universal History, October 26, 1907, 6a, Karl Lamprecht Nachlass 243: 3, Bibliotheca Albertina, Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig.

[132] Chickering includes Lamprecht's personal library, since Lamprecht intended to donate it to the institute, and the university responded by donating a building. Other donations of books and subsidies followed, including a move orchestrated by Althoff to encourage Bernhard von Bülow to provide a grant of 10,000 marks to the seminar. Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*, 352.

[133] Lamprecht to Academic Senate, April 6, 1911, S 2713 : UL : 10, ULB Bonn.

FIGURE 7: A photo of Yale University taken by Karl Lamprecht in 1904. ULB Bonn, Nachlass Lamprecht, NL Lamprecht: 47.

"especially because in Berlin, following the announcement by the Chancellor of the Reich (and owing to the University of Berlin's backwardness in the field of the humanities), and inner motives, the expansion to humanities institutions is not currently envisaged."[134] In a letter to the city's mayor several days later, he echoed his position: Berlin's development could be a good incentive for Leipzig and Saxony.[135]

Responding in part to developments in the capital, Lamprecht crafted a new vision for a complex of research institutes in Leipzig. In contrast to Berlin, which had declared its intention to focus on the natural sciences (there would ultimately be twenty-six institutes of natural science there before World War II), Leipzig would emphasize its current strength: the humanities. In addition to cultural history, Lamprecht suggested that the city develop such new disciplines as psychology, linguistics, and sociology.[136] By capitalizing on its specialization in these "border disciplines" (*Grenzwissenschaften*), Leipzig could use its less traditional features to become an urban stronghold for the study of the humanities in general.[137]

[134] Draft by Lamprecht, November 15, 1910, S 2713 : UL : 10, ULB Bonn. Later published as Karl Lamprecht, "Eine Versicherungsprämie," *Leipziger Neuester Nachrichten*, October 30, 1910.

[135] Lamprecht to the Lord Mayor, November 24, 1910, S 2713 : UL : 10, ULB Bonn.

[136] On this oppositional initiative, see Gerald Wiemers, "Karl Lamprecht und die Staatliche Forschungsinstitute," *Neues Archiv für sächsische Geschichte* 64 (1993): 141–150, here 141.

[137] In contrast to Berlin, where the institutes would not have a connection to the university, those in Leipzig would also be university institutes, "for which there existed a more secure and faster progress to new results." Lamprecht to unknown, May 6, 1913, S 2713 : UL : 10, ULB Bonn.

There is no doubt that Berlin was on Lamprecht's mind as he crafted this vision.[138] He showed further insight in skillfully using the increasing interconnectedness of the world to benefit Leipzig's standing in the inter-city competition. Drawing on regional pride in the long history of its internationally minded royalty like King John of Saxony, who himself had maintained a lengthy correspondence with the American historian George Ticknor, Lamprecht conducted his own "foreign cultural politics."[139] He traveled to Berlin to promote his institute to foreign ambassadors and campaigned tirelessly to move the professor exchange to Leipzig.[140] He had even more success raising money from foreign sources.[141] Though Lamprecht initially relied on Berlin to mediate his relationship with the U.S., he also competed with it. When Berlin tried to acquire a collection of Chinese encyclopedias that had been a gift to his institute from the Chinese emperor, Lamprecht put up a fight.[142] Just as his colleagues at the Leipzig Ethnography Museum looked to other cities in Europe as both models and sources of competition to cultivate a cultural center, Lamprecht

[138] So Matthias Middell argues in "Konfrontation auf Augenhöhe? Die Universitäten Leipzig und Berlin im Wilhelminischen Deutschland," in vom Bruch, *Die Berliner Universität im Kontext*, 189–212. On anti-Prussianism as an organizing force in Saxon identity, see James Retallack, "Introduction: Locating Saxony in the Landscape of German Regional History," in Retallack, *Saxony in German History*, 1–30, here 1; and Simon Lässig and Karl Heinrich Pohl, eds., *Sachsen im Kaiserreich: Politik, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Umbruch* (Weimar, 1997). This is perhaps not surprising when one considers the experience of other cities such as Hamburg, where Berlin also figured prominently in the debate on the eve of World War I about whether to found a university and how to distinguish its scholarly mission. Emily J. Levine, *Dreamland of Humanists: Warburg, Cassirer, Panofsky, and the Hamburg School* (Chicago, 2013), 81–92. On the relationship between antipathy toward the Prussians and a strong "particularist" identity in other regions, see Dan S. White, "Regionalism and Particularism," in Roger Chickering, ed., *Imperial Germany: A Historiographical Companion* (Westport, Conn., 1996), 131–155, especially 133.

[139] That relationship may have led to its own *Wissenstransfer* in the public library movements of nineteenth-century Germany and America. According to Thomas Adam, at the end of the nineteenth century, Ticknor modeled the Boston Public Library on the Royal Saxon Library in Dresden, which in turn inspired library reform in Germany. Adam, "Philanthropy," in Akira Iriye and Pierre-Yves Saunier, eds., *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History: From the Mid-19th Century to the Present Day* (Houndmills, 2009), 832–834, here 832. Lamprecht himself was involved in mediating between Ticknor's heirs and Prince Johann Georg of Saxony to publish this correspondence. For Lamprecht's efforts in this regard, see, for example, his letter to the prince about Charles Eliot's decision to publish an edition of the correspondence, NL Lamprecht : 1 : 28, 1 : 31 and 1 : 43, ULB Bonn. On "foreign cultural politics," see Karl Lamprecht, *Rektoratserinnerungen* (Gotha, 1917), 15; Lamprecht, "Über auswärtige Kulturpolitik," in Herbert Schönebaum, ed., *Ausgewählte Schriften: Zur Wirtschafts- und Kulturgeschichte und zur Theorie der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Aalen, 1974), 809–820, here 809; also published in *Mitteilungen des Verbandes für internationale Verständigung* 8 (1913): 3–14.

[140] Though he succeeded in having the Wisconsin political scientist Paul Samuel Reinsch split his time between Berlin and Leipzig while he served as the Roosevelt Professor in 1911–1912, Lamprecht was not able to establish a lasting role for his city in the exchange program. Lamprecht to his younger daughter (whose grandchild recently donated this unarchived letter), May 24, 1910, Lamprecht 76, ULB Bonn; Lamprecht, *Rektoratserinnerungen*, 13.

[141] He received a substantial donation for his institute from the Carnegie Foundation and remarkably persuaded the French Culture Ministry to pay for lectures in French after Saxony denied him funding for this purpose. Lamprecht to "Monsieur le Ministre de l'instruction Publique de la République Francaise," November 10, 1908, 11125, Ministerium des Kultus und öffentlichen Unterrichts, 10230/21, Sächsisches Staatsarchiv, Hauptstaatsarchiv Dresden [herafter StA Dresden]. On Carnegie's contribution to Lamprecht's institute, see Louise Schorn-Schütte, *Karl Lamprecht: Kulturgeschichtsschreibung zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik* (Göttingen, 1984), 306.

[142] The negotiations concerning the Chinese encyclopedias continued for decades. See the letters between Lamprecht and the Culture Ministry of Saxony and Berlin in 11125, Ministerium des Kultus und öffentlichen Unterrichts,10230/21, StA Dresden.

aspired to achieve a world-class scholarly institute in his home city. He was a German abroad and a Leipziger at home.[143]

Critical in this equation was the United States, which for Berlin was a source of competition, but for Leipzig was a storehouse of ideas. Lamprecht's visit to Madison, Wisconsin, in 1904 provided the inspiration for his history seminar (later institute), which he founded shortly after returning from America.[144] Largely due to his successful emulation of American fundraising in the industrial sector for that effort, Lamprecht was named rector of the university for the 1910–1911 academic year, a position that gave him the opportunity to test American-style innovations in university reform debates. His first order of business was to organize an "exhibition in the assembly hall visualizing the advances in the American higher education sector."[145] Drawing on his contacts in the U.S., in particular Rudolph Tombo Jr., founder of the Deutsches Haus at Columbia University, Lamprecht collected as much university material as possible, including campus maps, building floor plans, and course catalogues, to put on display. Though the burden of collecting would fall on Tombo, the goal was to achieve a cross-section of materials from such "representative" American universities as "Columbia, Harvard, Yale, Pennsylvania, Baltimore, Madison, Chicago, perhaps also Denver, in order to have a totally new example, lastly Berkeley and Leland Stanford, in addition a couple of women's universities like Vassar or Bryn Mawr would be very desirable." As Lamprecht discussed with Tombo, "We stand here at the beginning of a university reform movement; likewise it is not impossible that in the near future there will exist a couple of new universities, for example in Hamburg or in Frankfurt … All of this suggests that we are concerned much more than before with the American universities, namely with what the exterior features involve."[146]

Lamprecht was all too eager to share his urban-development strategy with his allies. He fielded questions from education reformers in Hamburg on the merits of founding scholarly institutions rather than a university.[147] And he advised the founders in Frankfurt in much the same spirit with which he had promoted his agenda in Leipzig. In an open editorial published in 1909, Lamprecht urged the city to capitalize on its strengths and concentrate on the humanities rather than try in vain to compete with the initiative in the natural sciences now underway in Berlin.[148] In the cities struggling at the periphery, American innovation was a source of inspiration; but when it came to the German capital, it was always seen as competition. The German-

[143] For Penny, "This dramatic change in attitude is perhaps best illustrated by the rhetoric and actions of Karl Weule, who succeeded Hermann Obst as the director of the Leipzig museum in 1906." Penny, "Fashioning Local Identities in an Age of Nation-Building," 500–501, quote from 501.

[144] Herbert Schönebaum, "Karl Lamprechts hochschulpädagogische Bestrebungen," Sonderdruck aus *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik* 2, no. 1 (1956): 1–16, here, 10. Z 56/44, ULB Bonn.

[145] Rudolf Tombo Jr. to Lamprecht, November 24, 1911, S 2713 Korr. 50, ULB Bonn; Lamprecht, *Rektoratserinnerungen*, 13–14.

[146] The idea was clearly brewing for some time. In the original, Lamprecht misspells both Leland Stanford and Bryn Mawr. Lamprecht to Rudolf Tombo Jr., December 29, 1909, NL Lamprecht : 22 : 47, ULB Bonn.

[147] Anonymous letter addressed to Lamprecht and titled "Fragen betreffend Einrichtung von Forschungsinstituten am Kolonialinstitut Hamburg" (Questions Concerning the Establishment of Research Institutes at the Hamburg Colonial Institute), November 27, 1913, NL Lamprecht : 35 : 13, ULB Bonn.

[148] Lamprecht, "Die Universität Frankfurt," *Kleine Press*, December 24, 1909; copy in 11125, Ministerium des Kultus und öffentlichen Unterrichts, 10281/203, StA Dresden.

born Harvard professor Hugo Münsterberg's maneuvers in 1910 to found the Amerika Institut in Berlin, a service center to facilitate the experience of American students and exchange professors in Germany, fueled Lamprecht's jealousy.[149] Although Münsterberg and Lamprecht had ostensibly the same goals—to promote the cultural exchange between Germany and America to better transatlantic relations—their terse correspondence suggests that with respect to scholarly exchange, the local and regional superseded national affiliations.[150]

Lamprecht saw himself as a *Wissenschaftsmanager* who understood the challenges facing the university in his day, and his position as rector gave him the opportunity to share his reform ideas with a local audience. In the spring of 1911, he raised the idea of selling one of the university buildings in the center of Leipzig, with the proceeds to be used to purchase land outside the city center in Probstheida, an inner suburb in the southeast section of the city.[151] For this project, Lamprecht turned again to Tombo and requested architectural designs from McKim, Mead & White, the firm that had recently finished construction of Kent Hall in Manhattan's Morningside Heights.[152] Lamprecht was seeking to turn Leipzig into a university with an American-style campus.[153]

As with many of his ideas, the faculty did not take Lamprecht's academic resettlement plan seriously, and it was quickly tabled. His colleagues did not trust him to manage the university's funds. Like most iconoclastic visionaries, Lamprecht had a difficult personality, which may have prevented his ideas from achieving their full impact.[154] He continued to experience friction with his colleagues in the philosophy

[149] Having raised a significant donation from the banker Leopold Koppel for this cause, Münsterberg persuaded Althoff in 1910 to approve the project. Charlotte A. Lerg, "Das erste Berliner Amerika-Institut: Think Tank oder 'politischer Trumpf'?," paper presented at the conference "Follow the Money? Wissenschaftspolitik und Wissenschaftsgeschichte in internationaler und globaler Perspektive," April 19–20, 2013, Free University, Berlin.

[150] It is clear that Lamprecht viewed some of his American contacts, including Columbia professors Tombo and John W. Burgess, as Leipzig's partners alone. This political struggle is evident in such correspondence as Tombo to Lamprecht, April 14, 1910, S 2713 Korr. 50, ULB Bonn; and John W. Burgess to Hugo Münsterberg, October 12, 1910, Harvard University Archives, UAI 5.160, box 2, folder 43, "Amerika Institut." Thanks to Charlotte A. Lerg for bringing the latter source to my attention.

[151] For correspondence and projections concerning this deal, see Ankauf weiteren Areals in Leipzig-Probstheida und Zuckelhausen für Zwecke der Universität, RA Nr. 1582/ I and II, UAL. A detailed map can be found in Vorentwurf zu dem Bebauungsplan fur die Verlegung der Leipziger Universität nach Probstheida, S 2713 : B : 10, ULB Bonn, which shows the plan for professor and student housing on the edges of a quad that is punctuated by a church and a library, and surrounded by playing fields and a swimming pool. These documents are cited by Chickering, who, drawing on Schönebaum, emphasizes that Lamprecht's vision actually predated Althoff's similar proposal to remove the University of Berlin to Dahlem. Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*, 390; Schönebaum, "Karl Lamprechts hochschulpädagogische Bestrebungen," 2, 14. On Lamprecht's discussion of these plans, see *Rektoratserinnerungen*, 47–55.

[152] Rudolf Tombo to Karl Lamprecht, April 6, 1911, S 2713 Korr. 50, ULB Bonn.

[153] Chickering argues that Lamprecht's campus design was likely modeled on the "Walduniversität" (forest university) in then-rural Palo Alto. Chickering, *Karl Lamprecht*, 378; Schönebaum, "Karl Lamprechts hochschulpädagogische Bestrebungen," 10. However, Lamprecht seemed to draw on distinct features from multiple universities, including the history seminar at the University of Wisconsin–Madison, the fields of Stanford University, and the private funding of urban institutions like Columbia University. In this sense, Lamprecht understood that diversity was an essential element of the American system that German universities ought to emulate.

[154] Lamprecht complained that his colleagues did not respect him; *Rektoratserinnerungen*, 55. Wiemers argues that it is to Leipzig's detriment that they rejected his idea to concentrate on five institutes in the humanities, as well as the expansion plans for an urban university campus; "Karl Lamprecht und die Staatliche Forschungsinstitute," 150.

faculty even after he received a separate seminar in 1904. Even though he was now rector, he did not have the support of the faculty, and, unfortunately for Lamprecht, a German rector did not have the power of an American university president. Without the support of the faculty, he was unable to implement his ideas.[155]

Even after he stepped down as rector, Lamprecht continued to lobby the Royal Ministry for Religion and Public Education in Dresden for his reforms, including the establishment of institutes within the university, a system that was meant to replace both the failing German seminar and the flawed American department.[156] It was a structural innovation clearly based on his own institute, but his colleagues found the invocation of America suspicious and were never able to look beyond that perceived threat to see the potential of these innovations. Instead, Lamprecht's *Amerikareise* became a liability.[157]

The skepticism that his Leipzig colleague Wilhelm Ostwald expressed about the Americans was more typical of the German trend. Ostwald returned from St. Louis gloating about Clark University's apparent setback, by which the American students seemed brazenly undeterred. "We are hoping to eventually shift the intellectual center of gravity of all mankind across the entire Atlantic Ocean to us," he recalled their reporting.[158] Lamprecht's Leipzig opponents may also have been influenced by the wider shift signaled by Weber's lecture at the *Hochschullehrertag*, delivered while Lamprecht was rector, as Germans grew increasingly skeptical of American-inspired institutional innovations. In that same year, prominent socialists such as Karl Liebknecht worried about the nefarious influence that private industry might have on the scholarly field.[159] In 1918, when Weber delivered a more famous lecture to a crowded hall in Munich, that fear seemed vindicated. He bemoaned that "[a professor] sells me his knowledge and his methods for my father's money, just as the greengrocer sells my mother cabbage."[160] For Weber, transatlantic *Wissenstransfer* had become nothing more than a commodity exchange.

It is perhaps not surprising, though no less tragic, that with the advent of World War I, the inroads made in knowledge exchange came to a halt. Most scholarly projects between 1914 and 1919 would be harnessed for nationalist goals.[161] Following

[155] Schönebaum attributes Lamprecht's failure to implement his reforms to the conservatism of the university system in general and the tremendous costs that his plans would have required. "Karl Lamprechts Hochschulpädagogische Bestrebungen," 15.

[156] Lamprecht to the Royal Ministry of Religion and Public Education in Dresden, July 19, 1914, 11125, Ministerium des Kultus und öffentlichen Unterrichts, 10230/21, StA Dresden.

[157] Karl Lamprecht to Nicholas Murray Butler, April 1906, Nicholas Murray Butler Papers, MS#0177, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University. Thanks to Tara Craig for her assistance with this collection.

[158] Ostwald, *Lebenslinien*, 3: 399.

[159] Karl Liebknecht, "Kunst und Wissenschaft im Dienste des Kapitals: Preußens Universitäten- ein Kapital preußischer Unkultur. Reden im preuß. Abg. Haus zum Kultusetat am 15. und 16.3.1911," in Liebknecht, *Gesammelte Reden und Schriften*, 9 vols., vol. 4: *Januar 1911 bis Februar 1912* (Berlin, 1961), 236–274.

[160] Max Weber, "Science as a Vocation," in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, trans. and eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York, 1946), 129–156, here 149.

[161] E. B. Poulton's 1915 lecture *Science and the Great War* (Oxford, 1915) is typical of the nationalism that usurped the universalist scholarly enterprise in this era. On the differing British and French scholarly responses to the First World War, see Tomás Irish, "'The Aims of Science Are the Antithesis to Those of War': Academic Scientists at War in Britain and France, 1914–18," in James E. Kitchen, Alisa Miller, and Laura Rowe, eds., *Other Combatants, Other Fronts: Competing Histories of the First World War* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2011), 29–53.

the infamous German Manifesto signed by ninety-three scholars in support of the war, the French and British insisted on a boycott of German science.[162] Though it was penned in 1926, the year in which Germany reentered the international community of scholars, Ostwald's memoir reflects a resentment that lingered among Germans. Lamprecht, for his part, continued to correspond with Butler and recommended international exchange and American-style reforms until his death in 1914.[163] Schmidt-Ott and Münsterberg conveyed disappointment, and a sense of betrayal, to their overseas partners.[164]

Much of the literature on the cultural history of World War I focuses on the mobilization of scholarship for war and the pernicious use of scientific discoveries.[165] However, this focus on the national level misses the frustrated attempts to continue partnerships and clouds the broken relationships that are an equally valid part of any transatlantic history of the war, and which set the stage for a renewal in 1919. Following the war, German scholarly reformers believed that more was required of universities to welcome foreign students and to encourage the study of foreign subjects. This dual mission became a critical component of the mission of the University of Hamburg, one of the three new "Weimar-era" German universities founded in 1919.[166] Its founders envisioned a place for the city—not just Germany—in the new Europe that was emerging from World War I. The Association of German Higher Education made a similar decision when it selected another culturally central but politically peripheral city, Dresden, as the site of a new college to be built in the American style. Situated in the former castle of Prince Albrecht of Prussia, the "Castle College Dresden: An American College for Undergraduates" would be a coeducational school of two hundred American and German students and operate under a protectorate of the American and German educational authorities.[167] Just as Lamprecht had on the

[162] On the boycott of German science in the 1920s, see Brigitte Schroeder-Gudehus, "Internationale Wissenschaftsbeziehungen und auswärtige Kulturpolitik, 1919–1933: Vom Boykott und Gegen-Boykott zu ihrer Wiederaufnahme," in Rudolf Vierhaus and Bernhard vom Brocke, eds., *Forschung im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Gesellschaft: Geschichte und Struktur der Kaiser-Wilhelm-/Max-Planck-Gesellschaft aus Anlaß ihres 75jährigen Bestehens* (Stuttgart, 1990), 858–885.

[163] In his final letter to Butler on the eve of World War I he wrote, "We have made real progress in the upbuilding of our international cultural movement and hope in this way to have served the cause of international peace, even though threatening clouds from the East as well as from the West hang over us." February 24, 1914, Butler Papers, Columbia University.

[164] For the increasingly strained transatlantic relationships owing to the war, see, for example, Charles Eliot to Schmidt-Ott, September, 25, 1914; Francis Peabody to Schmidt-Ott, October 20 1914; Schmidt-Ott to Charles Eliot, January, 7, 1915, 475, NL Schmidt-Ott.

[165] See, for example, Carol Gruber, *Mars and Minerva: World War I and the Uses of the Higher Learning in America* (Baton Rouge, La., 1975); and Martha Hanna, *The Mobilization of Intellect: French Scholars and Writers during the Great War* (Cambridge, Mass., 1996) both of which detail the zealous efforts of scientists and scholars to assert the utility of their work for the war of *Kultur*.

[166] The others were the University of Frankfurt, which was founded in 1914 but effectively began operations following the conclusion of the war, and the University of Cologne, which was re-founded in 1919.

[167] One of the board members suggested that Berlin was too saddled with political matters to take the lead in this effort. According to the promotional materials from 1927, "Castle College will be the natural link between the old seats of learning and of scientific research as represented by the German Universities and Technical Colleges, and the modern aggressive American College or University with its great resources in men and material, methods and manners and its more intimate contact between faculty and student body on the one side, and college and public on the other." R 64011, 9.1927–11.1927, Hochschul 1 Deutschland, Hochschulwesen und Studium in Deutschland, Ausländerstudium, Politisches Amt, Berlin.

eve of World War I, these reformers believed that innovation would come from hybridization: in this case, the American amalgamation of the English residential college and the German research university. The postwar reemergence of Dresden and Hamburg, peripheral cities with strong international connections and histories, underscores the benefits of integrating the local into this narrative.

These four pairs in *Wissenstransfer*—Gilman and Klein and Butler and Lamprecht, to which we might add Baltimore and Göttingen and New York and Leipzig—shed light on how knowledge exchange occurs: it is local; competition and cooperation feed each other; and it is precarious. Neither the Germans nor the Americans at the beginning of the twentieth century were clear on the implications of competition for higher education. Among German education reformers and scholarly managers, the rhetoric of competition served short-term needs. It became *de rigueur* in this period to cite the declining number of American students at German universities as a potential threat to the international reputation of German science.[168] Even if that decline was exaggerated—Harvard professor Francis Peabody assured his German colleagues that such was not the case—the sense of decline and crisis served the needs of German reformers, who used it to further their aims.[169]

In the twenty-first century, attuned as we are to university rankings, such anxieties sound familiar. Yet debates about higher education remain largely unhistoricized.[170] Insofar as lessons for today can be drawn from these studies, Gilman's hybrid approach to scholarly innovation emerges not as a *post facto* historical explanation, but as a successful strategy employed by proactive scholarly managers. The failure of Hall's "purist" approach to *Wissenstransfer* does not bode well for contemporary attempts to export academic models wholesale to, say, Shanghai or Qatar. Thus this

[168] See, for example, Hugo Münsterberg to Friedrich Schmidt-Ott, September 17, 1910, Bl. 8, 410, NL Schmidt-Ott.

[169] The number of American students did begin to decrease, in both absolute and percentage terms, around 1900, though as Peabody suggested, the number was higher if one examined places of high exchange such as Harvard, Göttingen, and Heidelberg. Peter Drewek, "Die ungastliche deutsche Universität: Ausländische Studenten an deutschen Hochschulen, 1890–1930," *Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung* 5 (1999): 197–224. See also Thomas Weber, *Our Friend "The Enemy": Elite Education in Britain and Germany before World War I* (Stanford, Calif., 2008), 214. Indeed, Francis Peabody insisted that in the years 1905 to 1910, of the Harvard students who studied abroad, the majority went to Germany—in total, thirty-two out of eighty-five students, with seventeen opting for France and fourteen for England. Francis Peabody, "Weitere Bemerkungen zum Professorenaustausch," *Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst, und Technik* 4, no. 3 (March 26, 1910): 385–390, here 385–386. 474, NL Schmidt-Ott.

[170] For an article that is typical of the press's preoccupation with global rankings, a focus that nonetheless lacks a historical perspective, see Christopher F. Schuetze, "Asian Schools Jump in Rank," *New York Times*, October 24, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/25/world/asia/asian-schools-jump-in-rank.html. A 2014 column by then-American Historical Association president Jan Goldstein exemplifies the growing interest among historians in the topic, though the "long pedigree" she refers to has yet to be explored. Goldstein, "A Slice of American Academic Life, Suzhou-Style," *Perspectives on History*, March 2014, 4. When education scholars historicize the globalization of higher education, they generally do not investigate roots earlier than the 1970s, or they do so in only a cursory way. Heinz-Dieter Meyer, "Path Dependence in German and American Public Education: The Persistence of Institutional Difference in a Globalizing World," in Douglas E. Mitchell, Robert L. Crowson, and Dorothy Shipps, eds., *Shaping Educational Policy: Power and Process* (New York, 2011), 189–211; and Ben Wildasky, *The Great Brain Race: How Global Universities Are Reshaping the World* (Princeton, N.J., 2010).

history might offer guidance in contemporary debates, including whether Ivy League universities are really suitable models for the German state-based university system, how the Bologna reforms might better standardize European institutions, and whether New York University Abu Dhabi and Bard College Berlin represent successful "translations" of American institutions abroad.[171]

These exchanges also reveal that the American research university emerged as early as the first decade of the twentieth century as the central model in a global framework. That this remains the case today forces us to reconsider the "rise and fall" narrative of America in the "Transatlantic Century." For even if at the close of the century the United States found itself out of step with Europe on issues of religion, markets, and wars, its universities maintained their global preeminence and remain among the nation's greatest cultural assets.[172] That said, World War I also created the opportunity for new partners. On the other side of the world, the young Chinese education reformer Cai Yuanpei, who had attended Karl Lamprecht's seminars in Leipzig, adopted aspects of the German university to modernize China's system of higher education. Upon becoming chancellor of National Beijing University in 1912, Cai envisioned a globalized world of higher education in which China would find a place. "If there were a university which made every effort to encompass all the world's teachings," he declared in 1914, "then our language and history would constitute a department . . . This is proof that the world has become more integrated."[173] On a two-year visit in China that coincided with the 1919 May Fourth movement, the American educator and philosopher John Dewey confirmed that China would be both pupil and teacher in the postwar age.[174]

Yet this story should also give us pause about a global history of education that places nineteenth-century nationalism and internationalism in a dialectical struggle.[175] Germany and the United States never replaced Cambridge and Chicago or

[171] On the "Excellence Initiative" as an importation of the American Ivy League, see Walter Inderer, *Die deutsche Exzellenzinitiative und die amerikanische Eliteuniversität* (Berlin, 2007). According to Paul Michael Lützeler, the Bologna reform was at once an Americanization and a Europeanization of the German university, in which ideas, traditions, and practices were adopted from the German, French, and American systems. Lützeler, *Transatlantische Germanistik: Kontakt, Transfer, Dialogik* (Berlin, 2013), 61. For an argument on how Bard approaches the problem of "translating" American academic institutions abroad, see Susan Gillespie, "The Practice of International Education in the Context of Globalization: A Critique," *Journal of Studies in International Education* 6, no. 3 (2002): 262–267. On the manipulation of Humboldt's ideals in these debates, see Mitchell G. Ash, "Bachelor of What, Master of Whom? The Humboldt Myth and Historical Transformations of Higher Education in German-Speaking Europe and the US," *European Journal of Education* 41, no. 2 (2006): 245–267. The essays in Tor Halvorsen and Atle Nyhagen, eds., *Academic Identities—Academic Challenges? American and European Experience of the Transformation of Higher Education and Research* (Cambridge, 2011), also draw on historical examples for lessons in contemporary transatlantic exchange.

[172] This is Mary Nolan's "anti-triumphalist" narrative of Americanization in Europe, a narrative that does not include America's ascendance in the university. Nolan, *The Transatlantic Century: Europe and America, 1890–2010* (Cambridge, 2012), chaps. 11–12.

[173] According to Timothy B. Weston, this statement, which he cites and translates, was part of the introduction to a new journal that Cai hoped to launch but that never came into being. Weston, "The Founding of the Imperial University and the Emergence of Chinese Modernity," 123.

[174] According to Jessica Ching-Sze Wang, John Dewey was "enthusiastic" about the movement. Wang, *John Dewey in China: To Teach and to Learn* (Albany, N.Y., 2007).

[175] This is the pattern employed by such new global histories as Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (London, 2013). It is mirrored by Elisabeth Crawford's older prosopographic study of the Nobel Prize population, *Nationalism and Internationalism in Science, 1880–1939: Four Studies of the Nobel Population* (Cambridge, 1992). By focusing on the scientists at the extra-university Kaiser

Göttingen and Leipzig as far as higher education was concerned. According to some historians, city dwellers with strong local and regional identities "became Germans" when they went abroad, and found their "particularist" identity usurped by the tide of nationalism.[176] Not everyone appears to have experienced that reversal, however. Upon returning to Germany, for example, Klein and Lamprecht warned of potential urban obsolescence and promoted what we might call today "urban competitiveness."[177] Though we might be tempted to see Adolph Wagner's anxiety about the declining German university as an offshoot of political imperialism, this story suggests that universities developed differently than did other political institutions in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Europe and America.[178]

Competition among nations did not make transnational educational cooperation impossible, but the potential for such cooperation depended on local factors. It is possible that Lamprecht was able to look beyond the ostensible threat from the United States and see it as a source of reforms because of the peripheral status of Leipzig in Germany in the first decade of the twentieth century. A similarly open spirit seemed to be at work in Lyon and Nancy, where French academics in the provinces utilized competition among nations to promote their regional and local causes.[179] Reformers in peripheral cities may have identified with foreign models as a way to challenge their diminished significance resulting from political centralization. This could have prompted them to conceive of alternate identities: Leipzig as a center of interdisciplinary studies, for example, or Basel as a city of "unseasonable ideas."[180] The University of Leipzig would likely never compete with Columbia

Wilhelm Institutes—a "particular breed of elite science"—however, Crawford fails to capture the changing nature of the university as an institution in this period (5).

[176] Matthew P. Fitzpatrick, *Liberal Imperialism in Germany: Expansionism and Nationalism, 1848–1884* (New York, 2008).

[177] Peter Karl Kresl and Daniele Ietri, *Urban Competitiveness: Theory and Practice* (London, 2015). Such urban reform language has already influenced urban history even if, as James J. Connolly argues, it implies that the twenty-first-century American city has more autonomy than it actually does. Connolly, "Can They Do It? The Capacity of Small Rust-Belt Cities to Reinvent Themselves in a Global Economy," in Connolly, ed., *After the Factory: Reinventing America's Industrial Small Cities* (Lanham, Md., 2010), 1–17, here 7–8.

[178] Sebastian Conrad presents cultural exchange in a colonialist framework and calls for a decolonization of science. Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, 47–48; Conrad, "Doppelte Marginalisierung: Plädoyer für eine transnationale Perspektive auf die deutsche Geschichte," *Modernisierung und Modernität in Asien*, Special Issue, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28, no. 1 (2002): 145–169, especially 151. Yet models of intellectual development do not always follow political imperialism, as Marianne Bastid argues with respect to Chinese education reform, where the adoption of education models was out of sync with the power dynamics of the time; the Chinese adoption of the Japanese model preceded the Japanese military presence, and the American model in 1922 did not coincide with the height of American political and economic influence. Bastid, "Servitude or Liberation? The Introduction of Foreign Educational Practices and Systems to China from 1840 to the Present," in Ruth Hayhoe and Marianne Bastid, eds., *China's Education and the Industrialized World: Studies in Cultural Transfer* (Armonk, N.Y., 1987), 3–20, especially 11.

[179] Weisz, *The Emergence of Modern Universities in France*, 168–169. Pierre-Yves Saunier's urban study of Lyon as a center of "international circulation" reinforces this argument. Saunier, "Changing the City: Urban International Information and the Lyon Municipality, 1900–1940," *Planning Perspectives* 14, no. 1 (1999): 19–48, here 20; discussed in Bender, *A Nation among Nations*, 276. Further work on Lyon and other cities would be required to determine a wider pattern.

[180] Lionel Gossman, *Basel in the Age of Burckhardt: A Study in Unseasonable Ideas* (Chicago, 2000). Another lesson to heed here might be the controversial notion that a smaller non-capital city cannot afford to compete in the natural sciences but can develop a niche in the humanities or social sciences, as Lamprecht urged Leipzig to do.

University, the American example that he often cited as a benchmark. Lamprecht could, however, re-create elements of Columbia in Leipzig, and that might give it a leg up on Berlin.[181]

The connection between urban context, civic identity, and educational institutions is undeniable.[182] However, an approach that ties these strands together would need to account for the fact that not all universities are equally essential to their home cities' identities, and cities, by contrast, could both promote and undermine universities.[183] After a visit to the top universities in America in 1910, the American journalist Edwin Slosson observed that Columbia, "situated in the largest city . . . has the best chance to become the greatest of American universities—and it is improving the chance."[184] Under the leadership of such presidents as Seth Lowe and Nicholas Murray Butler, Columbia University capitalized on the growth of the city to catapult to the top, while Baltimore's stagnant economy stalled Gilman's ambitions for Hopkins.[185] At the University of Wisconsin, new opportunities in Madison for civic partnerships and the democratization of knowledge epitomized the "Wisconsin idea," which integrated civil service and applied fields into the university's commitment to pure research.[186] By expanding our understanding of the concurrent urbanization and globalization to include tiers of cities, this story shows that intellectual centers do not always align with political or economic centers; rather, distinct kinds of intellectual and university life were possible in different kinds of localities.

The exchange of professors and models for the organization of knowledge also offers broader lessons about the relationship between globalization and urbanization, which has been a subject of renewed interest among social scientists in the last two decades.[187] In his multivolume classic *Civilization and Capitalism*, Fernand Braudel showed that "world cities," such as Amsterdam, Venice, and Florence, rose as early

[181] In his speech delivered to mark the conclusion of his tenure as rector, Lamprecht boasted that he had raised more than a million marks, still slight when compared with Columbia University's six million marks, but impressive nonetheless. "Rede des abtretenden Rektors Dr. Karl Lamprecht: Bericht über das Studienjahr 1910/1911," in *Rektorwechsel an der Universität Leipzig am 31. Oktober 1911* (Leipzig, 1911), 14, NL Lamprecht : 66 : 6, ULB Bonn. By further situating universities, as we do cities, in their economic and cultural networks, we can see more clearly who their competitors were. Some cities would continue to operate in largely regional markets, while others would become part of new global networks. Ironically, this meant that the regional universities that could not compete globally were more likely to be in a position to cooperate globally. This might be closer to the urban history model as promoted by Charles Tilly in "What Good Is Urban History?," *Journal of Urban History* 22, no. 6 (1996): 702–719. Thanks to James J. Connolly for this reference.

[182] The essays in Thomas Bender, ed., *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present* (Oxford, 1988), present enticing connections between various cities and their historical contexts that require elaboration in a synthetic history.

[183] As Bender emphasizes, Leiden, Geneva, and Edinburgh represent examples where the university was saved by the city life, whereas Florence, on the other hand, suggests the opposite—too much extra-university culture could threaten the university's authority. Thomas Bender, "Introduction," ibid., 3–10, here 6. See also Gene Brucker, "Renaissance Florence: Who Needs a University?," ibid., 47–58.

[184] Edwin E. Slosson, *Great American Universities* (New York, 1910), 446.

[185] McCaughey, *Stand, Columbia*, 209–210. Gilman wrote about his increasing financial troubles to his former student Richard Ely; Gilman to Ely, March 2, 1893, Box 6:3, Richard T. Ely Papers, Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison.

[186] For an exposition of the "Wisconsin idea," see Lincoln Steffens, "Sending a State to College," *American Magazine* 68 (1909): 350–363.

[187] A new wave of studies in the social sciences argues that globalization has not diminished but has reinvigorated localism today. See, for example, Benjamin R. Barber, *If Mayors Ruled the World: Dysfunctional Nations, Rising Cities* (New Haven, Conn., 2013); and Daniel A. Bell and Avner de-Shalit, *The Spirit of Cities: Why the Identity of a City Matters in a Global Age* (Princeton, N.J., 2011).

as the fifteenth century.[188] More recently, following Saskia Sassen, scholars have identified what they call the "global city," which has resulted from a "combination of spatial dispersal and global integration [that] has created a new strategic role for major cities."[189] Yet, despite this long span of urban influence, Daniel Rodgers observes, "So accustomed are modern readers to thinking of nation-states as the key actors in social politics that the point is worth pausing over."[190] In our desire to "internationalize" the history of education, we should be wary of muffling this local register.[191]

In the rhetoric and reform of higher education, different scales were often at work—the local, national, and global—and scholars referenced and invoked them alternately and occasionally simultaneously.[192] As Ian Wei shows, the medieval University of Paris, while not "global" in our sense of the term, was a local institution that nonetheless was more universal in its composition and aspirations than it was national.[193] A *longue durée* history that emphasizes this tripartite formula reveals how *Wissenstransfer* persisted in unexpected moments. Even under National Socialism, Germans adopted the American notion of Fordism and strategies of organizational management in the Kaiser Wilhelm Society.[194] Conversely, at the height of the Cold War, the inter-institutional rivalry between Stanford and MIT was as fierce as the competition in the international realm.[195] Historians have described how the world wars interrupted global interconnectedness, which was restored at the end of the twentieth century.[196] The advantage of examining universities as the basis for historical analysis is that the university's history begins long before the twentieth-century

[188] Braudel, *The Perspective of the World*, 26. He also referred to these as "super-cities" (31).

[189] Saskia Sassen, *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, 2nd ed. (Princeton, N.J., 2001), 3. Sassen first used the term in 1984 and has revised and expanded it since.

[190] Rodgers, *Atlantic Crossings*, 112. Moreover, we should also not isolate this urban inquiry. Jürgen Osterhammel, whose global history *The Transformation of the World* (Princeton, N.J., 2014) contains an excellent discussion on cities (chap. 6), drops the urban approach in other sections of his compendium, including that on the university. Rodgers, on the other hand, maintains the urban focus, but despite the latent presence of the university as mediator for these exchanges, admits that the university itself is a topic that "the best historians of late-nineteenth-century American social thought . . . have . . . largely unexplored"; *Atlantic Crossings*, 77 n. 2.

[191] Adam R. Nelson argues that Veysey's work "might change significantly if subjected to a more international approach." Nelson, "The Emergence of the American University: An International Perspective," *History of Education Quarterly* 45, no. 3 (2007): 427–437, here 430.

[192] This observation applies to a period much earlier than that under investigation here, as Adam Nelson argues: "Looking back not just a decade or two, but a century or two (or ten), it reveals that, in many respects, the university, as an idea—and an ideal—has always been 'international' (even if the international contexts in which the university operates have changed over time)." Nelson, "Introduction," in Adam R. Nelson and Ian P. Wei, eds., *The Global University: Past, Present, and Future Perspectives* (New York, 2012), 1–21, here 12.

[193] Ian P. Wei, "Medieval Universities and Aspirations to Universal Significance," ibid., 133–151, especially 133, 139. Richard Kirwan examines how the new "territorial" universities of Helmstedt and Würzburg competed through a vital festival culture and other public media for prestige in various economies throughout the region. Kirwan, *Empowerment and Representation at the University in Early Modern Germany: Helmstedt and Würzburg, 1576–1634* (Wiesbaden, 2009), 85.

[194] Rüdiger Hachtmann's work on the Nazi period is a good example of how globalizing German history and localizing *Wissenstransfer* is possible even in this period. Hachtmann, "'Die Begründer der amerikanischen Technik sind fast lauter schwäbisch-alemannische Menschen': Nazi-Deutschland, der Blick auf die USA und die 'Amerikanisierung' der industriellen Produktionsstrukturen im 'Dritten Reich,'" in Lüdtke, Marssolek, and von Saldern, *Amerikanisierung*, 37–66.

[195] On inter-institutional competition during the Cold War between Stanford and MIT, see Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley, Calif., 1997), especially 73.

[196] Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany*, 68.

wars and will likely continue long after. The longevity of the university permits us to circumvent the narrative conventions and caesuras to which we have traditionally been held hostage—1914, 1919, and 1933—and to rebalance the framework of our analysis, both spatially and chronologically.[197]

These studies also illuminate structural changes, the most consequential of which was the recognition of scholarship's economic utility, and the growth of a new type of scholarly reformer who adapted to these conditions. To be sure, understanding the implications of the university's becoming an economic asset presents challenges, not least because it is in moments of financial stress that the myth of the university as a preserve outside of economic forces often emerges.[198] On both sides of the Atlantic, academic and cultural prestige gave way as the yardsticks of competition to more concrete and empirical measures of performance. Scholars around the world reacted to the realities of the increasingly global economy by vying to have the most successful ideas and institutions in the local, national, and international contexts.[199]

Revealingly, all of the German visitors to America around 1900, including Weber, Klein, Lamprecht, and Münsterberg, commented on the extraordinary ability of Americans to cultivate private philanthropy for the scholarly cause, a fact that came to epitomize everything that was unique about the American interpretation of the German university: it enabled applied science, funded the buildings that adorned the campuses, and fed an active student social life.[200] Weber bemoaned these changes in the first decade of the twentieth century, and another round of critiques leveled against Americanization accompanied the attempts of German scholarly reformers to cultivate American-style philanthropy and university management after World War II.[201] The seeds of these efforts, however, had been planted earlier. Althoff,

[197] German historians are particularly wedded to these dates. James Albisetti, Charles E. McClelland, and R. Steven Turner conclude that where Germany is concerned, more comparative work is necessary, specifically about "science elsewhere." Albisetti, McClelland, and Turner, "Science in Germany," Commentary, *Science in Germany: The Intersection of Institutional and Intellectual Issues*, Special Issue, *Osiris*, 2nd series, 5 (1989): 285–304, here 287.

[198] According to Peter Uwe Hohendahl, this was the case in the 1990s, when Germans conjured the myth of the Humboldt ideal to challenge the reality of the neoliberal university. Hohendahl, "Humboldt Revisited: Liberal Education, University Reform, and the Opposition to the Neoliberal University," *New German Critique* 113, vol. 38, no. 2 (2011): 159–196.

[199] Competition has been a crucial feature of recent arguments for European exceptionalism, but these works tend to focus on military competition. Yet what economists call a "tournament" that leads to innovation might provide a helpful explanation for why the research university developed in Europe rather than elsewhere. See, for example, Philip T. Hoffman, *Why Did Europe Conquer the World?* (Princeton, N.J., 2015), 15–18. Relatedly, the university played no role in Michael Mitterauer's examination of the European *Sonderweg*, a fact he tried to address with a supplemental article. Mitterauer, *Why Europe? The Medieval Origins of Its Special Path*, trans. Gerald Chapple (Chicago, 2010), xii; Mitterauer, "Die Anfaünge der Universitaüt im Mittelalter: Raüume und Zentren der Wissenschaftsentwicklung," in Wolfgang Mantl, ed., *Phaünomenologie des europaüischen Wissenschaftssystems* (Baden-Baden, 2010), 45–88. I have tried to argue that universities themselves were exceptional—and not Germany, or America, for that matter.

[200] Hugo Münsterberg, *Die Amerikaner* (Berlin, 1904), 57; Lamprecht, *Americana*, 90–91.The French, too, showed extreme interest in the American use of private financing of scholarship. At a banquet in honor of the French-American partnership that was attended by the U.S. ambassador to France, James B. Eustis, Ernest Lavisse of the Académie française spoke in 1897 on the French need to encourage private donations to universities along the American model. "Le banquet universitaire franco-américain," *Revue internationale de l'enseignement* 33 (1897): 76–78, here 76. See also Weisz, *The Emergence of Modern Universities in France*, 132–133.

[201] Many émigrés contributed to this effort, which focused on the need to develop student social life. Werner Richter, *Die Zukunft der deutschen Universität* (Marburg, 1949), 22–24; published in English as

Klein, and Lamprecht saw partnerships with industry as an opportunity to implement educational innovations or to establish new semi-private extra-university institutes, many of which were more open and tolerant than the state-controlled German university.[202] They were not vestiges of the imperial age but early scholarly managers who presciently aimed to capitalize on these changes, a fact that, if nothing else, shows that an institution often described as in "crisis" has proved itself to be extremely adaptable over time.[203]

Nonetheless, that transition has been ambivalent: Weber's discontent reminds us that universities remained dedicated to extra-economic ideals, and thus were at least partial outliers in the increasingly global economy. Fichte's concept of the "closed commercial state" (*Der geschlossene Handelsstaat*) is a tempting antidote to the insidious consequences of the integrating forces. In that recently revived work, the nineteenth-century German philosopher allegedly proposed "radical isolation" in response to what he saw as the negative impact of the internationalization of trade.[204] However, the university reformers here (Weber included) did not believe that their institutions could be cut off from the world. Indeed, even Fichte himself, the author of the nationalist 1808 *Addresses to the German Nation*, conceded that science was "[t]he only thing that entirely eliminates all differences between peoples and their circumstances and that belongs merely and solely to the human being as such and not to the citizen."[205] Scholars may have feared competition, but they recognized the benefits of knowledge exchange. In *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*, Clark showed how the university became a paradoxical institution, both a product and an opponent of bureaucratic rationalization.[206] We can now see a

Re-educating Germany, trans. Paul Lehmann (Chicago, 1945). According to Paul Michael Lützeler, German university administrations have more recently established American-style alumni associations to maintain contact with students, but the donations have so far been inconsequential. See, for example, www.alumni-clubs.net. Lützeler, *Transatlantische Germanistik*, 76.

[202] That these semi-private extra-university institutes in Germany became a refuge for women, Jews, and socialists, where the university was still often closed to them, should give us some pause before we offer blanket characterizations of the insidious consequences of private money for the organization of knowledge. That Klein was also Jewish could not have eased concerns about this new scholarly partnership with private wealth, though most work on the fear of Judaizing in mathematics does not mention this institutional element. David E. Rowe, "'Jewish Mathematics' at Göttingen in the Era of Felix Klein," *Isis* 77, no. 3 (1986): 422–449. For an excellent study on the exclusion of Jews from elite American universities, see Jerome Karabel, *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton* (New York, 2006).

[203] For an invocation of the "crisis" of the university, see Frank Donoghue, *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities* (New York, 2008). The former president of the University of California, Clark Kerr, on occasion joked, "[The university] and the church, are the two most persistent institutions society has known. This has been true in the past. It is true now. It will be true in the future." However, the university's longevity can be viewed as a sign of either outmodedness or adaptability; it is the latter point that I emphasize here. Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960–1980* (Albany, N.Y., 1991), 48.

[204] See J. G. Fichte, *The Closed Commercial State*, trans. Anthony Curtis Adler (New York, 2012; original German ed. 1800); and Isaac Nakhimovsky, *The Closed Commercial State: Perpetual Peace and Commercial Society from Rousseau to Fichte* (Princeton, N.J., 2011). On Fichte's articulation of isolation as an answer to international commerce, see ibid., 64, 164. See also Blackbourn, "Germany and the Birth of the Modern World," 13.

[205] Fichte, *The Closed Commercial State*, 198.

[206] "The research university forms part of this modern order, in which the visible and the rational triumphed over the oral and the traditional. But through the cunning of history (or something) the rationalized academic world that we now enjoy spared academic charisma." Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*, 3.

similar pattern emerging with respect to the university's role in the wider world. The university was both a product and an opponent of an economically integrating society. This paradoxical institution thus forces us to rethink our standard histories of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and sheds light on the institutions in which many of us make our home.

Emily J. Levine is Associate Professor of Modern European History at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. She is the author of *Dreamland of Humanists: Warburg, Cassirer, Panofsky, and the Hamburg School* (University of Chicago Press, 2013), which was awarded the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize by the American Historical Association for the best book in European history from 1815 through the twentieth century. The book was also a finalist for the Jordan Schnitzer Book Award in Cultural Studies and Media Studies awarded by the Association for Jewish Studies. Levine spent 2012–2013 as an Alexander von Humboldt fellow at the Free University in Berlin, where much of the research for this article was completed. She is now at work on a transatlantic history of the research university tentatively titled *Exceptional Institutions: Cities, Capital, and the Rise of the Research University*.