

Received: 29 July 2022 Accepted: 16 October 2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v20i1.2745>

## German-Jewish Scholars in Turkish Exile: From the Winter of Despair under Nazism to the Spring of Hope in Turkish Academia

Filiz Kunuroglu<sup>1</sup> and Ali Sina Önder<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

*This paper documents the migration experiences of German-Jewish scholars who fled from the Nazi regime and sought refuge in Turkey in 1930s. Reflecting on the historical narratives originating from the memoirs of renowned scientists, their relatives, or their Turkish colleagues –e.g., a 1986 interview with renowned economist Fritz Neumark, memoirs of Klaus Eckstein –son of famous pediatrician and public health expert Albert Eckstein– and narratives of colleagues of influential chemist Fritz Arndt, we analyze the dynamics of forced migration processes of German-Jewish scholars, which is a highly qualified and influential immigrant group, to scrutinize the factors affecting their psychosocial adaptation processes in Turkey. The method of qualitative document analysis is used and deductive approach is adopted. Results reveal that premigration expectations, perceived cultural distance, language, intergroup relations and children-related issues were the main themes affecting the adaptation of German-Jewish scholars. Results are discussed drawing on the acculturation theory.*

**Keywords:** *Skilled migration; acculturation theory; emigrant scientists; Nazi era; Jewish community; university reform*

*“It was the best of times, it was the worst of times [...] it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair.”*  
 — from *A Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens

### Introduction and Motivation

On 7<sup>th</sup> April 1933, only a few months after the National Socialist German Workers’ Party (Nazi Party) secured its majority in the German parliament, they passed the *Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service* –short version in German *Berufsbeamtengesetz*. According to this law, a civil servant was not allowed to have any Jewish grandparent, and any civil servant who failed to fulfil this criterion at that time was released from the civil service with immediate effect. The same law came into force in Austria after its annexation to Germany in 1938. Anyone who had at least one Jewish grandparent was considered to be of Jewish officially and hence was subject to the *Berufsbeamtengesetz* (Friedländer, 1997). A particular area that was hit severely by this law was higher education and research. Most of the permanent positions and chaired professorships in research institutes and universities in Weimar Republic were officially positions of civil service and hence were subject to laws and regulations thereof. This meant that many prominent professors such as Albert Einstein and

<sup>1</sup> Filiz Kunuroglu, Psychology, Izmir Katip Çelebi University, Izmir, Turkey. E-mail: [filiz.kunuroglu@ikc.edu.tr](mailto:filiz.kunuroglu@ikc.edu.tr)

<sup>2</sup> Ali Sina Önder, Economics, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, UK. E-mail: [ali.onder@port.ac.uk](mailto:ali.onder@port.ac.uk)



Erwin Schrödinger in physics, or Richard von Mises in mathematics, or Fritz Neumark in economics needed to look either for alternative careers or new destinations. Kröner (1983) documents 1617 German-Jewish professors and scientists whose jobs were directly or indirectly jeopardised by the *Berufsbeamtengesetz*. The Turkish government at that time did invite several of these scholars to Turkey in an effort to restructure the Turkish university system. As a result of these efforts, many prominent German-Jewish scholars came to Turkish universities during 1930s.

This unexpected brain gain came at a time when the young Republic of Turkey was reforming its higher education as part of an unprecedented attempt to widely modernize its political, social, and economic institutions. The large influx of German-Jewish scholars taking up lecturer positions, guest professor positions or even permanent professorships contributed extensively to the modernization and restructuring of the academic and scientific landscape in Turkey, leaving its mark in the Turkish academia until today.

We focus on narratives of individual scientists on media as well as the existing literature to gain a better insight into their individual circumstances and experiences during these times. Based on personal narratives, we reflect on main issues emerging in forced migration processes of German Jewish scholars as well as on factors affecting migrants' social psychological processes, i.e., consequences of their migration, factors making their adaptation smoother as well as factors causing them to return or stay.

Our study is novel for several reasons. Although the experiences of German-Jewish scholars settling in Western contexts such as the US and the UK is extensively documented in the literature, much less is known about scholars who settled in other countries such as Turkey. Statements of immigrating German-Jewish scholars about their situation in the US are collected in *The Cultural Migration* by Crawford (1953). A more comprehensive work is provided by Beilyn and Fleming (1968), entitled *The Intellectual Migration* that contains statements of first and second generation immigrants, including scientists who emigrated to the US as child. Unlike seminal works that document experiences and sentiment of immigrant German-Jewish scholars in the US, there is limited documentation about German-Jewish scholars in Turkey, and we aim to fill this gap. In addition, we adopt a comprehensive approach and focus on the whole migration cycle, namely pre-migration as well as post migration processes of German-Jewish scholars. There is a dearth of research focusing on the psychosocial processes of German-Jewish refugees and discussing their experiences from their own perspective within the socio-political context of Turkey. Our study provides valuable insight for interested researchers on a neglected group in Turkish migration history.

### **Historical Background: Emigration from Germany and Atatürk's University Reform**

With introduction and enforcement of the *Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service (Berufsbeamtengesetz)* on 7<sup>th</sup> April 1933, all concerned scholars and scientists at German (and in 1938 at Austrian) universities and research establishments lost their jobs. At that time most university professorships counted as civil servant positions and were therefore affected by the law. Between 1933 and 1934 more than a thousand scientists had to resign or retire earlier than planned (Hartshorne, 1937). According to Waldinger (2011) and Hartshorne (1937), they made up about 15% of all German scholars at the time. Due to the dismissals, the German-speaking area lost many leaders of their profession. At first, the law excluded Jewish professors, who had been in their positions before 1914, fought in World War I or lost father



or son in World War I. The exclusion was abrogated with the *Reich Citizenship Laws* in 1935, also to define Jewish descent in more general terms. In the meantime, many of the former unaffected Jewish scientists had left the German-speaking area voluntarily (Waldinger, 2010). The same law was applied in Austria after the annexation in 1938. The fact that they lost their jobs was not the only problem. Most of the scholars feared for their own lives and the lives of their families. Kröner (1983) documents a total of 1,617 emigrant scientists who were affected by the *Berufsbeamtengesetz*. Among these 1,617 emigrant scientists, there were 457 doctors or medical scientists, 166 chemists, 132 economists, and 124 physicists.

An important concern of emigrant scientists was their safety. The *Third Reich* was threatening German emigrants beyond German borders (Tutas, 1975). As a result, many of the emigrant scientists moved promptly from one country to another after leaving Germany. Exile- and international relief organizations played an important role in the distribution of dismissed scientists (Grossmann 1981). One of these exile organizations was the *English Academic Assistance Council*, later called the *Society for the Protection of Science and Learning* in Great Britain (Waldinger, 2010). This relief organization helped emigrant scientists to gain ground in Great Britain and establish a new life (Bentwich, 1953). Another exile organization was the *Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Scholars* in the US, which managed to rescue over 400 scientists (Duggan and Drury 1948). Some immigrant scientists helped others to escape the Nazi regime, especially the ones, who managed to leave the country first, lend a hand.

Another important issue for the emigrant scientists was to find a new job at their destination, as well as adapting to new circumstances and environments. At that time, Turkey turned out to be an exceptional immigration target for German and Austrian emigrant scientists regarding job opportunities as 1933 was the year in which the University Reform of the young Turkish Republic started. Modernization and westernization of Turkish education system had already begun in 1924 when the education system started to be secularized, as one of the important components of Atatürk's attempts to modernize the Turkish state and nation during the 1920s and 1930s. In 1931, the Turkish government commissioned Albert Malche, a Swiss professor of pedagogy, to study the current Turkish higher education system and create a road map for its modernization. Malche submitted his report in 1932, and an enthusiastic restructuring started in 1933. *Dar-ül Fünun* became Istanbul University on 1<sup>st</sup> August 1933 (Reisman, 2006). Thanks to the efforts of Malche and Philipp Schwarz, who was a pathologist and founder of Notgemeinschaft Deutscher Akademiker im Ausland (NDAA --Emergency community of German scientists abroad -another organization of peers to help peers to find a job abroad) Istanbul University received about 40 foreign professors and, counting non-professorial positions as well, 70 foreign scientists during the start phase of the university reform (Strohmeier, 2008, Reuter, 2008). Over the following years, more emigrant scientists called Turkey and Turkish higher education institutes home. Feichtinger (2001) reports that NDAA had been able to place until 1939 about one hundred scientists in Turkey, including prominent Austrian scientists and academicians such as Leo Spitzer, Clemens Holzmeister and Richard von Mises. Kröner (1983) lists 84 emigrant scientists whose paths crossed Turkey, which we document in more detail in the Appendix of this study. Reisman (2006) lists 189 emigrant scientists and intellectuals (pp. 474-478), and reports that most of the emigrant professors were in medicine, natural sciences, and mathematics; fewer in law and social sciences. Reuter (2008) writes that 200 to 250 German scientists have found jobs at universities in Istanbul and Ankara during and immediately after the years of unprecedented modernization in Turkey and inferno in and around Germany. Reisman (2006) sums it up very nicely by writing "Just

a couple of decades after the Ottoman Empire had taken its last breath, the general exodus had so depleted Germany's premier higher-learning institutions of professors that [Istanbul University] was rightfully considered and sincerely called the best German university in the world." (p.24).

## **Methodological Framework**

People who leave their countries for any reason, may it be to improve their social rights or to escape poverty or war, go through an acculturation process, which can be defined as "the process of cultural change that occurs when individuals from different cultural backgrounds come into prolonged, continuous, first-hand contact with each other" (Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936, p. 149). Although the change is experienced by both groups, the minority group is affected the most. According to the major acculturation model proposed by Berry (1997), migrants ask themselves two main questions upon arrival in a new country: "How important is it for me to maintain my home culture?" and "Should I adapt to the host culture?" The second question is originally referred to as the desire of cultural contact, but is often taken as an indication of host culture adoption (Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver, 2006). Answers to these questions are also referred to as immigrants' acculturation orientations.

Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver (2006) have proposed an acculturation framework encompassing acculturation conditions, orientations, and outcomes. In their framework, cultural maintenance and cultural adoption are two dimensions of acculturation orientations, and they are placed at the intersection of acculturation conditions and acculturation outcomes. Acculturation conditions refer to characteristics of the receiving society, of the society of origin, of the immigrant group, and other personal characteristics. For instance, personal traits of an immigrant could be given as concrete examples of personal characteristics. Immigration policies affecting immigrants' wellbeing in the destination country as well as that country's cultural diversity refer to characteristics of the receiving society within acculturation conditions. These conditions are assumed to affect the acculturation orientations of immigrants, which in turn influence their acculturation outcomes, encompassing their psychological well-being and sociocultural competence both in the ethnic and the host culture. Previous research revealed that Muslim migrants whose ethnic, religious and cultural identities are not perceived positively in the Western European countries, are more likely to have cultural orientations towards their ethnic culture, and to experience more acculturative stress (Te Lindert et al., 2008; Vedder, Sam & Liebkind, 2007).

Acculturation is a dynamic, multilayered and context-dependent phenomenon affected by personal factors, heritage, and host culture characteristics. Perceived cultural distance is the collection of discrepancies between home and host cultures, and it is reported to be a significant predictor of acculturation (Suanet and Van de Vijver. 2009). Big differences between values and norms of home and host cultures as well as immigrants' perceived identities lead to acculturative stress, and hence a harder acculturation process (Berry, 1997). Such stress may even result in immigrant's withdrawal from the host culture (Tasuva et. al., 2019). In addition to affecting the acculturation process of immigrants, perceived cultural distance affects mainstreamers' attitudes towards immigrants, that is, intergroup relations. Mainstreamers are reported to have more positive attitude towards immigrants when they perceive them culturally more similar (Monthreuil and Bouris (2001).



The method of document analysis is chosen due to the historical nature of our study and further to be able to situate our study within current theories of acculturation. Previous studies report document analysis to be the only reliable and objective approach in historical and cross-cultural research (Bowen, 2009; Merriam, 1998). Therefore, the documents served us as intended participants in our study, namely German Jewish scholars, in the socio-historical context of 1930s' Turkey and provided us an excellent source for their experiences, attitudes, values and the perceived societal context. Deductive (directed) document analysis method is adopted, which allows us to identify key concepts and variables as initial coding categories. The deductive or directed qualitative content analysis is implemented to corroborate the pertinence of the theories guiding the study as well as to extend the application of those theories to contexts or cultures other than those in which they were developed (Kibiswa, 2019).

We selected our documents based on the four criteria of Flick (2018), namely, authenticity, credibility, representativeness, and meaning (or the significance of documents' content). The directed content analysis was conducted using standardized methods (Hsieh & Shanon, 2005). Two researchers independently read and manually analyzed the documents using content analysis to identify the common themes. Inconsistencies in coding were discussed and resolved. Qualitative data are presented in this study using quotes from German-Jewish lecturers, and their close network.

### Reflections on the Experiences of Scholars

Analysis of immigrant German-Jewish scholars' experiences in the existing literature as well as the narratives of the scholars revealed that individual differences (or within group differences) existed in the adaptation processes. In addition, premigration expectations, perceived cultural distance, language problems, intergroup relations, perceived discrimination and children-related issues were the main themes emerging in the narratives of the scholars. Adaptation processes varied greatly by the nature of migration experiences, individual differences and acculturation orientations of the scholars. Our findings are discussed within the theory of acculturation (Arends-Tóth & Van de Vijver, 2006).

Narrations regarding the acculturation conditions for German-Jewish scholars initially reveal that they did not have realistic expectations about Turkey at the time of migration. As majority of them had not visited Turkey before, they had no previous knowledge except for what they heard from others or read in books. Most scholars state that they perceived their migration as an adventure.

Prof. Fritz Neumark (1900-1990) was an economist specializing in the field of public finance. He migrated to Turkey in 1933 where he lived until he returned to Germany in 1952. In an interview in 1986<sup>3</sup>, Neumark explained his first impressions and expectations about Istanbul as follows:

“Those of us who were young and was able to escape from the Third Reich saw this immigration as an adventure. I thought this was a city of fairy tales. [...] We felt we

---

<sup>3</sup> Journalist Holger Douglas interviewed Fritz Neumark in 1986. Major parts of this interview (ca. 44 minutes) can be found on Youtube under the title *Zeitgeschichte: Flucht nach Istanbul* (original title of the program: *Ich war dabei – Zuflucht in Istanbul*) at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q9ucvVJNfc8> We accessed this online resource between 28 June and 1 July 2022. The interview was held in German, and we translated the parts, which we directly quote in this study, to English.

were partially in Europe but to a large extent in a place that we only know from the stories of Karl Meier. [...] The very first thing I had to do was *pazarlık* to get on a small boat with help of an interpreter to get us from ship to the shore.” (1.31 mins.)

Their motives for migration to Turkey can be analyzed in terms of pull and push factors. Push factors lead people to leave a country whereas pull factors attract people towards another country. They help us to outline the social, economic, political and even environmental factors influencing migration decision. Existing literature reveals the main push factor as Nazis coming to power and firing thousands of German-Jewish professors (Eden & Irzik, 2012). Most professors ended up with no prospects and positions offered neither in Europe nor in the US. Although most scholars initially perceived the situation to be a rather temporary problem, they needed to decide to migrate once they realized that the situation will last longer than expected. The quotation below outlines the migration motivation of Fritz Neumark and his reason for choosing Turkey as the destination country:

“Motivation was provided by the arrival of the Hitler regime and firing of me and many friends, colleagues due to the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service which had the exact opposite effect as what its name suggests. I thought it would be over soon and tried to get another job for this short while. Within a couple of months, I realized this was not the case. A former student offered me a job as salt salesman, and apart from that, I had no other offer or alternative. [...] [*The reason I chose Turkey*] was due to a series of coincidences. A colleague from the University of Frankfurt Faculty of Medicine had a father in law who was a professor in Zurich who knew a city councilor from Geneva [*Albert Malche*] who was invited to Turkey a few months earlier by Atatürk to help to plan the modernization of the Turkish higher education system. [...] They had a plan of what institutes to create, how many professors to hire and in what fields. [...] I was informed that I could obtain a professorship in Turkey if I wanted to.” (5:47-7:20 mins.)

As stated in the quotation above, most professors had networks arranging the positions in Turkey. Also in the past, it was not unusual for German professors to have visiting professorships or expert positions even during the final decade of the Ottoman Empire (Kreiser, 2008). However, the situation in 1930s was dramatically different for them as job abroad meant survival. In addition to it, German professors found a motivating as well as challenging task at hand, namely to modernize Turkish universities and raise a new generation of Turks in line with Atatürk’s reforms (Reuter, 2008).

A good example of how push factors for leaving a country may dominate so that the migration takes place despite very weak pull factors into the target country is the case of the famous linguist Erich Auerbach. Prof. Auerbach (1892-1957) replaced Leo Spitzer, who arrived in Istanbul earlier than Auerbach and stayed rather short term, to chair the Faculty for Western Languages and Literatures at Istanbul University in 1936. Although Auerbach stayed in Istanbul for more than ten years and created his major work *Mimesis* during this period, the driving force behind his emigration is clearly due to push factors.

“[Auerbach’s] concerns were far more a matter of life and death. [...] He had heard Spitzer’s and others’ stories about Turkey, and, quite simply, he did not like the idea of living there: ‘This world’ --by which he presumably meant Turkey – might be ‘quite





good for a guest performance, but certainly not for long term work’.” (Konuk, 2010, p.35)

One of the major themes emerging in the narratives of professors was difficulties experienced during the adaptation period in Turkey. Language problems, perceived cultural distance and perceived discrimination were the main axes of this theme. According to their contracts, emigrant professors were requested to learn Turkish and publish books in Turkish within a two-year period upon arrival. However, the period was turned out to be short to acquire a foreign language, let alone publish research in that language. In the quotation below, Neumark expresses his experience:

“You must distinguish between those who were very talented for foreign languages, and those who did not have such talent, yet were eager to make the effort. There was an official requirement in our contracts with the Turkish government which stated that we had to show effort to learn Turkish and to publish textbooks and other teaching material in Turkish within two years. We all, talented or not, soon realized two years were not sufficient to learn Turkish.” (11:32 mins.)

Language was also reported to be an important aspect to be accepted by the Turkish community. Those who acquired the language were able to better adapt to their work environment and the society. Those who could not, started even to search for other destinations. Neumark points out to this issue in his interview as reported below:

“[Language] was a prerequisite to acclimate yourself. Some migrants did not recognize this fact or did not recognize it early enough so that they could feel home. Exactly because of language problems, they were later eager to switch from Turkey to the US, England, Holland or Sweden.” (13:47 mins.)

Language was also the key to reach and be accepted by the students at the University. Prof. Fritz Arndt (1885-1969) was professor of chemistry when he was fired from the University of Breslau in 1933. He emigrated to Turkey in 1934 and lived there until 1957 when he returned to Germany. Prof. Ismet Gürgey, a previous student of Prof. Fritz Arndt during 1954-1955 at Istanbul University provides a vivid picture of Arndt’s lectures. Arndt’s conversation was reported to be joyful and humorous and his lectures as free of linguistic errors. It is also believed that Arndt invented certain words in Turkish such as ‘çözücü’ for solvent, ‘çözelti’ for solution and ‘değerlik’ for valence (Reisman, 2006). Gürgey describes his experience as below:

“He used to give lectures in an amphitheater-shaped classroom that was named for him. Attendance to lectures was not obligatory and attendance was not taken; however, classroom used to fill up to brim.” (Reisman, 2006, p. 29)

One of the major challenges that immigrant professors encountered was the cultural distance perceived between the patterns of Turkish culture and their heritage culture. New cultural practices were reported to be observed both in public places and at the workplace. A difficult experience told by Neumark is as follows:

“I can mention a bad anecdote, or rather a characteristic because this was not an isolated case. It was time of exam, I submitted grades. Then came the time for second attempt exams where I used to receive visit from students’ parents or grandparent or

aunts or uncles. During the war time when butter was scarce, they would come to my office with a piece of butter as present, kissing my hand or even try to kiss my shoe, begin to cry and explain how the destiny of the whole family depended on this student receiving a passing grade. I hang on to my solid answer that I cannot allow any exception. I would lose my innocence in the very moment I give in to your wish. Either I alter everyone's marks to pass everyone in the similar situation to yours or I alter no one's mark." (17:50 mins.)

Another challenge awaiting emigrant professors was the attitudes of Turkish mainstreamers towards them and their families. Neumark achieved great reputation in workplace as well as among the public. He was not only one of the most appreciated and well-known scholar in his field but he also played a central role in designing the income tax reform during the late 1940s in Turkey, which replaced Turkey's insufficient and outdated tax system back then with a modern approach to income taxation for individuals and corporations. Neumark was one of the leading figures of the tax reform (Andıç and Andıç, 1981). As a great scholar and tax reformer, he was very well accepted by his colleagues and students. His involvement in the income tax reform, however, gained him also some public disapproval. He recalled during his interview when discussing his personal relations with locals and how his socio-economic engagements affected these relations:

"One day my wife came back from shopping, she told me that a shop refused to sell her anything when they heard that she is Mrs. Neumark." (26:17 mins.).

In addition to the above mentioned mixed public opinion about emigrant professors, sometimes the very expectations of Turkish universities and even the Turkish government from emigrant professors were perceived as being restrictive by emigrant professors. Some emigrant professors felt that their criticism is neither welcomed nor warranted by their host, which may have contributed to discontent of some emigrants over time. Towards the end of his stay in Turkey, Auerbach wrote to one of his former German colleagues:

"I am, after all, a typical liberal. If anything, the very situation which the circumstances offered to me has but strengthened this inclination. [...] It is exactly this attitude of somebody who does not belong to any place, and who is essentially a stranger without the possibility of being assimilated, which is desired and expected from me." (Konuk, 2010, p. 96)

Another important theme on the agendas of emigrant scholars was certainly issues regarding their children. Children are the most affected group in forced migration experience. As a closely-knit community with high solidarity, they mostly resided in the same neighbourhoods or even in the same building. Therefore, children of immigrant professors, as well as their families were mostly in contact with their in-group members or other minority groups such as Armenians or Greeks rather than Turkish counterparts. Families did their best to provide their children with paramount education, not to inflict their traumas on children and enable them to lead a peaceful life. Although their kids had a much better life compared to most Turkish children, they got their share from the natural consequences of the experience (Reisman, 2006). Prof. Albert Eckstein (1891-1950) was a paediatrician and university professor in Düsseldorf. He moved to Turkey in 1935 and played a pivotal role in the creation of the paediatrics department at Ankara University. In 1950, he returned to Germany and





passed away shortly afterwards. Klaus Eckstein, son of Albert Eckstein, describes his experience as a child in Turkey as below:

“As a German *émigré*, I as a foreign body within Turkish community, could of course, not have any contact with the German children from the Corps *Diplomatique*, and even among the children of Allied diplomats, I was a foreign body --and foreign bodies cause irritation. [...] When I arrived in Ankara in December 1935, with my brothers and mother, I was about three and a half years old. Of course, I have but few memories from that time. [...] I was something of a glutton and could eat enormous quantities, but if we were invited to a proper Turkish feast, then this did occasionally surpass my capacity. [...] I was very fat, much to the chagrin of my mother, who often, unsuccessfully, tried to subject me to a diet. On the other hand, I was the ideal beauty for Turkish mothers who often would ask my father for the secret how he managed to get me so wonderfully fat.” (Reisman, 2006, p. 38)

Similar to the experiences of the adults, children also had to deal with the discrepancies between the curricula, school systems and even discrimination. Klaus Eckstein mentioned an experience of him in middle school in the quotation below:

“I went to middle school where again I had some good friends, but I did not so much like the teaching there. What finally and definitely spoiled it [school] for me was the teaching of history. We had to write an essay on the siege of Vienna (1529). At that time, I was very ambitious and wanted to write the best essay in the class, so I did not only use the Turkish school textbook as source material, but also very comprehensive *German History of the World* by Otto Jaeger, which contained at least four times as much on this subject as the Turkish school book. Thus, my extensive essay contained four times as much from the German source as from the Turkish and was much longer and detailed. But, as I did not appreciate at the time, the German material provided the aspect opposite to the Turkish, and thus I also wrote four times as much on the German point of view. My Turkish teacher was not amused by this, and I was given the mark “0”.” (Reisman, 2006, p.39)

## Discussion

This study explores migration experiences of German- Jewish scholars who were displaced from Germany by Nazi Regime in 1930s and sought refuge in Turkey. In the first part of the paper, we provide background information on German-Jewish scholars’ migration conditions. In the second part, using directed document analysis method on the existing literature, we reflect on themes and issues emerging in their psychological and sociocultural adaptation processes. Acculturation model of Arends-Tóth and Van de Vijver (2006) is used to form the theoretical base of our study. Results of the directed document content analysis reveal that psychological and sociocultural adaptation of scholars are strongly influenced by premigration expectations, motives for migration, perceived cultural distance, acculturation orientations of migrants as well as perceived attitudes of Turkish mainstreamers towards them.

One of the factors that play a major role in acculturation processes of migrants is pre-acculturation expectations of migrants such as expected duration of stay or conditions of the host country (Tartakovsky, 2007; Yijala & Jasinkaja Lahti, 2010). We document that some scholars did not have realistic expectations about the conditions in Turkey, further; they could

not foresee whether or when the crises in Germany would possibly end so that they could return. Most scholars stated that acquiring the language was much harder than they expected. Most scientist came to Turkey with the motivation to have an impact on modernization of Turkish universities, build up western-style faculties and departments. Some even found the opportunity to have labs to do their experiments in Turkey. However, the dream met reality and they had to bear many obstacles like bureaucratic difficulties of red tape in the Turkish administrative system. This finding is consistent with the study of Ward and colleagues in that the incongruity between expectations and actual circumstances lead to psychological dissatisfaction among immigrants (Ward, Bochner & Furnham, 2001).

Perceived attitudes of host society appear to be influenced by economic, social, cultural and religious factors. Most Turkish academics at universities were reported to perceive emigrant scholars as a threat to their positions at the university. Comparatively higher salaries of German professors created discomfort on Turkish colleagues (Reisman, 2006). Some German-Jewish professors, who did not feel well accepted, tended to leave and move to other safe countries. In the literature, discrimination is reported to be as the greatest risk factors for physical, mental and psychological health of immigrants (Berry & Hou, 2017). Language emerges as the main aspect enabling refugees to be accepted by the mainstreamers or serving a boundary marker. Scholars who were willing to learn Turkish could have smoother contact both with their colleagues and the mainstreamers in public places. It is also stated in the literature that language proficiency, level of social contact in the host society, ability to deal with regulations and daily problems in work, school and family life are other indications of socio-cultural adaptation for immigrants (Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2008; Te Lindert et al., 2008). This proved especially important and useful for scientists who became public figures due to their work that directly affects politics and economics, such as Fritz Neumark, or for doctors working in the field, i.e., going out of their own way to make home calls in Anatolian villages, such as Albert Eckstein (Reisman, 2006).

Religious discrimination has been reported to be a major source for acculturative stress particularly for the case of Muslim refugees in the West. Although it may not have been religiously motivated, the cultural distance between emigrant scholars' native culture and the culture of the host country, may have resulted in exclusion of emigrants in some aspects of the public life, as discussed above with the help of the memoirs of emigrant scholars' children. Religion is an integral part of culture and hence it feeds into it. As a result, we claim that our study provides unique evidence for the experiences of religious immigrant group in a non-western context in 1930s. The negative impact of discrimination could be minimized with in-group support from other German-Jewish residents in Turkey. Most lived in the same neighborhood or even in the same apartments with their co-ethnic peers. In-group support has also been frequently reported as a protective factor for minorities (Safdar, Struthers & Van Oudenhoven, 2009).

The implications of this study are valuable to researchers, historians, theoreticians and policy makers working on migration. Besides documenting migration experiences of German-Jewish scholars, our study reveals acculturation-related findings for immigrants from a hardly studied group, place and time. Therefore, this will further contribute to the work of academics, psychologists, social workers, counsellors, educators and other professionals assisting in the process of cross-cultural adaptation of immigrants and refugees.



## References

- Andıç, F.M. & Andıç, S. (1981). Fritz Neumark, Teacher and Reformer: A Turkish View. *FinanzArchiv/ Public Finance Analysis*, 39(1): 11-19.
- Arends-Tóth, J., & Van de Vijver, F. J. (2006). Issues in the Conceptualization and Assessment of Acculturation. In M. H. Bornstein, & L. R. Cote (Eds.), *Acculturation and parent-child relationship: measurement and development* (pp. 33-62). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Beilyn, B. and Fleming, D. (1968). *The Intellectual Migration*. Harvard: Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History.
- Bentwich, N. (1953). *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46), 5-68. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x>Cassarino
- Berry, J. W., & Hou, F. (2017). Acculturation, discrimination and wellbeing among second generation of immigrants in Canada. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 61, 29-39.
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative research journal*, 9, (2):27-40.
- Crawford, W.R. (1953). *The Cultural Migration*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Duggan, S. and Drury, B. (1948). *The Rescue of Science and Learning - The Story of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars*. New York: The Macmillian Company.
- Eden, A., & Irzik, G. (2012). German mathematicians in exile in Turkey: Richard von Mises, William Prager, Hilda Geiringer, and their impact on Turkish mathematics. *Historia Mathematica*, 39(4), 432-459.
- Feichtinger, J. (2001). *Wissenschaft zwischen den Kulturen: Österreichische Hochschullehrer in der Emigration 1933-1945*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Friedländer, S. (1997). *Nazi Germany and the Jews. Vol. 1: The Years of Persecution 1933-1939*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Grossmann, K.R. (1981). *Emigration, Geschichte der Hitlerflüchtlinge 1933-1945*. Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.
- Hartshorne, E.Y. (1937). *The German Universities and National Socialism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2008). Long-term immigrant adaptation: Eight-year follow-up study among immigrants from Russia and Estonia living in Finland. *International Journal of Psychology*, 43(1), 6-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590701804271>.
- Kibiswa, N. K. (2019). Directed qualitative content analysis (DQICA): A tool for conflict analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(8), 2059-2079.
- Konuk, K. (2010). *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Turkey*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kreiser, K. (2008). Türkische Vorlesungen deutscher Professoren am Istanbuler Darülfünun 1915-1918. In: *Deutsche Wissenschaftler im türkischen Exil: Die Wissenschaftsmigration in die Türkei 1933-1945*, eds: C.Kubaseck and G.Seufert, Würzburg: Orient-Institut Istanbul.
- Kröner, P. (1983). *Vor fünfzig Jahren: Die Emigration deutschsprachiger Wissenschaftler 1933-1939*. Münster: Gesellschaft für Wissenschaftsgeschichte.
- Kurt, E., Keser, A., & Ataç A. (2013). The contribution of German lecturers to Turkish university reform and medical education, during the university reform of 1933. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106: 2661-2670.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Montreuil, A., & Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Majority acculturation orientations toward "valued" and "devalued" immigrants. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(6), 698-719.
- Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. H. (1936). Memorandum on the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 38, 149-152. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/aa.1936.38.1.02a00330>
- Reisman, A. (2006). *Turkey's Modernization: Refugees from Nazism and Atatürk's Vision*. Washington DC: New Academia Publishing.

- Reuter, E. (2008). Erinnerungen und Reflektionen zum Aufenthalt meines Vaters Ernst Reuter in der Türkei. In: Deutsche Wissenschaftler im türkischen Exil: Die Wissenschaftsmigration in die Türkei 1933-1945, eds: C.Kubaseck and G.Seufert, Würzburg: Orient-Institut Istanbul.
- Safdar, S., Struthers, W., & van Oudenhoven, J. P. (2009). Acculturation of Iranians in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands: A test of the multidimensional individual difference acculturation (MIDA) model. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40(3), 468-491.
- Strohmeier, M. (2008). Der zeitgeschichtliche und politische Rahmen der türkischen Universitätsreform und die Rolle der deutschen Wissenschaftsmigranten. In: Deutsche Wissenschaftler im türkischen Exil: Die Wissenschaftsmigration in die Türkei 1933-1945, eds: C.Kubaseck and G.Seufert, Würzburg: Orient-Institut Istanbul.
- Suanet, I., & Van de Vijver, F. J. (2009). Perceived cultural distance and acculturation among exchange students in Russia. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 19(3), 182-197.
- Tartakovsky, E. (2007). A longitudinal study of acculturative stress and homesickness: High-school adolescents immigrating from Russia and Ukraine to Israel without parents. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 42(6), 485-494.
- Taušová, J., Bender, M., Dimitrova, R., & van de Vijver, F. (2019). The role of perceived cultural distance, personal growth initiative, language proficiencies, and tridimensional acculturation orientations for psychological adjustment among international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 69, 11-23.
- Te Lindert, A., Korzilius, H., van de Vijver, F., Kroon, S., & Arends-Toth, J. (2008). Perceived discrimination and acculturation among Iranian refugees in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 32, 578-588. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.09.003>.
- Tutas, H. (1975). *Nationalsozialismus und Exil*. München: Hanser-Verlag.
- Vedder, P., Sam, D. L., & Liebkind, K. (2007). The acculturation and adaptation of Turkish adolescents in North-Western Europe. *Applied Development Science*, 11(3), 126-136.
- Waldinger, F. (2010). Quality Matters - The Expulsion of Professors and the Consequences for Ph.D. Student Outcomes in Nazi Germany, *Journal of Political Economy* 118:787-831.
- Waldinger, F. (2011). Peer Effects in Science: Evidence from the Dismissal of Scientists in Nazi Germany. *Review of Economic Studies*, 1-24.
- Ward, C., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge
- Yijälä, A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2010). Pre-migration acculturation attitudes among potential ethnic migrants from Russia to Finland. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 34(4), 326-339.

## Appendix: Individual Data on Immigrants

In 1983, 50 years after the *Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service* was passed, Peter Kröner published an impressive collection of data where he listed 1,617 German and Austrian scientists and intellectuals who emigrated between 1933 and 1939. Most of these 1,617 individuals were fired from their university positions as a direct result of this law, and some had to leave due to this law's indirect consequences. Kröner (1983) documents migration paths of emigrants in great detail, so that their movements can be traced year by year. As we mention in the main part of this study, paths of 84 of these 1,617 scientists took them to Turkey. Some stayed very briefly for one or two years and moved on to other countries whereas some stayed 20 years or more. We provide a subset of Kröner's (1983) data in this appendix and list all German and Austrian scientists who emigrated from Germany or Austria after 1933 and stayed in Turkey for at least a while. We list each scientist's name, field, year of arrival in Turkey, and the year they left Turkey (either to move back to Germany or to move to another country). If a scientist died in Turkey, that year is marked with a "+". It is important to note that not all but most of these 84 scientists were involved with Turkish universities. For more information on the role of German scientists in Turkish universities during and



after the university reform, we recommend readers to consult e.g., Reisman (2006) and Kurt et al. (2013).

- Fritz Arndt, *Chemistry*, 1934-1957  
 Ernst von Aster, *Architecture*, 1936-1948+  
 Erich Auerbach, *Linguistics*, 1936-1947  
 Clemens Bosch, *History*, 1935-1955+  
 Hugo Braun, *Medicine*, 1933-1949  
 Leo Brauner, *Botany*, 1933-1955  
 Friedrich Bensch, *Chemistry*, 1937-1971  
 Ernst Caspari, *Biology*, 1935-1938  
 Herbert Dieckmann, *Linguistics*, 1934-1938  
 Lieselotte Dieckmann, *Literature*, 1934-1938  
 Wolfram Eberhard, *Sinology*, 1937-1948  
 Albert Eckstein, *Medicine (Pediatrics)*, 1935-1950  
 Ernst Engelberg, *History*, 1934-1948  
 Erwin Finlay-Freundlich, *Astrophysics*, 1933-1939  
 Alfred Frank, *Medicine*, 1933-1957+  
 Johann Gassner, *Botany*, 1934-1939  
 Otto Gerngross, *Chemistry*, 1938-1943  
 Wolfgang Gleissberg, *Astronomy*, 1933-1958  
 Walter Gottschalk, *Literature*, 1941-1954  
 Philipp Gross, *Chemistry*, 1937-1939  
 Hans Güterbock, *History*, 1936-1948  
 Hans Hamburger, *Mathematics*, 1947-1953  
 Karl Heckmann, *Medicine*, 1936-1939  
 Alfred Heilbronn, *Botany*, 1933-1956  
 Karl Hellmann, *Medicine*, 1936-1943  
 Reginald Herzog, *Chemistry*, 1934-1935+  
 Franz Hillinger, *Architecture*, 1937-1956  
 Arthur Hippel, *Physics*, 1933-1935  
 Ernst Hirsch, *Law*, 1933-1952  
 Julius Hirsch, *Medicine*, 1933-1948  
 Clemens Holzmeister, *Architecture*, 1938-1954  
 Richard Honig, *Law*, 1933-1939  
 Josef Igersheimer, *Medicine*, 1933-1939  
 Alfred Isaac, *Economics*, 1937-1950  
 Alfred Kantorowicz, *Medicine*, 1934-1947  
 Gerhard Kessler, *Economics*, 1933-1951  
 Curt Kosswig, *Biology*, 1937-1955  
 Walter Kranz, *Philology*, 1943-1950  
 Fritz Kraus, *Assyriology*, 1937-1950  
 Benno Landsberger, *Assyriology*, 1935-1948  
 August Laqueur, *Medicine*, 1935-1954+  
 Rudolf Leuchtenberger, *Medicine*, 1934-1936  
 Berthold Lichtenberger, *Agronomy*, 1938-1939  
 Wilhelm Liepmann, *Medicine*, 1933-1939+  
 Werner Lipschitz, *Medicine*, 1933-1939  
 Hans Marchand, *Linguistics*, 1934-1953  
 Alfred Marchioni, *Medicine*, 1938-1958  
 Eduard Melchior, *Medicine*, 1936-1954  
 Karl Menges, *Philology*, 1937-1940  
 Max Meyer, *Medicine*, 1935-1941  
 Richard von Mises, *Mathematics*, 1933-1939  
 Hilda von Mises (Geiringer), *Mathematics*, 1934-1939  
 Fritz Neumark, *Economics*, 1933-1952  
 Rudolf Nissen, *Medicine*, 1933-1939  
 Siegfried Oberndorfer, *Medicine*, 1934-1944+  
 Gustav Oelsner, *Architecture*, 1939-1951  
 Wilhelm Ornstein, *Mathematics*, 1939-1946  
 Berta Ottenstein, *Medicine*, 1935-1950  
 Tibor Peterfi, *Biology*, 1939-1946  
 Wilhelm Peters, *Psychology*, 1937-1952  
 William Prager, *Engineering*, 1934-1941  
 Paul Pulewka, *Medicine*, 1935-1954  
 Hans Reichenbach, *Philosophy*, 1933-1938  
 Friedrich Reimann, *Medicine*, 1942-?  
 Wilhelm Roepke, *Economics*, 1933-1937  
 Georg Rohde, *Philology*, 1935-1949  
 Hans Rosenberg, *Astronomy*, 1938-1940+  
 Walter Ruben, *Linguistics*, 1935-1948  
 Alexander Rüstow, *Economics*, 1933-1949  
 Wilhelm Salomon-Calvi, *Geology*, 1934-1941+  
 Stefan Schultz, *Linguistics*, 1936-1937  
 Philip Schwartz, *Medicine*, 1933-1950  
 Andreas Schwarz, *Law*, 1934-1953+  
 Max Sgalitzer, *Medicine*, 1938-1943  
 Leo Spitzer, *Linguistics*, 1933-1936  
 Kurt Steinitz, *Biochemistry*, 1934-1943  
 Karl Strupp, *Law*, 1933-1935  
 Karl Süßheim, *Oriental Studies*, 1939-1947+  
 Bruno Taut, *Architecture*, 1936-1938+  
 Andreas Tietze, *Oriental Studies*, 1937-1958  
 Martin Wagner, *Architecture*, 1935-1938  
 Edith Weigert, *Psychology*, 1935-1938  
 Hans Wilbrandt, *Economics*, 1934-1952  
 Hans Winterstein, *Medicine*, 1933-1956