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Introduction:

What Factors impact the Internationalization of Scholarship in the Humanities and Social Sciences?

The export and import of goods is what keeps economies alive. The export and import of knowledge is equally important to any society. Therefore, the mobility of scientists and scholars within the global scientific landscape has been of major concern. International faculty, student exchanges, and cross-national collaborations are key elements for any top university or scientific institute around the world. However, statistics prove that certain disciplines, especially the natural sciences, seem to do better in terms of researchers’ mobility, English-language publications, international collaborations, and employment of international staff than others. The situation in the humanities, and to a certain extent also in the social sciences looks different. Here local studies, the use of national languages, and a low rate of international collaboration determine the picture. These discrepancies have puzzled university administrators, scientists, scholars, and politicians alike. What factors motivate a scholar or scientist to decide to go abroad, publish in a foreign language, or invest money in an international collaboration? Is it skill? Is it opportunity? Or are these decisions culturally motivated?

The Transatlantic Science and Humanities Advisory Board of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation identified the problem as an issue that needed special attention. The members aimed to understand the situation in the humanities and social sciences, and identify the factors that hinder scholars in these specific fields from expanding their international experiences. Therefore, the Humboldt Foundation invited German and U.S.-American experts from the humanities and social sciences, scientific organizations, and representatives of the European Union to discuss the situation with the Board Members and identify possible measures for changes.

The workshop “What Factors impact the Internationalization of Scholarship in the Humanities and Social Sciences” took place November 2, 2004, at the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation’s headquarters in Bonn – Bad Godesberg. The participants set out to identify the present day obstacles in respect to mobility for young scholars in their specific working and research environments. In her key-note lecture "Transatlantic Mobility and Collaborations: Experiences in the Humanities and Social Sciences", Dr. Heike Jöns offered her expertise on the question of researcher’s mobility, the underlying motivations, and long-term consequences. In two panels the participants followed two specific aspects of the problem: the first examined the question of university training. How do young scholars find their way into international scholarly activities? What programs and mechanisms are in place to assist them in building (or developing)an international network? The second set of questions clustered around the problems that arise when working together internationally. The lively discussions revealed a great number of answers and pointed to new questions.

The present situation in the humanities and social sciences poses many challenges for the scholarly community. A tight job market resulting in a fierce competition for
positions in those fields is only part of the problem. However, it prevents a large mobility among young scholars who are afraid to lose their positions or job opportunities. Non existing international networks of senior scholars and the lack of role models for cross-national collaborations make it difficult for young scholars to understand the significance of these structures for their own work. On top of this, we are also confronted with major demographic changes that impact the academic world. Especially in the U.S., we find dramatically different student bodies and faculties than e.g. 30 years ago. This has implications on the curricular and the scholarly interest people develop. Afro-Americans, Asian-Americans, or Hispanic-Americans will hardly develop strong interests in German history or literature, especially when the jobs offered look for a background in gender- or minority studies. Furthermore, new global markets in Asia and in other world regions cause a shifting interest. Changing political interests, shifting economic and cultural relationships and new migration patterns are all important factors that impact research and teaching. It is important to be aware of these factors. However, they also offer new opportunities for scholars to work together.

The following papers were written by scholars who participated actively in the discussion.

The texts in the "Working and Discussion Papers of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation" document the personal views and experiences (sometimes even biographical), of each author. Nevertheless, this documentation is meant to point to a problem that needs to be explored in more detail in the future.

Dr. Katja Rampelmann
Transatlantic Science and Humanities Program
May 2005
Academic Mobility and Collaboration across the Atlantic: Experiences in the Humanities and the Social Sciences

By Heike Jöns

Introduction

In times of what is assumed to be a growing international ‘knowledge economy,’ international circulation of scientists and scholars is of topical interest to modern nation states and individual academic institutions. This has been true for European countries and institutions in particular which increasingly have to compete for highly qualified researchers, academic reputation, research funds, and infrastructure on an international level. All of these play a key role in the long-term development of international relations, economic competitiveness, and social development (see, e.g., Altbach 1989, OECD 1996, Jöns 2003a).

International competition for academic resources is currently shaped by powerful academic centres in the USA and a growing number of scientifically successful institutions in east and southeast Asia (see, e.g., Blumenthal et al. 1996, Woodward 2002, Kantrowitz 2003, Lepenies 2003, King 2004, Leydesdorf und Zhou 2004). Bearing this global perspective of academic exchanges in mind, this paper aims at providing insights into recent developments in transatlantic academic mobility and collaboration by addressing five topics:

- Contemporary and historical patterns of scholarly interaction;
- Motivations for circular transatlantic academic mobility;
- The nature of subject-related travel and collaborative cultures;
- Experiences with circular transatlantic academic mobility;
- Follow-up mobility and other outcomes of a research stay abroad.

The paper compares circular or transient academic mobility in the humanities and the social sciences with the one in the natural sciences. Its main aim is to challenge the idea that social scientists and scholars of the humanities are less ‘successful’ in terms of international collaboration than natural scientists. Although the following statistics present striking differences between disciplines in regard to international mobility and collaboration, I argue that these discrepancies are related to profound dissimilarities in researchers’ needs and chances to collaborate on national and international levels. These differences can even be detected within broad disciplines such as the natural sciences because they depend on the object, type, and stage of one’s work.

In the following, I will present some of the underlying reasons. I will suggest that these reasons are of particular importance for recent evaluations of international contacts in higher education and research as well as for policy measures that foster international mobility and collaboration in different academic fields.

Building upon recent statistics and studies on international academic mobility and collaboration in Germany and elsewhere (see, e.g., Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft 2002, Teichler 2002, DAAD 2003, Enders and Mugabushaka 2004), the paper discusses the empirical results of two research projects conducted at the
Department of Geography at the University of Heidelberg between 1999 and 2004. Both projects examined the nature and results of state-sponsored academic mobility to Germany in the second half of the 20th century. The first project studied the research stays of about 2,000 U.S. senior scientists who had been granted Humboldt Research Awards in the period between 1972 and 1996 (Jöns 2002a, 2003a). The second project examined the experiences of Humboldt Research Fellows, mainly post-docs, assistant and associate professors, from different countries; all of them spent a sabbatical year in Germany over the past fifty years. Every tenth fellow came from the USA (Jöns 2002b, 2003b, 2004, Jansen 2004, Jöns and Meusburger 2005).

The empirical results are based on the Humboldt Foundation’s database as well as on three surveys conducted among former visiting researchers and their German hosts (over 4,000 questionnaires in total). The study comprises the responses of about two thirds of all Humboldt Awardees from the USA from 1972 to 1996; every ninth Humboldt Research Fellow during the past 50 years; and every tenth of their academic hosts in Germany. This paper is also based on the results of 85 semi-structured interviews conducted with former Humboldt Award Winners and Humboldt Research Fellows at Harvard University, M.I.T. (Cambridge, MA), Boston University, the University of Chicago, I.I.T. (Chicago) and the University of California at Berkeley. For the discussion of broad patterns, the following analysis concentrates on the statistical findings rather than individual biographies (for in-depths views of researchers working in different academic fields, see Jöns 2003a).

**Comparative patterns of scholarly interaction**

Due to a lack of statistical data on the international flow of visiting researchers, empirical studies have mainly to rely on the analysis of sponsorship programmes. The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) and the Hochschul-Informations-System GmbH (HIS) have published a data report series since 2001 that provides a comprehensive overview on the exchange of researchers sponsored by Germany-based institutions. While such a compilation of data from different sponsorship programmes can never provide a ‘complete’ picture, it nevertheless offers striking evidence for the main directions and characteristics of international academic exchanges (DAAD 2001, 2003).

German institutions support three times more visiting researchers to Germany than they support German researchers going abroad. A comparison of the countries of origins of sponsored visiting researchers to Germany with the destinations for German visiting researchers going abroad reveals the country’s intermediary position in a worldwide hierarchy of scientific centres. The results show a huge interest by visiting researchers from Asian countries in Germany, while a quarter of sponsored German researchers abroad prefer as their destination the USA (25%), followed by the United Kingdom (13%, see figure 1).
Looking at the career stage of researchers going from the USA to Germany and vice versa reveals a completely different picture: Among visiting academics from the USA to Germany, established researchers account for the strongest group. Among German academics going to the USA are primarily graduates and post docs (figure 2). The fact that 40% of all sponsored German post-docs chose the USA, underlines the country’s significant role for further education of young researchers. In turn, the USA’s large research universities and their laboratories strongly benefit from the influx of highly motivated and well-educated German and other foreign post-docs.

In combination with other results this situation indicates a high quality of research on both sides of the Atlantic and the existence of functioning sponsorship programmes in most segments of transatlantic academic mobility. However, it also reveals that international academic mobility of senior German researchers could be considerably improved (see below).
Historical perspectives on scholarly interaction

Transatlantic mobility and collaboration underwent dramatic changes in the course of 20th century (see, e.g., Littmann 1996, Jöns 2003a, 211-223). These developments are important to consider when evaluating contemporary patterns of transatlantic exchange. Main features of the post-war history of German-American relations can be illustrated by the development of the Humboldt Fellowship programme. It is the most important sponsorship programme for long-term research visits for foreign academics to Germany, and the most prestigious programme for visiting scholars below 40 years of age. During the past 5 decades the foundation has received more than 50,000 applications. Of those approximately 20,000 fellows from more than 130 countries received Humboldt sponsorship in Germany – among them 2,000 from the USA.

Germany's rebuilding of scientific resources after WWII is reflected by several factors: steadily growing numbers of applications for Humboldt Fellowships; an increasing number of countries participating in the program; Germany's gradual reintegration into the international scientific community, and a significant increase in the quality of higher education and research (figure 3a).

By the seventies the interest shown by researchers from the USA was a clear indication that Germany had been completely reintegrated in the international academic community. In both absolute and relative terms, the numbers of applications and fellows from the USA reached its zenith in the third decade of sponsorship (1974-83). The favourable job situation in the expanding U.S. system of higher education was one of the factors that encouraged post-docs and young professors to spend a period of time abroad. The growing education market offered enough jobs to choose from on their return.

Huge state investments in German higher education and the establishment of Humboldt Research Awards in 1972 made it possible to bring more international academic excellence to Germany. For the first ten years the Award Program only applied to distinguished scientists and engineers from the USA (figure 3b). Later it was opened to other disciplines and countries.

On the initiative of former Humboldt fellows and awardees another important link in the transatlantic exchange network was established in 1979. The Feodor Lynen Research Fellowships opened German post-docs the way for a research stay at the home institutions of former Humboldt Fellows and Humboldt Award Winners. By 2002, approximately 2,500 post-docs had taken advantage of this opportunity. They went to more than 60 different countries of the world. More than half of all Feodor Lynen Research Fellows, however, chose the USA (figure 3c).
Figure 3: Sponsorship programmes of the Humboldt Foundation, 1954-2001
Data source: Annual Reports of the Humboldt Foundation.

These figures highlight the existence of close academic ties across the Atlantic. In the mid- and late-nineties, however, a decline of applications was observed in various sponsorship programmes. This development has been discussed intensively in broad public debates as a possible indicator for a decreasing international attractiveness of German higher education and research (see, e.g., Bode 1997, Gries 1997, Lepenies 2003). I would like to suggest that these fluctuations are the result of a complex bundle of international and domestic developments that are not primarily linked to the quality of research. On the contrary – the quality of German researchers seem to be very competitive. From 1991 to 1995, for example, German scientists shared a top position alongside British and Canadian scientists as international co-authors of U.S. scientists and engineers. This was a clear improvement over their position from 1981 to 1985 (NSF 1998). According to this statistics every tenth international co-author of U.S. scientists and engineers comes from Germany, while every fifth international co-author of German researchers comes from the U.S. (1991-95).

The reasons for a decline in the number of applications for fellowships in recent years rather lay in an exceptionally strong interest in Germany during the unique historical
situation of reunification, the decentralisation of international academic contacts after the fall of the Iron Curtain, and various country-specific developments. The new situation contributed to an increasing international competition for highly qualified visiting researchers in the late nineties. Among those factors that have influenced the transatlantic relationship between Germany and the USA considerably, are the following:

- Greater range of fellowships on offer worldwide.
- Consequences of a decreasing birth-rate lead to fewer young academics available for postdoctoral research.
- Many graduates prefer financially more attractive jobs in industry over those in academia.
- Due to a growing competition in the U.S. among post-docs for jobs in academia they have to be available for job interviews and cannot afford to leave the country for one or two years. In addition the prestige connected to postdoctoral positions in the U.S., specifically at the large research universities, outshines working experience in most places in Europe.
- The number of researchers in higher education has been stagnating in both Germany and the USA during the nineties. Therefore, the potential for academic mobility is at least temporarily much less than in times of expansion as witnessed, for example, in the late sixties and seventies.
- In Germany, investments in new large research facilities which characterised German science in the eighties, stagnated in the first half of the nineties due to a temporary priority shift from scientific policy towards Aufbau Ost, i.e. the restructuring of higher education and research in the new Länder.
- Finally, decreasing biographical connections to Germany and Central Europe are responsible for a further decline in interest in longer-term research stays in Germany. This seems to be of particular importance in those fields of the humanities and the social sciences in which language and cultural heritage play a crucial role.

Motivations for circular transatlantic academic mobility

The empirical findings show that close personal contacts to the academic host and biographical connections to the host country are among the most important influencing motivations for a research stay abroad. Among U.S. Humboldt Awardees are ten times more people born in Germany than one can find among the faculty of U.S. universities. My personal interviews revealed that almost every second interviewee was biographically connected to Germany in one way or the other; by German ancestors, parents who emigrated in the Nazi period, a partner of German origin, or relatives living in Germany (Jöns 2003a, 269-270).

Among the Humboldt Research Fellows from the USA every second respondent considered close personal contacts to the academic host as an important motivation for his or her research stay in Germany. Approximately every third respondent identified friendships and family contacts as influencing factors.
The development of the German-born population in the USA between 1870 and 1997, however, indicates that the number of people who have biographical bonds to Germany or neighbouring countries are declining sharply for historical reasons (figure 4a). A comparison of the percentage of German-born researchers in different fields reveals that the social sciences and the humanities may be particularly affected by these developments (figure 4b). However, based on my interview experience it is important to stress that the effect of this development should not be underestimated for research stays in the natural sciences and in engineering either. In the nineties, for
example, about 20% of the U.S. faculty in engineering was born in Asia (NSF 1998). Interviews disclose that Asian-born faculty spend at least one or two of their sabbaticals back home in Asia, close to their families, friends, and long-term collaborators; thus proving the hypothesis that cultural bonds play an important role.

Based on these findings it becomes evident that the various ways in which cultural and historical relations mould academic exchanges are calling for policy measures that go far beyond research itself. In the future new scientific, programme-related, cultural incentives, the strengthening of personal relationships through exchange programmes at early career stages, and Germany's presence in the media will become ever more important to consolidate the current level of transatlantic academic mobility.

Altogether, the motivation for visiting academics to spend a year in Germany comprises a multitude of factors. More than three quarters of the U.S. Humboldt Research Fellows, for example, were attracted to their hosts by specific research topics or projects at the host institution. In relative terms these are more researchers than in any other region. The same number of researchers looked forward to a time without administrative or teaching responsibilities in which to do research and to publish academic works. The meaning of other research-related incentives such as attractive research infrastructure, highly qualified researchers, and multinational collaborations varied considerably among different fields and types of work.

The nature of subject-related travel and collaborative cultures

The disciplinary profile of visiting researchers to Germany between 1954 and 2001 is characterised by a significant shift in subject emphasis (figure 5). In the fifties, most Fellows came to Germany from disciplines in which research required comparatively few human and material resources. Since the research infrastructure was still being built, it was difficult to find adequate or well-equipped work-places for natural scientists. Therefore, the humanities accounted for about 40% of all Humboldt Fellows from 1954 to 1963.
During the sixties and seventies, research visits to Germany from scientists and engineers increased. The major reasons for this were a growing economic importance of these fields, and the development of scientific and engineering research institutions, among them the Max-Planck-Institutes and other specialized research institutions. In the humanities, growing interest in recent German events and increasing access to archives led to a research boom, particularly in history at home and abroad. However, taking all disciplines of the humanities into account, sponsorship figures hardly doubled so that their proportion of Fellows as a whole declined.

The establishment of a new research infrastructure in the natural sciences, which generally operate with relatively standardized communication and interaction – characterized, for example, by laboratories and by the use of technical English –, can massively raise the interest in Germany. The mobilisation of new visiting researchers in the humanities and social sciences, however, remains difficult for basically two reasons. First, most research projects are tied to specific sites and local sources such as archival material, interview partner, or particular cultural settings. While these topics often can not be detached from field sites and taken away to actual places of analysis or be converted into movable representations, research travel is often less concentrated on leading research centres than in more infrastructure-dependent types of academic work (Jöns and Meusburger, in print). Second, language skills and cultural knowledge are often necessary for conducting research projects in the social sciences and humanities. But the number of foreign scholars with German language skills is not only restricted but, as outlined above, declining, (figure 4).

Therefore, the long-term shift in subject emphasis among Humboldt Research Fellows, as displayed in figure 5, cannot be simply attributed to the international attractiveness of different national academic communities. To a considerable extent it is the result of varying travel and collaborative cultures in different academic fields. Most natural scientists have more opportunities to collaborate internationally because they often share complex research infrastructure and operate with much more standardized communication than scholars in the humanities and the social sciences. This enables them to engage in relatively unproblematic exchanges of ideas, methods, and materials between a few comparable sites of experimentation. An analysis of host countries German visiting researchers chose for their stay abroad in different subjects reveals that in medicine more than two thirds of German visiting researchers concentrate on the USA, whereas researchers working in area-, language- and cultural-studies are distributed across various countries (DAAD 2003, Jöns and Meusburger in print).

In this context case studies have shown that researchers’ needs and opportunities to reach out from a place of knowledge production in order to communicate and to interact, to work and to mobilize new resources in different places vary considerably according to the significance of the geographical context for different types of research work (Jöns 2003a, 420-428): The more a researcher deals with physically embedded, place-specific, and hardly standardized research objects, such as archival material, field sites, landscapes, technical equipment, people and events, the stronger he or she is dependent on a particular local research context. This hinders researchers to do certain parts of their work elsewhere. Theories and thoughts, in turn, are as mobile as
their physical vehicles allow them to be (e.g., researchers, computers, books, etc.). In between these extremes of lowly and strongly context-dependent types of work, there are various other practices. Typical travel and collaborative cultures can be best systemized along the lines of different subjects (e.g. natural sciences, engineering, humanities), types of work (e.g. theoretical, experimental and interpretative research) and areas of work (e.g. basic and applied work).

These subject-related patterns of academic mobility and collaboration are also intimately related to systematically varying results of research stays abroad. Publications resulting from Humboldt research stays in Germany, for example, show that co-authorship with German colleagues is dominating in the natural sciences, while in mathematics, the humanities, and the social sciences publishing is much more characterized by single authorship. This is particularly true for work that involves more thinking and interpretation of specific ideas (figure 6).

---

**a) Publications with researchers in Germany, 1974-2001**

![Graph showing publication patterns](image)
Experiences with circular transatlantic academic mobility

Based on their experiences with the German academic system, the former visiting Humboldt Research Fellows were asked to evaluate certain characteristics in comparison to the working environment in their home countries. In a questionnaire they were able to choose from five categories, namely "significantly worse", "worse", "similar", "better" and "significantly better". In striking contrast to researchers from other countries, U.S. fellows evaluated none of the aspects in question on average as being better than in the U.S.. Instead they regarded the following characteristics of the academic system as being equally good:

- Level of education of doctoral students and postdocs;
- Level of research;
- Scientific infrastructure standards;
- Integration of foreign guests and work atmosphere;
- Size of a professor’s research group;
- Non-scientific staff in a professor’s research group;
- Opportunities to conduct basic research and research projects with long-term perspectives.
In comparison, former Humboldt Research Fellows from Australia evaluated the following aspects as being better in Germany than in Australia:

- Availability of research funds at universities;
- Scientific infrastructure standards;
- Level of research;
- Level of education of doctoral students and post docs;
- Library standards (stock of books/magazines);
- Size of a professor’s research group;
- Opportunities to conduct basic research and research projects with long-term perspectives.

According to the U.S. researchers the following aspects are on average considerably worse in Germany than in the US:

- Library standards (stock of books/magazines);
- Availability of research funds at universities;
- Openness towards new research approaches (particularly in the humanities);
- Workplace equipment;
- Supervision of doctoral students (in accordance with Australians);
- Level of teaching (in accordance with Australians);
- Library organisation (opening hours, assistance).

This means that the strengths of German higher education and research lie in the quality of research work and infrastructure, including the opportunity to conduct basic research and research projects with long-term perspectives, and the level of education of young academics. The relatively weak image of teaching at German universities, however, bears the danger of diminishing interests of U.S. students in Germany. In the long-term, this situation could make it increasingly difficult to mobilize future collaborators and visiting researchers in later stages of their career. At the same time, the quality of libraries has been criticized in other studies as well (see, e.g., Teichler 2002), which makes investment in related areas a *conditio sine qua non* for creating an attractive research environment in the humanities and the social sciences:

> In the twenty years I’ve left Germany universities have been bled out and they have lost resources. Cologne was the biggest institute of musicology, the library was terrible, it had some good old sources, but it was terrible to use and they had just stopped buying books a long time ago... That was the big frustration... It was a shock to come back and it was difficult to work. [Musicologist from Chicago]

Further starting points for potential reforms result from the fact that Australian and American researchers seem to agree that there is significantly less of the following in Germany, particularly in the humanities and the social sciences:

- Team work in research and teaching;
- Communication between teams/institutes;
- Interdisciplinary collaboration;
- Contact between professors and students.
Furthermore, former visiting researchers stressed that U.S. scholars will do archival research in Germany but not necessarily teach because they assume that the German system would be closed to foreigners for teaching:

Graduate students, foreign graduate students normally don’t get a job in a German university. You have to be German and so on. [Musicologist from Chicago]

Altogether these assessments represent personal experiences of established researchers that shape the image of the German academic system abroad. While the results point to some of the issues that could be improved on both sides of the Atlantic, it is important to note that the vast majority of former Humboldt visiting researchers expressed their gratefulness for their visit in Germany for academic, personal, and cultural reasons. Researchers’ experiences varied considerably depending on different fields, countries of origin, and even age groups:

I think the American system is better for young people, the German system is better for old people, so it’s like other aspects of the society it’s more stable, secure, and here there is more uncertainty but at the same time sometimes more opportunity. [Physicist from Cambridge, MA]

**Follow-up mobility and other outcomes of a research stay abroad**

In one third of the cases, the contact between a Humboldt Award Winner and his or her Humboldt host resulted from visits by German academics in the USA. Conference travel as much as post-doctoral research stays support the great significance of sponsored research travel in both directions in order to induce sustainable transatlantic academic relations. Accordingly, research stays of visiting researchers in Germany resulted in further academic mobility (figure 7).

Almost every second U.S. senior scientist came back to Germany for a further longer-term stay (figure 7a). About a third of them arranged visits by U.S. post-docs and doctoral students to Germany. In two thirds of all cases and thus most frequently of all, personal contacts were continued by German post-docs in the USA. An important field for action in higher-educational policy, however, are longer-term visits to the USA by established German professors. Because of fundamental differences in the organization of science and research and due to the lack of programmes on offer, this kind of extended co-operation did not occur very often. Those ten percent of German professors, for example, who spent a sabbatical in the U.S. after hosting a Humboldt Awardee, were almost all of U.S. origin. In the case of Humboldt Research Fellows from all countries and from the USA, the percentage of former Humboldt hosts participating in subsequent mobility was even less than 3% (figure 7b). The empirical findings, however, show that the more established researchers are internationally mobile, the more post-docs and other younger academics are attracted to his or her home country for a temporary research stay.
The follow-up mobility generated by Humboldt Research Fellows follows similar patterns, even if these vary considerably according to disciplines and countries of origin (figure 7). U.S. researchers in the social sciences and the humanities who spent a sabbatical year as a Humboldt Research Fellow in Germany are often working on topics related to German history, culture, or language. Therefore, they return more often for a further long-term stay to Germany than their colleagues in the natural and engineering sciences (42%, all fields: 30%). They also send more doctoral students (14%) and undergraduates (16%) to Germany, while postdoctoral positions tend to be less prominent in the humanities and social sciences (8%). Altogether, the need for U.S. scholars, working on topics related to Germany or Central Europe, to spend some time researching in Germany is much higher than for German scholars in the same field to go abroad. However, due to several international leading U.S. research centres and schools, renowned scholars and well-equipped libraries and archives, the frequency of follow-up mobility from Germany to the USA is – apart from the postdoctoral level – not much less in the social sciences and the humanities than in other fields. Since researchers working in the humanities and social sciences often travel themselves when conducting research, and do rarely send post-docs as mediators between research groups in Germany and the USA, there are even slightly more cases in which established professors from Germany (Humboldt hosts) stayed in the USA after hosting a Humboldt Research Fellow from this country (4% versus 3% in all fields).

The differences in international mobility patterns of U.S. and German researchers in similar phases of their careers mainly result from other responsibilities and tasks in different systems of higher education. These are, for example, related to differences concerning the organization of the research process within a research group (e.g. concentration on research versus management functions), and influenced by the size of the research group. Groups tend to be larger in Germany, have different modes in the allocation of academic functions, and less administration support staff at universities. In addition there is an unfavourable ratio of students per professor at German universities compared to prestigious U.S. research universities.

Finally, the relationship between a research stay abroad and various forms of follow-up mobility underlines the great importance of sponsorship programmes for international integration. In the case of the Humboldt Award-Programme, which was established in 1972 as one of several appreciation measures for the Marshall-Plan, case studies show that the related research stays of renowned U.S. scientists in Germany speeded up Germany’s final phase of reintegration into the international scientific community by encouraging personal relationships, knowledge and technology transfer as well as increasing mobility of post-docs to the USA (Jöns 2003a, 396-407). This situation sheds a different light on the understanding of ‘brain drain’ as a negative phenomenon per se, especially against the background that many of the U.S. Humboldt Award Winners emigrated from Germany to the USA either during the period of National Socialism or the post-war period. By re-building or maintaining close academic relations with German colleagues in the past fifty years, many emigrants acted as hosts for researchers from Germany and as mediators for German-American relations more generally, thereby contributing to increasing international collaborations.
a) Humboldt Research Award Winners, 1972-1996

b) Humboldt Research Fellows from the USA, 1974-2001

c) US Fellows from the Social Sciences and the Humanities, 1974-2001

Figure 7 Patterns of follow-up mobility to research stays in Germany

Figures in brackets relate to the situation of Research Fellows in the humanities and social sciences from all countries (n = 406). a) n = 995, b) n = 200, c) n = 74.

Data source: Own surveys, 1997 and 2003.

Concluding Remarks

Transatlantic mobility and collaboration between Germany and the U.S. establishes links between two of the most advanced nations in higher education and research. Over the past three decades, these relations have become quite intense. However, recent political and socio-economic developments may support other regional orientations in both countries in the future. In Germany, this is due to growing academic
linkage within the enlarged European Union, while American academic relations have lately been strengthened across the Pacific.

On this background, I would like to advance two interrelated arguments. First, international academic relations are shaped by historical, political, and cultural events as much as by subject-related mobility and collaborative cultures. Second, both aspects need to be considered when evaluating international contacts in higher education and research and designing policy measures that foster international mobility and collaboration in different academic fields.

In view of diminishing biographical connections to Germany among U.S. researchers, I would like to propose four suggestions for discussion that may help to consolidate or even strengthen German-American academic exchanges in the humanities and the social sciences:

- Establishment of internationally advertised research seminars, each for 20 to 30 PhD students working in a particular field on both sides of the Atlantic, in order to discuss their work and to enable the establishment of life-long collaborative ties (different topics annually);
- Creation of a prestigious mobility programme for research stays of German professors in a different country in order to motivate them to spend a sabbatical abroad and thereby closing a gap in the current structure of sponsorship programmes;
- More encouragement and training for young German researchers to publish in internationally peer-reviewed journals at an early stage of their career in order to be better prepared for an international career;
- Introduction of intermediate academic positions with tenure track between the level of assistants and professors (e.g., lectureships) and (thereby) opening up the academic job market for foreign applicants.
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Beyond Biography

By Kenneth Prewitt

The strong ties that have linked the German and U.S. scholarly communities for more than a half-century are frequently and correctly attributed to biographical connections—especially to the large number of German scientists and scholars who fled to America in the late thirties and early forties and then established themselves in leading U.S. universities. In the social sciences this is perhaps nowhere as powerfully evident as in the University-in-Exile that later became the New School for Social Research in lower Manhattan. This highly interdisciplinary graduate faculty, it is recorded, conducted its business in German. But the University-in-Exile was simply the most visible symbol of a much wider phenomenon that cut across all disciplines and reached into dozens and dozens of America’s leading research universities. The academic Diaspora served as a foundation for high levels of collaboration as Germany’s universities were revitalized in the post-war period, as well as for strong flows of graduate students in both directions. In the post-war period the importance of bi-national scholarly connections was simply assumed, and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation was in part designed to regularize and fund scholarly interactions between Germany and the U. S.

Though the biographical connections have not totally disappeared as we enter the 21st century, they have weakened to the point that we no longer take-for-granted the overriding importance of sustaining the bi-national scholarly ties between the two countries. In the American social sciences, the reference disciplines for these notes, there are a few places where “take-for-granted” still prevails. The New School for Social Research is one instance, where the continental tradition in philosophy flourishes and where a German-influenced historically rooted sociology, political science, and economics has left strong curricular traces. In a number other universities, Harvard being a prominent example, ties remain strong because there is a continuing dedication to the study of the German language, history, and contemporary matters.

Our interest, however, is with a broader question than the undeniable fact that there continues to be a strong scholarly tradition in the United States that concerns itself with the study of Germany. We want to situate the bi-national link in the more general issue of the internationalization of science and scholarship as it is unfolding in the 21st century. That is, we seek a rationale for the bi-national link that is not dependent on the lingering effect of the biographical connections and not dependent on the strong presence of German studies in the American social sciences and humanities, however important both of those factors are.

Beyond biography and beyond German studies, what is the rationale for continuing to invest in bi-national ties in the social sciences and the humanities? Because I know them better, I restrict attention here to the social sciences, though I believe the generalizations to follow can be applied to the humanistic disciplines as well. And I take up the question only from the American perspective, leaving to German colleagues an examination from the perspective there.
The American social science disciplines are generally recognized as exceptionally strong, at least in comparison to their counterparts in most other nations. By “strong” observers have in mind theoretical sophistication, methodological skills, quality of graduate education, breadth and excellence of journals, variety of funding sources, and other such indicators.

Less familiar to us is the observation that the American social sciences are parochial, but that is the first point I stress. In the latter decades of the 19th century, when the U.S. social sciences disciplines took shape, the central project was to make American liberal democracy work better. And I would suggest that that has generally remained the major project to this day. You do not have to go very far into political science to find its preoccupation with the theory and practice of American political institutions and practices. Economics is, at its core, about models to make the American-style capitalist market system work better. Sociology has never drifted far from the concerns about social disorder and social integration or social opportunity and mobility that were present in the 19th century -- what was summarized as “the social problem.” Psychology has been about socialization, learning, maturation, individual rationality, and group dynamics, all within a largely American set of experiences. (I return to anthropology in a moment.)

This then is the first point. The project of American social science has been America. This project, to be sure, has been in some tension with a different project -- to build a science of politics or economics or psychology. But I believe that a close reading of disciplinary history would demonstrate that the “American project” has time and again taken precedence over the “science project” and that our claims to universal truths are, empirically, very much about the experience of American society since the late 19th century.

I offer this as a fact, not as praise or in judgment. Nor do I think it is a surprising fact. The same could generally be said of French or German or British social science over the same time-frame.

What is true of the domestically focused disciplines also holds for the more internationally oriented scholars. In the American tradition international relations -- the study of security alliances and security threats, of international trade and finance, of the construction and workings of international organizations -- has in substantial amount been about the way in which the U.S. participates in, and is affected by, matters international. That is, IR has been an extension of the American project to include protecting the great liberal democratic experience from foreign threats and also, of course, projecting it abroad.

Those studies which have been most explicitly non-American, that is, foreign area studies since the end of WWII, were initially justified in terms very much American. Government funding of area studies followed hard on Sputnik, and the concern that perhaps Soviet communism could win the allegiance of the newer nations of Africa and Asia. Vast amounts of federal and philanthropic funds were dedicated to foreign language training and foreign area studies so that the U.S. could intelligently exercise
its world leadership. I earlier ignored anthropology, when describing the disciplines in the context of their quest to improve the practice of American liberal democracy, but can now give that discipline its proper place. Anthropology has, along with history, been the lead discipline in area studies -- the discipline that was best equipped to explain the “foreign other”; the disciplines that being less preoccupied with the American experience was perhaps epistemologically best equipped to study wholly different ways of raising children, maintaining social order, organizing economic production, providing social justice, and so forth. Area studies in general, and anthropology more specifically, has helped to make the social sciences less parochial, but even here we do not find a fully internationalized scholarship. Whether in support of the American project abroad, or strongly critical of it, the reference point has largely been America.

An internationalized American social science would break free of its parochial, American-centric roots. In urging this scientific project forward, there are two reasons for sustaining strong bi-national ties to Germany’s social sciences. First, across the social sciences Germany is strong enough to be an equal intellectual partner, and that matters to the American disciplines. Second, Germany’s social sciences are already more outward looking, and this will only accelerate as the European community deepens and extends its borders. Collaboration with Germany will prove valuable and even indispensable to American social scientists as they turn to the scientific agenda of the 21st century.

This is not the place to set that agenda out in detail. It is guided by an over-arching issue: Is social change on a scale and at a pace that is radically transforming? That is, should the social sciences see the present and near-term future as incremental change, as development-by-accumulation, and consequently as implying only gradual modifications of practice and beliefs? Or, should we view our period as one of radical transformation. At the core of this question is how to interpret the consequences of information technologies and the arrival of knowledge societies. What we want to understand is whether the IT revolution is on the same scale as what, in retrospect, we associate with the agricultural revolution and then the industrial revolution. These transformations reordered the division of power on the planet, in the first instance placing the fertile crescent at the center of world history and in the second moving the power center from the Mediterranean to northern Europe and then to the eastern seaboard of the United States. These power shifts were not peaceful, not simple, and not controllable. The revolution that gave mankind control over the food supply and then the revolution that displaced muscle power with mechanical power each penetrated deeply into culture, religion, learning, and every aspect of the organization of society. They frame the issues with which social science deals.

There are many other large-scale questions on the horizon: in politics, is liberal democracy the only or simply one among many ways to organize the political life of community of people sharing a common territory? Disorder, uncertainty, anxiety, crime, corruption, rule by the strong -- change that comes too fast, too unpredictably, and that leaves large parts of the population without familiar guidelines or anchor points challenge the premises of democracy. A political science that came of age with “liberal
constitutional democracy” as its project will have to expand its theoretical horizons. Scholars of international security know that theories of containment and mutual deterrence that worked for the Cold War have limited relevance in the face of proliferation and non-state terrorism.

To shift from politics to economics, there is the broad challenge of deciphering the likely shape and momentum of, cliché notwithstanding, the global economy. Lurking behind familiar front-page stories as free trade vs. protectionism, how to internalize the now negative externalities of resource exploitation and energy use, the potential destabilization of national economics associated with the international movement of finance capital, is a more complex question. Will those countries that captured the benefits of the industrial revolution reproduce their success in the new global economy, or will those -- China, India, for example -- who fell behind the last time around now force their way in and perhaps even displace the Atlantic hegemony? That is, will the rich stay rich and the poor stay poor, or will a new economic rank-order emerge in the next half-century?

Meanwhile, the world debates the optimum size for human habitation on this planet, a debate framed as the carrying capacity of the natural resource system. The technological optimists hold that the pie can continue to expand, and suggest that agronomy will be the wonder-science of the next quarter-century or so, displacing biology from its favored perch, even as biology had displaced physics which reigned supreme among the sciences in the decades after the Second World War. The pessimists hold that the ecosystem is too fragile to sustain a world population twice and more than what it is today, at least if we assume that an increasing proportion of that population will enjoy the caloric intake now limited to the better off half of the population. Between these two camps is what one scientist (Joel Cohen) has called the “better manners” school and the belief that we can and should improve the terms under which people interact. If we were successful at doing this, there is ample food supply. The “terms under which people interact” does, of course, encode all the big sociological questions -- how to organize production and distribution, how to allocate across generations, how to balance equity and efficiency, how to plan for not only a larger but a differently structured and highly mobile population.

In politics, economics, and society, the central questions can only be posed internationally and interactively. That is, it is not what one country will do or what each country will do independently. It is about human choices, resource allocation and social organization that are responsive to what others are doing. A social science for these questions is, consequently, necessarily international.

The rationale for strong bi-national ties between the U.S. and Germany has less to do with biography and habit and less to do with the study of matters German (by Americans) or matters American (by Germans) than it does with a scientific agenda than requires theories and methods not beholden to the experiences of a single nation-state.

**Professor Dr. Kenneth Prewitt**, Carnegie Professor of Public Affairs, School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, USA.
Comments on the Future of the Atlantic Scholarly Alliance

By George E. Walker

Introduction
I would like to thank the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation for the opportunity to attend this meeting and to discuss with the other attendees ideas for strengthening collaborations between European and American scholars in the Humanities and the Social Sciences. The Atlantic Scholarly Alliance has been and should continue to be important for the scholarly disciplines and for the scholars and the respective nations and cultures they represent. The goals and strategies that major foundations embrace need to evolve to meet new opportunities and challenges and therefore this meeting is especially timely. We have been made aware that, relatively speaking, the number of Humboldt applications from scholars in the Unites States has significantly decreased in recent years compared to the number of applications from Asia - particularly China. Why is this and what, if anything, should be done to alter this trend (particularly focusing on the Humanities and Social Sciences)? I would like to briefly focus on three areas that may be helpful in understanding and addressing the current trend. These areas are:

1. Evolving conditions in the Humanities and Social Sciences.
2. Important issues as revealed by the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate
3. Comments and suggestions for the future that come from informal interviews with senior American International Scholars (some former Humboldt fellowship winners)

Evolving Conditions
Students graduating from American high schools continue to have a significant lack of foreign language training and international travel experience compared to their European counterparts. Moreover, the population of the United States no longer is completely dominated by those of (recent) European descent. Many of the students who choose to go to graduate school and thus are the pipeline for Humboldt fellowships are different from the American scholars who have traveled to Germany in the past. That is, they are not overwhelmingly male, white European or of European descent and have had a European language spoken in their home. Their interests are somewhat more likely to be in a variety of scholarly areas such as women's or gender studies, Afro-American studies, class and economic struggles in the United States, public history, etc. than in more traditional areas of study that might make a lengthy stay in Germany especially attractive. Of course these generalizations have important exceptions. However, there has been a change in the pipeline. Many leading U.S. scholars in the Humanities and Social Sciences who taught highly respected courses on European language, culture and history had either immigrated from Europe or were the children of immigrants from Europe in the middle of the last century. Many of these scholars have either retired or soon will be. There exist tight budgets at universities in the U.S. and there is competition from many other emerging disciplinary areas of interest. If we are not careful, the previous undergraduate vision of an International European-American Scholar may not be as intense or may be blurred by competing
visions involving collaboration in other areas of the world. This has important implications for the Humboldt Foundation.

The academic job market in the Humanities and Social Sciences remains very competitive in the U.S. Thus young scholars may worry that significant time abroad may result in their being out of the loop for junior positions or that being absent, might hurt their chances for tenure. This challenge to lengthy foreign travel is compounded by the fact that now scholars are often part of a two career family with each member having a full time job (with children at home). This means that the stress, logistical challenges, and economic barriers to lengthy international travel and relocation can be significantly greater than for earlier generations.

**Issues form CID Related Experiences**

Background information (the invitation to participate and commissioned essays by leading scholars in Chemistry, Education, English, History, Mathematics, and Neuroscience) on the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID) has been provided to the von Humboldt Foundation. We have also discussed the CID informally at this meeting. I should emphasize that globalization (in the sense of international collaboration involving Europe) has not been a major theme as doctoral granting departments have thought about their discipline’s future and improving their Ph.D. programs. Ken Prewitt has noted this in his comments and I want to underscore his observations. The CID programs and the essayists have focused on such issues as

1. The domain of the discipline.
2. Important traditional components in doctorate programs such as curriculum mentoring, qualifying exams and other high stakes tests, nature of the Thesis, the pedagogy of research and teaching experience.
3. Interdisciplinary opportunities and challenges
4. Professional Development

When issues of globalization are discussed, for example in History, the focus is on areas such as Asia, Africa, and South America and thinking about more general themes as opposed to particular nation states or eras. I would be very interested in your comments regarding the next generation of German scholars with regard to these issues.

**Comments and Suggestions for the Future**

The demographics and areas of interest of American scholars are changing but there will remain important opportunities for scholarly alliances across the Atlantic. The Humboldt Foundation fellowship remains highly prestigious and the recipients have found their fellowship and time in Germany extremely career enhancing, stimulating, and enjoyable. Those I talked to especially wanted me to thank the Foundation on their behalf. The comments of the senior scholars to whom I talked are contained in the observations and suggestions summarized below:

1. International students and faculty visitors allow American students to learn about other cultures and can be an important motivating force for international careers.
2. International work-shops, seminars, summer schools and on-line courses are particularly important for American graduate students and recent Ph.D.’s.
3. There needs to be more effort, especially on the American side to internationally coordinate curriculum credits and credit transfer to encourage a truly international curriculum. This is especially important for graduate time to degree if one anticipates some overseas formal experience prior to the Ph.D. The U.S. needs to be even more sensitive to European progress in making seamless the access to courses and knowledge. The U.S. needs to follow suit by making course descriptions, curriculum, and scheduling complementary to those in Europe so that world wide students can have access to knowledge. (This is an especially difficult challenge given the decentralization of U.S. research universities. However, if a few U.S. universities are seen to benefit from this kind of co-operation, others will be likely to follow.)

4. Aggressive recruitment into international fields by respected senior scholars is very important.

5. It is important that international funding not require too many local reports or publishing in "local" journals that do not have the appropriate international prestige. Careers of young international scholars must not be compromised by their being out of the "respected" publishing loop or missing out on important conferences or scholarly dialogues.

6. International peer review for leading journals needs to be encouraged.

7. Field research requires long term connections. Access to archives and sites is necessary but not sufficient. Long term relationships with local scholars is important to bring a balance of perspective. Relatedly, international funding grants need to be longer. Instead of one or two year grants, perhaps five year grants should be available from the Humboldt Foundation. (See more expanded comments below.)

8. Institutions on both sides of the Atlantic need to keep in mind that there are now centers of knowledge all over the world. Trans Atlantic alliances where American-German scholars collaborate together in other parts of the world may be important to encourage.

9. Investments in open source digital libraries need to be increased.

10. Foundations on both sides of the Atlantic should find more ways to co-operatively encourage and fund the Atlantic Scholarly Alliance.

As alluded in No.7 above, scholars in the Social Sciences and Humanities are often interested in a site or a culture for decades. I am informed this may require lengthy trips at least every five years or so for twenty-five to thirty years. In order for this to occur, scholars need long-term access and funding. As we are all aware, such long term funding is difficult. More mechanisms for facilitating long term collaborations are needed. Perhaps some progress can be made by creating long-term international institutes that are supported by modest endowments. This issue not only affects current international scholars but also their enthusiasm and success in recruiting future scholars into international fields with special opportunities and risks.

Professor Dr. George E. Walker, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Stanford, CA, USA.
Challenges of Internationalization:
Careers in Humanities and Social Sciences

By Konrad H. Jarausch

In contrast to the easy exchanges among the natural sciences, most careers in the humanities and social sciences have proven rather resistant to internationalization. That lag is less a result of ill-will than of their different subject matter in which culture and language play a more important role. If one wants to study the literature, philosophy, history or to a lesser degree the social structure, political system or economy of another country, one has to immerse oneself in local sources which are by and large culturally determined. While comparative approaches are fruitful in the humanities and transnational methodologies, drawn from the Anglo-American discussion, tend to dominate the social sciences, this local dimension of the knowledge puts a premium on the mastery of specific contents and peculiar intellectual styles. As a result, the career patterns in these areas include some promising elements of internationalization, but in general require scholars to remain within one cultural context in order to succeed. During the past decades several German and to a lesser degree also American foundations have done an outstanding job in intensifying academic communication across national borders. But since there are few transnational institutions who would offer positions for crossing frontiers, international careers remain the exception rather than the rule.

My personal case illustrates the considerable problems of transatlantic scholarly development rather than demonstrating its many possibilities. In order to break out of the narrowness of Adenauer Germany, I enrolled in American Studies at the University of Wyoming in Laramie in the early 1960s, completing my BA in three rather than four years. After finishing my MA at the University of Wisconsin, then one of the leading institutions in European history, I could not return to Germany, because the University of Cologne refused to recognize my US degree and would accept only four semesters as transfer credit (the Otto Suhr Institute at the Free University of Berlin was more liberal, but took too long to process my application). I therefore returned to the US, completed my PhD in Madison and accepted a position at the University of Missouri in Columbia, because it was impossible get an Assistentenstelle in Germany from abroad and I did not want to become someone’s academic peon either. Subsequently, I spent much time in the Federal Republic on research leaves, but rejected an offer for a regular professorship (C-4) from the University of Saarbrücken, because that would have stranded my wife, a Romanistin, without possibility of employment in a country where her training was not recognized. Only when the children were grown, was I able to accept the directorship of the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung in Potsdam, spending 8 months of the year in Germany, and reducing the teaching obligations of my endowed chair at the University of North Carolina to 4 months of the year. What proved impossible in the beginning, and difficult in mid-career could therefore be realized only towards the peak of my professional life.

Graduate education in the humanities and social sciences on both sides of the Atlantic has started to include a greater component of internationalization, but career paths remain firmly locked into distinctive national hierarchies. Already promising undergraduates are in the US customarily encouraged to do a “junior year abroad,”
while in the Federal Republic the Erasmus Program sends students in the middling semesters to England or France to learn other languages or cultures. Especially when working on comparative or transnational topics, doctoral students are required to spend a year overseas, working in the archives or libraries of another country, such as in the US for German Amerikanisten or in Germany for specialists in European Studies. Doing research abroad is almost considered mandatory, since it is assumed that students will gather experience in a different academic setting, learn local content otherwise unavailable, and broaden their methodological horizons beyond what is preferred in their home settings. Nonetheless, institutions on both sides of the Atlantic maintain barriers against switching in a more permanent way, because they have all manner of degree requirements that are non-transferable, meaning that one has to stay within one institutional envelope or national system. Moreover, recent PhDs find out quickly that with a foreign degree and without adequate domestic networks, career advancement is virtually impossible. The experience of my own students shows that young foreign scholars tend to get into marginal positions as project researchers in Germany or teachers in small colleges in the US, rather than having the placement success which the intellectual quality of their work would warrant. While visitors in student or faculty exchanges are welcomed with open arms, outside competitors for jobs are generally shunned in order to reserve the few contested positions available for the best prospects coming from the inside.

This career structure is also a product of the ambivalent nature of the rewards for internationalization in the humanities and social sciences. Only in humanities fields such as German Studies in the United States or American Studies in Germany, where knowledge of another culture is essential, will its acquisition materially advance one’s standing. In the social sciences there is a somewhat broader track for “international studies” graduates in international institutions such as the World Bank, the UN and the like, but even here domestic opportunities far outweigh chances abroad. On both sides of the Atlantic there is also a narrow track of administrators of international program that requires transnational experience. But the US tenure criteria of publication (preferred in English), teaching (at a local institution) and service (largely institutional, sometimes national), have no explicit place for international experience. In recent years German hiring at least in the discipline of history has become somewhat more European and in a few cases global in specialization, but even there, the majority of the courses to be taught for the Staatsexamen candidates remains focused on national content. To be true the DAAD program of Gastdozenturen in other countries provides chance for international experience in the early to mid-career stages, which in a few cases has resulted in scholars entering the system of their host country, and some of the academic surplus products are taken up as promising German specialists in the UK or Scandinavia. But there is no comparable US program (the Fulbright Fellowships expect people to return), and Americans have succeeded in Germany only in a few specialties for which there was nobody available with local training (Max Planck Institute für Wissenschaftsforschung). Though it remains exceptional, it is more possible for established scholars of truly international reputation to cross systems, since they are beyond having to prove their excellence to their peers.

International careers in the humanities and social sciences are therefore only available to a small and well prepared minority, which is aware of the considerable risks that they entail. The first prerequisite for success is an adequate knowledge of
foreign languages. Without being truly fluent in English, it is impossible for Germans to launch an international career, and the converse is true of Americans, who will not succeed without German, French, Russian etc. Gaining bilingual fluency demands extended study abroad, internships and the like. A second requirement is working on a comparative or transnational topic with a methodology that is universally recognized, because a broader specialization is more easily transferable than a competence that merely relies on a single local cultural context. If the content of one’s research is already international, then a career that crosses frontiers will be much easier. A third important aspect is the participation in international meetings from the beginning stages on so as to build a network that reaches beyond one’s national borders which can then help with acquiring the appropriate funding. Only if a young scholar is recognized beyond his own context, will he be taken seriously by researchers in another place – this basic rule applies to transnational settings all the more. Needless to say, the acquisition of these prerequisites also makes it easier to qualify for transnational fellowships from leading foundations, participate in international scholarly organizations and to take advantages of the cosmopolitan centers for advanced studies such as the CASBS in Stanford or the Wissenschaftskolleg in Berlin. Though the problems of launching international careers remain considerable, the intellectual rewards of broadening horizons beyond one’s own sphere and fostering cross-cultural understanding are nonetheless high enough to make taking them worth while.

Professor Dr. Konrad H. Jarausch, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung, Potsdam.