

# Austrian Economists, the Rockefeller Foundation, and International Economics

*by Janek Wasserman*  
*University of Alabama*



© 2019 by Janek Wasserman



## Abstract

This paper examines the role that Austrian economists played in international economics discussions in the 1920s and 1930s. With the support of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, Austrian scholars received the opportunity to study abroad, learning the latest social scientific techniques in use, particularly in the United States. They also applied to the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) for funds to support their ongoing research in Central Europe. The most notable innovation was the Institut für Konjunkturforschung (IfK; Institute for Business Cycle Research), which existed as an independent economics institution until the Anschluss in 1938. The IfK became the crown jewel in a string of Central European business cycle institutes. Under the leadership of Friedrich Hayek and especially Oskar Morgenstern, the institute introduced innovative techniques and produced reliable economic data. Additionally, the Austrians wrote books and organized conferences about the Great Depression. Finally, when many Austrians sought refuge from the ever-worsening political situation in Europe, they turned to their contacts at the RF for assistance in finding employment or for financial assistance. For several of the émigré Austrian scholars, the relationship with the RF endured throughout most of their productive careers. Well into the 1960s, the RF continued to sustain projects from the Austrians, some of which outlived their originators.

## **Austrian Economists, the Rockefeller Foundation, and International Economics<sup>1</sup>**

The continued relevance of Austrian economics today owes partially to a central irony: the precariousness of their foothold in the academy of First Republic Austria and post-WWI Central Europe. Viennese economists became adept at establishing connections to scholars and institutions abroad, particularly in the United States. As the “fourth generation” of the Austrian School reached university age – among others, Herbert Furth, Gottfried Haberler, Friedrich Hayek, Fritz Machlup, and Oskar Morgenstern – the Austrian School lived a precarious existence at the University of Vienna. Carl Menger, the founder of the school, had long since retired. Professors Eugen von Böhm-Bawerk and Eugen Philippovich passed away during the Great War, while Friedrich von Wieser retired in 1922. Joseph Schumpeter, a professor in Graz before the war and then finance minister after, permanently left the Austrian academy, becoming a bank director and then a professor in Bonn. The new economics faculty in Vienna consisted of the Marxist economic historian (and future director of the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research) Carl Grünberg, the universalist Othmar Spann, and Wieser’s student, Hans Mayer. The economics faculty was sharply divided on questions of theory and method. Younger Austrians received an eclectic economic education. They tried to accommodate their advisers Spann and Mayer despite the growing enmity between the two senior scholars.

Although a Wieser student, Mayer remained skeptical of the methodological individualism and marginal utility theory associated with Menger, Böhm-Bawerk, and Mises. The Menger tradition, represented by Mises, had a harder time in the academy. Despite his later renown, it is not clear that Mises exerted much influence on Austrian economics students in the early 1920s. This was partly due to his status as an untenured *Privatdozent* (and then professor extraordinarius) and because his Privatseminar was a postgraduate affair. Mayer’s seminar was at

least as popular, attracting Paul Rosenstein-Rodan, Morgenstern and others.<sup>2</sup> Given Spann's great popularity, it is likely that his seminar boasted the largest attendance of the interwar economics seminars. Even as the Mises seminar became more established, its participants realized how few opportunities existed in Austrian academic institutions for scholars from their school.

The appearance of the Rockefeller Foundation (RF) therefore represented a godsend for this generation of Viennese social scientists. The RF interaction also helps explain the shifts in research focus in the Austrian School in the 1930s. After the 1924 establishment of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial fellowships for European social scientists to research in the United States, Viennese economists formed a strong working relationship with historian Alfred Pribram, the RF selector in Austria.<sup>3</sup> Fürth, Haberler, Machlup, Morgenstern, Rosenstein, Gerhard Tintner, and Erich Voegelin received fellowships in the next decade.<sup>4</sup> Fellowships, which typically lasted one or two years, introduced the Austrians to new research trends in the Europe and the United States, particularly the business cycle research conducted at the Cambridge (UK) Economic Service, the Harvard Economic Service, and the National Bureau of Economic Research. While Schumpeter and Mises had deduced the mechanisms of the trade cycle from theoretical precepts, empirical research loomed larger for the younger generation as a result of these transatlantic connections. These confrontations between deductive and inductive approaches, combined with a growing mistrust of statistical data, pressed the younger thinkers beyond the theoretical deductions of the previous generation. Meanwhile extended absences from Vienna accentuated the intellectual discontinuity between the earlier generations of the Austrian School and the fourth. This is not to say that the Hayek generation broke with its predecessors. Nevertheless, a shift was already underway in the mid-1920s—and the transatlantic exchange had a lot to do with it.

Scholars have told the story of “transatlantic enrichment” from a number of angles,<sup>5</sup> though investigation of some key intellectual constellations, centered on

the RF, yield new insights. In addition to the RF fellowships, a dense network of RF-subsidized social scientific research centers sustained Austrian social scientific research. Schumpeter, a professor in Germany after 1925, noted the success of the Austrian selection process, while lamenting the divisions within the German RF committee. Morgenstern also applauded the advancement possibilities afforded by the RF, observing that Austrians outstripped German economists in international reputation through RF participation.<sup>6</sup>

The RF also financed social scientific research institutes across Europe; again, Austrians benefited from this generosity. The London School of Economics (LSE) received substantial grants from the RF to sustain its activities. The RF supported the founding of the Paris-based Institut de Recherches Economiques et Sociales, headed by Charles Rist, and William Rappard's Institut Universitaire de Hautes Etudes Internationales in Geneva. It provided money to the League of Nations, including the Economic and Financial Sections. In Vienna, it financed two fledgling centers: Karl and Charlotte Bühler's Psychologisches Institut and the Institut für Konjunkturforschung.<sup>7</sup> The latter was founded in 1927 by Mises and directed by Hayek until 1930, when he was joined by Oskar Morgenstern. As Hayek described in a grant proposal to the RF:

The first aim of the Institute has been to prepare and issue a regular economic service ....The Institute has however planned, in accordance with its original aims, to undertake several special investigations into problems connected with business cycles of a more general character.<sup>8</sup>

In endorsing the project, Alfred Pribram drew an explicit connection between Mises' research trip to the United States and the formation of the center, while Charles Bullock, head of the Harvard Economic Service, recommended the institute. The unification of theoretical work with empirical bulletins was made explicit in the grant document itself. The RF responded positively, providing a five-year grant totaling \$20,000 beginning in 1931. This was \$1,000 per annum *more*

than Hayek requested, with the extra funds earmarked for the Directors Morgenstern and Hayek, since “these two men are among the ablest of the younger economists in the German speaking countries, and there is some danger that they will be drawn away from Vienna unless conditions can be made for [sic] attractive for them.”<sup>9</sup> The RF was right to fear a brain drain, for Hayek left Vienna for London in 1931 and gave up his directorship in 1932. Likewise, Morgenstern had regular employment requests, declining positions at Berkeley and Kiel.<sup>10</sup> The RF renewed its support in 1936 for two years at \$6,000 per annum and again for three years in 1938, though it would cancel payment after the Anschluss.

Oskar Morgenstern played the decisive role in the growth of the institute after 1930, as well as its transition toward mathematical economics and statistics.<sup>11</sup> He invited an impressive array of scholars to contribute to its activities, including Gottfried Haberler, Abraham Wald, Gerhard Tintner, and Karl Menger. He attracted commissions from the League of Nations, the International Chamber of Commerce, and the Bank for International Settlements. The institute published works by Friedrich Hayek, Fritz Machlup, and Ragnar Nurske. He also received monies for larger comparative studies of economic conditions in the Habsburg successor states and programs in mathematical economics.<sup>12</sup> The little Viennese center, which never had a staff of more than eleven,<sup>13</sup> became the envy of other European institutes, even eliciting complaints from fellow directors about Morgenstern’s ambition, political involvement and policy advice.<sup>14</sup> Nonetheless, the RF maintained “a warm place in [its] heart for the little group down in Vienna which...is justified by their performance.”<sup>15</sup> This positive assessment served as the basis for the assistance that the Viennese received when they decided to quit Austria.

Oskar Morgenstern’s departure from Europe is both singular yet exemplary. He found himself in the United States as a Carnegie Visiting Professor when the Anschluss occurred in March 1938. Deciding not to return to Europe, he wrote to colleagues from his fellowship days, in search of a job. Put in touch with Abraham

Flexner, he accepted a position at Princeton University. The RF paid half his salary for several years. Morgenstern's departure from Europe was later than many of his colleagues, yet it reflected the experience of Austrian intellectuals well. Interwar Austrian intellectual migration was peculiar in that political and racial persecution played a minor role initially. Moreover, Austrian social scientists had more success finding employment than many other émigrés. Part of this owes to the transnational networks the Austrians had established.

A look at the biographies of several Austrian economists confirms this impression. Joseph Schumpeter taught at Bonn from 1925 until 1932, when he left for Harvard. As Christian Fleck observes, Schumpeter “was an émigré but no refugee.”<sup>16</sup> From Cambridge, he played an important role in assisting German intellectuals escape National Socialism. He regularly enlisted the help of the RF in efforts to obtain fellowships for “displaced scholars.”<sup>17</sup> Paul Rosenstein left for London in 1930, receiving a subvention from the RF at University College. He also taught at LSE for seventeen years. Friedrich Hayek departed Vienna in 1931 for LSE. Gottfried Haberler and Ludwig Mises headed to Geneva in 1934—the former took a position with the League of Nations Economic Section where he worked with Arthur Loveday, an adviser to the RF, and the latter joined William Rappard's Institut Universitaire.<sup>18</sup> Fritz Machlup spent a semester as a Rockefeller fellow at Harvard in 1935 before receiving an appointment at the University of Buffalo, which was subsidized by the RF. While many Austrian economists—e.g. Herbert Furth, Alexander Gerschenkron, Martha Steffy Brown, Walter Fröhlich, and Erich Schiff—were still in Austria as late as 1938, those associated with the Austrian School were more successful emigrating than almost any other Viennese intellectual cohort, often thanks to the RF.<sup>19</sup>

Institutional support continued to shape the trajectories of the Austrians into the 1940s, keeping their work in conversation with one another. For example, many of their earliest works published in emigration centered on international economics. The RF sponsored these endeavors, encouraging scholars of business cycle theory

to develop new comparative studies between national economies and to analyze the world economy. In a 1935 report, Tracy Kittredge of the RF hoped to “redefine its [RF] project programs in terms of practical human problems of immediate importance.”<sup>20</sup> He listed six areas for specific concentration: business cycle research; study of international exchanges and international trade; problems of national income and its internal distribution; labor legislation; monetary banking and credit phenomena; impacts of non-economic forces on trade. He envisioned this larger project as primarily empirical, since “economic policy still lacks for the most part any definitely scientific basis.” In language informed by discussions with Austrian economists, Kittredge elaborated:

There is substantial agreement that the most urgent task before the economists of the world today is to complete the analysis of contemporary economic phenomena with a view to making available for future practical programs definite knowledge of the results of previous governmental attempts to modify and control economic processes. The gap between economic theory and economic life is still very wide. Regardless of theoretical considerations, the populations of the world are insisting on governmental action. Governments are forced to undertake vast programs without adequate preparation or sufficient knowledge of the processes involved, or of the possible and unpredictable repercussions of their actions.<sup>21</sup>

The discussion of government planning and interventions, the emphasis on market processes and the role of knowledge in the economy reflect Kittredge’s familiarity with Hayek and Mises’ work. His attention to the insufficiency of economic knowledge demonstrates a familiarity with Morgenstern’s pessimistic account of economic forecasting. Fittingly, Kittredge recommended Haberler, Mises, and Morgenstern for a potential conference.<sup>22</sup>

The summer of 1936 in Europe proved an auspicious moment for this type of meeting, for economists had already planned two major conventions. Austrians—and the RF—were at the center of these endeavors. The League of Nations Financial



and Economic Section, with funding from the RF, planned a conference to discuss international trade and business cycles, with Haberler's *Prosperity and Depression* serving as a starting point.<sup>23</sup> Haberler was probably the best regarded member of the younger Austrian School. *International Trade*, published in 1933, established his reputation. It attracted the attention of Arthur Loveday of the League of Nations. The League then commissioned Haberler to write a work "coordinat[ing] the analytical work then being done on the problem of the recurrence of periods of depression." The final product, *Prosperity and Depression*, was immediately hailed as a seminal contribution. No less an authority than Joseph Schumpeter regarded Haberler's work as a "masterly presentation of the modern material." *Prosperity and Depression* became the model for all subsequent League publications on economic conditions. His approach became known as the "Haberler method," and the RF wanted to encourage the dissemination of his ideas.<sup>24</sup>

Meanwhile, the European business cycle institutes, also funded by the RF, scheduled their biennial meeting in Vienna, with Morgenstern serving as host. After consulting with Oskar Morgenstern and Arthur Loveday of the League, the RF scheduled their economic methods conference between the other two in the French town of Annecy just outside of Geneva. The list of invitees represented a who's who of international economists, with the Austrians occupying a central position. In addition to the participation of Haberler, Morgenstern, and Mises, Schumpeter was invited but had to decline (in order to complete his own book on business cycles.)<sup>25</sup> Oskar Anderson, the head of the Sofia institute and a regular attendee at Vienna seminars, wrote the initial draft statement, with Haberler, Morgenstern, Lionel Robbins, and Wilhelm Röpke providing commentary.

For the Austrians, the Annecy conference raised important questions about economics to which they had long devoted themselves. It also suggested future directions. In the agenda for the conference, the organizers posed three overarching themes: 1) Is there such a thing as a "world economy"? If so, what

forces act on it? 2) How can these forces be measured and analyzed? 3) What deficiencies exist in the research on economic change and how can they be remedied? The discussion focused on the relative importance of research at the national and international levels and on the reliability of currently available economic data. The Austrians contributed on all three questions. Morgenstern embraced the use of new statistical reporting, yet he stressed theory: “purely scientific research work” was “of basic importance.”<sup>26</sup> Given the diversity of statistical sources and the variability across national borders, Morgenstern advocated for better data collection at the national level, more international coordination, and a continued skepticism regarding available empirical information. Haberler concurred, noting the gaps in historical economic data. Mises highlighted the unreliability of information coming from non-industrial nations and the danger of focusing too much on the rapid changes associated with industrial development rather than the “glacier-like” changes of agricultural society that lie beneath. Most significantly, Morgenstern and Mises made common cause in their criticism of Ohlin and Lipinski, who believed that the members of these institutes had a proper role to play in policy decisions. Instead, Morgenstern argued, the institutes had to investigate the impacts of government policy. Mises reiterated these points, maintaining that it was too easy for governmental committees to “capture” economic experts by rigging the composition of those commissions. Therefore, experts should remain outside the policy realm, criticizing government interventions. Mises argued that it was necessary for economic experts to coordinate their actions internationally to make sure that the best ideas and latest research achieved the broadest circulation.<sup>27</sup>

The Annecy Conference gave new impetus to trade cycle theory and served as a springboard for work on international economics. With the RF one of the few institutions still funding research in years of the Great Depression and immediately after WWII, scholars with RF connections had greater opportunity to conduct new investigations. The Austrians were major beneficiaries.

Even though the Austrian economists became citizens in their adoptive homes, there was no question of their continued commitment to Austria, its economic traditions, and the revitalization of the social sciences. As early as 1946 they returned to Vienna, hoping to restore the city to intellectual greatness. As Hayek wrote to the RF, “There is clearly an opportunity to preserve Vienna as an intellectual centre, and the Austrians themselves are trying hard to get the help of those people who during the inter-war period have left Austria.... I am naturally most interested in seeing the tradition in Economics preserved.” Hayek proposed “to get some of the Austrian economists who are now located in the United States or in England to go to Vienna for a short concentrated course.”<sup>28</sup> He mentioned the names of Haberler, Machlup, Morgenstern, and possibly Mises, Schumpeter, Voegelin and Tintner. Haberler and Morgenstern joined Hayek for a seminar in 1948 (Machlup and Voegelin had to withdraw). That these three men spearheaded the effort to restore Austrian economics is striking, since they are often presented as the most divergent among the fourth generation. The reports they filed described the humble yet promising conditions of the social sciences in Vienna. What comes through in the reports, especially Hayek’s, is that Austrian economics represented a broad tradition that was alive and well—just not in Austria. Hayek expressed disappointment with the absence of Mises and Schumpeter, since they would have broadened the survey of economics provided to Austrian students. After castigating the deplorable state of economics at Austrian universities, all three economists applauded the RF-supported Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (WiFo), the successor to Hayek and Morgenstern’s IfK, for reviving economic research. They also singled out the Österreichische College and its Alpbach seminar for stimulating intellectual and social scientific debate in Europe. Hayek, Machlup, Haberler, and Karl Popper were regular participants over the years. They pressed the RF (and later the Ford Foundation) to support these fledgling endeavors and to renew their commitment to the social sciences in Central Europe. They all stressed the need for a fifteen- or twenty-year plan for restoring Austrian prominence. As Hayek opined, it would only take the return of one or two accomplished scholars as endowed professors “completely to alter the

atmosphere.”<sup>29</sup> This intervention by the “former Austrians”<sup>30</sup> resulted in RF grants to the Österreichisches College and WiFo into the 1950s, even though Austrian School economics never did recapture a foothold in the Austrian academy.

The Austrian émigrés struggled to elevate the stature of the social sciences in postwar Austria. They enlisted support for new research centers from their earlier US benefactors. Hayek, Morgenstern, and Paul Lazarsfeld established an Institute for Advanced Studies (Institut für Höhere Studien, IHS) in Vienna in the 1950s and early 1960s.<sup>31</sup> Between 1955 and 1960 Hayek devised a program for an “Institute for Advanced Human Sciences at Vienna” that he proposed to Henry Ford II, then to the Ford Foundation (FF), and finally to the Austrian government. Conceived as a private, autonomous institution like the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, it would concentrate on political and moral thought and the social sciences and humanities. Hayek foresaw a grand undertaking: a center with twenty senior fellows with permanent positions; forty junior fellows (5-7 year appointments); a guaranteed yearly budget of about \$1 million (\$8.6 million in 2018 dollars). He also sought either an endowment of \$25 million (\$215 million) or a \$15 million (\$129 million) commitment over twenty years. He provided a list of “ex-Austrian” scholars who might be lured back. In economics, he identified Haberler, Machlup and Morgenstern. In making his case he marveled at the caliber of scholars that tiny Austria had produced through the years and expressed optimism that the best of the émigré generation could be enticed back. For him, the Austrian tradition was something *sui generis*:

Although the first aim would be to bring back so far as possible the men who can revive and continue the interrupted tradition, the efforts should not be confined to this. Much as Vienna has always owed to native talent, the fact that it has been the center of a multinational empire has contributed not a little to its eminence. And there are probably few other intellectual communities in Europe of which a foreigner can become as rapidly a full member...<sup>32</sup>

Historically, Vienna had been a melting pot of diverse individuals and competing ideas, and it could again. He met with representatives of the FF, the Austrian Education Minister and Secretary of State, the head of the Austrian National Bank and others to get the project off the ground.<sup>33</sup>

Ultimately, a less expensive proposal from Paul Lazarsfeld won favor. Central to the negotiations was Morgenstern, a favorite of the FF and the ruling conservative party in Austria, the ÖVP. Hayek was left out in the cold. Hayek served as an inaugural fellow in 1962-3, but he only played a minor role thereafter. The IHS became the site of administrative dysfunction and political infighting, which soured him on it. Morgenstern, not Hayek, became the driving force behind the IHS: he co-founded the Institute with Lazarsfeld and became director in 1965. The IHS became one of the leading European centers of social scientific research. A large number of émigrés made their way back to Vienna to teach summer courses and serve as visiting professors. Morgenstern, Hayek, Haberler, and Tintner accepted fellowships or professorships. Even with this success, only Tintner permanently returned, suggesting that there was no real going back for the others. The Institute nevertheless succeeded in attracting Nobel Prize winners and other renowned scholars to Austria.<sup>34</sup>

Alongside Morgenstern, it was Machlup who made most use of his ties to foundations. After his arrival in the United States, Fritz Machlup's work moved in a number of different directions, yet several avenues continued from Austrian traditions, particularly his interest in economic methodology and international economics. While his work dealt more with international finance than Haberler's, their output bore a family resemblance. Machlup extended his insights on international trade into the areas of patent protections, monetary theory, and knowledge theory, with the RF playing a fundamental role in this work. The RF supported his patent research of the 1950s and 1960s, which produced the counterintuitive yet decidedly Austrian conclusions that patents were detrimental for economic innovation and growth. In the 1960s Machlup also helped found a

comparative economics project, the Wiener Institut für international Wirtschaftsvergleiche (WIIW), which was affiliated with the IHS and WiFo and drew on the international economics work he had helped pioneer in the 1930s. It, too, was aided by the Ford Foundation.

Machlup also founded and organized the most significant conference on international monetary theory, the Group, which met between 1964 and 1975. It could not have succeeded without RF assistance. Writing to Haberler and the economists Willy Fellner and Robert Triffin in 1982, Machlup reminisced about their decades-long collaboration: “The four of us were once called ‘the Quartet’... I can assure you I miss the presence of you [at the Group of Thirty, or G-30].”<sup>35</sup> The G-30, a powerful consulting group formed in 1978 to address problems in the global economy, evolved out of a series of conferences on the international monetary system that “the Quartet” had orchestrated in the early 1960s. Over twenty-seven meetings, Machlup and his colleagues reshaped the Bretton Woods landscape, providing the intellectual foundation for the shift from the postwar gold exchange standard to floating exchange rates and financial liberalization. Designed to establish connections between officials from national banks, international financial institutions, and academics, the association received its unofficial name from the Villa Serbelloni, the RF-owned estate in Italy where the meetings took place. In the early years, RF funds also made it possible for 32 scholars to gather together to conduct their initial explorations in international monetary policy.<sup>36</sup>

As this research has detailed, the intervention of the RF in Central European affairs and the careers of young Austrian School economists was a decisive factor in the School’s continued existence and its enduring success. The younger Austrians’ international reputation owed much to this serendipitous liaison, and their successful transatlantic emigration was facilitated by this intervention. Moreover, the development of international trade and monetary theory, not to mention business cycle theory, would not have been the same without this productive collaboration between Central European scholars and US philanthropic

organizations. This legacy endures today as organizations like the IHS, WiFo, WIIW, and G-30 still exist today, suggesting that the process of transatlantic enrichment is still alive and well.

---

<sup>1</sup> The author would like to thank the Rockefeller Archive Center for a grant-in-aid to conduct research in their files in the summer of 2015. For extended treatment of the subjects covered in this report, see: Janek Wasserman, "Beyond Hayek and Mises: Austrian Economics in America at Midcentury," in *Quiet Invaders Revisited*, ed. Günter Bischof (Innsbruck, Austria: Studien-Verlag, 2017): 163-81; Wasserman, "'Un-Austrian' Austrians? Haberler, Machlup, and Morgenstern, and the Post-Emigration Elaboration of Austrian Economics," *Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology* 34A (2016): 93-124; Wasserman, *The Marginal Revolutionaries: How Austrian Economists Fought the War of Ideas* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019), especially Chapters 4 and 6.

<sup>2</sup> Robert Leonard, *Von Neumann, Morgenstern, and the Creation of Game Theory* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 83-7.

<sup>3</sup> Christian Fleck, *A Transatlantic History of the Social Sciences* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2011), 58. See also Earlene Craver, "Patronage and the Directions of Research in Economics," *Minerva* 24 (1986): 205-22.

<sup>4</sup> Fellowship recorder cards, Rockefeller Foundation Archives (hereafter RF), RG 10.2, FA 426, Drawer 1, Rockefeller Archive Center (hereafter RAC).

<sup>5</sup> Christian Fleck, *Transatlantische Bereicherungen* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2007), 37-42, 65-180; Johannes Feichtinger, *Wissenschaft zwischen den Kulturen* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 2001), 199-213; Leonard, *Von Neumann*, 93-5, 146-50, 169-81.

<sup>6</sup> Fleck, *Transatlantische Bereicherungen*, 63.

<sup>7</sup> On the Psychologisches Institut, see Gerhard Benetka, *Psychologie in Wien* (Vienna: WUV-Universitätsverlag, 1995). On the Institut, see Austrian Institute for Trade Cycle Research, RF, RG 1.1, Series 705S, Box 4, Folders 36-39, Rockefeller Archive Center (RAC).

<sup>8</sup> Quoted in John Van Sickle to Edmund Day, 13 October 1930, RF, RG 1.1, Series 705S, Box 4, Folder 36, RAC.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Oskar Morgenstern to Tracy Kittredge, 2 November 1932, RF, RG 1.1, Series 705S, Box 4, Folder 36, RAC.

<sup>11</sup> Hansjörg Klausinger, "From Mises to Morgenstern: Austrian Economics During the Ständestaat," *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics* 9, no. 3 (2006): 25-43.

<sup>12</sup> Oskar Morgenstern, "Report on the Activities of the Austrian Institute for Trade Cycle Research 1931-1935," 13 February 1935, RF, RG 1.1, Series 705S, Box 4, Folder 37, RAC.

<sup>13</sup> Leonard, *Von Neumann*, 180-1.

<sup>14</sup> Program Files, Business Cycle Conference, RF, RG 3, Series 910. Box 4, Folder 29, RAC.

<sup>15</sup> John Van Sickle to Edmund Day, 1 May 1933, RF, RG 1.1, Series 705S, Box 4, Folder 36, RAC.

<sup>16</sup> Christian Fleck, *Etablierung in der Fremde* (Frankfurt: Campus, 2015), 376.

<sup>17</sup> Thomas McCraw, *Prophet of Innovation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), 229-32. See also Fleck, *Etablierung*, 375-400.

<sup>18</sup> Tracy Kittredge, "Project Program in the General Field of Economic Stability and Security," RF, RG 3, Series 910. Box 4, Folder 29, RAC.

- 
- <sup>19</sup> “Tentative and Very Incomplete List of Displaced Austrian Scholars and Scientists,” May 1938, RF, RG 2, Series 705, Box 184, Folder 1320, RAC.
- <sup>20</sup> Kittredge, “Project Program.”
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>23</sup> John Van Sickle to Arthur Loveday, 30 October 1935, RF, RG 3, Series 910, Box 4, Folder 29, RAC.
- <sup>24</sup> L.H. Officer, “Prosperity and Depression—And Beyond,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 97, no. 1 (1982): 149-59.
- <sup>25</sup> Joseph Schumpeter to John Van Sickle, 11 April 1936, RF, RG 3, Series 910, Box 4, Folder 29, RAC.
- <sup>26</sup> “Record of the Discussions at the Conference called by the Rockefeller Foundation to consider the Desirability and Feasibility of Encouraging Coordination of Economic Research upon Problems of Economic Change,” RF, RG 3, Series 910, Box 4, Folder 31, RAC.
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>28</sup> Friedrich Hayek to J.H. Willits, 31 October 1946, RF, RG 1.1, Series 700, Box 2, Folder 15, RAC.
- <sup>29</sup> Friedrich Hayek, “Report on Visits to Austrian and Switzerland,” RF, RG 1.1, Series 700, Box 2, Folder 15, RAC.
- <sup>30</sup> This was Willits’s appellation. Hayek alternated between “Austrians” and “ex-Austrians” in his correspondence.
- <sup>31</sup> On the IHS, see Christian Fleck, “Wie Neues nicht entsteht,” *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 11 (2000): 129-77.
- <sup>32</sup> “Memorandum on Condition and Needs of the University of Vienna,” Friedrich Hayek Papers, Box 62, Hoover Institution Archives.
- <sup>33</sup> “Proposal for the Creation of an Institute of Advanced Human Studies at Vienna, Austria,” FHP, Box 62.
- <sup>34</sup> Fleck, “Wie Neues.”
- <sup>35</sup> Machlup to Haberler, 16 July 1982, Fritz Machlup Papers, Box 42, Hoover Institution Archives, copyright Stanford University.
- <sup>36</sup> International Monetary System files, RF, RG 1.2, Series 200S, Box 547, Folders 4680-1, RAC. See Matthias Schmelzer, *Freiheit für die Wechselkurse und Kapital* (Marburg: Metropolis, 2010) on monetary policy. On the Bellagio Group, see Carol Connell, *Reforming the World Monetary System* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2012).