

Exile and Acculturation: Refugee Historians since the Second World War

BENEFICIAL ACCULTURATION KNOWS two forms, intended and unintended. Within the domain of historical writing, both exist. A famous example of intended historiographical contact was the arrival of the German historian Ludwig Riess (1861-1928), a student of Leopold von Ranke, in Japan. On the recommendation of the director of the bureau of historiography, Shigeno Yasutsugu, Riess began to lecture at the Imperial University (renamed Tokyo Imperial University in 1897) in 1887. He spoke about the Rankean method with its emphasis on facts and critical, document- and evidence-based history. At his suggestion, Shigeno founded the Historical Society of Japan and the *Journal of Historical Scholarship*. Riess influenced an entire generation of Japanese historians, including Shigeno himself and Kume Kunitake, then well known for their demystification of entire areas of Japanese history.¹ However, this famous case of planned acculturation has less well-known aspects. First, Riess, who was a Jew and originally a specialist in English history, went to Japan, among other reasons, possibly on account of the anti-Semitism and Anglophobia characteristic of large parts of the German academy at the time. Only in 1902 did he return from Japan to become an associate professor at the University of Berlin.² Second, Riess and other German historians (such as Ernst Bernheim, whose *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode und der Geschichtsphilosophie*, published in 1889, was popular in Japan) were influential only because Japanese historical methodology focused before their arrival on the explication of documents.³ Riess's legacy had unexpected

I am very grateful to Georg Iggers, Shula Marks, Natalie Nicora, Claire Boonzaaijer, and Anna Udo for their helpful criticism.

¹ *Kodansha Encyclopedia of Japan* (Tokyo, 1983), vi. 312; *Global Encyclopedia of Historical Writing*, ed. D. Woolf (New York, 1998), pp. 484, 521, 523, 832; *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing*, ed. K. Boyd (London, 1999), pp. 1089-90.

² C. Hoffmann, 'The Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants to British Historiography', *Second Chance: Two Centuries of German-Speaking Jews in the United Kingdom*, ed. W. Mosse (Tübingen, 1991), p. 159.

³ Masayuki Sato, 'Kognitive Geschichtsschreibung – normative Geschichtsschreibung', *Westliches*

sides: not only had he another career in mind, but also, once in Japan, his ideas fell on fertile ground.

Historiographical acculturation stemming from exile belongs to the second form of acculturation, the unintended. Its benefits are unpredictable by-products of a disadvantageous situation. The imprisonment and exile of the Belgian historian Henri Pirenne (1862-1935) during the First World War may serve as an example. In 1916, Pirenne and his colleague Paul Frédéricq were arrested and deported to Germany for having protested against the reopening of the University of Ghent as a Flemish university by the Germans. While living in German internment camps, Pirenne lectured on history several days a week to a camp audience of more than two hundred. Even the German soldiers who were supposed to monitor what he said became so interested that they joined the prisoners in asking questions after the lectures.¹ Later, isolated in the village of Creuzburg, Pirenne wrote a famous history of medieval Europe.² His biographer, Bruce Lyon, notes:

He [Pirenne] soon realized that his limited supply of books from Jena was actually a blessing. Deprived of his own superb collection of books and without easy access to others, he was forced to reassess his thought, to ponder longer questions and problems, and to compare and generalize more than was his usual tendency. What he wrote was consequently a distillation and synthesis of his vast erudition; it was a challenge that stimulated him and led him to speculate more about history, its methods, and its purpose.³

This story, too, invites comment. Strictly speaking, Pirenne's forced stay in Germany was not an exile but an internment with some of the characteristics of exile. In addition, the case is not a prototype of acculturation, because Pirenne worked in relative isolation in Creuzburg (despite contacts with the villagers, he felt lonely). Finally, his great work was published posthumously, almost twenty years after his return home when he had ample occasion, with his superb library nearby, to revise it. Nevertheless, Pirenne's experience shows how a disadvantage experienced in an alien context can be transformed into something like a 'blessing in disguise'.⁴

Geschichtsdenken, ed. J. Rüsen (Göttingen, 1999), pp. 205, 211, 222; English trans. in *Western Historical Thinking: An Intercultural Debate*, ed. J. Rüsen (New York, 2002).

¹ B. Lyon, *Henri Pirenne: A Biographical and Intellectual Study* (Ghent, 1974), pp. 247-8, 258-62.

² Published as H. Pirenne, *Histoire de l'Europe des invasions au XVIe siècle* (Paris, 1936).

³ Lyon, *Pirenne*, p. 260.

⁴ The genesis of Marc Bloch's last book, *Apologie pour l'histoire*, written in internal exile (1940-1) without his library and published posthumously, is comparable to Pirenne's experience. Bloch himself was aware of this analogy; see L. Fèbvre, 'Comment se présentaient les manuscrits de "Métier d'histor-

Many wonder whether exile, notwithstanding the possible benefits, can be seen as a blessing in disguise without mocking its tragic nature. The Greek moral essayist Plutarch, and others after him, argue that it can.¹ Founders of Western historiography such as Thucydides and Xenophon wrote their master works in exile. The same goes for later historians such as Polybius, Josephus, Niccolò Machiavelli, and Francesco Guicciardini.² Undeniably, exile can have beneficial effects on historiography: exiled historians often find themselves working in relative peace, unfettered by dictatorial censorship and in a country that respects scholarly freedom. Another, perhaps more probable, advantage is the change in perception and refreshment of perspective accompanying exile. The exiled Polish philosopher and historian of philosophy Leszek Kołakowski maintains that the position of outsider, with its uncertain status and identity, confers a cognitive privilege: creativity arises from insecurity.³ When, for example, the French historian Charles-Olivier Carbonell posed the question why Western historiography emerged with Herodotus and Thucydides, he attached great importance to their exile and ensuing peregrinations: experiences that enabled them to transcend the particularism of the *polis*.⁴ They made the horizon vaster.

There is, of course, another side to the question. Many master works of history were not written by exiles. Nor do all exiles write compellingly. Often, their work is polemical and rancorous and much of it could have been written at home. Still, the historian Christhard Hoffmann is right to assert that 'Plutarch's thesis may have a kernel of truth; the experience of persecution and exile usually causes a break in the refugee's biography. This, and their encounter with foreign countries and cultures, may set free productive forces like new perspectives, unusual methods, and the ability to compare, all of which positively influence history-writing. In this sense, exile and emigration may function as catalysts for innovative historiography.'⁵ Plutarch's thesis underpins the reflections that follow on the contributions of refugee historians to twentieth-century historiography. First, however, one must examine the dimensions of the refugees' plight.

* * * * *

ien''', M. Bloch, *Apologie pour l'histoire ou métier d'historien* (originally 1949; Paris, 1967), p. 105.

1 Plutarch's text, almost a eulogy of exile, was written to comfort an exiled friend from Sardis: 'On Exile (De Exilio)' [originally after AD 96], *Plutarch's Moralia in Sixteen Volumes*, trans. P. de Lacy and B. Einarson (London, 1959, repr. 1968), vii. 511-71 (523C-612B).

2 Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', pp. 153-5.

3 L. Kołakowski, 'In Praise of Exile', *Times Literary Supplement*, 11 Oct. 1985, p. 1133.

4 C.-O. Carbonell, *L'Historiographie* (originally 1981; Paris, 1991), pp. 12-13.

5 Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', p. 154. This was Arnold Toynbee's opinion, too; see N. Bentwich, *The Rescue and Achievement of Refugee Scholars: The Story of Displaced Scholars and Scientists, 1933-52* (The Hague, 1953), p. 94.

What is a ‘historian’ and what is a ‘refugee historian’? Defining the historian is difficult for the following reasons. First, the title ‘historian’ is not protected: anyone writing a historical work can claim it. Second, the further one moves away from the present, and from countries with developed historiographical traditions, the less obvious is the classical definition of the historian as the professional who methodically studies the past. Third, when persecuting authorities strike at history, they do not necessarily distinguish between the professional historian and anyone else who writes about the past: they deal with a perceived threat irrespective of the qualifications of those behind it and pay attention to all potentially dangerous interpretations of the past. Fourth, and most pertinent here, exile turns the career patterns of many refugees upside down. Some scholars, who had trained in other disciplines, had to give up their professions in the countries of asylum and, consequently, turned to history-writing only during exile. To exclude this group would be to miss a significant body of the exiles’ output.¹ Therefore, a flexible definition of the historian includes, on the one hand, all professionals and trainees in the historical sector broadly defined (not only historians *appellation contrôlée*, archivists, archaeologists, but also students of history), and, on the other, anyone whose education and/or occupation includes an important historical component.

The definition of ‘refugee historian’ should be adapted from the official United Nations definition of a refugee: ‘[A historian who] owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country.’² Technically, whereas exiled historians are unable to return because they have been expelled, banished, or deported following official decrees, refugee historians are unwilling to return because they left more or less voluntarily or escaped ahead of the decrees or without any measures decreed at all. Although, in

¹ G. Iggers, ‘Die deutschen Historiker in der Emigration’, *Geschichtswissenschaft in Deutschland: traditionelle Positionen und gegenwärtige Aufgaben*, ed. B. Faulenbach (Munich, 1974), p. 98; J. Malagón, ‘Los historiadores y la historia’, *El exilio español de 1939* (Madrid, 1978), v. 247; F. Fellner, ‘The Special Case of Austrian Refugee Historians’, *An Interrupted Past: German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States*, ed. H. Lehmann and J. Sheehan (Cambridge, 1991), p. 113; C. Epstein, *A Past Renewed: A Catalog of German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933* (Cambridge, 1993), p. 16.

² United Nations (UN), *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees* (1951), article 1(A)(2). The convention includes arrangements made since 1926. See also UN, *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948), articles 9, 13-15; *Geneva Convention IV* (1949), articles 44, 70, and its *Additional Protocol I* (1977), article 73; UN, *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* (1998). For other definitions, see, e.g., G. Ionescu, ‘Introduction à un essai sur l’influence des exilés politiques au XXIème siècle’, *Liber amicorum Salvador de Madariaga* (Bruges, 1966), pp. 339-44, and *Literary Exile in the Twentieth Century: An Analysis and Biographical Dictionary*, ed. M. Tucker (Westport, 1991), pp. vii-xxiv.

principle, the distinction applies to many cases, it is too difficult to apply consistently, often owing to lack of data (and to the *trompe-l'oeil* effect discussed below). However flexible, the definition still excludes the following categories.

First, *Metaphorical exile*. Scores of historians who were ruthlessly discriminated against and isolated under dictatorial repression went into *innere Emigration* (withdrawing into silence in fear or protest).¹ A metaphorical variant – related to Plutarch's thesis – views exile as a form of intellectual nomadism, diaspora culture, and cosmopolitanism. However tempting and fashionable it may be to portray exile in this way, it idealizes the outsider and impoverishes the refugee experience.²

Second, *Internal displacement, internal exile*. Life as an internally displaced or as an internal exile under a repressive regime represents a particular form of cruelty, combining the worst of two worlds. Internally displaced historians sometimes helped to set up refugee campuses in remote areas of their home countries, as several Chinese historians did during the Sino-Japanese war³ and French historians during the Second World War. Internal exile usually takes the form of confinement to a village in a remote area, in which the exile is supervised or spied upon.⁴ In a country like the Soviet Union, internal exile to Siberia was commonplace, and heavily influenced the regime's use of external exile.

Third, *Exile planned, not realized*. Numerous historians wishing to flee were either blocked,⁵ tried too late, or gave up after failing to obtain a visa. The German historian Hedwig Hintze, who committed suicide in 1942 for this reason, and the French historian Marc Bloch, who eventually joined the army and was executed in 1944 by the Gestapo, fall into this category.⁶

Fourth, *Voluntary emigration*. Many historians emigrated voluntarily for economic or political reasons.⁷ However, the line between émigrés and refugees can be thin. For example, the prospect of a life spent in poverty and without career prospects at home may force young historians to seize opportunities abroad. Other, politically sensitive historians may feel so

1 W. Schulze, 'Refugee Historians and the German Historical Profession between 1950 and 1970', *Interrupted Past*, ed. Lehmann and Sheehan, p. 221. Schulze mentions Ludwig Dehio as an example.

2 A third use, not incorporated here, is inspired by religion: human life on earth itself can be considered an exile from heaven. See Plutarch, *Plutarch's Moralia in Sixteen Volumes*, vii. 568-71 (no. 607).

3 E.g., Dong Zuobin, Qian Mu, Chen Yinke, Zhang Qiyun, Lei Haizong.

4 Kofakowski, 'In Praise', p. 1133. A systematic practice in such countries as the Soviet Union or Franco's Spain, internal exile was also known in Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, Iran, Laos, Maldives, Mauritania, Portugal, Turkey, and Vietnam.

5 Malagón, 'Los historiadores', p. 326.

6 C.-D. Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research* (originally German 1987; Amherst, 1993), pp. 89-90.

7 E.g., Benzion Netanyahu (Palestine), Halil Inalcık (Turkey).

alienated from their government that they prefer to leave.¹ In addition, a *trompe-l'oeil* effect may be at work: many refugees initially left their countries disguised as tourists or émigrés to avoid arousing suspicion or to gain time for deciding whether to leave permanently. They became refugees when, once time had run out, they were still unwilling to return.

Fifth, *Expulsion of non-nationals*. Foreign historians residing in a country and expelled after less than a decade are excluded.² Those who live for more than a decade in a country are assumed to have developed the same ties with their host countries as nationals, and are included.

Sixth, *Expulsion from colonies*. Nationals living in a colony, caught up in a movement towards independence and deported, expelled, or repatriated to the mother country, are excluded, however painful their experiences.³

Seventh, *Political imprisonment abroad*. Historians who, as prisoners of war, were held in enemy camps in foreign countries (and sometimes died there) had lost their liberty and therefore belong to a distinct (and more severe) category of persecution.

Eighth, *Criminal escapees*. The United Nations Refugee Convention does 'not apply to any person with respect to whom there are serious reasons for considering that (a) he has committed a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity ... ; (b) he has committed a serious non-political crime outside the country of refuge prior to his admission to that country as a refugee ...'⁴ This clause refers to collaborators with dictatorial regimes who flee to avoid prosecution.⁵ Thus, small-fry collaborators not prosecuted either before or during their exile are included in the database. To apply the clause is not easy. Many refugee historians fled to avoid imprisonment or, when already abroad, were deprived of their citizenship or sentenced *in absentia*, without having committed an offence.⁶

Ninth, *Second-generation exile*. Historians born in exile or exiled at a young age (before they had decided whether to study history in their parents' host country) are not included in the database, although they constitute a special segment of their age group. Many of them choose to study history in order to understand their fates and that of their parents,

¹ E.g., Owen Lattimore, W. E. B. Du Bois (United States). This was also the case for some white South African historians under apartheid (e.g., Shula Marks).

² I identified sixteen cases.

³ E.g., British historians expelled from Southern Rhodesia; Dutch history teachers expelled from Indonesia.

⁴ UN, *Convention*, article 1(F).

⁵ E.g., Robert Van Roosbroeck (Belgium), Jacques Soustelle (France), Georges Boudarel (France), Balint Homan (Hungary), Ferdinand Nahimana (Rwanda).

⁶ E.g., Joseph Ki-Zerbo (Burkina Faso), Nasr Abu-Zeid (Egypt), Zdzisław Najder (Poland), Ioan Culianu (Romania), Michel Aflaq (Syria), Slobodan Jovanović, and Momčilo Ninčić (Yugoslavia).

and, hence, their roots and migration history.¹ They often specialize, not surprisingly, in the history of their countries or regions of origin.²

Tenth, *Database restrictions*. The database, compiled within the framework of world-wide research on the censorship of historical thought in the period 1945-2000, encompasses, in principle, every refugee historian alive in 1945, or since, about whom we have sufficient data, even if exile began before 1945 or continued after 2000.³ Those alive in 1945 but whose exile was completed before 1945 and those whose exile began after 2000 are excluded.

* * * * *

The database takes account of the following variables:

TABLE 1. REFUGEE HISTORIANS AND OTHERS CONCERNED WITH THE PAST
(ALIVE IN 1945-2000) (i)

Database Variables for Each Case

<i>General</i>	<i>Education and Occupation</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>During Exile</i>	<i>After Exile</i>
1 Country 2 Name of historian 3 Life span (birth-death)	0 Do not know 1 Historian, archaeologist, archivist, history teacher	1 Political activist 2 Jewish 3 Human-rights activist	1 Start exile: year 2 Start exile: age 3 Countries of destination	1 Return: intermittent-temporary 2 Double exile 3 Triple exile

¹ I counted the following numbers of second-generation refugee historians: Austria, 7; China, 2; Czechoslovakia, 3; Germany, 44; Israel, 3; Poland, 3; Romania, 1; Spain, 16; Soviet Union, 10. See also, A. De Baets, *Censorship of Historical Thought: A World Guide, 1945-2000* (Westport, 2002), pp. 55, 127, 148, 216, 381, 412, 440, 480.

² *Interrupted Past*, ed. Lehmann and Sheehan, pp. viii-ix, 2; Fellner, 'Special Case', p. 113; Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', pp. 154, 160; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, pp. 3, 13; Malagón, 'Los historiadores', p. 302; H. Möller, 'From Weimar to Bonn: The Arts and the Humanities in Exile and Return, 1933-80', *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Émigrés, 1933-45*: II, ed. H. Strauss and W. Röder (Munich, 1983), pp. lx, lxiii; *Out of the Third Reich: Refugee Historians in Post-War Britain*, ed. P. Alter (London, 1998), pp. xv, xvii-xx; J. Antonio Ortega y Medina, 'Historia' and 'Antropología', *El exilio español en México, 1939-82* (Mexico, 1982), p. 282, also p. 715. There were, of course, exceptions, such as Geoffrey Elton, son of the German-Czech historian of antiquity Victor Ehrenberg; he specialized in British history during his entire career. Between first- and second-generation exiles, there is a small middle group: those historians educated in their country of origin as well as in their country of destination. Francis Carsten (1911-98, exiled 1936) is an example; see *Third Reich*, ed. Alter, pp. 27-33.

³ For general sketches of intellectual and literary exile, see *Companion to Historiography*, ed. M. Bentley (London, 1997), pp. 473-80; M. Fenyo, 'Exile', *Censorship: A World Encyclopedia*, ed. D. Jones (London, 2001), pp. 762-6. For an overview of exile waves from nine countries, see 'Exile im 20. Jahrhundert', *Exilforschung: Ein internationales Jahrbuch*, XVIII, ed. C.-D. Krohn et al. (Munich, 2000).

<i>General</i>	<i>Education and Occupation</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>During Exile</i>	<i>After Exile</i>
4 Sex (male-Female)	2 Related academic professions: art historian, literary historian, curator, Egyptologist ... 3 Other academic profession 4 Academic manager: dean, rector, museum director ... 5 Non-academic profession: politician, journalist, diplomat, writer, filmmaker, unemployed ... 6 Student of history, archaeology 7 Other student 8 Member government-in-exile	– <i>before, after exile</i> – 4 Persecuted: censored, threatened, dismissed, imprisoned – <i>during exile</i> – 4 Persecuted: censored, threatened, dismissed by country of origin 5 Persecuted: censored, threatened, dismissed, imprisoned by country of destination 6 Founder of institution 7 Founder of journal	4 Period of exile	4 Return: definitive

NOTES: Historians include (1) professional historians, (2) non-historians who:

(a) received training in history, wrote a historical work, or were otherwise studying the past,

(b) became historians during or after their exile (see text).

Occupational data were codified separately before, during, and after exile. Given the long career-spans often involved, data were frequently combined. For example, persons first employed as historians and then dismissed and unemployed before exile received code fifteen (one for 'historian', five for 'unemployed'). A student of Spanish before exile who became a historian during exile and a lecturer in Spanish and a journalist after exile received code seven ('other student') before exile, sixty-one ('student of history' and 'historian') during exile, and thirty-five ('other academic profession' and 'journalist') after exile.

Some of the variables yielded complete data or sufficient data to allow sustained analysis. Data for others, scarce or conjectural, offered no firm ground for quantitative conclusions, but were sometimes important for suggesting or testing hypotheses. The uneven quality of the data reflects not only the deficiencies of research, but also the difficulties involved in translating complex careers into streamlined data. Table 2 presents some results for the universe of refugee historians:

TABLE 2. REFUGEE HISTORIANS AND OTHERS CONCERNED WITH THE PAST
(ALIVE IN 1945-2000) (ii)

Some General Indicators

<i>Origin</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Periods in which at least Three Refugees/Exiles Left</i>	<i>Double Exile</i>	<i>Average Age at Start of Exile</i>	
					<i>N</i>	<i>Age</i>
Afghanistan	1				1	55
Algeria	1				1	40
Argentina	12	1	(1) 5 in 1946		11	51
Austria	39		(2) 3 in 1936 (3) 31 in 1938-9	3	36	42
Belarus	1				1	52
Belgium	2				2	45
Bolivia	2				1	38
Bosnia- Herzegovina	2	1			2	59
Brazil	9	1	(4) 7 in 1964		3	32
Burkina Faso	1				1	61
Burundi	1				1	35
Cameroon	1					
Chile	8	2	(5) 7 in 1973	1	2	51
China	27		(6) 18 in 1948-9 (7) 3 in 1989	1	22	52
Colombia	1			1		
Congo (Zaire)	2				2	35
Cuba	9	1	(8) 6 in 1959-60		8	53

Czechoslovakia	47	1	(9) 8 in 1939 (10) 10 in 1945 (11) 7 in 1948 (12) 7 in 1969 (13) 3 in 1976	1	42	42
Dominican Republic	7		(14) 3 in 1930	1	2	30
Egypt	3				2	47
El Salvador	2					
Ethiopia	2				2	42
Germany	256	18	(15) 86 in 1932-3 (16) 143 in 1934-40 (17) 3 in 1949 (18) 3 in 1958	12	229	39
Greece	4			1	3	40
Guatemala	4				1	29
Haiti	2			1		
Hungary	18		(19) 3 in 1948 (20) 6 in 1956-7	1	15	40
Indonesia	3				2	46
Iran	2			1	2	48
Iraq	3				2	50
Israel	1				1	38
Italy	10	1	(21) 4 in 1938-9		10	39
Ivory Coast	1				1	37
Kenya	2				2	45
Laos (French Laos)	2				2	33
Latvia	1				1	47
Lithuania	1					
Netherlands	2				2	34
Nicaragua	1					
Nigeria	2				2	37
Norway	1				1	67
Pakistan	2				1	50
Paraguay	6		(22) 3 in 1940	2	5	47
Peru	1			1		

Origin	N	F	Periods in which at least Three Refugees/Exiles Left	Double Exile	Average Age at Start of Exile	
					N	Age
Poland	19	1	(23) 9 in 1939 (24) 3 in 1968	1	16	43
Portugal	9	1		1	6	43
Romania	7				5	39
Saudi Arabia	2					
South Africa	7	2			5	45
Soviet Union	77	3	(26) 18 in 1917-20 (27) 9 in 1921-3 (28) 23 in 1968-80	2	62	41
Spain	106	8	(25) 100 in 1936-9	6	52	41
Sri Lanka	1					
Syria	1			1	1	43
Thailand	3			1	1	52
Trinidad & Tobago	1			1		
Tunisia	1					
Turkey	3				3	42
Uganda	3				3	34
United States	5	1			5	38
Uruguay	2			1	1	48
Venezuela	3				3	47
Yugoslavia	7				4	58
Zimbabwe (South Rhodesia)	2				2	38
Total	764	42		41	593	41

NOTES: N: Total of Universe.

F: Female.

Periods in which at least three refugees/exiles left: numbers in italics are codes combining countries of origin and periods in which at least three refugees/exiles left; these codes are the fundament of Table 4.

Double exile: listed under country most relevant according to database criteria; includes six cases of triple exile.

Average age at start of exile: total calculated from 593 individual ages (i.e., all cases of single exile and with sufficient data).

Germany: Nazi Germany: 239; German Democratic Republic: 16; Federal Republic of Germany: 1.

SOURCES: A. De Baets, *Censorship of Historical Thought: A World Guide, 1945-2000* (Westport, 2002): see here list of sources accompanying all country entries, since supplemented with other sources including files of the Council for Assisting Refugee Academics (CARA) held at the London South Bank University.

Turning to Table 2 as a whole, and leaving analysis of its parts until later, one notes 764 refugee historians and others studying the past (5.5% of them women) from sixty-three countries on all continents. The highest-ranking are, in declining order: Germany, Spain, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Austria, China, Poland, Hungary, Argentina, and Italy. The data of Table 2 does not capture the whole universe of refugee historians alive between 1945 and 2000:¹ to trace every member of a given refugee universe is impossible partly because exiles, by definition, have interrupted careers and are distributed over several countries. The data represents a reasonably reliable picture of the real universes for countries hosting considerable numbers of refugees. The fact that four of the ten top-ranking countries are Western European and three Middle or Eastern European (four, if the Soviet Union is included), is no coincidence. It is not determined by the sources, many of which are international in scope, and only secondarily by the database restrictions stipulated above, which are restrictions in time but not in space. The ranking mainly reflects the demography of the historical profession. In countries with developed historiographical traditions, the number of professional historians is higher than elsewhere, and, as a result, the number of refugee historians after any given wave of repression is also higher. Likewise, in many countries, the number of exiles is low because the number of professional historians employed there was small: fifty-three of the sixty-three countries examined provide fewer than ten refugees. The smaller the number of detected refugees and the higher the probability of undetected refugees, the greater the risk of distorting the picture for a given country.

Reliable estimates of the numbers of refugee historians do not exist for any of the sixty-three countries other than Germany, the country with the highest number. Table 3 demonstrates that the smaller the size of the group to be estimated, the more divergence there is between estimates.

¹ For example, after I compiled the tables published here and discussed them with CARA staff in London, seven new possible cases emerged from CARA's files. A small test performed on some readily available variables (nationality, birth, year of exile) for these cases confirmed the discernible trends.

TABLE 3. REFUGEE HISTORIANS FROM NAZI GERMANY

Comparison of Estimates

<i>Years of Departure</i>	<i>Estimates for Historians</i>				<i>Estimates for Art Historians</i>				<i>Total</i>		
	<i>i</i>	<i>ii</i>	<i>iii</i>	<i>iii*</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ii</i>	<i>iii</i>	<i>iii*</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ii</i>	<i>iii and iii*</i>
1933-4	34		54	50	40		26	30	74		80
1933-6		53	81	76		62	37	42		115	118

* *Corrected.*

NOTES: Date of estimate: (i) March 1935; (ii) fall of 1936; (iii) May 2004.
Estimate iii (corrected): see text.¹

SOURCES: (i) *A Crisis in the University World*, ed. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (Jewish and Other) Coming from Germany (London, 1935), p. 5; (ii) C.-D. Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research* (German ed., 1987; Amherst, 1993), p. 12; (iii) author's own database.

Take, for example, the historians who left Nazi Germany in 1933-4: the contemporary estimate (i) is thirty-four, whereas mine (iii) is fifty-four. In estimate (iii), scholars qualifying as both historians and art historians (four cases) are classified as historians: therefore, the corrected figure is fifty. One cannot explain the remaining sixteen cases, owing to the lack of a list of names behind estimate (i). First, probably not all the names were known at the time (March 1935). Second, estimate (i) is scholar-centred, whereas estimate (iii) is historian-centred: estimate (i) provides figures for twenty-three subjects, and some of the scholars listed under 'classics and archaeology', 'oriental philology', or 'philosophy' are no doubt listed as historians in estimate (iii). Nonetheless, when the figures are viewed at a broader aggregate level – the totals for 1933-6 – the difference almost disappears (115 versus 118). This test, and the plausibility of the reasons why the esti-

¹ When the other professional categories included in the database (see Table 1) are added to the estimate, the totals are 117 for 1933-4 and 164 for 1933-6. The following example demonstrates how difficult data comparison is. Ulrike Wendland, *Biographisches Handbuch deutschsprachiger Kunsthistoriker im Exil: Leben und Werk der unter dem Nationalsozialismus verfolgten und vertriebenen Wissenschaftler* (Munich, 1999), pp. vii-xv, contains 253 art historians for the period from 1933. If we exclude from these 253 those dismissed (15), those internally displaced (11), those who planned but never realized exile (6), those deported and murdered (6), those who died before 1945 (11), we are left with 204 art historians. Of these 204, (a) 55 have an unknown date of death, (b) an unknown number comes from Austria, and (c) an unknown number is neither refugee nor exile but émigré (such as Ernst Gombrich).

mates diverge, supports the claim of the reasonable reliability of the data, but does not imply a comparable degree of reliability for the data about countries with fewer refugee historians.

The abundant information about the exile of German (and, to a lesser extent, Austrian) historians¹ is not surprising, because Nazism caused the departure of (among others) 12,000 intellectuals, including historians. Substantial, if less, information is available on the exile of historians after the Spanish Civil War² and the Russian Revolution.³ In the case of Spain, 100 historians and others studying the past (out of a total of 106 for the whole period) who fled during the civil war of 1936-9 were still alive in 1945. Little information has been gathered *systematically* on the exile of historians from Central and Eastern Europe in 1948 or later (with the exception of Czechoslovakia), from China, or from Latin America.⁴ Several facts may account for this. In the country of origin, research on exiles is often not treated as an aspect of the history of scholarship but as a secondary aspect of political history.⁵ In the immigration historiography of the countries of asylum, one-sided concepts such as assimilation and adaptation may be preferred to more revealing concepts such as acculturation or diaspora.⁶ The international (and, less relevant here, interdisciplinary) character of exile research is also a factor.⁷ And, finally, the financial resources available in the United States and Europe are larger than elsewhere and spent mainly on research into one's own history. Russian, East European, Chinese, and Latino refugee historians deserve fuller study.

The world-wide study of refugee historians adds in four ways to what we know from in-depth studies of Nazi Germany or Franco's Spain in the 1930s. First, it provides original proof for the universality of the phenom-

1 See, e.g., *Third Reich*, ed. Alter; Epstein, *Past Renewed*; Fellner, 'Special Case'; Iggers, 'Die deutschen Historiker'; *Biographical Dictionary*, ed. Strauss and Röder; *Biographisches Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration nach 1933*: I, ed. W. Röder and H. Strauss (Munich 1980); P. Walther, 'Emigrierte deutsche Historiker in den USA', *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, vii (1984), 41-52.

2 See, e.g., *Exilio español en México*; Malagón, 'Los historiadores'; R. Gray, 'Spanish Diaspora: A Culture in Exile', *Salmagundi*, nos. 76-7 (Fall 1987-Winter 1988), pp. 53-83.

3 See, e.g., A. Mazour, *Modern Russian Historiography* (Princeton, 1958), pp. 234-42.

4 A. Graham-Yooll, 'The Wild Oats They Sowed: Latin American Exiles in Europe', *Third World Quarterly*, ix (1987), 246-53. For Slovak historians, see M. Stolarík, 'Slovak Historians in Exile in North America, 1945-92', *Human Affairs* [Slovakia], vi (1996), 34-44; for Palestinian historians, see E. Sanbar, 'Le Vécu et l'écrit: historiens-réfugiés de Palestine – quelques propositions pour la recherche', *Revue d'études palestiniennes*, i (Automn 1981), 62-75.

5 Fellner, 'Special Case', pp. 110-11.

6 Krohn, *Intellectuals*, pp. 2-3.

7 In Krohn's words ('Exile im 20. Jahrhundert', ed. C.-D. Krohn, et al., p. 9): 'that, at least until recently, exile research was done by outsiders and that, despite its results produced in the meantime, it barely belongs to the canon of mainstream science. The financial cost of international research and the necessity of interdisciplinary analysis with its reach transcending the patterns of national history doubtlessly contributed to this': my translation.

enon of refugee historians; limiting the study to Nazi Germany in 1932-44 and Franco's Spain in 1936-9 accounts for only 43% of the cases (327 of 764) and only 3% of the countries of origin. Second, it provides additional proof for hypotheses derived from the history of these two countries. Third, it allows the testing of additional hypotheses: for example, the importance of internal exile; the relative importance of historians in governments-in-exile; the role of philosophers of history as mentors; the role of refugee historians as founders of historical institutions and journals; and the rarity of historical-school formation. And fourth, it allows the formulation of new hypotheses, for instance, that political exile is better documented than civil and intellectual exile.

* * * * *

When we select the years in which at least three refugees left a country, we can identify the crisis situations that caused their flight:

TABLE 4. REFUGEE HISTORIANS AND OTHERS CONCERNED WITH THE PAST
(ALIVE IN 1945-2000) (iii)

Types of Crisis Causing Exile

<i>Type of Crisis Causing Exile</i>	<i>Codes (Table 2)</i>	<i>Number of:</i>			<i>Rank According to Number of:</i>	
		<i>Periods</i>	<i>Countries</i>	<i>Historians</i>	<i>Periods and Countries</i>	<i>Historians</i>
		<i>Involved</i>				
(a) Dictatorship installed, coup staged	1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 22, 25, 26	13	12	266	1	1
(b) Dictatorship continued	2, 7, 12, 13, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 27, 28	11	8	207	2	3
(c) Revolution installed (<i>subgroup of a</i>)	6, 8, 11, 17, 19, 26	6	6	55	3	5

(d) Protest, rebellion crushed (<i>subgroup of b</i>)	7, 12, 13, 20, 24	5	4	22	4	8
(e) Civil war waged (<i>subgroup of a and b</i>)	6, 25, 26, 27	4	3	145	5	4
(f) Country annexed	3, 9, 23	3	3	48	6	6
(g) Country partitioned	6, 17, 23	3	3	30	7	7
(h) Race laws introduced (<i>subgroup of a and b</i>)	15, 16, 21	3	2	233	8	2
(i) Democracy installed	10	1	1	10	9	9

NOTES: Codes combine countries of origin and periods in which at least three refugees/exiles left (see Table 2); they can be classified under more than one type of crisis.

SOURCE: Table 2, column 4.

Table 4 tells us the obvious: that dictatorship, either new or old, is the most likely cause of exile. Other causes – partly variants of dictatorship, partly other types of situations – are both less noticeable and depend on whether one matches the distribution of crisis types with the number of historians or with the number of countries.

The waves of refugee historians coincide only partly with broader refugee waves for three reasons. First, general waves often affected the poor rather than privileged groups. Second, as refugee waves are large-scale phenomena, detailed information about individuals, including historians, is unavailable.¹ Third, incidents of repression in a country may result in the flight of few historians because earlier events had already driven larger numbers to flee.²

¹ The Baltic countries (1940-91), Haiti (1957-86), Malawi (1964-94), Iraq (1963-2003), Uganda (1971-9), Cambodia (1975-9), and Iran (1979-) may be examples.

² Russia (tsarist, Soviet), Austria (1934, 1938), Czechoslovakia (1939, 1945, 1948, 1969), Poland (1939, 1948), Argentina (1946, 1966, 1976), Paraguay (1947, 1954), and Hungary (1948, post-1956) are possible cases.

It is plausible to suppose that historians went into exile because they belonged to a target group, not because their individual works offended the ruling elite. The usual punishment for the historian singled out was censorship or imprisonment. The reasons for individual exile are more diverse than the reasons for collective exile. Even when refugee historians belonged to recognizable categories – in Argentina: anti-Peronists (at least in the 1940s); in Nazi Germany: Jews, socialists, and Communists; in Spain: republicans; in China: nationalists and anti-Communists; in the Soviet Union: anti-Communists or Communists of the wrong school – the waves of exiles were made up of heterogeneous individuals.

The exile of groups of historians meant that most had not been politically active: the usual reason for collective exile was civil, not political.¹ The politically active group was not large, but it was famous. A glance at one of the most visible political layers of exile life – governments-in-exile – shows that historians were well represented in several. Historians with strong political commitments remained, however, the minority.²

TABLE 5. REFUGEE HISTORIANS AS MEMBERS OF GOVERNMENTS-IN-EXILE

An Indicator of Political Exile

<i>Origin</i>	<i>Historian</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Government-in-Exile</i>
Czechoslovakia	Josef Korbel (1909-77)	United Kingdom	<i>Czech government-in-exile</i> : head of its broadcasting department
Dominican Republic	Juan Bosch (1909-2001)	Cuba, Costa Rica	<i>Anti-Trujillo movement</i> : major leader (became Dominican Republic's premier in 1963)
Greece	Panayotis Kanellopoulos (1902-86)	Egypt	<i>Greek government-in-exile</i> : member (1942-[5]) (became Greece's premier in 1945 and 1967)

¹ Iggers, 'Die deutschen Historiker', pp. 98-9, 101-2; Walther, 'Emigrierte deutsche Historiker', pp. 44-5, 47-8; Malagón, 'Los historiadores', p. 317; Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', p. 160; Krohn, *Intellectuals*, p. 15.

² Politically active historians, once in exile, sometimes became human-rights activists: e.g., Mohammed Harbi (Algeria), Vladimir Dedjler (Yugoslavia).

Haiti	Leslie Manigat (1930-)	Venezuela	<i>Anti-Duvalierist government-in-exile (1978-85): founder (became Haiti's premier in 1988)</i>
Poland		United Kingdom	<i>General Władysław Sikorski's government-in-exile:</i>
	Jan Hulewicz (1907-80)		member
	Stanisław Kot (1885-1975)		minister without portfolio (1939-40) minister of internal affairs (1940-)
	Marian Kukiel (1885-1973)		vice minister minister of national defence
Spain			<i>Spanish Republican government-in-exile:</i>
	Claudio Sánchez Albornoz (1893-1984)	Argentina	member (1939-59) premier (1959-71)
	Lluís Nicolau D'Olwer (1888-1961)	Mexico	minister (1945-6) its ambassador to Mexico (1947-)
Tibet	Tsepon Shakabpa (1907-199?)	India	<i>Tibetan government-in-exile:</i> Dalai Lama's official representative in New Delhi (1959-66)
Yugoslavia		United Kingdom	<i>Royal Yugoslav government-in-exile:</i>
	Slobodan Jovanović (1869-1958)		vice premier (1941-2) premier (1942-3) [before exile: vice premier (1941)]
	Momčilo Ninčić (1876-1949)		minister of foreign affairs (1941-3) [before exile: minister (1941)]

NOTES: *All*, except Bosch and Shakabpa, are professional historians. Historians (or others with a history education) not mentioned in the table include: Jesús de Galíndez, reportedly the representative of the 'Basque government-in-exile' in the United States; those who were heads of state or government *before* their exile: Juan Domingo Perón (Argentina), Juan Natalicio González (Paraguay), Mário Soares (Portugal), Marcello Caetano (Portugal), and Niceto Alcalá Zamora (Spain); those who became heads of state or government *after* their exile: Luigi Einaudi (Italy), Amintore Fanfani (Italy), and Laurent Gbagbo (Ivory Coast).

SOURCES: Author's own database, supplemented with *Historical Abstracts* and several historical dictionaries.

The pattern in smaller waves is different: the smaller the wave of refugee historians, the more probable the political dimension, the less probable the intellectual dimension, and the higher the number of returnees. Destinations were of four kinds: regional destinations, close to the country of origin and reflecting the hope of returning soon; cultural destinations, not always close but with a similar culture (Latin America – particularly Mexico – for Spaniards, Palestine/Israel for Jews); unusual destinations, mostly profession-related (sinologists fleeing to China); and, finally, universal destinations (notably the United States and the United Kingdom). The refugees' routes, which seldom led directly to the country of final destination, included: exile to emigration (the majority); exile to new exile; or exile to return to new exile. The third variant sometimes reveals a regular pattern of short exiles, especially in Latin America.¹ Double and triple exiles make up 5.4 per cent of the total (Table 2). For example, after the Russian Revolution, exiles fled to Central Europe, and after Hitler came to power, from there further west (or east again). Some Central European Jewish historians and art historians went to Italy, where they were driven out after the introduction of the race laws in 1938. Many Spanish historians took refuge in France in 1939, only to flee over the ocean when France was occupied one year later. Coups in Latin America caused some of them to move yet again.

In any event, exile normally implied that, in addition to personal belongings and financial means of subsistence, cherished sources and sometimes manuscripts and notes had to be left behind. Given that, then as now, most historians specialize in national history, the loss could not easily be compensated for. Look, for example, at Peter Linehan's description of the situation of the Spanish medievalist Claudio Sánchez Albornoz, exiled in 1937, who lived in Argentina from 1940 until his return to Spain in 1983:

The refugee's baggage in 1940 was mostly the transcripts he had made in the archives of northern Spain in the 1920s. These were the fruit of heroic labours, a

¹ E.g., Germán Arciniegas (Colombia), Efraím Cardozo (Paraguay).

harvest of permanent value. They were to provide his staple diet for the rest of his active career: a wholesome diet but unvarying and seriously deficient in tracing elements of foreign flavouring ... It could hardly have been otherwise. Buenos Aires in the 1940s and 50s [i.e., largely Perón's era] was not the place to study medieval Spain in a European setting. The historian's sense of isolation transferred itself to his subject.¹

Refugee historians had to leave their natural environments, give up, partly at least, their languages, cultures, and traditions, and sometimes adopt the uncertain existence of stateless citizens. Some even had to destroy their own papers before they left.² All of this affected them deeply and dramatically.

* * * * *

A look at the average age at the start of exile (Table 2) reveals two contradictory tendencies. On the one hand, it is reasonable to suppose that older, well-known, and established historians are over-reported and younger historians at the start of their careers under-reported. On the other, younger historians are generally more vulnerable, more easily dismissed, and quicker to leave and start anew abroad. Both tendencies are at play in varying degrees in many countries, but the average age of forty-one (that is, slightly below mid-career) suggests that they balance each other.

Upon arrival in the country of asylum, the refugee's plight was determined by three factors. The first was career change. Quantitative analysis of career change is complicated; the figures in Table 6, which are only meant to give an impression, show that micro-research is better suited than a macro-approach to showing career change.

¹ P. Linehan, 'A History of Isolation', *Times Literary Supplement*, 11 Oct. 1985, p. 1144.

² E.g., Aron Freimann (Germany), Aleksandr Nekrich (Soviet Union).

TABLE 6. REFUGEE HISTORIANS AND CAREER CHANGE DURING EXILE
An Indicator of Intellectual Exile (i)

	N	%
Universe	764	
Cases with occupational data known both before and during exile	653	
<i>The 'historically minded' (cases with codes 1 or 6):</i>		
Before exile	439	
During exile	468	
Before and/or during exile, <i>of which:</i>	544	100
Before and during exile	363	66.7
Mutations or career changes, <i>of which:</i>	181	33.3
Before but not during exile	76	14.0
During but not before exile	105	19.3

NOTES: Universe: see Table 2. Cases with codes 1 or 6 are cases for which education or occupation includes important historical component (see Table 1).

SOURCE: Author's own database.

Of those whose education and/or occupation were known *both* before and during exile (653 of 764 cases), the 'historically minded' (a short formula to indicate those whose education or occupation contains an important historical element) rose slightly from 439 before exile to 468 during exile. Career changes, however, went in two directions: seventy-six of the 'historically minded' did jobs during exile unrelated to history, while 105 persons who were not particularly 'historically minded' before their exile became so during exile. Hence, there were 181 relevant career mutations: an estimated *one-third* of the exiles experienced (fundamental) career change. In addition, many who did not change their careers experienced dismissal and unemployment either before or during exile (experiences invisible in the table) and they generally worked in inferior conditions than before exile. Age and poor mastery of language, for example, limited the career opportunities of older refugees and often led them to private study. It was easier to succeed in the more internationalized fields of ancient, medieval, and oriental history than in modern history, in which national differences in style were more pronounced.¹ Many younger

¹ Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', pp. 161-3; *Third Reich*, ed. Alter, p. xv.

historians were unemployed for short or long periods, and on taking up their profession again had to accept more junior positions. Many refugees and exiles were persecuted after they left: their citizenship, title, or right to teach was revoked, they were spied upon, and their work was published without their authorization or under another name.¹ Thus, career change remains intriguing, and Plutarch's thesis appealing and puzzling.

Second, the political and economic situation in the host country was often unfavourable to refugees. In the United States, for example, the economic crisis of the 1930s limited the employment opportunities not only of refugees but also of many indigenous historians. It also led to anti-Semitism and to doubts among immigration and other officials of the Americanism of politically radical newcomers.² Remarkably enough, the Second World War eased the situation: not only did unemployment figures fall, but the army, the Office of Strategic Services (established in 1942 and forerunner of the Central Intelligence Agency), and the other intelligence services suddenly needed expertise in German and European affairs. Many refugee historians found temporary jobs working for the government, often with some post-war extension to do research.³

Third, the new countries' universities had a limited capacity to absorb refugees, especially when their academic culture deviated widely from the standards to which the refugees had been accustomed. Hoffmann pointed to the reservations among English and German historians about each other's historiographical traditions.⁴ Nonetheless, scholars in the host countries, appalled by the repression abroad, took many individual or collective initiatives to support their refugee colleagues. For example, in the United States, the University in Exile was founded in 1933, to be renamed the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science of the New School for Social Research in New York in 1935. Although the faculty lacked a historical institute, it employed historians.⁵ In February 1942, the *École Libre des Hautes Études* was established in New York, to function during the war as the only free French university; later it became a permanent part of the State University of New York.⁶ In London, the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning (now called CARA, the Council for

¹ Some committed suicide (Theodor Mommsen [1905-58, Germany], Ramón Iglesia [Spain]); others were assassinated (Ioan Culiuanu [Romania], Jesús de Galíndez [Spain], Sabarotnam Sabalingham [Sri Lanka] and, perhaps, Ali Shariati [Iran]).

² E. Schulín, 'German and American Historiography in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries', *Interrupted Past*, ed. Lehmann and Sheehan, p. 24; Krohn, *Intellectuals*, pp. ix, 11.

³ Iggers, 'Die deutschen Historiker', pp. 106-7; Krohn, *Intellectuals*, p. xii.

⁴ Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', pp. 159, 163. See also, Walther, 'Emigrierte deutsche Historiker', p. 46.

⁵ E.g., Henri Grégoire, Erich Kahler, Alexandre Koyré, Gaetano Salvemini, and Lionello Venturi.

⁶ Krohn, *Intellectuals*, p. 85.

Assisting Refugee Academics) was established in 1933. The University of Bordeaux received many Spanish refugees. The Casa de España in Mexico, established for Spanish exiles in 1938 at the behest of the president, Lázaro Cárdenas, and Mexican historians such as Daniel Cosío Villegas, became the precursor of El Colegio de México (1940) with its famous Centro de Estudios Históricos.¹ Many historians went to great pains to support their refugee colleagues.²

* * * * *

Return is as difficult a phenomenon to analyse as departure.³ It is often not known who returned, and for those who did, whether they returned permanently or temporarily, why, and at what age. Return is especially difficult to categorize for exiles still alive. On the one hand, they may decide not to return once the crisis in their home country is over and, therefore, change de facto from exiles into émigrés. On the other, it is not uncommon for such émigrés to return home upon retirement. The number of returnees seems to depend on the duration of the crisis that provoked the exile, but this conclusion is misleading: when the crisis is short, the potential returnee may judge that too little has changed, when it is long, that too much has changed.

None of the larger waves returned *en masse*. This is understandable: most had built something resembling a new life in their host countries that even in the least favourable circumstances might be preferred to a return accompanied by nagging doubts. Even though returning would re-establish contact with the home country, neither the refugee nor the home country might remain recognizable after so many years and so deep a crisis. Animosity developed between the returnees and those who had stayed: some of the latter ostracized refugees as escapees, or as troublemakers who had deserted to live privileged lives as outsiders while their former activities led to increased repression. Conversely, some refugees did not see the stay-at-homes as victims humiliated by dictatorship but rather as collaborators with the criminal regime.⁴ Other facts complicating the decision to return home are the degree to which fresh dictatorial experiments were likely and the prospect of satisfying employment. Although dictatorship, war, and purges of collaborators affected the

¹ Malagón, 'Los historiadores', pp. 248, 353; Ortega y Medina, 'Historia', *passim*.

² For some examples, see A. De Baets, 'Resistance to the Censorship of Historical Thought in the Twentieth Century', *Making Sense of Global History: The 19th International Congress of Historical Sciences, Oslo 2000, Commemorative Volume*, ed. S. Sogner (Oslo, 2001), pp. 400-1.

³ Some general data in *Biographical Dictionary*, ed. Strauss and Röder, p. lxxxiii.

⁴ Compare Graham-Yooll, 'Wild Oats', pp. 247, 251.

demography of the historical profession and created opportunities for returnees, their chances of filling the vacancies in a chaotic transition period characterized by numerous competing claims were low. The restoration of their legal and social positions was equally uncertain. Nevertheless, most refugees who chose not to return tried to reconnect themselves with their countries of origin. Those who had the choice tried to combine the best of both worlds: they settled in their new countries but became visiting professors or went on lecture tours in their old.¹

With such turbulent lives, refugee historians had enough to think about. A few destroyed their papers before dying or stipulated that they should be destroyed after their deaths.² Others developed a remarkable penchant for writing memoirs.³ Exile was a multifaceted experience: for many, it meant the physical loss of their homes; often it also meant that they became alienated from their children who quickly integrated into their host countries; finally, it meant the gain of (some) freedom and new experiences. In provoking feelings of distance, alienation, and isolation, but also in providing fresh opportunities, exile changed the identities of most refugees beyond recognition.

* * * * *

In order to give an impression of the difficulties involved in identifying the losses and benefits of exile, let us reconsider the well-known comparison between the exodus from Nazi Germany and the exodus of the Greek elite to Italy after the fall of Constantinople in 1453.⁴ The League of Nations' office of the high commissioner for refugees, for example, wrote in 1935: '[The refugee scholars'] presence in other countries could fertilize scholarship as significantly as the migration of Greek scholars in the fifteenth century.'⁵ This thesis, developed in the sixteenth century and repeated for centuries, is only partly tenable. Steven Runciman states: 'Italy had for more than a generation been full of Byzantine professors.'⁶ And Peter

1 Möller, 'From Weimar', p. lxii; Schulze, 'Refugee Historians', pp. 207-9, 212-13, 219-20, 222-3, 227; Fellner, 'Special Case', pp. 113-14; Krohn, *Intellectuals*, p. 3; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, pp. 7-8.

2 E.g., Elias Bickerman (double exile from the Soviet Union and Germany), Otto Neugebauer (Germany), Theodor Mommsen (Germany), Helene Wieruszowski (Germany).

3 The memoirs of twenty refugee historians consulted must be a small proportion. Exiles constitute a disproportionately large subgroup of historians who write memoirs and autobiographies. For a case study, see J. Radkau, 'Der Historiker, die Erinnerung und das Exil: Hallgartens Odyssee und Kuczynskis Prädestination', *Exilforschung: Ein internationales Jahrbuch*, ii, ed. T. Koebner, W. Köpke, and J. Radkau (Munich, 1984), 86-103. Radkau writes that 'on the whole, the literature of exile surely displays an affinity with the genre of memoirs' (p. 89; my translation).

4 Krohn, *Intellectuals*, pp. ix, 11.

5 *A Crisis in the University World*, ed. Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (Jewish and Other) Coming from Germany (London, 1935), p. 7.

6 S. Runciman, *The Fall of Constantinople, 1453* (Cambridge, 1965), p. 188.

Burke writes that the revival of learning in Italy began in the fourteenth century, and perhaps as early as the twelfth. Remarkably, he adds: 'These immigrants [both before and after 1453] had an important effect on the Italian world of learning, not unlike that of scholars from central Europe ... on the English-speaking world after 1933. They stimulated Greek studies. However, their importance was that they satisfied a demand which already existed.'¹ Exile was only one, and not necessarily the most important, cause of beneficial effects. If this was the case in the fifteenth century, it was more the case in the twentieth.

Comparing exile experiences should be done cautiously. Undeniably, repression and exile profoundly affected the historiography of refugee historians: they usually signified a rift in the exiles' modes of thought. On the one hand, they pondered on the history of their country of origin and asked why recent events had taken such a cruel turn. This penchant for reflection fits with the more general theory that collectivities gain stronger historical awareness after defeat and uprooting. Whereas victors make history, impose their version of the facts, need little reflection, and allow themselves to forget the past, the defeated feel compelled to ask – sometimes to the point of self-castigation – why history had been so unkind to them. On the other hand, the refugee historians enlarged their horizons. Their self-knowledge was deepened by the comparative perspective and they enlarged their hosts' knowledge by correcting clichés about their countries of origin. Exiles became international and intercultural go-betweens.² Although this cross-fertilization might have taken place without exile (as cases of voluntary emigration such as Salo Baron's or Aloïs Schumpeter's suggest), exile accelerated it.³

* * * * *

When drawing up the balance of the impact of refugee historians upon historiography, we are the prisoners of data from the better-studied (especially German and Spanish) exiles. A proper balance comprises answers to three questions. In asking, first, whether the stream of refugees exerted an influence on the historiography of the country of origin, one notes that all stages of exile (departure, stay abroad, return) had their effects. The departure and concomitant brain drain have been described as a huge loss.

¹ P. Burke, 'Hosts and Guests: A General View of Minorities in the Cultural Life of Europe', *Minorities in Western European Cities (Sixteenth-Twentieth Centuries)*, ed. H. Soly and A. Thijs (Brussels, 1995), p. 49; P. Burke, *The Italian Renaissance: Culture and Society in Italy* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1987), p. 232.

² L. Fermi, *Illustrious Immigrants: The Intellectual Migration from Europe, 1930-41* (Chicago, 1968), p. 358; Gray, 'Spanish Diaspora', p. 69; Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', pp. 171-3; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, p. 17; *Third Reich*, ed. Alter, pp. xix, xxi.

³ Epstein, *Past Renewed*, p. 12.

At the time the refugees were leaving, critical historiography was often replaced with servile propaganda on behalf of the repressive regime. Work able to stand the test of time was confined to specialized sectors not monitored by official ideology: constitutional history under the Third Reich is cited as one example.¹ A second effect was the impetus to produce new editions of sources. Once the umbilical cord with the home country was cut and access to many sources lost, refugee historians became influential as the editors of primary sources.² Finally, works by refugees who did not return home became known or were rediscovered in their countries of origin after long delays, sometimes in translation. Many who did return maintained their networks, enriched scholarship with exogenous ideas, and promoted scholarly and cultural exchanges.³

The answer to the first question is mixed, although loss dominates. However, the exceptions in each case qualify the general rule, as the examples of South Africa and the German Democratic Republic demonstrate. The work of South African refugee and émigré historians revised South African historiography during and after the last decade of apartheid. Notwithstanding the academic boycott, South Africa remained intellectually permeable. White émigré historians visited the country, white South African students studied in the United Kingdom, and work written abroad circulated around South Africa's universities. In the exiles' main hub, London, they met regularly to exchange ideas.⁴ But their influence was indirect, partial, and delayed. The German Democratic Republic offers a clear case of the influence of returnees on the historiography of their home country. After the Second World War, several Communist refugee historians who had fled from Nazi Germany went to the Soviet zone of occupation, which became the German Democratic Republic, where exile was perceived as a weapon in the struggle against Fascism. Atypically, most of them had gone into exile on account of their political activities. Historians such as Jürgen Kuczynski, Ernst Engelberg, Alexander Abusch, Alfred Meusel, and Leo Stern (the last one an Austrian) played important roles in creating East Germany's historiography,⁵ of which little survived the

1 Möller, 'From Weimar', p. lx; Iggers, 'Die deutschen Historiker', p. 111; Gray, 'Spanish Diaspora', p. 68; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, pp. 3-4. For a sketch of the position of exile in the gamut of options open to historians living under dictatorship, see De Baets, *Censorship*, pp. 19-20.

2 Epstein, *Past Renewed*, pp. 18-19.

3 Möller, 'From Weimar', p. lxii; Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', pp. 168-71; Schulze, 'Refugee Historians', p. 213; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, p. 8.

4 Shula Marks, personal communication to author (Aug. 2002).

5 Iggers, 'Die deutschen Historiker', p. 108; Möller, 'From Weimar', pp. lxi-lxiii; Krohn, *Intellectuals*, p. 3. M. Kessler, *Exilerfahrung in Wissenschaft und Politik: Remigrierte Historiker in der frühen DDR* (Cologne, 2001) identifies (pp. 317-18) twenty-two historians exiled from Nazi Germany in 1933-9 who returned to the Soviet Zone of Occupation or the German Democratic Republic in 1945-59. If I exclude nine second-generation refugees (born after 1915 and therefore less than eighteen years old in

challenge of re-unification in 1989.¹ Elsewhere, the impact of the relatively small numbers of returnees on post-dictatorial historiographies remained limited.

The second question centres on the manner in which refugee historians influenced their countries of asylum. In general, they asked analogous historical questions based on analogous experiences, but their responses were predictably diverse: dependent on method, concept, world-view, and political position. Coherent historical schools founded by refugee historians are rare. The exception may be the Russian émigrés of the so-called Eurasian school, which postulates that Russia does not belong either to Europe or Asia but constitutes a separate unit on account of the long Mongol occupation. The school, however, had no fixed geographical location. Among its leading spokesmen, some stayed in the Soviet Union, others, like the geographer Petr Savitsky, lived in Czechoslovakia, while the historian George Vernadsky, after a stay in Prague, left for the United States.² Although several refugee historians were active institution builders, the general picture is one of scattered, heterogeneous, and individualized influences.³ In Paris, for example, the Marxist-oriented works of the Greek historian Nikolas Svoronos, who went abroad before the civil war of 1946-9, inspired a circle of Greek economic historians.⁴ In the case of the German-speaking emigration, the refugee political scientists and sociologists had greater influence than the historians, not only over their own disciplines but also over history. Explanations for this phenomenon differ widely. One attributes it to the fact that the most eminent German historians (Friedrich Meinecke, for example) did not go into exile: the talent, innovation, and creativity of refugee historians was less than in neighbouring disciplines whose most eminent figures (such as Erwin Panofsky in art history) did emigrate.⁵ A second maintains that the marked difference in quality in the nineteenth century between German and Anglo-Saxon works of history had disappeared by the 1930s, while this was not the case for younger disciplines such as psychoanalysis. A third simply states that few refugee historians specialized in the subject that would have

1933) and four others whom according to Kessler's footnotes could also be omitted, nine are left. Of those, eight are in my database. Kessler devotes eight chapters to nine of the twenty-two returnees: again, eight of them are included in the database (the ninth is excluded for being 'second-generation'). The database includes nine returnees (historians and non-historians) absent from Kessler's list (although not the book).

¹ De Baets, *Censorship*, pp. 223-34.

² Mazour, *Modern Russian Historiography*, pp. 236-42.

³ Walther, 'Emigrierte deutsche Historiker', p. 50; Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', p. 172; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, p. 10; *Third Reich*, ed. Alter, p. xiv.

⁴ A. Kitroeff, 'Continuity and Change in Contemporary Greek Historiography', *European History Quarterly*, xix (1989), 271, 291.

⁵ Möller, 'From Weimar', pp. lx-lxi.

given them the most influence, namely the history of the country of destination.¹

Nonetheless, in some specialized fields of research, their influence was significant. In many countries, they developed the genre of diaspora studies.² In the United States and the United Kingdom, they excelled in (Central) European history, most notably German and Jewish history, and in Renaissance studies.³ Meinecke's numerous exile students, who made their way to the United States, brought with them their emphasis on the history of ideas, even if they began to place ideas within their social context, thus advancing the social history of ideas.⁴ Finally, interest in comparative and world history increased, especially after the US intervention in the Second World War.⁵ The situation of Spanish exiles was more clear-cut: history was their preferred discipline; among professional historians, the history of Spain; among politicians and journalists, the history of the Second Republic and the civil war; and among both groups, Spanish influence on American history.⁶ In this case, too, the history of ideas was notable, owing to the influence on refugees of José Gaos, an exiled philosopher, socialist, and former rector at the University of Madrid, who inspired refugee historians with his study of ideas in their historical context. Gaos translated German philosophers into Spanish and introduced the work of his mentor, José Ortega y Gasset; he influenced history departments throughout Latin America.⁷ The history of ideas thrived because it depended less heavily on access to the archives.

Some individuals created a renaissance in certain fields almost single-handedly. To cite one double example, Arnaldo Momigliano and Moses Finley both became political exiles after dismissal from their academic positions, the former from Italy after the introduction of Mussolini's race laws in November 1938, the latter from the United States in 1952 during the McCarthy era. They influenced the study of ancient history far beyond

¹ Epstein, *Past Renewed*, p. 9.

² See, e.g., Joseph Walk (Jewish); Pyotr Kovalevsky (Russian); Vilém Prečan (Czechoslovakian); Javier Malagón Barceló, Juan Antonio Ortega y Medina, Vicente Lloréns Castillo (Spanish); Herbert Strauss, Hanns Reissner (Central European).

³ Iggers, 'Die deutschen Historiker', p. 104; Walther, 'Emigrierte deutsche Historiker', p. 49; Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', pp. 164, 173; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, pp. 1, 8, 11; *Third Reich*, ed. Alter, p. xix.

⁴ Iggers, 'Die deutschen Historiker', p. 106; Schulín, 'German and American Historiography', p. 27; Hoffmann, 'Contribution of German-Speaking Jewish Immigrants', p. 163; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, p. 10; Walther, 'Emigrierte deutsche Historiker', pp. 41-4, 50.

⁵ Fermi, *Illustrious Immigrants*, pp. 353-4.

⁶ *Exilio español en México*, p. 888.

⁷ Malagón, 'Los historiadores', pp. 247, 281, 310, 321, 324, 328, 331, 333, 336, 338; Ortega y Medina, 'Historia', pp. 237-42; *Exilio español en México*, pp. 775-6; Gray, 'Spanish Diaspora', pp. 70-1; *Historiadores de México en el siglo XX*, ed. E. Florescano and R. Pérez Montfort (Mexico, 1995), pp. 146-7.

the United Kingdom where they found a new home. For them, exile, as Plutarch contended, raised the quality of the work to towering heights.

To analyse the influence of historians, one needs to know what they *did* as well as what they *thought* or *wrote*: for example, their membership of boards of historical associations and journals, and the numbers of prizes bestowed on them. Table 7 accounts for refugees who founded historical institutions or journals.

TABLE 7. REFUGEE HISTORIANS AS FOUNDERS OF
HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONS AND JOURNALS DURING EXILE

An Indicator of Intellectual Exile (ii)

<i>Origin</i>	<i>Historian</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Historical Institution/Journal</i>
Argentina	Emilio Ravignani (1886-1954)	Uruguay	[1950]	Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas, Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad de Montevideo
Austria	Arnold Wiznitzer (1899-1972)	Brazil	?	Instituto Judaico Brasileiro de Pesquisa Histórica
Belgium	George Sarton (1884-1956)	United States	1924	History of Science Society
			1936	<i>Osiris: Studies on the History and Philosophy of Science, and on the History of Learning and Culture</i> (companion to <i>Isis</i> , 1912-), relaunched by the History of Science Society (1985-)
	Henri Grégoire (1881-1964)	United States	1941	Transfer of <i>Byzantion: Revue internationale des études byzantines</i> , co-founded by Grégoire (1924), to New York (1941-6) [Also founder-president École Libre des Hautes Études, New York]

China	Fu Sinian (1896-1950)	Taiwan	1948	Transfer of Academia Sinica Institute of History and Philology (with help of Qian Mu, Luo Jialun, Li Ji, Dong Zuobin)
	Zhang Qiyun (1901-)	Taiwan	1954	National Historical Museum [also re-established three universities]
Czecho-slovakia	Joseph Kirschbaum (1913-)	Canada	1992	Chair in Slovak Culture and History, University of Ottawa (held by Mark Stolarik)
Egypt	Ahmad Shalabi (?1914-)	Sudan	[1965]	Department of History and Islamic Civilization, Islamic University of Omdurman
Germany	Guido Kisch (1889-1985)	United States	1938	<i>Historia Judaica: Journal of Studies in Jewish History, Especially in the Legal and Economic History of the Jews</i> (from 1962 part of <i>Revue des études juives</i>)
	George Hallgarten (1901-75)	United States	?	American Committee to Study War Documents (later: American Historical Association Committee for the Study of War Documents) (co-founder)
	George Urdang (1882-1960)	United States	1941	American Institute of the History of Pharmacy, Madison WI (co-founder)
	Ernst Posner (1892-1980)	United States	1945	Organized summer courses in archival education, called summer institutes (on archive administration, 1945-61; on genealogical research, 1950- ; in records management, 1954- ; on interpretation of historic sites, 1949-50)

<i>Origin</i>	<i>Historian</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Historical Institution/Journal</i>
Germany (Cont'd)	Albrecht Goetze (1897-1971)	United States	1947	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i> (journal about ancient Mesopotamia and Anatolia; Baghdad School of American Schools of Oriental Research) (co-founder)
	Stephan Kuttner (1907-96)	United States	1955	Institute of Medieval Canon Law (Washington, Yale, Berkeley, from 1991 Munich; from 1996 called Stephan Kuttner Institute of Medieval Canon Law)
Poland	<i>Various exiles</i>	France	1962-	<i>Zeszyty historyczne</i> (Historical Notebooks), Paris, Instytut Literacki. Published about blank spots of contemporary history; copies illegally introduced in Poland, sometimes in miniature versions.
	<i>Council of Jews from Germany</i>	United States	1955	Leo Baeck Institute for the Study of the History and Culture of German-speaking Jewry (New York; branches in Jerusalem, London, Berlin) (President: Leo Baeck [1873-1956]; chairman of the board: Siegfried Moses [1887-1974]; editor of <i>Year Book</i> (1956-); Robert Weltsch [1891-1982], and others)
Soviet Union	<i>Various exiles and émigrés</i>	Czecho-slovakia	[1923]	Russian Cultural and Historical Museum and Russian Foreign Historical Archive, Prague (archives confiscated in 1946)

Soviet Union (Cont'd)	Lev Bagrow (1881-1957)	Germany	1935	<i>Imago Mundi: International Journal for the History of Cartography</i>
	Natalya Gorbanevskaya (1936-)	France	1979-83	Edited volumes 2-6 of <i>samizdat</i> journal <i>Pamyat: Istoricheskii sbornik</i> (Memory: An Historical Anthology), 'temporarily' published as <i>tamizdat</i> in Paris
Spain	Francisco Barnés (1877-1947)	Mexico	?	Museo Nacional de Historia, Chapultepec, Mexico DF
	Juan Comas Camps (1900-79)	Mexico	1941	Escuela Nacional de Antropología e Historia (co-founder) [Also founder of Instituto de Investigaciones Antropológicas, National Autonomous University of Mexico, 1973]
	José María Miquel i Vergés (1904-64)	Mexico	1941	Centro de Estudios Históricos, Colegio de México (co-founder)
	Ángel Palerm Vich (1917-80)	Mexico	1973	Centro de Investigaciones Superiores, Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia (from 1980: Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social) (co-founder) [Also founder-director of Department of Social Anthropology and Instituto de Ciencias Sociales at Universidad Iberoamericana (1967-80)]
	Claudio Sánchez Albornoz (1893-1984)	Argentina	1940	Instituto de Historia de España, Universidad de Buenos Aires
1944			<i>Los Cuadernos de Historia de España</i>	

<i>Origin</i>	<i>Historian</i>	<i>Destination</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Historical Institution/Journal</i>
Spain (Cont'd)	Juan María Aguilar y Calvo (1889-1948)	Panama	?	Organized academic curriculum for universal and American history, Universidad de Panamá
	Pedro Bosch Gimpera (1891-1974)	Guatemala	[1945]	Facultad de Humanidades, Universidad de San Carlos, including its history curriculum (co-founder)
		El Salvador	[1947]	Similar activities as in Guatemala
	Manuel Tuñón de Lara (1917-97)	France	1970	Organized conferences of Centro de Investigaciones Hispánicas, Pau University (1970-80)

NOTES: Belgium, China: two important transfers are included. Germany, Poland, the Soviet Union: it is unknown whether the collective actors (printed in italics) included historians. The Soviet Union: Gorbanevskaya is not a historian but a poet and translator.

SOURCE: Author's own database.

Table 7 could be entitled 'Plutarch's dream' and cited as corroboration of his thesis. Even so, it reflects only part of the exiles' real performance. In addition to those mentioned in the table, ten historians founded institutions of a *larger than* historical nature and nine founded institutions of *another than* historical nature during their exile. And to these, one could add the many refugee historians who founded institutions or journals *after* returning from exile. The institutional and editorial activities of refugee historians were substantial but, naturally, far from covering the entire institutional and editorial landscape in the countries of asylum. As a whole, the contribution of refugees, however precious, was neither of cardinal importance nor a crucial difference to scholarship in the host countries.

The third and most difficult question is whether loss for the country of origin was of corresponding benefit to the country of destination. Career change (Table 6) complicates the answer. Pondering this question for German refugee historians in the United States, Peter Walther speaks of the benefit for the receiving country ('sicherlich ein Gewinn'), but emphasizes the huge loss for Germany ('nicht messbarer Verlust'). But for Catherine Epstein: 'The fact that so many refugees changed careers challenges the common notion that American scholarship benefited from what the

German scholarship lost.¹ One could add that the more political the reasons for exile, and the more time given by refugees to political activities, the less their impact on the discipline. On the whole, the balance shows that loss for the country of origin outweighs benefits for the country of destination.

From no angle of analysis, except institutional innovation, can the exiles' overall effect be called undilutedly positive. Usually, the forced departure was a tragedy at the micro-level of the individual refugee and often a career breach only laboriously reparable. At the macro-level of historiography, the loss to the country of origin was not equalled by gains for the country of destination. The international cross-fertilization embodied in, or emanating from, refugee historians would have happened anyway, if more slowly. Of course, some countries, domains, or even individual refugees constitute strong exceptions.

The unique role of refugee historians may be located elsewhere, in a fact rarely mentioned by exile researchers: in the courage with which refugee historians kept alive, in unenviable circumstances, the alternative versions – and often the critical principles of logic and evidence – of the historiography of their countries of origin when it succumbed to tyranny, falsification, and lies. This was the real blessing in disguise for the historical profession, embodied in products and even more in principles, in output and even more in plurality, in thoughts and activities and even more in symbols. Even so, with their frozen memories and new horizons, refugee historians were not the only custodians of sound method and interpretation. To maintain this would be to underestimate the integrity of the historians who lived, sometimes for decades, under the severest of dictatorships and still were able, with frozen horizons but lively memories, to create small margins of freedom in their unrelenting search for historical truth.

University of Groningen

¹ Walther, 'Emigrierte deutsche Historiker', p. 50; Epstein, *Past Renewed*, p. 4.