Introduction

Stanislaw Aronson recalls the onset of political violence and the consequences for his life as follows: ‘One moment I was enjoying an idyllic adolescence in my home city of Lodz, and the next we were on the run’. Stanisław Aronson, a Polish Jew, born in 1925, now living in Tel Aviv, found himself more than once ‘at the sharp end of European history’, as he puts it, and warns retrospectively against the power of deliberately spreading lies, which for him is what preceded discrimination and persecution and at the same time concealed disastrous consequences for him and his family. ‘I would only return to my empty home five years later, no longer a carefree boy but a Holocaust survivor and Home Army veteran living in fear of Stalin’s secret police, the NKVD.’

The extremes of the twentieth century have undoubtedly encouraged and promoted flight and migration, which are by no means matters of the past. Forced migration is – unfortunately – still part of current political events. This book takes the timeliness of the topic as an opportunity to recall refugee scholars in general and émigré historians in particular. Above all, however, the book advances research questions on émigré scholarship. At the centre of the book is the question of the dynamics of emigration and its repercussions for scholarship. First, we ask about concrete consequences of
persecution for the lives of intellectuals and scholars. How did researchers who emigrated appropriate their new social and institutional environment and – sometimes completely unknown – academic scene? What considerations and policies shaped the organisations that brokered on their behalf and supported them? What role did the micropolitics of scholars play in all these processes? A further important element is the persona of the scholars: how did the personae of scholars change in this context? How did émigré scholars deal with various if not inconstant and contradictory (self-) images? In what kind of active self-fashioning were they engaged, and what role did gender play in this process? Finally, the question arises as to how dynamics of migration prompted new historical concepts and questions: which ideas remained untouched? Which notions, questions, and the spectrum of themes and questions, altered and evolved?

Scholarship in Exile: Historiographical Reflections with Special Emphasis on Historians

In our contemporary globalised world, scholars move around different countries with considerable ease. Never before in the history of the historical and related academic professions has it been so easy to spend time abroad during one’s studies and again, later, during the dissertation or postdoctoral phases, and later still, when established as visiting professors or fellows at centres of advanced study in different parts of the world. Transnational biographies of historical scholars are increasingly common in a profession that is no longer contained by national boundaries, even if it would be dangerous to underestimate the continued significance of those borders. The contemporary permeability of national scholarly boundaries has led to an increase in the phenomenon of voluntary emigration for many reasons: scholarly advancement, better pay, improved research opportunities, the desire to learn more about other academic cultures, or simply the offer of a job. Such migration is, however, by no means restricted to the contemporary age. It was found already in the nineteenth century. Thus, for example, Ludwig Riess, a pupil of Leopold von Ranke, taught at Tokyo Imperial University between 1887 and 1902, leaving a deep legacy of historicism in the Japanese historical profession. Especially in the intense decades of globalisation around 1900, which arguably have not yet been surpassed in the first decades of the twenty-first century, voluntary scholarly migration was a common phenomenon, resembling the contemporary situation. In between lies the twentieth century, characterised in its first half by hypernationalisms that, combined with racism, led to two world wars, civil wars and genocides on a hitherto unprecedented scale. In its second half, the Cold War ideological conflict
led to innumerable wars in which the capitalist US and the Communist Soviet Union sought to dominate a world politics characterised by the institutionalisation of the nation-state principle on a global scale in the wake of decolonisation.

Although the phenomenon of exile scholarship is an ancient one that can be traced back many centuries, the question emerges whether the twentieth century was the one in which enforced exile was a particularly frequent experience. Ideologies such as nationalism, fascism and communism forced many scholars into exile, where they sometimes established diaspora historiographies that often had a transgenerational impact on scholarly traditions. One particularly prominent example among many is the exile and subsequent diaspora historiography of the Baltic states during the Cold War of the twentieth century. It forged alternative national histories of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to the ones that were written under the Soviet rule between the end of the Second World War and the regained independence of the Baltic states in the early 1990s.7

Voluntary migration might have, at times, amounted to a self-imposed exile, but it was quite distinct from the exile situations that were the consequence of brute force and often denied scholars any choice in the matter of migration. Never before did so many historians have to leave their homelands if they wanted to avoid persecution, imprisonment and death than in the twentieth century. And the ‘crimes against history’ continue, of course, into the twenty-first century and our present. When the International Federation of Human Rights, one of the oldest human rights organisations in the world, founded in 1922, reported these crimes and spoke out against ‘history producers’ in Russia, it adopted a concept and a book title by Antoon De Baets, who has been the most important historian to date in highlighting the contemporary and ongoing persecution of historians around the world.8 Naturally, force is an expandable concept. Is, for example, economic force not also a force? If historians cannot get jobs in their home countries are they not forced to migrate if they want to continue to be historians? There is also the vexed question of political or methodological bias that excludes historians from making a career in their native countries. One of the greatest British social historians of the post-Second World War era, George Rudé, spoke of his own professional existence in Australia as one of exile. Even if he described it as ‘one of the most pleasant’, there clearly was a feeling of being exiled from the place that was at once his homeland and one of the main focuses of his scholarship; another focus being France, with his studies on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century radicalism.9 In the field of exile historiography, it certainly makes sense to differentiate between different types of exile.10 Yet it also seems reasonable not to draw the lines too narrowly but instead to look at all situations in which historians found them-
selves confronted with a situation in which they moved from one country that was familiar to them to another that was, at least at first, alien to them. It would appear that those situations were particularly frequent in the twentieth century, given the political nature of historical thinking and its abundant ideological instrumentalisation in the age of extremes.

If the writing of history eschewed antiquarianism and was, in Friedrich Nietzsche’s sense, ‘critical history writing’ – that is, connected to a present and its search for possible futures – then historians following such a path often lived dangerously, for their work amounted to interventions in political debates that had contemporary relevance. If their writing was part and parcel of a counter-discourse that was opposed to those in power, they were likely to feel the wrath of those to whom they spoke of an unwanted history. Hence, the history of exile historiographies has often been connected to a history of engaged history writing in which the historians saw themselves as contributing to public political debates to which the past was relevant. The borderline between historians and politicians could be a narrow one. Thus, Marian Kukiel was Professor of History at the Polish University in Exile during the Second World War, but he was also the Minister for War in the Polish government in exile. Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz and Lluís Nicolau d’Olver were both historians but also worked in government; in Albornoz’s case as head of the Spanish government in exile, between 1959 and 1971, and in d’Olver’s case as ambassador of the government in exile in Mexico. Many German scholars exiled by National Socialism volunteered their services during the Second World War to the American Office for War Information, the Board of Economic Warfare, and the Office of Strategic Services (OSS). Hajo Holborn, a pupil of Friedrich Meinecke, who had to leave his professorship of history at Berlin’s Hochschule für Politik in 1933 and successfully established himself as professor of history at Yale University between 1934 and 1969, even became President of the American Historical Association between 1967 and 1969 and was head of the Department of Research and Analysis at the OSS during the Second World War. Thereafter, he frequently advised different American governments on questions relating to Germany, and after 1960, he was the Director of the American Council on Germany. In this part of the story of exile historiographies, the exiled historians found themselves in exile for a political reason.

However, another story of exile historiography is completely unrelated to a tradition of engaged history writing and instead has to do with the persecution of historians not because of their historical work or their civic engagement or a connection between the two, but because of ethnic, racial, religious, class or gender discriminations regardless of what historians wrote or said. Hans Rothfels, to give just one example, was a deeply conservative German historian in the interwar period who championed a form of...
‘Volksgeschichte’ that was deeply nationalist and even racist. His political outlook would have been compatible with the National Socialists had he not been a Jew – at least in the eyes of the National Socialists. Hence, he reluctantly left National Socialist Germany for the United States in 1938 to embark on a very successful career at the University of Chicago, before returning, after 1945, to West Germany, where his conservatism influenced the postwar West German historiography for decades to come.

Religion is a marker of exclusion in Islamic nation states of the contemporary era just as it was in Protestant nation states of the nineteenth century. For Islamist historians, it is thus impossible to imagine a non-Muslim historian employed at the universities of the Islamic Republic of Iran, just as many Protestant historians in nineteenth-century Germany or Britain found it impossible to imagine a Catholic or Jewish historian as a respected member of the historical profession.

University education is a privilege largely enjoyed by middle-class people, and class remains an important exclusionary factor for the recruitment of historians. In many parts of the West, it was unthinkable until well into the twentieth century to use either the language of class or deal with topics that highlighted the existence of class differences or social movements built around constructions of class identities. The exclusion of Gustav Mayer from the historical profession is a case in point. Mayer, one of the most important early labour historians in Germany, had to flee the National Socialists after 1933 and experienced not only exclusion within Germany but also exile. Here, however, we are already back with questions of power, engagement and exclusion discussed in the previous paragraph.

Another prominent exclusionary factor was gender. The professionalisation of history writing in the nineteenth century was characterised by the systematic exclusion of women from the profession. Whilst, over the last forty years women have been slowly catching up in the West, they remain discriminated against in many other parts of the world. When Western universities began to admit women again from the last third of the nineteenth century onwards, history became a popular subject, and hence exile was a fate that women historians shared with their male colleagues. Among the refugees from National Socialist Germany, for example, were also women historians such as Emmy Heller and Lucie Varga. Their fate in exile was by no means uniform – some were more successful than others in establishing themselves in their new surroundings. Yet, their struggle was clearly characterised by another dimension that was lacking from the struggle of their male colleagues: gender discrimination.

Class, gender and religious exclusions in themselves, however, rarely produced situations of exile, as these tended to be exclusions preventing the recruitment of workers, women and members of religious minorities of even
becoming historians in the first place – in most cases. Ethnic/racial discrimi-
nation did produce a significant exile community because of regime changes
that introduced such ethnic exclusions, most notably the National Socialist
regime in Germany. And indeed, much exile historiography has focused on
the emigration of racially discriminated scholars from central Europe/the
German lands in the 1930s.21

Indeed, the dictatorships of the twentieth century and their racially or
politically motivated persecution of historians has taken centre stage in the
historiography of exiled historians to date.22 Both fascist and communist dic-
tatorships and their dealings with historians they regarded as oppositional
have been studied widely. Italian fascism produced relatively few exiles, as
most historians attempted to arrange themselves within the regime, which
was, in any case, willing to tolerate a certain diversity of opinion within the
academy.23 Thus, for example, Benedetto Croce was able to publish his na-
tional history of Italy under fascism, despite the fact that it was a thinly veiled
critique of the fascist view of Italian history.24 However, the fascist state
could also turn murderous, as was the case with the brothers Rosselli, who
had joined the Resistance and were killed by fascist thugs in exile in France
in 1937.25 Others, like the socialist Gaetano Salvemini or the lapsed com-
munist Franco Venturi, were forced into exile, where they upheld different
national master narratives than the fascist ones.26

The situation in National Socialist Germany was not altogether differ-
ent. Here also only a minority of historians were dismissed by the regime,
whilst the majority made their peace with the fascists.27 The minority con-
sisted of those deemed Jewish by the National Socialists and those who were
Social Democrats, Communists, or otherwise politically opposed to the
National Socialist regime, like Felix Gilbert.28 When Francoism was finally
established in Spain, following a bloody civil war between 1936 and 1939,
many liberals and left-wing academics left the universities and went into
exile in other European or, often, Latin American countries.29 Around one
third of all university professors at Spanish universities lost their jobs after
1939. Among historians, the exodus included Rafael Altamira, Pere Bosch
Gimpera, Claudio Sánchez-Albornoz and Américo Castro.30 Javier Malagón
even claimed that Spanish history was the most pressing issue amongst the
many exiled intellectuals that the Spanish Civil War produced.31

The communist regimes in the twentieth century were at least as thor-
ough in uprooting scholars that were ideologically opposed to them and less
willing to accommodate other views than their fascist counterparts. They
produced large exile communities. Many so-called ‘bourgeois’ historians
left the Soviet Union in the years after the successful Bolshevik October
revolution in 1917.32 They settled in Paris, Berlin and especially in Prague,
where they set up a whole host of institutions, such as the Russian University
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in Prague, the Kondakov Institute, the Russian Historical Archive Abroad and the Russian Library (later renamed Slav Library). The Soviet Union put considerable energy into building up its own historical expertise and completely remoulded the historical profession in the 1920s. In the 1930s, many of those first-generation communist historians were purged by Stalin and ended up as victims in the Gulag or they were killed in the prisons of the Soviet state that they had helped to legitimate through their historical writing.

In Communist Eastern Europe after 1945, we can observe similar patterns. ‘Bourgeois’ historians went into exile using existing networks that often comprised of historians of their own nationality who already were abroad, whilst a new generation of communist historians were often trained by those who had returned from exile during the Second World War. Many journalists, philosophers, linguists, novelists, poets and diplomats who were exiled from Communism during the Cold War turned to history as a result of having become exiles. Hence we can see that the experience of exile encourages in exiles a turn to history in the search for explanations about their own fate.

Such a turn to history produced a range of historical institutions. Exiles from Communist Eastern Europe were particularly diligent institution-builders: the Polish Instytut Historyczny in Rome, the Collegium Carolinum in Munich, the Harvard-Ukrainian Research Institute, the Archive of Czechs and Slovaks Abroad in Chicago, the Bakhmeteff Archive at Columbia University, the Polish Institute and Sikorski Museum in London, the Museum of Russian Culture in San Francisco, and the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America were just some of the most prominent exile institutions that brought together historians and scholars from other disciplines to promote scientific work and build bridges with the scientific communities of their host countries. Exiled historians also founded scientific journals that became successful platforms for research on the countries they had been exiled from; for example, The Polish Review, published by the Polish Institute for Arts and Sciences in America. They founded publishing houses that became hubs of exile scholarship presenting alternative interpretations to the ones peddled by Marxist-Leninists behind the Iron Curtain.

Yet, as the Ukrainian exiles in Canada during the Cold War demonstrated, all scholarly exile undertakings benefited enormously from lively interaction with their host societies, in that it allowed for the modernisation of concepts and methods. It is interesting to observe that the refugees from National Socialism, although hugely influential in their host countries (e.g. in the US and Britain), were far less active as institution-builders. They concentrated more on fitting into the existing institutions of their host countries, where they were often hugely successful.
After the Communists took over power in China in 1949, the historical profession, like other humanities disciplines, was also completely transformed. Many non-communist historians either joined the Kuomintang in Taiwan or left for other shores, especially the United States, which, as one of the biggest academic markets and one that was relatively open to foreign talent, took a huge share of exiled scholars, including historians in the twentieth century.

The huge influx of exiled scholars from fascist and right-wing dictatorships in Europe and from the Communist Soviet Union saw the setting up of a whole host of institutions meant to help the exiles: the Academic Assistance Council was founded in Britain in 1933 and became the Society for the Protection of Science and Learning in 1936. The Comité de Savants in France, the Notgemeinschaft Deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland in Switzerland, and the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars, later extended to Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars, served the same purpose.

Whilst the writing of exile historiography to date has largely focused on the twentieth century, a trend that this current volume is following, a broader chronological look might yield interesting results. Thukydides famously claimed that his twenty years of living in exile made him a more insightful historian. The Jewish-Spanish historian Salomo Ibn Verga, the chronicler of Jewish persecution, had to leave Spain for Portugal in the late fifteenth century and eventually was allowed to leave Portugal for the Ottoman empire, but he died en route to his new place of exile. The turbulent years of the English civil war and its aftermath saw a number of historians exiled at different points in their lives. Upheaval often produced situations of exile. The European nineteenth century is often described as a century of revolutions. Starting with the ‘great French revolution’ of 1789, the nineteenth century saw many revolutionary uprisings in different parts of Europe, for political and nationalist reasons, of which the 1848 revolutionary cycle was particularly prominent. Revolutions produced upheavals in which historians were uprooted from their professional positions and forced into exile or where they lost their jobs. Jules Michelet, for example, could stay in France, but he lost his position as keeper of the national archives and professor at the Collège de France for supporting the revolution of 1848. He had to earn a living by publishing a series of popular books together with his wife on everything from the sea to love and the mountains.

As a historian in Paris, he had been deeply influenced by his contact with the Polish exiled poet Adam Mickiewicz, who also wrote history. Michelet’s works on Polish history and some of his concepts were directly inspired by Mickiewicz, who in turn was deeply influenced by Michelet’s historical works. Paris in the 1830s and 1840s was a key hub for exiles, and they often rubbed shoulders with French academics and intellectuals in those
Another earlier example of a nineteenth-century exile is Germaine de Stael, who produced her work under the impact of a double exclusion from professional recognition and integration – that is, as an exile who had to flee revolutionary France in the 1790s and as a woman. It was from this position that she wrote her insightful history of the German lands. Political persecution produced many exile histories. This was as true of socialism in the nineteenth century as it was for communism in the twentieth. Louis Blanc and Karl Marx are two famous examples of socialist/communist historians who penned their histories in exile. In the twentieth-century, Arthur Rosenberg and Boris Souvarine were two examples of historians who used their exile situation in order to rethink constructively their Marxist approaches and reconsider the future perspectives for revolutionary change. As a result, they left the Communist Party and reoriented themselves politically in their new host countries.

With communism, much of the writing on exile scholarship and refugee historians has focused on the northern transatlantic world (i.e. Europe and North America). Yet the phenomenon was a global one, with strong relevance to Latin America, Asia and Africa. During the course of the twentieth century, a succession of right-wing dictatorships in Latin America exiled scores of left-of-centre historians for political reasons. Sometimes, like in the case of Emilio Ravignani and José Luis Romero, two Argentinian historians fleeing from Peronism, they found new academic homes in neighbouring countries – in Ravignani’s and Romero’s case in Uruguay, from where they could develop powerful positions as institution-builders and constructivists of historical master narratives. Exiled scholars, of course, served as important institution-builders elsewhere, and one of the most famous examples is the New School in New York, which would not have come into being and would have looked very different without the influx of refugees from Central Europe. In Europe before the First World War, Pavel Vinogradoff’s establishment of the École Russe de Hautes Études Sociales in Paris is another example of successful institution-building by exiled historians.

Returning to Latin America, Mario Sznajder and Luis Roniger have argued convincingly that the politics of exile was, almost throughout the whole of the twentieth century, an important means of institutional exclusion practised by most Latin American governments to silence unwelcome voices, including those coming from history writing. But, as the cases of Argentina and Uruguay underline, the same governments that put scholars into exile could also receive scholars fleeing from elsewhere if they fitted the particular political framework of the receiving country. It is intriguing to observe how in some Latin American countries, like Argentina and Uruguay, this history of exile, and mutual scholarly relations through exile, is a continuous one from the interwar period to the end of the twentieth century.
In Latin America, the topic of exile historiography has a political immediacy, as the contexts of dictatorships are often recent and the legacies both of those who chose exile and those forced into exile are contentious and the subject of acrimonious contemporary debate.59

Elsewhere, the writing of Black history and the many black African diasporas across the globe has become the subject of intense debate.60 In Southern Africa, exile histories have constructed the experience of exile, and in particular the experience of living in ‘the camp’, as a crucial foundational experience for the construction of a post-apartheid South Africa.61 And ‘refugee historians’ from Burundi, living in Tanzania, played a crucial role in producing historical narratives that were vital in forging collective identity among Burundian refugees.62

National insurrections in postcolonial situations in Africa and Asia frequently led to exile, yet the same is true for Europe. Here many historians who had sided with nationalist uprisings against multinational empires in the nineteenth century were forced into exile after these uprisings had failed. Thus, for example, Poland saw two major uprisings, in 1831 and 1862, in which nationalists sought to re-establish Poland on the map of Europe, from where it had vanished in multiple treaties that partitioned the Polish lands between Prussia, Russia and the Habsburg empire in the late eighteenth century. Joachim Lelewel, the archetype of the radical romantic historian,63 had to leave his native Warsaw after 1831 for his part in the uprising. He settled in Paris and later in Brussels, from where he continued to write a succession of history books on the Polish lands, aimed at keeping awake the Polish historical consciousness and defining the Polish lands, especially at the border with the Russian empire.64

Writing national historical master narratives from a position of exile was quite a common phenomenon, as exiled historians remained vexed and fascinated by their former homelands, and they often wanted to contest either imperial, colonial or alternative master narratives. A fully-fledged Basque national historical narrative, for example, only emerged in exile after 1939: in close association with leading exiled politicians, Basque historians constructed a nationalist narrative that aimed at distancing the Basque country from Spain.65 Teaching and writing outside of their old homeland in new surroundings, exiled historians often inspired students of history in their new countries to specialise in the histories of their homelands. Thus refugee historians from National Socialism in both Britain and the United States taught a generation of British and American historians the history of Germany and central Europe, thus contributing to a flowering of this subject in English-language historiography after the Second World War.66

Regardless of such success stories, the situation of the exiled historian is always connected to uprooting experiences that are deeply alienating. Con-
Contrary to Plutarch’s famous thesis, they have rarely been a blessing in disguise. Contributions of refugee historians to scholarship were made against the odds. It is intriguing to reflect on the fact that historians of ancient historiography have frequently stressed how the experience of exile was fundamental to the quality of ancient Greek historical writing. This set a trend that can also sometimes be found in modern historiography despite the plain and simple fact that exiled historians were violently extracted from one country and transplanted into another. As a consequence, exiled historians often developed an acute sense of space that could produce a longing for the ‘lost homeland’, or, alternatively, an overriding desire to integrate themselves as quickly as possible into the new space they were transplanted to, their new ‘homeland’. Often it produced a mixture of the two. In any case, the memory of the old homeland and the memory of the transition from the old to the new often haunted exiled scholars for many decades, if not for their entire lifetime.

Where the hankering after the space they lost was dominant, exiled historians delved deep into their memories and in some respects came to live in the past. The anti-communist historians that fled revolutionary Russia after 1917 are a case in point. Wherever they eventually settled, they primarily mixed among other Russian exiles and protracted their pre-revolutionary concerns as historians into the post-1917 period, largely ignoring the caesura. In their habitus as in their scholarly concerns they literally lived in a past that no longer had any meaning outside of their closed exile circles. Where they had an impact on the historical profession in their host countries, they prolonged pre-1917 research traditions as well as political commitments (strong anti-Communism). They lost touch with the post-1917 Soviet historiography and its developments that they regarded as politically illegitimate and scholarly humbug. We can find a similar unwillingness to engage with the new host countries among prominent Chinese exile scholars from Communism, such as Ping-Ti Ho. To what extent exiled historians were willing to learn from their new environment depended on how they perceived the quality of the academic world they entered in relation to the one that they came from. Thus, for example, many German scholars emigrating from National Socialist Germany had a very high opinion of German scholarship and did not rate the scholarship in many of the places they settled. If anything, they saw their mission in introducing German ‘Wissenschaftlichkeit’ into their new surroundings. Hans Rothfels’ habitus at the University of Chicago would fit that pattern perfectly, as it would be hard to argue that he ever became integrated into the American academic culture that he despised. His success at Chicago was based on the high reputation of German scholarship in the US and on the willingness of Chicago-based scholars to adopt the German habitus, which did not really make it a happier place.
Yet exile also often produced in the exiled historian an acute desire to look for explanations of why they found themselves in exile, which often had to do with the fact that their ‘cause’ had lost in power struggles, forcing them to leave. Reinhart Koselleck once observed that the losers in historical conflicts write the more innovative history, as they tend to search more deeply for the reasons for their defeat, whilst the victors write a facile and teleological history ending up in their own victory.73 The obsession with defeat producing exile has, by contrast, resulted in many excellent histories. The rethinking of history that resulted from situations of exile frequently involved conceptual innovation. Thus, for example, exiles from the Soviet Union in the interwar period established the concept of Eurasianism in order to distance themselves from those who had argued in favour of Russia modernising and catching up with the West. Westernisation, according to them, was the root cause for the destruction of the Romanov empire, with liberals and socialists/communists all attached to those Westernising tendencies. Instead, Eurasianists justified Russia’s difference to the West and saw it located firmly in the East, where it allegedly had an imperial mission that was aimed at establishing an alternative to the path of Western modernisation.74 Another example of conceptual innovation in exile is Henri Pirenne, who spent time in enforced exile as a prisoner of war in Germany during the First World War. Here, Pirenne, an ardent admirer of the German historical sciences before the First World War, developed a criticism of the strong ethnonationalist foundations of some of the German scholarship he had come to admire. He came to realise how this had also influenced his own thinking on national history; for example, in his famous history of Belgium, which was in fact first published in German in 1899. In the interwar period, he systematically de-ethnicised this history in subsequent editions of the work to be published in French.75

If historians stayed alert to their new surroundings and were willing to learn from them, they could also often draw from the historiographical traditions of their home countries to shed new light on the histories of their countries of origin. Thus, a generation of historians exiled from National Socialist Germany and growing up in the United States picked up theoretical pre-occupations of US historians (e.g. the progressive tradition of US American historical writing) and developed from those traditions perspectives on the history of Germany that were highly original and that in turn influenced German historians in the Federal Republic of Germany. Hans Rosenberg, for example, had to leave National Socialist Germany in 1936 and continued his career at Brooklyn College in New York and the University of California in Berkeley. After 1945, he returned to several visiting professorships at West German universities before resettling in West Germany in 1970, and his physical presence in the country from where he once had to emigrate...
increased his influence on the postwar generation of West German historians. Rosenberg’s concepts, such as ‘the Great Depression’ or ‘Bonapartist rule’, were integrated into German ‘Gesellschaftsgeschichte’ as it developed in the 1970s and 1980s. Refugee historians from National Socialist Germany remained emotionally highly involved with German affairs. It is no coincidence that the role of the German resistance to National Socialism was a topic that was close to their heart, as it allowed them to construct notions of ‘another Germany’ that had remained ‘decent’ in the face of the German descent into barbarism.

An interesting phenomenon in the study of exile historiographies is that of ‘second-generation exile’ – that is, historians who either fled as children or were born to exiles already in the new homeland. Growing up with exile often produced an intense interest in the homeland of their parents’ generation. In their training as historians they therefore specialised in the histories of those countries from where their parents originated. If we take, for example, the historians Wilma and Georg Iggers, who had both fled their native countries – Czechoslovakia and Germany, respectively – they retained in their scholarship a lifelong concern with the Bohemian lands (in Wilma’s case) and with the history of Germany (in Georg’s case). Wilma Iggers’ Women of Prague and Georg Iggers’ The Conception of German History are good examples of how second-generation exiles remained focused on the histories of their origin, which was an attempt to retain and revitalise old bonds of belonging and explain why they had been ruptured. The Iggers are also a good example of how exile did not only influence scholarship but also ways of life and political engagement. Their struggle against the ongoing discrimination of black people in the United States, against the Vietnam War and against the blind anti-Communism in the West were examples of political commitments that were related to the experience of early dislocation produced by exile.

Some studies in the historiography of exile have focused on ‘internal exile’ – that is, the banishment of historians from their former places of work, usually in metropolitan centres, to the peripheries of academia or outside of academia altogether. In the vast empire of Russia/the Soviet Union, historians could be banished from Moscow and St. Petersburg to the far east or some other remote part of the empire, where their influence was limited. In the communist worlds of the twentieth century, it was a common phenomenon to demote historians who had not been willing to tow the party line and make them work in factories or other non-academic jobs as a form of punishment. Sometimes they could return from there to re-occupy positions in academia, whilst at other times they simply disappeared. The Italian fascists practised ‘confino’ to silence antifascists, who were sent to remote islands or villages where they were de facto imprisoned and their voices remained unheard. ‘Internal exile’ has also been used as a term of
description for those scholars who felt at a distance to dictatorial regimes but did not speak up against them. Withdrawing into their scholarship was seen as a form of ‘internal exile’. However, this concept is highly problematical, as it was used in the aftermath of dictatorships to veil the fact that many scholars simply arranged themselves with dictatorships and sought to protect their way of life and their position in the academy by going along with dictatorships.

Foremost among the questions that historians of exile historiography have tackled are those about their impact, both on their countries of origin and on their countries of residence. Often historians became bridge-builders between the two. They could uphold alternative histories to the ones that were produced in their countries of origin, thereby resisting attempts by dictatorial regimes to streamline history into one uncontested and homogeneous storyline. They could also inspire a new generation in their new home countries through the methods, theoretical insights and subject areas they brought with them from their countries of origin. Thus, for example, the Renaissance scholar Hans Baron brought his phenomenal knowledge of Italian Renaissance archives first to Britain and then to the United States and inspired a huge revival of Renaissance studies in both countries, especially in the United States, where he eventually settled.

Yet one should not glorify most historians’ experience of exile. They often struggled economically. If they could find jobs as historians at all, they were often jobs that were poorly paid and had huge teaching loads, making it difficult to continue research careers. As Ragnar Björk has shown for Scandinavia, the process of re-embedding exiled historians from National Socialism was a difficult one that rarely succeeded. The internationalism of historical studies that found expression, above all, in the world history congresses, organised from the late nineteenth century to the present day, has not helped much either, as it was organised through its national affiliates, hence making the nation state and its historical profession the building block of transnationalism, thereby leaving exiled historians without representation. Within exile historiography, there is a clear bias towards studying those who made it in their new homelands, who managed to continue their careers and were successful. These historians did not only leave more material behind, but they were also often influential, in both their new homeland and in their country of origin. Hence the writing on exile historiography has tended to underestimate the catastrophe that exile meant to the overwhelming number of exiles and highlighted instead the few cases where exile produced, in Peter Burke’s words, a ‘double deprovincialization’ of historical writing. Burke’s impressive attempt to see a ‘silver lining’ in the experience of exile by highlighting the exiles’ ability to distance themselves from their own research traditions, to engage with new research traditions in their host countries, to move towards comparison and to mediate between different scholarly traditions and act as bridge-builders is certainly pointing to vital
elements of the experience of scholarly exile, but it is referring to those ‘who made it’ against the backdrop of many more who did not.

The cases that are selected in this volume speak to many of the historiographical themes that are identified above as key ones in the history of historiography on émigré scholarship. We focus on some of the key countries in which historians have been exiled in the twentieth century, especially Germany, but also Russia, Poland, Hungary, the Iberian Peninsula and Serbia. Both Eastern and Western Europe are prominently represented in this volume. We have also selected individuals who are either not very well known in the existing literature on émigré scholars, or we have provided new perspectives on individuals about whom much has been written already. Overall, the contributions in this volume fit neatly into the historiography of émigré scholarship and provide tantalising new facets to the picture of transfers, adaptations and reinventions that mark the experience of exiled scholars in many parts of the world.

The editors of this volume would like to express their deep gratitude to the Fritz-Thyssen-Stiftung, whose financial support made the project possible and led to this publication.
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2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. On historians, see, for example Munro and Reid, Clio’s Lives, where the transnational elements of historians’ biographies are a prominent theme. For the neighbouring discipline of geography, see Marcus, Transnational Geographers in the United States. On the importance of crossing cultural borders in historiography, see the contributions in Fuchs and Stuchtey, Across Cultural Borders. With regard to journeys to foreign archives and libraries see Müller, ‘Doing Historical Research’; idem, Geschichte machen, 257–317.
5. Berger, The Past as History, chapter 6 acknowledges the weakening of national(ist) traditions in professional history writing but also that considerable remaining linkages get stronger if we consider historical writing outside of the universities and academies of contemporary Europe. For an overview of global contemporary developments, see Maissen and May, National History and New Nationalism in the Twenty-First Century.
7. Tamm, ‘Displaced History?’.
10. For conceptual discussions, see De Baets, ‘Exile and Acculturation’.
17. On the dominance of Protestantism and its exclusion of Catholicism within the academic culture of Imperial Germany, see Vom Bruch, *Wissenschaft, Politik und öffentliche Meinung*.
22. Tortarolo, ‘Historians in the Storm’.
23. Goetz, *Der freie Geist und seine Widersacher*.
25. Morgan, ‘Reclaiming Italy?’.
27. Schönwälder, *Historiker und Politik*.
28. Lehmann, *Felix Gilbert as Scholar and Teacher*.
35. Barber, *Soviet Historians in Crisis*.
36. Zadencka, Plakans and Lawaty, *East and Central European History Writing in Exile*. Antoon De Baets counted 156 historians from East Central and Eastern European countries, excluding the Soviet Union, who were exiled by the newly established communist regimes after the Second World War. See De Baets, ‘Exile and Acculturation’, 328.
37. Stolarik, ‘Slovak Historians in Exile in North America, 1945–1992’, found 21 exiled Slovak historians, but only a handful of them were already historians before they were exiled. The rest became historians as a result of their exile experience.
40. See for relevant archival documentation: Hammel and Grenville, *Refugee Archives*.
41. Wang, ‘Between Marxism and Nationalism’. See also Unger, *Using the Past*.
42. Leff, *Well Worth Saving*; Coser, *Refugee Scholars in America*.
44. Bowersock, ‘The Personality of Thucydides’.
46. MacGillivray, *Restoration Historians and the English Civil War*.
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52. Loubère, Louis Blanc; Sperber, Karl Marx.
53. Kessler, Grenzgänger des Kommunismus; Roche, Boris Souvarine et la Critique Sociale.
55. Krohn, Wissenschaft im Exil.
60. Wright, Black History and Black Identity.
61. Williams, ‘Silence, Voices, and “the Camp”’.
62. Sommers, Fear in Bongoland.
64. Stobiecki, ‘National History’. On Lelewel see Kanka, Joachim Lelewel; on nineteenth-century Polish exiles, including historians, compare Marchiewicz, ‘Continuities and Innovations’.
65. Aggirreazkuenaga, ‘Reinterpreting the Basque Past in Exile’.
66. One example among many of such an inspiring refugee historian was Francis L. Carsten. See Alter, ‘Refugees from Nazism and Cultural Transfer to Britain’, 83–85. On the manifold interconnections between British and German historiography that were often enriched by experiences of exile, see Stuchtey and Wende, British and German Historiography as well as Berger, Lambert and Schumann, Historikerdialoge.
67. De Baets, ‘Plutarch’s Thesis’; an updated version with the same title can be found in De Baets and Berger, Writing History in Exile, 27–38.
69. Creet and Kitzmann, Memory and Migration.
70. Raeff, Russia Abroad.
74. Wiederkehr, Die eurasische Bewegung.
75. Schöttler, ‘After the Deluge’.
76. On Rosenberg, see Winkler, ‘Ein Erneuerer’.
77. Lamberti, ‘The Search for the “Other Germany”’.
79. See their double biography: Iggers, Two Lives in Uncertain Times.
80. Martin, Dissident Histories in the Soviet Union.
81. Garofalo, Leake, and Renga, Internal Exile in Fascist Italy.
82. Schiller, ‘Made “Fit for America”’, 345–60.
83. On the hardships of exile, see also Goddeeris, ‘The Temptation of Legitimacy’, 395–405. On the more general repercussions, see also Rose, The Dispossessed.
85. Erdmann, Toward a Global Community, 162–79.
86. Burke, ‘Silver Lining’, 39–48. See also Burke, Exiles and Expatriates.
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