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"Burn me (my books)!": Oskar Maria Graf protested in the  
Viennese Arbeiterzeitung of May 12, 1933 against his inclusion  
in a so-called White List of authors of the "New Germany"  
which, as he stated, could only be a "black list in the world  
conscience." This White List had been compiled by the  
National-Socialists on the occasion of their book-burning of  
May 10, 1933 on Berlin's Opernplatz. "After a life devoted to  
writing I have the right to demand that my books be surrendered  
to the pure flame of the stake, and not to the bloody hands  
and the deranged minds of the brown murder gangs. Burn the  
works of the German spirit! It will be as ineffaceable as your  
disgrace!" This bitter demand did not remain unheeded. In the  
main auditorium of Munich University students, in the presence  
of professors, burned the works of the "Bavarian Bal-
zac," which the Reichspropagandaminister Goebbels had  
mistakenly left out of his autodafé. This book-burning which  
destroyed not only literary works of world fame but also numer-
ous scientific and journalistic writings of older and recent  
date, was a public manifestation of a censureship policy that  
put about 3,000 works on the index of banned books by 1934.  
Within a few months public libraries were "purged" of writ-
tings that were classified as "degenerate" or that were written  
by authors of Jewish background, or by politically disagree-
able persons, which was a priori the case for leftist authors.  

In quick steps, the N.S. government had created the "legal" ba-
sis for its actions. It recurred to this device every time the use  
of "spontaneous" popular rage seemed to be an in-appropriate  
means of terror, as, for instance, in the so-called Reichskristall-
nacht on November 9, 1938. The Verordnung des Reichspräsi-
denten zum Schutz von Volk und Staat (Reichstagsbrandverord-
nung) (Decree of the Reichspräsident for the Protection of  
People and State) of February 28, 1933 already abrogated the basic  
rights which the Weimar constitution had guaranteed, and  
allowed the persecution of political opponents and the restric-
tion of the freedom of the press. The Verordnung des Reichs-
präsidenten zur Abwehr heimtückischer Angriffe gegen die Regie-
rung der nationalen Erhebung (Decree of the Reichspräsident  
for Countering Treacherous Attacks against the Government  
of the National Revolution) permitted the punishment of crit-
ics of the N.S. government or the organizations supporting it  
(especially the N.S.D.A.P. or its sections) even when a Ger-
man had committed the "deed" in a foreign country. The so-
called Schriftleitergesetz (editors' law) of October 4, 1933 estab-
lished the guidelines for "collaborating with the N.S. auth-
orities in the programming of the intellectual content of news-
papers and political journals edited in the Reich." In the case  
of professional journals, the Reichspropagandaminister decided,
sense, had been culturally active. The suppression of books, the demagogic criticism of writers, artists and scholars, and the spectacular expatriations of émigrés which occurred soon after their flight from Germany — all these facts must have been an obvious warning already during the first months of the "new Germany" to those who remained. Also those who did not have to feel included in the polemics against "corrosive Jewish asphalt literature" and in whom the régime had an interest — as long as they conformed to its aims — because it wanted to use them as world-renowned representatives of German culture, had to decide — as in the case of Thomas Mann — whether or not they should take the risk and remain in Germany and thereby reject the solidarity with esteemed colleagues and friends who had escaped from imminent danger. "Burn me," for many reasons, was the motto not only of Oskar Maria Graf. To protest against violations of basic human rights which they considered a pre-condition for any viable cultural life, and to reject the barbarism visible even at this early stage, in addition to direct pressures due to political or "racial" persecution, were the main motives for the departure from the N.S. state also of the cultural emigrants. In numerous cases, several motives can be discerned: The date of emigration could be determined by the variety of these motives or by external factors, such as the "annexation" of Austria by the German Reich in 1938, or the Munich Pact of 1938 and the resulting destruction of Czechoslovakia in 1939, all of which caused a further wave of emigration. Finally, the impending or already existing German military occupation compelled further emigration after the initial emigration had taken place. For these reasons, many European countries were for most emigrants only intermediate stations of their Odyssey. Main centers of German-language exile like France, the Netherlands and Czechoslovakia were starting points for the New World; many did not succeed in getting there because the necessary visas were not granted: Anna Seghers has vividly described Marseilles as a transit center of émigrés. Individual life histories show how oppressive the uncertainty of escaping in time from the Germans or from the collaborating governments was. Walter Benjamin committed suicide in this predicament, and he was only one of many.

No matter how varied the motives for emigration may have been in the individual case, in a wider sense the cultural emigration deserves the rating "political," as emigration was also an act of resistance against the totalitarian claim to power of the N.S. régime for most of the emigrating scientists, artists and authors. Of course, this statement must not lead to the misunderstanding, that the term "European resistance," which is frequently encountered in émigré circles, signifies a well-organized movement, reaching beyond the borders of, or existing in, individual countries and having a uniform objective and homogeneous structure. Although homogeneous points of crystallization for an organized resistance existed, for instance, in the constantly renewed threat of the expanding N.S. régime or the Spanish Civil War in 1936, the cultural emigrants were characterized by individualism and heterogeneity, frequently even by totally contrary attitudes in contrast to the political emigrants, who were organized in separate groups. The reasons for this were not only the different material and professional situations of those concerned, not only their pronounced individuality, but — also without party affiliation — their varied political attitudes. Numerous emigrants fell into deep social and political disorientation. In this situation, they formed more or less formal circles, which were based, as a rule, on common convictions or old friendships, but were short-lived because of the extreme fluctuations of their membership. The varying degree of success in integrating themselves quickly (though superficially) into the host countries, which frequently accepted the emigrants only reluctantly and often only as transit travellers, reduced the feeling of solidarity. Klaus Mann described this lack of understanding which the emigrants often faced in his autobiography Der Wendepunkt, Lion Feuchtwanger the inner tensions besetting the cultural exiles in his novel Exil. In fact, contrary to what much secondary literature frequently maintains, no homogeneous German exile literature existed. Nor do other sectors of the cultural emigration show homogeneity in contents. The cultural emigration can only be defined precisely by its common elements: the resistance to the Nazi régime, the danger it represented to the émigrés and the material conditions of existence in exile.

For a definition of the term "cultural emigration" the following constituent factors are relevant, in addition to objectives set by individual emigrants and emigrants' groups: the contours of German intellectual life after World War I, the cultural situation in the Third Reich and finally, the attempt of the emigrants to present German culture in exile as that of another, better, Germany with the help of writings, proclamations, and organizations of all kinds. This was common to most cultural activities if not in their respective contents at least in form. The positive cultural aim was common to all directions, it pointed back to the years prior to 1933 and at the same time to the time after 1945. The activities of the cultural emigrants took place "facing Germany" and were, at the same time, directed towards the respective host countries. But already at this point, new difficulties for a stringent definition become obvious. The reason for this heterogeneity of the cultural emigrants lies, on the one hand, in the basic structure of Weimar culture, which had been decisively influenced by later emigrants, and, on the other hand, in the contents of the N.S. polemics against this culture.

The reasons for the explosive cultural wealth of the Weimar years can hardly be reduced to a common denominator. Rather, they become more tangible with the aid of formal criteria, the most important of these being the general consciousness of crisis and the revolutionary impetus within the Republic, which has lately been analyzed by John Willet under the title The New Sobriety. Art and Politics in the Weimar Period 1917—1933. The general consequence of this culture was the erosion of the middle or, as Hans Sedlmayr puts it, the "loss of the middle." This consciousness of crisis and the revolutionary elements originated long before World War I. Jacob Burckhardt's cultural pessimism, the spirit of the Fin de siècle, the fascinated prophecy of threatening disaster by Friedrich Nietzsche, early expressionism: these are only a few of the influences. But the increase in, and cumulative of, these tendencies in the twenties was a consequence of the World War, characterized culturally by the development toward extremism. These extremisms professed to be revolutionary in an exclusive manner: the Conservative Revolution on the one hand, the Socialist Revolution on the other. In the view of either directions, the Weimar Republic never had a chance from the beginning, but bore the obvious features of transition and disso-
lution. In both camps, the keen perception of social, political, and ideological problems was joined to the defamation of the republican state and its political institutions. During this process, the new Republic shrank to a merely transitional form of government, no matter how many years it would survive. Past and future crushed it into an episode of insignificance. But the Conservative Revolutionaries were not only agents of restoration: Although their attitude was obviously marked by political reaction, they too strove toward new goals. Whatever the "Third Reich" of Moeller van den Bruck and his partisans may have been meant to look like, it was not meant to be a simple resurrection of the vanished monarchy. The Conservative Revolutionaries recognized, rather, as Carl Schmitt did, the symptoms of the political and constitutional crisis, and, as Oswald Spengler and Ernst Jünger pointed out, the importance of modern technology and the changes of life due to urbanization, and, finally, the fundamental structural social changes as well, which Ernst Jünger described in his novel-essay Der Arbeiter. The paradox extended also to the political form of organization of the future: despite all elitist disgust for the recognized mass character of modern society, some of these conservative-revolutionary enemies of the Weimar Republic supported a Caesarism whose plebiscitarian basis Carl Schmitt had recognized. But plebiscitarian Caesarism had nothing to do with the restoration of the Hohenzollern monarchy. It is fruitless to share still today this disastrously erroneous view of German nationalists and some other conservatives. Weimar democracy would hardly have succumbed to the anti-revolutionary and restorative tendencies of the twenties and early thirties alone, although the advocates of these goals belonged to its gravediggers.

And on the other end of the political spectrum? The intellectual left had no better intentions toward the Republic. Perhaps its attacks on the system were more varied in a few points, yet the fact that it failed in the face of the N.S. revolution, whose earliest victim it became, must be conceded. The Weimar Republic offered a home to the intellectual left — despite the embitterment of the latter; the Weimar government treated this opponent well; its rich culture resulted above all from this tolerance. But did the renowned analysts of the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research — who were, after all, a product of capitalist patronage and intellectual open-mindedness — really have a personal reason to fight the political and socio-economic system of Weimar? Did Carl von Ossietzky and Siegfried Jacobsohn really have reason enough to do with the restoration of the Hohenzollern monarchy. It is fruitless to share still today this disastrously erroneous view of German nationalists and some other conservatives. Weimar democracy would hardly have succumbed to the anti-revolutionary and restorative tendencies of the twenties and early thirties alone, although the advocates of these goals belonged to its gravediggers.

For those who still hoped for the Socialist Revolution and frequently held these hopes to be scientific gospel, the state of Weimar was seen as a despicable product of an unfinished revolution and merely transitory. On the other hand, these leftist intellectuals contributed to the founding of modern sociology through their keen analyses of social problems. One need only remember Siegfried Kracauer's essays Uber die Angestellten, which appeared as a series in the liberal Frankfurter Zeitung, Theodor Geiger's analyses of Die soziale Schichtung des deutschen Volkes, Siegfried Neumann's analyses of Weimar political parties, Emil Lederer's, Carl Grünberg's and many other sociologists' works on problems of social development, for instance, Die Darstellung des gewerblichen Proletariats by the liberal Goetz Briefs. No less sharp-witted were the commentaries on, and criticism of, daily politics, which Kurt Tucholsky and others published in Ossietzky's periodical, Die Weltbühne, as well as other kinds of diagnoses of the times. Hermann Broch described the "dissolution of values," and Lion Feuchtwanger and Oskar Maria Graf the social breeding ground for National Socialism. The Politisches Theater of Erwin Piscator and Bertolt Brecht influenced the opinion of the intellectual community. The high level of daily journalism, for instance of the Berliner Tageblatt, the Vossische Zeitung and the Frankfurter Zeitung, was marked by a liberal spirit, and treated the new Republic with more respect than the sharp-tongued left, but on the whole it can be stated that the Republic had no good press on either side. The politically moderate journals and newspapers without party affiliation, which had either a liberal or Social-Democratic character, or those which were oriented towards political Catholicism, remained in a minority, as did the parties that had founded Weimar democracy in 1919 — S.P.D., Zentrum and D.D.P. — and, since the first election to the Reichstag in 1920, remained in the minority.

Peter Gay called his book on the intellectuals of the Weimar Republic Weimar Culture. The Outsider as Insider. And,
indeed, the Weimar state was a republic of outsiders, but in regard to the intellectuals, it was hardly a government-imposed outsider position. Rather, the “new” intellectuals of the left and right did not accept the Republic, and the old cultural elites of the empire usually did not know what to make of the Republic. Vernunftrepublikaners, i.e. those who accepted the Republic for mere pragmatic reasons, existed among the scholars, e.g. Friedrich Meinecke, and among authors and artists, e.g. Thomas Mann and Max Liebermann. Certainly this list could be enlarged with well-known names, but how representative was this group for the spirit of the era? This spirit was, generally yet concretely stated, for the most part critical of the times, analyzed society and politics with great intellectual acumen, wanted to be political and yet cared little for the political consequences of its behavior. George Grosz drew the “ruling class” in biting caricatures; Reichspräsident Ebert, Reichsaußenminister Stresemann — to name only these two pioneers of the Weimar Republic — appeared in the same light as the “pillars of society” of before 1918. John Heartfield depicted upcoming National-Socialism in his photomontages and buried his criticism in his hatred of capitalist society, of which he considered National-Socialism to be a product. He did not recognize, and did not want to recognize, the difference between the Nazis and the Weimar democrats whom he also fought, until the N.S.-revolution of 1933 made it clear to everyone how the critics had identified and fought enemies and friends alike without differentiating between the two. Intellectualism of this kind was a symptom of the crisis and, at the same time, the most keen-eyed diagnosis of the crisis. In the short time of its existence, the critics of the Republic did not give it enough time. They criticized not as democrats, not with critical sympathy, but with hostility.

Weimar intellectuals, as Walter Laqueur has rightly remarked, were in a certain way unable to carry on a dialogue: Leftist intellectuals took no notice of the intellectuals of the right, and vice versa. The old cultural elites, for their part, did not know how to deal with the revolutionary spirit of this culture. This is also true for the art of those years. They rather knew what to do with Conservative Revolutionaries like Oswald Spengler, but also in this case much leads us to assume that individual catchphrases — like the title of his historical-philosophical main œuvre, _Untergang des Abendlandes_, had more influence than the frequently vague political ideas of the author. On the left as well as on the right wing, there existed such a polarity that no communication took place. Indeed, they ignored one another. There was a circular movement of ideas that always led to renewed cell divisions: The line of demarcation was usually the attitude towards official party communism, the orthodoxy of which the most renowned heads of the intellectual left rejected sooner or later, since it threatened to paralyze their critical thought. By the end of the twenties and the beginning of the thirties more and more humanitarian motives, as well as political and scholarly reasons for the rejection of the K.P.D. were brought forward. The Stalinist show trials of the thirties and the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939 brought disillusionment to many. And thus it is revealing that the majority of the cultural emigrants, even those who were leftists, did not emigrate to the U.S.S.R. In regard to the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research, Martin Jay has remarked: “The Marxist and anti-capitalist-oriented Institute, characteristically enough, did not emigrate to the communist Soviet Union, but to the center of the capitalist world, to New York.” And this at first sight specific observation is true for the general state of affairs. The critical intellectuals were in a strict sense dependent on the crisis-shaken, imperfect, criticizable Republic of Weimar, on its social problems, on its capitalist economic system, even on the colorlessness of its political leadership. The critical faculties of these intellectuals were made keen by this world, they became brilliant in their polemics against the Weimar state beyond justice or truthfulness. Their quality lay in the accuracy of their social criticism, not in constructive politics; the political sphere, as a result of Marx’s model of interpretation, was relatively neglected anyhow, in comparison to the social and the economic spheres. It is not by chance that, neither during emigration nor after 1945, a similar highly developed journalism, which was at the same time politically destructive, could develop. The fatal blow which Goebbels gave to this Weimar brand of journalism was successful not because its protagonists had been driven away, incarcerated, forbidden to work or murdered, but because the N.S. revolution had removed the breeding ground which had nourished this critical potential, the state of Weimar.

In a different way — and in regard to developments after 1945 much more effectively, the N.S. regime removed the Conservative Revolution: This was achieved primarily through the establishment of a radical dictatorship, which fundamentally discredited the similar aims of the Conservative Revolutionaries, and which made visible the devastating effect of such ideas, even if they only appeared identical with National-Socialist rancour and the ideological components of its state. Spengler’s postulate of a master race, which was not based on biological arguments, as that of the National-Socialists, serves as an example. In addition, National-Socialism effected a radical restructuring of the social hierarchy, a social revolution and mobilization of the masses, which ran counter to the elitist thinking of the Conservative Revolution. This social revolution forced the conservatives either to change their thinking, to turn to opportunism, to “inner emigration,” or to actual physical emigration, above all, when they realized the basically inhumane and anti-intellectual character of the régime and its ideology. Therefore, members of the political right, even former National-Socialists, were among the emigrants. At the end of this social revolution, any social basis for the Conservative Revolutionaries had disappeared. In this case, too, N.S. rule had removed the breeding ground of Weimar, from which the rightist intellectuals had drawn their strength.

National-Socialism was also a product of instability, of a fundamental shock and social, political, and moral disorientation, but it was not an intellectual reaction to them, as was the case with the programs promoted by intellectuals of the left and the right. It did not parallel the humane, moral protest that more or less motivated the intellectual left. It was, rather, of a socio-psychological order, thriving on anti-intellectual, anti-bourgeois prejudice and fundamentally questioning the principles of traditional morality. But it shared the contempt for Weimar democracy with the revolutionaries on both sides. It pursued, with anti-Semitic emphasis, anti-capitalism — although in an unreflected, not rationally programmatic, form as is characteristic of the varieties of Marxism. National Socialism was, in a different sense than is usually assumed, the mass movement of a center driven to extremism. In the field of cul-
ture it propagated a taste for simple-minded, harmonizing, "natural" mediocrity. This "völkisch" realism was in certain respects related to the socialist realism of Soviet origin. Apart from this, there existed, however, Hans Grimm's *Volk ohne Raum*, which was characterized by expansionism, or the self-aggrandizement of the monumental "master architecture" — for instance, of the buildings for the Nuremberg party rallies or the plans of Albert Speer for the capital Berlin.

A comparison of the inexpressive nudes by N.S. painters with those of the Weimar period or by exiled artists shows how strongly mediocre taste was liable to agree with the attacks of official N.S. "cultural policy" against "decadent" and "degenerate" art. Those painters who broke new ground in the fields of color and space, like Max Beckmann and Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, were too critical for such "art policy" and taste, too aggressive, too problem-oriented. But it would not necessarily have led to the destruction of Weimar culture or to emigration, if N.S. cultural policy had simply replaced diversity by a mindless simplicity. The fundamental animosity arose, because cause and effect had been confused. The diagnosticians of this crisis were blamed for the crisis of their times, for the shock that went to the roots of bourgeois life and security. It was easy to blame them since their caustic criticism went hand in hand with their wish for the downfall of capitalist society.

Without distinction, Communists, Marxists, Social-Democrats, Liberals, and Jews were considered exponents of the Bolshevist revolution. The problems of modernity were comprehended as the political challenge of the Soviet revolution and thus minimized. All those considered enemies were called adherents of Bolshevism. And enemies were fought to their physical destruction. The N.S. régime tried to overcome the uneasiness in the realm of the modern world with the aid of anti-intellectual and racial prejudice. In their "back to nature" slogan they set the metaphysics of "blood and soil", which offered a "natural identification" for the people, against the "labyrinth of the cities," against urban forms of life, in which art and artificiality were united. Among the "asphalt" authors of this acrimonious, homeless, intellectualism, the Nazis singled out many Jews. They embodied the foreign, the uncanny, which had not grown on native soil, the city against the country: the city which as a rule was the political stronghold of Social-Democrats and Communists, if it was not, for regional and religious reasons, dominated by political Catholicism.

The National-Socialists set the total claim of their resentments and ideology against the liberalism and pluralism of Weimar cultural policies. This total claim to power corresponded to that of the main enemy who was no less totalitarian: the Bolshevik ruling system in Russia, whose supposed exponents were to be destroyed in Germany. The general claim to humanitarianism advanced by leftist intellectuals served, paradoxically, to re-enforce National-Socialist animosity, which consciously employed biological and barbaric accents in their ideological conceptions. Prior to 1933, their language and their practice of terror showed this all too clearly — in an ideological sense, analogies could be found in many adherents of the Conservative Revolution. The basic animosity of National-Socialism toward liberalism, pluralism, and Bolshevism forced many to emigrate, but the structure of intellectual life during the Weimar Republic sketched above also brought about a continuing pluralism among the "cultural" emigrants, with their numerous ideological shadings, including the intellectual left — not to mention the differences between Catholic, conservative, liberal, social-democratic, and communist emigrants. The relatively short span of time of actual exile, which lasted for fifteen years and, of course, seemed to be long and had severe personal consequences for the survivors, suggests that we should not separate the term "cultural" emigration completely from its history before 1933 and its history after 1945. In so far, "cultural" emigration does not constitute an independent period of cultural history; its establishment and its impact must accordingly be taken into account. On the other hand, "cultural" emigration can neither be separated from the régime which caused it, nor from the conditions they met during their exile, or the possibilities for acculturation in their host countries and the mostly overseas countries where they finally found themselves. This aspect of their history will be analyzed by H. A. Strauss elsewhere in this introduction. We will only marginally touch upon it here.

A few remarks are necessary at this point on the relationship of emigrés towards the N.S. state and those among the cultural elite who did not emigrate. In this context, the question has to be answered to what extent the "cultural" emigration was "Jewish," as N.S. propagandists suggested. The question is important, since there is more to it than National-Socialist defamation. It has left traces in the self-perception of the Jewish "cultural" emigrants, as considerable segments of this group returned to their Jewish tradition only as a result of N.S. threats and the exile that followed. In other words, the consciousness of Jewish cultural identity among these groups was for many Jews not the cause but a consequence of the threat that all of them had to deal with.

The general assertion that among the emigrated cultural elite there were — in comparison to the whole population — proportionately large number of persons of Jewish background, is indeed true. This statement applies especially to the field of social research which has already been mentioned. It was, indeed, not by chance that Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno was asked to omit the Jewish-sounding part of his name (Wiesengrund) when he joined the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research in New York, because the Institute already had "too many Jewish names." Adorno complied with this wish of the directorate of the Institute, which was by no means anti-Semitic, but itself mainly of Jewish background.

Most of the members of the Institute were also Marxists, although they usually were not actively engaged in party activities. The majority were unorthodox, but orthodox C.P. members also existed among them. Both Jewish background and political conviction have to be considered here. Being Jewish in the sense of being of the Jewish religion was for many members of the Institute not a realistic factor: they were probably — like the Marxists of protestant or Catholic background — frequently atheists. Max Horkheimer's religiosity asserted itself only during his last years. He had grown up in a consciously Jewish home, but during his early and middle years the Jewish religion was not important enough for him to be concerned with his parents' disapproval of his marriage to a non-Jewish wife. Others, for instance Adorno, had either only one Jewish parent, or their ancestors had been integrated into German culture and society long ago. These facts also reduce the possibility to speak of Jewish culture in regard to the German-
speaking cultural elite. This is true especially when socialization is considered as the determining factor. The majority of the members of the Institute for Social Research mentioned here, for example, were influenced by the philosophy of German idealism, above all by Hegel. The philosophers who influenced Horkheimer's thought were, apart from Hegel, primarily Kant to whom he dedicated his dissertation and his habilitation thesis, Schopenhauer, and Marx — that is, only one philosopher, Marx, was of Jewish background, and his polemics against Jews are notorious. The point here is not to analyse who was influenced by whom, but to point out that a large part of the German émigrés of Jewish background mentioned above were influenced by the culture of their home countries just as much as by genuine Jewish traditions. Although these traditions stimulated their thought as well, they were only one factor of their cultural identity.

Those Jewish emigrants of the cultural elite who consciously adhered to their religion and Jewish cultural traditions prior to 1933 or were Zionists like Martin Buber or Gershom Scholem, constituted a special group. Scholem has described his personal discovery of Zionism in the German environment prior to the N.S. dictatorship in two books, Von Berlin nach Potsdam and Walter Benjamin — die Geschichte einer Freundschaft. Such persons were, without doubt, part of the "cultural" emigration but did not constitute the entire group. The "cultural" emigration, despite its high percentage of people with Jewish or partly Jewish background, was not simply Jewish emigration in the sense of having had a common cultural or national identity, and cannot be considered so in light of what caused so many of them to emigrate. In a biological sense — which, paradoxically, would be in line with the Nürnberger Gesetze — we cannot talk of "Jewish culture" in this context anyway.

Nevertheless, the high percentage of émigrés with Jewish background needs to be explained. The explanation has to be sought in two directions: First, in the N.S. threat, and second, in the special direction scientific interests had been pursued by the émigrés. Due to the fanatical anti-Semitism of the N.S. dictatorship, all Jews were sooner or later threatened, especially those who were considered exponents of the hated Weimar Republic, even if they had been opposed to it because of their communist or German-nationalist convictions. This applied even to the Jewish veterans of World War I, who were mostly patriotic and frequently nationalistic as well. But the N.S. politicians in charge of cultural policy did not understand this paradox. In other words: Jews, or those who were declared Jews because of their names or descent were endangered to a much greater degree than those who were classified as belonging to the "Aryan" part of the cultural elite.

Those whom the National-Socialists did not count as "cultural Bolshevists" were among the least threatened. This was hardly considered a compliment, as the appeal by Oskar Maria Graf at the beginning of this essay shows, but this fact must not lead to the conclusion that only those belonged to the cultural elite who were defamed by the new rulers as "cultural Bolshevists." Even after 1933 certain sectors of cultural life existed over which the N.S. rulers had little or no influence. Due to these circumstances, and especially due to the acute danger they faced, the percentage of those "cultural" émigrés who were Jews or were declared Jews by the Third Reich was bound to be larger than the percentage of Jews in the population as a whole.

The second reason for the high percentage of Jewish "cultural" emigrants is harder to define. It remains necessarily speculative as far as it claims to evaluate scholarly and artistic creativity. Two points have to be considered: First, the occupational discrimination against Jews which had lasted for centuries had resulted in a concentration in certain professions, among others in a high percentage of academically trained Jews in intellectual professions. Second, the unequal chances for employment which existed in the German Reich until 1918 and which had affected not only Jews but also Catholics and Social-Democrats, had strengthened the trend toward intellectual professions not covered by civil service employment for non-assimilated Jews. In this context, it has to be kept in mind that many intellectuals of Jewish background came from wealthy urban manufacturers' and merchants' families. To break out of this family tradition, which was frequently considered to be specifically Jewish by their social peers, did not necessarily signify social advancement, but it was an escape from a world which was from the start identified as a Jewish ghetto. This experience of life and family history and a latent and at times open anti-Semitism (which was, however, not restricted to Germany) increased the tendency to reflect on the nature of one's own social existence and aroused interest in social problems in general among those whose assimilation had not taken place generations earlier. In other words, it heightened the social sensitivity of those who had had the personal experience that they or their ancestors had belonged to a social minority — especially when they had to fear discrimination. Such effects have to be considered, although a large part of these Jews had been integrated into the upper middle class of society during the 19th and early 20th centuries and had more or less adopted its national and bourgeois systems of rules, i.e. had adopted a German identity.

This interpretation is supported by the autobiographies of numerous members of the cultural elite with Jewish background. It is very plausible but cannot claim sociological validity since its evidence is based on the perception of those who interpreted their own education under the impact of being totally uprooted by the National-Socialist danger. And here lies a possible answer to the question for the identity of German-speaking "cultural" emigration: It certainly had identity patterns, but these patterns were, with one exception, not overarching but competing. These competing identities could be of a religious or political nature, could be based on universal humanitarian ideals as an answer to ultranationalism, and could find their expression in nationalism, as for instance, in Zionism. They frequently had the aim of representing the cultural and humanitarian values of the "other Germany," in contrast to the barbarism of National- Socialism. But for most of the scientists, artists and writers, their rootedness in the German language and culture remained during exile. It is true that to this day some emigrants strictly refuse to use the German language because they see it in the language of Hitler — who really did not master it well — yet the majority of emigrants of Jewish background declined to let the National-Socialists deprive them of he language of Goethe and Heine. For this reason, Horkheimer flatly refused to publish the Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung in English. English contributions remained the
exception until 1940. But also those authors who viewed the German tradition from which they came more critically, in many respects could not escape from it. Theodor W. Adorno’s remark, he did not return to Germany because he loved it, but because his philosophizing was dependent on the German language and because he could therefore only count on reception, resonance and dialogue in Germany, is characteristic. Naturally this statement was true to a greater extent for those sectors of the “cultural emigration,” whose productivity was related to language, i.e. philosophy and literature. Of course, there were the exceptions of those who had learned to express themselves in both languages, more in the sciences than in literature. Taking all the above facts into consideration, we can conclude the following: The cultural identity of the émigrés was fractured in many ways, it cannot be clearly identified as “Jewish” or anything else, the common cultural tradition of the German-language countries remains as the single unifying factor, although Weimar had already been characterized by manifold cultural diffractions and competing identities. The backward-looking orientation to German culture on the one hand, and the necessity and frequently also the desire to become acculturated in the host country on the other, a process during which new national identities had to be found, became deciding factors when, at the end of the N.S. dictatorship, the question of return arose. However, this was not only a question of cultural identity, but frequently a question of professional opportunities, of age etc. The question “return — yes or no —” could not only be answered by considering what the émigrés had done during exile. Just as important was the answer to another question: What was cultural life in the N.S. state like? Did there exist anything else besides the government-decreed “Unkultur”, besides literature more or less strongly influenced by National-Socialism? Finally, what was the attitude of those members of the cultural elite who had remained at home towards the émigrés?

Is was doubtless the aim of the N.S. régime to replace the hated Weimar culture with the “gleichgeschaltet” N.S. ideology. N.S. policy led logically to the displacement of considerable sections of the cultural elite active after World War I. The damage to German cultural life consisted of the replacement of intellectual brilliance with ideological narrowness and dogmatic triviality. However, despite their claim to wield absolute power, the rulers never did actually have complete control over everything they aspired to dominate. For reasons of international prestige and as a defense against sharp criticism by German émigrés, the N.S. state needed to keep scholars and artists of rank in Germany who could be shown off abroad. For this reason, they were granted a certain amount of freedom. In addition, even Joseph Goebbels placed great value on artistic quality in certain genres useful for his propaganda, primarily in the motion picture industry. Aside from their propagandistic intent and disastrous political bias, one cannot deny that some films of high artistic quality were produced. In addition to the more or less dictated conformity and opportunism that were prevailing and the activities of convinced party members as well as the more or less “unpolitical” holdovers in several fields of scholarship, one is able to observe some resistance, a more or less secret or indirect opposition, the activities of persons who had found refuge in one of the several forms of “inner emigration” within the culture of the N.S. state. In addition, quite a few members of the cultural elite, as the elites of other fields, remained in their positions in order to keep up “cultural activities” which deserve this name to the largest possible extent. This perception of their task may have sprung at times from their desire to justify their behavior, at other times from an honest conviction that they had acted properly. Politically their attitudes acted in favor of the N.S. régime and were thus disastrous — even when, in the individual case, the desired goal was achieved in this manner.

In those fields in which the National-Socialists or their cultural functionaries developed ambition for ideological or personal reasons, there usually remained little room for free art and literature. Certainly there existed possibilities for withdrawal, as in music or the theater. Even after 1933, great art was still possible in these fields, when the régime was interested in outstanding artists for propaganda purposes, and these artists used their chances cleverly. One famous example is the actor, stage manager and state theater director, Gustav Gründgens. Others, who had similar success, let themselves be forced to greater compromises than Gründgens without using their position to help those persecuted by the N.S. régime, for instance, the composer Richard Strauss and the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler. Still, quite a few of the artists who made their career during the N.S. dictatorship were driven by ambition or opportunism. But the problems that especially actors had to face abroad due to their inability to function in a foreign language must also be taken into consideration. One frequent consequence was the decision to avoid emigration at all costs. In addition, the temptation was great to remain in a state which offered considerable chances to talented actors by the masterly use of the film for ideological purposes — chances which were an artistic challenge, as the achievements of Heinrich George and Emil Jannings demonstrate.

In regard to literature, similar examples can be cited although the possibilities were in several respects more limited. To stage German classics, for instance dramas by Schiller, whose criticism of tyranny could be understood by the audience as an allusion to current events and therefore as hidden criticism, was more easily possible than to write similar plays and criticism in a contemporary setting and thus provoke the suspicion of Nazi cultural functionaries and risk suppression by the régime. Nevertheless, a number of important writers of non-Jewish background remained in the Third Reich, some with at least a temporary sympathy for the régime, like Gottfried Benn, who was all the same forbidden to publish on March 18, 1938, as believing National-Socialist. Still others, for instance Gerhart Hauptmann, succumbed to being honored by the N.S. cultural establishment. Again others, who, like Ernst Jünger, had been bitter enemies of the Weimar Republic as partisans of the Conservative Revolution, did not accept a compromise with the régime after 1933. Finally, those authors should be mentioned who did not leave Germany, but felt themselves to be in a sort of “inner emigration” under the totalitarian régime: Elisabeth Langgässer, Gertrud von Le Fort, Erich Kästner, Frank Thiess, Oskar Loecke, Werner Bergengruen, Reinhold Schneider, Jochen Klepper, to mention only a few. Open criticism was impossible for them if they did not want to endanger themselves. Many of those who remained and did not sympathize with the régime published only little, or only harmless works during the twelve years of the dictatorship. Works which could be read as veiled criticisms of the régime,
regardless of whether they were intended to be so or not, appeared rarely. One exception was Ernst Jünger's *Auf den Marmorklippen*. With regard to the numerous younger authors who began to write only after 1933, the assessment is more complex. They profited from being unknown and it was assumed that their experiments were merely aesthetic and not recognizable as critical political statements. They grew up from the beginning with a "split consciousness" (gepaltenes Bewusstsein), as Hans Dieter Schäfer has recently remarked. In any case, those non-National-Socialist authors who remained in N.S. Germany gave expression to other trends in the German literature of the 20th century in aesthetic and thematic respects than had the exiled authors who had been formed, on the one hand, by their Weimar cultural background, and on the other, by their exile and in some cases by style and subject matter adapted from other national literatures.

In principle it can be stated for literature and art that the characteristic traits of Weimar cultural life existed with typical limitations in the culture of the exile, but not in the N.S. state. The latter took little or no notice of the exiled authors and their literature. The statement of that usually very perceptive man of letters, Wilhelm Hausenstein, "I doubt whether much has been written in exile that equals in rank this narrative" (Stefan Andrez's *Wir sind Utopia*), reveals how those who remained in Germany viewed their accomplishments. Hausenstein would hardly have drawn such a conclusion, had he read the works of Thomas and Heinrich Mann, or of Bertolt Brecht and Anna Seghers, written in exile. But his opinion shows once more, that the above mentioned incapacity to carry on a dialogue beyond the limits of like-minded friends, which had characterized the Weimar Republic, was continued in another manner. By the way, not only in creative writing, but also in the humanities and the social sciences, similarities can be observed: There was quite a number of scholars, who, although they loved to decorate their works with numerous references to other experts, only cited those scholars whose political and scholarly attitudes they shared. This explains, in part, why the scholarly works of emigrants received only partial and belated recognition (as did the works of scholars staying behind in the Third Reich).

In any case, aside from the defamations by N.S. functionaries, exile literature was much less discussed than more or less important contemporary French and American authors who were translated and published in the N.S. state until the end of the thirties: In the beginning, Sinclair Lewis, later William Faulkner, Ernest Hemingway, Thornton Wilder, Thomas Wolfe, as well as numerous authors of the better light fiction. French authors of rank also were published in German translation: André Maurois, Henry de Montherlant, Jules Romains, Georges Bernanos, Paul Claudel, Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, to mention only a few of the most important authors.

The claim of the National-Socialists to total power also had limits in other respects. Until 1935, four of the six volumes of Franz Kafka's *Gesammelte Schriften* could still be published. After its prohibition, Schocken published the two other volumes as well under the cover name of a publisher in Prague. This list of examples could be expanded. Defamed or unwanted authors were still published in Germany for a number of years, remaining copies of books printed before their prohibition could frequently still be bought on the market. Nevertheless, phases can be discerned: In addition to the intensified persecution and further wave of emigration of people with Jewish background which followed the terror of the so-called Reichskristallnacht of November 9, 1938, the cultural controls became tighter and censorship more strict. In 1937, Hitler delivered two programmatic speeches on cultural policy in Munich and Nuremberg, in which he once again proclaimed his "unalterable decision:" He would, "just as he had ended political confusion ... now also do away with the clichés in German cultural life." In the following years 1938/39, N.S. control over literary magazines and literary production was tightened. The result was anxiety among many authors, a more limited selection of titles offered, and caution on the part of the publishers.

A number of younger authors, who were to play an important role in German postwar literature and who were able to remain abroad during the N.S. rule for a shorter or longer period without being classified as exiles, avoided political themes anyhow. They withdrew to classical subjects, books of travel, the description of emotional life apart from its social background. Hans Dieter Schäfer has recently examined the literary position of these authors. Among them were Marie Luise Kaschnitz, Stefan Andres, Felix Hartlaub, Eugen Gottlob Winkler, Hans Erich Nossack, Günter Eich, Peter Huchel, Johannes Bobrowski, Karl Krolow, Erhart Kästner, Gustav René Hocke and others. "While in exile the satire, commentaries and the pamphlet in the tradition of Weimar lived on, in Germany National-Socialist and religious authors used speeches, war reports, or sermons and legends" (Schäfer). Naturally certain genres of writing which were common to exiled and non-exiled authors alike continued to be produced, but self-chosen or imposed restrictions existed nonetheless: Although important literary achievements were obtained during the Third Reich, they could only be created if the régime tolerated them, or illegally. Sociocritical or political statements which ran counter to the official ideology, could at best be written in extremely veiled language. The existence of literary or other artistic achievements does not invalidate N.S. claim to totalitarian controls, nor do these works change the fact in any way that this claim was asserted with utter brutality when it was of vital importance for the régime to do so. In this regard, phases of intermittent intensification of a radical cultural policy, or simple technical problems having consequence for cultural politics can also be observed. Among the latter was the scarcity of printing paper during the war, among the first were programmatic attempts at *Gleichschaltung*, as, for instance, in the above mentioned Hitler speeches, or through the exhibition *Entartete Kunst* in 1937.

In certain fields of scholarship we find considerable complexity although the totalitarian grip on cultural life was just as firm. Above all, the displacement of scholars of Jewish background or of politically "undesirable" scholars must be mentioned. They were usually replaced by party members and functionaries of N.S. university organizations. Comparatively harmless, although characteristic, were measures of a purely demonstrative character, for instance the abrogation of Thomas Mann's honorary doctor's degree by the University of Bonn. Paul Egon Hübinger has described this embarrassing incident in detail. The number of those who were dismissed and thus forbid-
den to work, and of those who were driven to their death by individual acts of terror, can only be estimated. According to a compilation assembled by the exiled sociologist, Emil J. Gumbel, Freie Wissenschaft, edited in Strasbourg in 1938, the N.S. government had dismissed about 1,500 scholars by the end of 1936; for the time up to the Anschluss of Austria in March 1938, Gumbel estimated their number at 2,000.

Aside from "racial" persecution, the already mentioned Gesetz zur Wiederherstellung des Berufsbeamtenstatus permitted the removal from the universities of practically any political opponent of the régime, or of scholars who had been denounced as unreliable. Seemingly minor infractions, such as vaguely defined "malicious" behavior toward the N.S. movement or the "abuse" of an official position to the detriment of "national-minded" officials, sufficed as grounds for dismissal. For an assessment of the political attitude of the accused it was permitted to consider retroactively his record during the Weimar Republic. This law was certainly the most hostile to the civil service ever, according to the classical rules of German administration. The abuses of the civil service system during the Weimar Republic, which had led to accusations of political favoritism by conservative and liberal civil service associations, cannot be compared to those committed under the new N.S. act.

Self-determination and autonomy of the university, a classical axiom of academic freedom which had often been used as a political weapon against the fledgling democracy during the Weimar years, were abolished with the introduction of the Führerverfassung. The rectors of the universities who were appointed by the minister, in turn appointed the deans who were also in charge of the university budget which had formerly been the prerogative of the senate. In order to obtain a lectureship, "character aptitude" had to be tested, an examination, which the candidates had to pass after six weeks' training in an "educational" camp. In addition, the applicant had to prove that he was a member of the National-Socialist Party. As in other sectors of social life, a number of organizations served as additional devices for political surveillance, in this case the NS-Dozentenbund. According to the contemporary calculations of Gumbel, the following number of members of the teaching staff at the University of Heidelberg, to take just one university, had been dismissed for political reasons by 1936 (comparison with 1932): Altogether 56 of 215 (~ 25%) professors had to give up their positions for political reasons during these four years. Gumbel considers this as the lowest possible number because other cases cannot be definitely clarified, since premature retirement and "voluntary" resignation are not included. A breakdown shows that these 25% are distributed rather unevenly among the different departments. The law school had the highest percentage (37%) of dismissals for political reasons, the natural sciences had the lowest percentage with 20%, in between lay the philosophy department with 30% and the medical school with 29%.

The positions of the dismissed were not given to members of the younger generation or to university lecturers but to new members of the teaching staff who were party functionaries of local N.S. organizations. During the five years ending in 1938, 21 of 50 full professors, 28 of 71 assistant professors and lecturers were appointed at the University of Heidelberg. In 1936 the total teaching staff consisted of 178 teachers, of which 81 had been appointed between 1933 and 1936. Nearly half of those teaching at the University of Heidelberg in 1938 had served less than four years at the university — in other words, they had come from the outside.

This fluctuation of personnel, which was similar at the other universities, is significant. In many disciplines which were not of primary interest to the National-Socialists, many "unpolitical" scholars of non-Jewish background remained more or less undisturbed. But a considerable part of the teaching staff behaved in agreement with the system out of conviction or out of opportunism. Open opposition against the régime remained the exception at the universities as well as in other sectors of society. This was probably more wide-spread than the anti-republican attitudes of many university teachers in 1933. Yet, it must be considered overall that the majority of possible opponents of Nazism had been dismissed from the universities.

One partial consequence of the change of personnel, but also of opportunism, were the changes inserted in the curricula of numerous courses which had little or nothing to do with the subject matter, but were pure N.S. propaganda. According to the university catalogue for the summer of 1935, the then most renowned German university, Berlin, offered not less than 28 "courses" on "ethnology" (Rassenlehre); with the number of lectures and exercises in military science not far behind. If one adds those courses which were directly devoted to political subjects or were politicized in line with N.S. ideology without acknowledgement, the degree to which the universities were "gleichgeschaltet" and the susceptibility of certain fields of scholarship to N.S. ideology becomes evident. The results were less willingness to study, a decline in excellence and the indoctrination of the students.

The censorship by the Reichsstelle zur Förderung des deutschen Schriftums was headed by the Führer appointee and N.S. ideologist Alfred Rosenberg — the author of Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts. This organization had local branches throughout the Reich and forced even those authors who did not sympathize with the régime to write prefaces to their books that seem embarrassing today, or to make other gestures of submission. Nevertheless, it has to be stated in this case as well, that even in those areas of the humanities which the rulers considered politically sensitive, a number of important works appeared, and in all disciplines scholars existed who did not make concessions to the ruling "spirit" of the times. In some areas of scholarship, free and undisturbed research was still possible. But even the natural sciences were affected by N.S. cultural policy. One example was the absurd effort to establish, an "Aryan physics."

Still, even some of the functionaries responsible for this trend, whose main representatives were the Nobel Prize winners Philipp Lenard and Johannes Stark, kept enough sense of reality to understand the material significance of scientific research for the N.S. state. High priority research, if it was to be used, for instance, for military purposes, could not be replaced by ideology. Thus, despite the removal of leading natural scientists for "racial" or, to a lesser degree, for political reasons, numerous leading representatives of the discipline still had possibilities to work, in physics, for example, Max Planck, Otto Hahn, Werner Heisenberg, and Fritz Strassmann.

Alan D. Beyerchen states in his monograph on scientists under Hitler: Politics and the Physics Community in the Third
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Reich that the cautious conformity of many physicists to the N.S. state soon gave way to increasing alienation. In addition, one important factor in their outwardly conforming to the state carried with it some advantages for physics. German scholars soon became more and more isolated internationally — an isolation which increased after the outbreak of the war. But certain research institutions, for instance, the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft (today the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft), succeeded in protecting themselves to a great extent from political interference and to restrict N.S. interference by making certain concessions. Alan Beyerchen called this procedure Selbstgleichschaltung. Although an exception, N.S. policy in regard to the sciences was at times openly criticized by scientists; in the field of physics the Nobel Prize winner Max von Laue deserves to be mentioned here. He did not leave Germany because he wanted to fight against N.S. rule there and be available at its demise, which he hoped would come soon. He remained unyielding, helped persecuted colleagues, deplored openly as early as September 1933 the losses which German science suffered through emigration, and delivered a public eulogy for Fritz Haber, who had to leave Germany because of his Jewish background.

The majority of the emigrating scientists was of Jewish background. This means, that the larger part of the scholars leaving Germany had to anticipate danger to their lives and limbs through the régime. Only a few not threatened in this way left Germany. The decision to emigrate was always the exception, unless it was absolutely necessary.

The number of scientists, especially of younger age, who decided not to pursue a scientific career in the N.S. state, was rather large. On the other hand, there were always cases where scientists managed in the end, to continue their work despite sharp attacks from N.S. organizations. This was true of Werner Heisenberg who faced a precarious situation when he was attacked by representatives of “Aryan” physics and members of the S.S. on the occasion of his appointment to the University of Munich. His international reputation convinced Rosenberg that it was inopportune to remove him. Above all his personal connections to Himmler’s family and other important leaders, in addition to a number of vehement protests by renowned physicists enabled Heisenberg to continue his work.

He had fallen out of favour with party and science functionaries by refusing to issue a loyalty declaration to the Führer by the employment of Jewish co-workers during the Weimar period, by respectfully referring to Einstein, and similar acts. As a representative of theoretical physics and the theory of relativity, he was a thorn in the side of the advocates of “Aryan” physics. The “Aryan” physicists succeeded in preventing Heisenberg’s appointment to Munich and to appoint instead a physicist, who was not experienced in theoretical physics, but had written a polemical tract against the “Jewish” relativity theory under the title Judentum und Wissenschaft. Nevertheless, the years of “Aryan” physics during the Third Reich can be counted. In 1942/43, the end of this pseudo-scientific movement began after renewed public controversy. Its more alleged than actual importance to the German wartime economy led to the re-establishment of scientific autonomy in physics (Beyerchen).

After having sketched its political preconditions, the cultural losses and the literary, artistic and scientific character of these losses can be described. “Cultural” emigration was an important, in some sectors the most interesting, part of German-language culture after 1933. But it was only a part, not the whole. This observation does not lessen the barbaric atrocity of the expulsion nor its cultural stupidity, but aims at a realistic assessment of the problem.

Can the cultural losses which Germany suffered after 1933 at the hands of the N.S. dictatorship be measured? The number of those emigrants who belonged to the “cultural” emigration is not exactly determinable, even under a strict definition — the more so as the criteria of definition are fluid and lead unavoidably to inaccuracy. Still, it is possible to estimate the approximate number, and it is appalling. Of the 104,098 emigrants of Austrian and German origin who emigrated during 1933 and 1941 to the United States, 7,622 (+7.3%) had an academic or artistic profession, and 1,090 of them were scientists, mostly professors. Included in this broadly defined academic emigration, which naturally consisted not only of members of a cultural elite which had published their own works, were 811 lawyers, 2,352 physicians, 682 journalists, 645 technologists, 465 musicians, 296 artists, and 1,281 following other professions (numbers according to R. Davie and D. Kent).

Doubtless the United States was the most important country of immigration, especially after the occupation of their European neighbors by the National-Socialists. One fourth of all German-speaking emigrants went to the U.S. after 1933, some immediately, most by detours through European host countries. Other states, too, offered a refuge to emigrating scholars, for instance Latin American countries and Turkey, frequently because of their own political interest in science. What was a loss to the German Reich, became a gain for Turkey, for example. The number of academic emigrants to the United States and other countries is greater than the number of the cultural elite in a narrower sense. The present second volume of this work lists 4,600 emigrants who originated in Germany, Austria, and other centers of German culture, for example Prague. These emigrants were full professors at universities and academies before or after their emigration, had distinguished themselves through scientific publications, literary, journalistic, or artistic achievements in the arts, architecture, music, theater, and film.

To this number have to be added those emigrants who have been included in Volume I because of their political activity, who also made significant contributions to culture. In addition, those persons have to be considered who were not included in the handbook because of the standards of inclusion dictated by the limits of space in such a reference work. The biographies are on file in the archives of the Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Munich, and of the Research Foundation for Jewish Immigration, New York. On the basis of these files, the total number of emigrants who belonged to the cultural elite during the thirties and forties, can be estimated with considerable accuracy: It amounts to about 5,000—6,000.

What were the fields of activity of these “cultural” emigrants? One of the qualitatively and quantitatively most important groups of German-speaking “cultural” émigrés after 1933 were doubtless the writers. The number of authors, journalists, and publicists in this group amounts probably to about 2,500 people. The greater part of the most important, most creative and original German-speaking writers emigrated already during
the first weeks or months of the régime, in the case of Austria frequently only in 1938. The emigrated writers are listed in this handbook. Without regard to differences in quality the most important shall be mentioned here: Bertolt Brecht, Herman Broch, Johannes R. Becher, Martin Beheim-Schwarzbach, Bernhard von Brentano, Max Brod, Ferdinand Bruckner, Elias Canetti, Alfred Döblin, Lion Feuchtwanger, Bruno Frank, Leonhard Frank, Richard Friedenthal, Stefan George, Curt Goetz, Oskar Maria Graf, Walter Hasenclever, Ödön von Horváth, Hans Habe, Julius Hay, Georg Hermann, Stephan Hermlin, Stefan Heym, Fritz Hochwärder, Hans Henny Jahnn, Hermann Kesten, Anette Kolb, Georg Kaiser, Irmgard Keun, Alfred Kantorowicz, Else Lasker-Schüler, Emil Ludwig, Thomas Mann, Heinrich Mann, Klaus Mann, Robert Musil, Walter Mehring, Peter de Mendelssohn, Ludwig Marcuse, Alfred Neumann, Theodor Plivier, Alfred Polgar, Joseph Roth, Gustav Regler, Ludwig Renn, Erich Maria Remarque, René Schickele, Anna Seghers, Hilde Spiel, Nelly Sachs, Kurt Tucholsky, Gabriele Tergit, Max Tau, Ernst Toller, Friedrich Torber, Fritz von Unruh, Johannes Urzidil, Jakob Wassermann, Franz Werfel, Armin T. Wegner, Ernst Weiss, Peter Weiss, Friedrich Wolf, Franz Carl Weis kopf, Karl Wolfskehl, Stefan Zweig, Arnold Zweig, Paul Zech, Carl Zuckmayer. Some of those mentioned, for instance Peter Weiss, began to publish much later than 1933, since they were still quite young at the time of their emigration.

Certainly, this enumeration contains authors of different literary significance, but there are leading representatives of German literature among them who enjoyed a very good reputation in Germany and abroad, or acquired it during their emigration. Several Nobel Prize winners and several later winners of the Friedenspreis des deutschen Buchhandels are also among the above mentioned emigrants. A comparison with the authors who remained in Germany, on the whole turns out in favor of the emigrants in regard to quantity and quality. Only few of those writers who remained in Germany acquired an international reputation. To a large part, they were younger authors, who reached the peak of their literary career only after the war.

The definition of the term "exile literature" is difficult. Attempts to define it by its subject matter or by the formal criteria of a theory of creative writing are hardly convincing. For instance, some observers have tried to show that the sonnet was the characteristic poetic form of exile literature. Besides the fact that the sonnet has a long history and had reached its height as a poetic form during the baroque period, such a genre-specific limitation would exclude just those forms, which the exiled writers used with great virtuosity and which helped to inform a large circle of readers about the conditions of existence in exile: the political essay, the feuilleton, and, above all, the epic form of the novel. In any case, the exiled authors employed the genre of the novel much more than the authors who lived in the N.S. state, among whom were, of course, also novelists of rank. Yet many German writers of these years preferred the shorter literary forms, for instance the novella.

This fact should not lead to the opposite and false conclusion to employ the term "exile novel" as an exclusive definition of the term "exile literature." Nevertheless many works of emigrated authors deal with the exile as their subject, for instance Lion Feuchtwanger's novels Exil and Geschwister Oppermann, Bruno Frank's novel Der Reisepass, Anna Seghers' novels Transit and Die Toten bleiben jung, Klaus Mann's novel Der Vulkan and his autobiography Der Wendepunkt, finally in a more intellectually challenging, indirect way, also Thomas Mann's trilogy Joseph und seine Brüder. Other novels of rank, Heinrich Mann's Henri Quatre or Alfred Döblin's Hamlet oder die lange Nacht nimmt ein Ende, which were written in exile, could not be called "exile literature" from a narrow thematic point of view — that is, if one considers the overt contents of a work as a criterion for its inclusion in "exile literature." In addition, several authors tried to continue works of highest literary value in exile, but did not succeed to do what they had intended. For instance, Hans Mayer recently said of Robert Musil's Mann ohne Eigenschaften that Musil, whom he knew personally, was not able to conclude the novel because of the conditions of his exile. Karl Corino described this fact with the words "Reflexionen im Vakuum." Aside from the well known limitations of this approach to the field of literary criticism as a whole criteria of literary theory are, in any case, too narrow to help us formulate a definition of the term "exile literature." The broadest definition of the term would include all literary productions, the feuilleton, the theater review, the political essay, and the traditional genres of literature which were used in exile as exile literature. Such a definition is without doubt rather vague, but the approach is justified if we consider the special conditions under which these writings took form. A specific and precise literary definition which would consider the poetic form, the immanent character of the work, the personal history of its author, stylistic and other techniques of literary analysis, is not excluded by this definition. This kind of approach is, however, not specific to exile literature. Only a recourse to the conditions of origin of the concerned works can be a valid criterion of definition. Exile literature comprises those writings which were written in exile. However, such a broad definition — Manfred Durzak, for instance considers it too broad — includes literature which contains neither in form nor content any recognizable constituents of the experience of exile. This corresponds to the statement Werner Berthold made at the symposium on exile literature in Copenhagen in 1972: "We are speaking today of exile research, and consciously no longer of research on exile literature... exile is interesting as a total phenomenon." Nevertheless, a closer look at the "cultural emigration" will reveal to what degree writers reflected upon the experience of life in exile. The authors belong to those groups of the "cultural emigration," whose works were most decisively marked by exile. This is not surprising since literature is always the expression of its time. In addition, writers with political commitments always wished to draw attention to the fate of the exiled, and the political situation in their home countries. The more politically motivated and realistic this commitment was, the less it aimed at artistic perfection. This characterization was particularly valid for genres whose form was not standardized by poetic rules and was therefore more flexible, i.e. essays, feuilleton, and topical reports. Within the whole of exile literature, there existed a sector which left behind the above-sketches common tradition and subject matter of the Weimar culture in reflecting and representing the situation of the exiled.

This widening of the former literary spectrum did not, however, create new forms: Most novels dealing with exile are rath-
er traditional in their narrative character; their subject matter is original, not their form. The literary avant-garde, expressionism, and playful or problem-oriented experiments were of secondary importance in comparison to the traditional, straightforwardly realistic forms. Markedly political works, especially in the broad genre of functional literature, were an answer to the political displacement caused by the N.S. régime. This political purpose of many writings and articles published in exile continued one of the Weimar traditions, and can be explained as a reaction to the N.S. dictatorship, but led in numerous publications to a strong overemphasis on current topics. The endeavor to attain literary levels in their works was frequently superseded by the political and moral interests of the authors. Not many writers succeeded, like Thomas Mann, in integrating the demands of both the literary and the political dimension in their life’s work, or to realize both aims simultaneously.

A further problem for the transformation of the problems of exile into literature was the change of the reading public and thus the conditions of reception. German readers were usually no longer available to the exiled authors; the readaptation to foreign-language readers required changes in style and form, and frequently dictated simplification. The challenges of the new, often uncomprehending, cultural environment were not conducive to the writing of literary masterpieces within a few months or years — rather, they were a heavy burden. Begging for understanding, autobiographical accounts of self-justification, written to secure short-term financial rewards, were further factors liable to impede literary excellence. The loss to German-language culture is not only ascertainable in the usual sense. The extreme worsening of living conditions also impaired the possibility of carefree literary work for most exiled authors. The living conditions of exiled writers have to be taken into consideration to a greater degree than usual in the interpretation of their works. Ernst Loewy explains their partly "emphatic-antifascist" character thus: "The best part of German literature had been forced into the role of resistance, objectively such a role had lost almost all foundation. It accepted the challenge without being able to cope with it, partly with very modest, partly with surprising, although in their immediate effect rather inconspicuous results. Thus the history of exile literature remains primarily — although again and again interrupted by great individual achievements — a chain of hopes, errors, and disappointments."

Aside from the necessary distinction of phases in exile literature, two contrasting assessments by Klaus Mann should be kept in mind. In his autobiography Der Wendepunkt, he had stated: "Especially during the first years of exile, from 1933 to 1936, the feeling of solidarity was strong and genuine. Yes, the ‘burned writers’ were something like a homogeneous elite, a real community within the whole, indistinct, amorphous emigration." A little later, he published a retrospective account which was probably more realistic in regard to this presumed homogeneity: "The majority of our emigrants consisted, after all, of honest citizens, who saw themselves primarily as ‘good Germans,’ only secondarily as Jews and last of all, or not at all, as anti-fascists." The last part of this statement may be exaggerated, however, since there is no doubt that the majority of the emigrants perceived themselves definitely as anti-fascists. The question was, rather, how explicit this antifascism was, and, above all, through which positive political conviction it expressed itself. And in this respect, the political partisanship and differences of Weimar continued to exist. The homogeneity of the writers, as stated above, existed only seemingly, or in small circles, for instance in the “P.E.N. Club of Exiled German-Speaking Writers,” which was the theme of an exhibition in Frankfurt in 1980, or in political and literary groups centered around the numerous exile periodicals, which Hans Albert Walter has described comprehensively. These periodicals partly continued the tradition of before 1933, for instance, Der neue Tage-Buch and Die neue Weltbühne. Some of these new established programs like the journal Die Sammlung edited by Klaus Mann, the Neue deutsche Blätter edited by Oskar Maria Graf, Wieland Herzfelde, and Anna Seghers, or Maß und Wort which was published by Thomas Mann and edited by Golo Mann. Finally, the journal Das Wort has to be mentioned. It was later on published in Moscow by Bertolt Brecht, Willi Bredel, and Lion Feuchtwanger, and replaced the Sammlung and the Neue deutsche Blätter. It propagated popular front ideas more strongly than any other journal, but published not only communists but also writers of other political persuasions.

However, such collaboration independent of political opinions could not prevent many disagreements. Some might have had personal reasons, like the quarrel between Klaus Mann and Leopold Schwarzschild, but the ways of life of these exile journals contained a good deal of explosive materials. Lion Feuchtwanger has described the Pariser Tageblatt in his novel Exil. The short lives of the publications of the exile press as well as their great number — which Lieselotte Maas has recorded — are an indication of the difficulties with which the "literary" or "political-literary" journalism of the German-speaking exile was confronted, but they are also an indication of the heterogeneity of the "political" and "literary" exile as a whole. All authors also had to fight a basic problem that Theodor W. Adorno defined concisely in his Minima Moralia in 1951: "Every intellectual in exile, without exception, is injured and had better recognize it himself, if he does not want to be cruelly disillusioned behind the tightly closed doors of his self-respect. He lives in an environment which must remain incomprehensible to him... His language is expropriated, and the historical dimension from which his thought drew its strength is cut away... The isolation gets worse, the more closed, politically controlled groups are established, suspicious of their own members and hostile toward outsiders. The percentage of the national income that falls to the foreigner’s share will not suffice and drives him into a hopeless secondary competition with other émigrés in addition to the general market competition... Escaped from the disgrace of the immediate Gleichschaltung in Germany, he wears just this escape as his distinguishing mark, an illusion and unreal existence within a living and alive society... All weights are shifted, and perceptions become blurred."

Within the "literary" emigration, two groups are included in these volumes that were of major importance: We have already mentioned one of them in this essay, the journalists, who seem to represent all that was characteristic of Weimar culture. The qualitative and quantitative range of what this group produced should come as no surprise. Its members reflected in
a most direct way political developments in Germany, and they could not help commenting on them, neither before nor after 1933. For this present volume, in which only journalists engaged in the cultural sector are included, the I.F.Z. chose nearly 250 persons according to its criteria for inclusion. To this have to be added the "political" journalists of Volume I, as well as those whom the R.F.J.I. has listed. Within the "literary" emigration, journalists of all kinds comprised a considerable group of several hundred persons. Among the publicists writing on cultural topics the following famous names are to be found: Jean Améry, Max Beer, Walter Benjamin, Julie Braun-Vogelstein, Martin Eisslin, Heinrich Frankel, Erich Franzen, Eduard Fuchs, Willy Haas, Werner Hegemann, Jakob Hegner, Konrad Heiden, Rudolf Hirsch, Artur Holtscher, Wieland Herzfelde, Robert Jungk, Alfred Kantorowicz, Richard Katz, Harry Graf Kessler, Fritz Landshoff, Erwin Leiser, Ernst Loewy, Valeriu Marcu, Max Osborn, Curt Riess, Harry Schluze-Wilde, Max Tau, Georg Stefan Troller. However, these publicists differ from the great representatives of "political" journalism, are only typical for the Weimar intellect in individual cases. Thus they could resume their work more easily after 1945. Many of those mentioned here returned therefore to journalism in Germany.

The second group which shall only be mentioned briefly here, is smaller in size, but was of greater importance, for some of its members succeeded in founding their own publishing companies in the United States. This group was important for the rest of the emigrants simply because the newly-founded publishing companies became points of attraction for them and offered the authors the readership they depended on. However, the most important European publishing companies for exile literature, for instance Querido or Allert de Lange in Amsterdam and Oprecht in Zurich, were not owned by émigrés. At any rate, without their publishers, the emigrated authors would have literally become speechless; their material existence, their being accepted, and their effectiveness crucially depended on their ability to find a publisher. Without these exile publishers, who were established in Prague, Amsterdam, Paris, and Zurich immediately after the N.S. seizure of power, the emigrated authors would have hardly been able to meet with any kind of response. "Who will publish our works?" was the urgent question with which German writers-in-exile took up their work again. They received a "surprisingly fast answer," wrote Wieland Herzfelde in 1937 in appreciation of the first four years of exile publishing later described in detail by H.A. Walter. Their work was carried out under the most difficult of conditions, and depended to a large degree on the ability to improvise. Frequently, authors acted as their own publishers and book dealers, and sold their mimeographed manuscripts themselves after holding readings or lectures. Others were published by emigrated publishers, for example, the Marxist-oriented Malik publishing company of Wieland Herzfelde, or the literary publishing company of Gottfried Bermann-Fischer, who published the great Stockholm edition of Thomas Mann's works-in-exile. Kurt Wolff's Pantheon Books, Martinus Nijhoff in the Hague, the left-wing Editions du Carrefour in Paris, where Dimitroff's Brownbook on the burning of the Reichstag was published, and smaller publishers also offered a home to exiled authors. However, there also existed German publishers like Schocken or Julius Springer in exile, who published little or no exile literature. The most important exile publishers — Querido, de Lange, and Oprecht — did not only act out of financial interest. Publishing exiled authors without a guaranteed reading public was a considerable risk, but, as Klaus Mann and others reported, done for political and humanitarian reasons, i.e. because the publishers opposed the N.S. régime. Querido had to pay with his life for this in 1942. The Dutch publishers employed capable persons formerly active in German publishing companies as heads of their exile departments, e.g. Hermann Kesten, Fritz Landshoff, and Walter Landauer, all former readers of the publisher Kiepenheuer in Berlin. The two Amsterdam publishers issued almost 200 titles by more than 100 authors by the spring of 1940 (A. Stephan).

The publishing activity of Emil Oprecht in Zurich was comparable. After the occupation of Prague in 1938 and of the Netherlands in 1940, he remained the only large exile publisher in German-language countries. These three publishers and Bermann-Fischer had published nearly 500 works of exile literature by 1946 which had reached a total circulation of about 1.75 million copies with an average of 3,000—4,000 copies per title (A. Stephan). Their number is only exceeded by the books published by Soviet publishers for foreign-language literature or for national minorities, which reached a total of two million copies (H. Hallmann). The disappearance of the exile publishing companies from central and Western Europe following the occupation of these countries was a heavy blow to the exiled authors. The Aurora publishing company in the United States and El libro libre in Mexico could not completely fill in this gap despite their successful activities. The "literary" emigrants are the qualitatively and quantitatively most impressive part of the "cultural" emigration. Their productivity was extraordinary; the special compilation of the German national bibliography issued in Leipzig in 1949 lists 12,717 titles which could not be published in Nazi Germany. This quantitative weight of the "literary" emigration and the well-advanced research of exile literature must not lead to an underestimation of other groups in the "cultural" emigration. A large number of important painters, sculptors, architects, musicians, and theater artists left National-Socialist Germany or fled from N.S. terror after 1933. The emigration archives compiled by I.F.Z. and R.F.J.I. list more than 3,000 artists and theater people among its 25,000 persons, of whom about 600 were included in this second volume. The ratio of representational artists remaining in the N.S. Reich to their ratio in the "cultural" emigration is comparable to the situation in the literary field. Outstanding painters and sculptors did remain in Germany during the dictatorship, but sooner or later they had to discontinue their public appearances. Neither attempted conformity nor retreat into private life protected numerous famous artists from being defamed as "degenerate," and thus losing the possibility of making their works available to the public. State museums and exhibitions remained closed to them. Emil Nolde, who had been declared "degenerate" in 1933, was forbidden to paint in 1941. He shared this fate with Karl Hofer and Karl Schmidt-Rottluff. Other painters had already been dismissed from their positions at academies of art in 1933, for instance, Otto Dix, Max Pechstein, Willi Baumeister, Oskar Moll and Oskar Schlemmer. Still others, like Ernst Wilhelm Nay, were forbidden to exhibit their works in 1936.

Among established painters who remained in N.S. Germany but whose effectiveness was considerably reduced, in addition
LIV Introduction

to those already mentioned, were Ernst Barlach, Friedrich Ahlers-Hestermann, Erich Heckel, Werner Heldt, Georg Meistermann, Otto Modersohn, Gabriele Münter, Franz Radziwill, Georg Scholz (who was also labelled "degenerate"), Fritz Winter, and a number of younger artists, whose works surfaced mostly after 1945. Max Liebermann, who was already 86 years old when the Nazis seized power, remained in Berlin until his death in 1935. The number of those prohibited to paint and exhibit, of dismissals and other measures which amounted to a professional ban, show how little freedom of movement visual artists enjoyed. The losses to German art through these discriminations were high and, in many cases, resulted in emigration. Again, many of the emigrants had contributed to the reputation enjoyed by German art during the Weimar years, as had those defamed after 1933. The most prominent émigrés are: Josef Albers, Max Beckmann, Lyonel Feininger, George Grosz, Thomas Theodor Heine, Paul Klee, Oskar Kokoschka, Wassily Kandinsky, Anna Mahler, Max Oppenheimer, Hans Purrmann, Hans Richter, Emy Roeder, and Kurt Schwitters. In addition, those have to be mentioned who had left Germany before 1933, and were forced to flee before the Germans occupied France and forbidden to exhibit their works in Germany during the N.S. dictatorship: they include for instance Max Ernst and Otto Freundlich, who did not survive his deportation.

Outstanding architects left National-Socialist Germany as well. The best known were Walter Gropius, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Bruno Taut, Erich Mendelsohn, and Ernst-Georg May. One of the few internationally known architects who remained and whose career was not impaired by N.S. rule, was Peter Behrens, in whose office some of the most famous architects of the 20th century had worked prior to 1933, e.g. Le Corbusier, Gropius, and Mies van der Rohe. Behrens was epoch-making primarily through his industrial and office buildings as well as his housing developments, but his most prominent buildings originated in the decades before 1933. The silencing and the professional banning of the artists remaining in Germany must be seen in relation to emigration. Although their number were smaller than those of the writers who emigrated, there were parallels. The most modern and exciting part of German art, which marked the first decades of this century, was banished by N.S. rule. In hardly any other field is more obvious how much N.S. cultural policy was a reaction to the rationalism of modernity. This was even the case in regard to those principles which N.S. functionaries were paradoxically not entirely opposed to, for instance, elements of the new functionalism that among others the Bauhaus architects had propagated.

For artistic schools like the Deutscher Werkbund, the Bauhaus and the Blaue Reiter, which were epoch-making in the history of art, there remained no room in the N.S. Reich. New functionalism, expressionism, surrealism, and abstract art were equally fought as "unnatural" and "degenerate." The artistic character of these trends contradicted the naive, "völkisch" realism, in demand after 1933. These tendencies ran counter to artistic conventionalism as well as to architectural monumentalism. They contrasted with the monotony of N.S. housing developments which contained no room for individualists. The dictorships of the 20th century were similar in their art policy: "The official artistic style of totalitarian countries is everywhere the same" (Werner Haftmann). Political utilitarianism, "popular" realism — a form of democratization of art, an adaption to the "sound popular instinct" — supervision of art through functionaries of state and party — these are only a few of the common characteristics of such art policy. Germanic and "blood and soil" mythologies and anti-Semitism were additional factors in the N.S. Reich. The fight against "Cultural Bolshevikism" and against art that served to "corrode" "popular instinct" and "state-supporting" N.S. ideology was aimed at representational art as well as at literature. The above mentioned steps in defamation are applicable here, too: Programmatic Hitler-speaches, for instance, in Nuremberg in 1934, the obligation to obtain permission for each exhibition from the "Reichskunstkammer" from 1935 on, the confiscation of "degenerate art" after 1937, the confiscation and squandering of valuable works of art starting in 1938/39. This fight was by no means directed against the living, the German, or the emigrated artists alone. Here too, the observation holds that art in Germany could — as far as it was modern — survive only in niches, in "inner emigration." "Art became a means of propaganda" (H. Weigert). German artists were cut off from trend-setting traditions and from the international art market. In this field, the loss was much higher than the prominence and number of emigrants suggests. In addition, a national, "völkisch" art was propagated which was characterized in subject and form by clichés corresponding to the alleged or real taste of the masses. The representational architecture of the party state, with its depressing monumentalism and its empty, declamatory classicism, completed the picture.

The most renowned emigrated architects succeeded in establishing themselves in the United States. Gropius taught at Harvard and founded The Architects' Collaborative, a firm in which a number of younger architects could work together in complete freedom and artistic self-realization according to his principle of teamwork. This team built, for instance, the Harvard Graduate Center in 1949 and erected an apartment building in the new Hansa section in Berlin at the international Bauausstellung in 1957, many years after the end of N.S. rule in Germany. Generally, the work of some of the emigrated architects became more international after the end of World War II. Gropius built the U.S. embassy in Athens from 1957 to 1961 and the Rosenthal china factory in Selb/Upper Palatinate in 1964. Mies van der Rohe, who taught at the Armour Institute of Technology in Chicago after 1968 and designed some buildings there, returned to his former productivity only after 1945. In a number of important designs, which continued his earlier period of "revolutionary glass skyscrapers" (N. Pevsner), he planned private houses, apartment blocks, and office buildings in New York, Toronto, Chicago and other North American cities. Finally, he built the glass-wall National Gallery (1962—68) in Berlin. Pevsner remarked that the style of these buildings was in the tradition of the twenties and thirties but not characterized by the trends of the last one-and-one-half decades in which they were built. Erich Mendelsohn, too, who emigrated via England and Israel to the United States, successfully realized his architectural plans. He had already been in the U.S.A. during the twenties. This visit had influenced his architectural style in the same way as the contact with architectural trends in the U.S.A. had prepared the ground for both of the above-mentioned architects to design their visionary buildings.
On the basis of this affinity, it was possible for architects of rank to gain considerable reputations in the United States and in other countries — as the example of Bruno Taut in Japan and Turkey shows — and even to influence the architectural development in their host countries. It has to be kept in mind here that architecture of this rank was also utilitarian art. Its utility, which was of benefit to the host country in a direct and visible way, considerably increased the chances of émigrés of continuing to work as artists during their emigration. The number of visual artists included in this volume amounts to nearly 250 — not only quantitatively but also qualitatively an important part of the "cultural" emigration. The less verbal and representational a work of art was, the less it was suspected by the N.S. rulers of being oppositional, and the higher became the number of those who had to leave Germany not on account of their "degenerate" style but in the face of a direct threat, i.e. because they were "Jews" as stipulated by the broad interpretation of the Nuremberg laws.

In the field of music, apart from artists of Jewish background, the N.S. régime again defamed those who were radical and experimental innovators, although there were exceptions. While the twelve-tone musician Arnold Schoenberg emigrated, Anton von Webern, who had used twelve-tone techniques since 1924, remained in his Austrian home country even after the Anschluss of 1938. He died there in 1945. He achieved his greatest fame only several years after the end of N.S. rule, not the least because of his inspiring influence on composers like Boulez, Stockhausen and Ligeti. Alban Berg, however, was spared the decision to leave his homeland since he died a few years before the German invasion of Austria. His art had also been rated "degenerate" by N.S. cultural policy.

In the field of music the number of emigrants is lower, although a respectable number of them were musicians of rank, in addition to Arnold Schoenberg for instance Paul Hindemith, Kurt Weill, and Hanns Eisler, as well as the conductors, Bruno Walter and Otto Klemperer. Nevertheless, musicians of high rank remained in the N.S. Reich, like Richard Strauss — whose unpolitical egocentrism Klaus Mann denounced in his Wendepunkt — Carl Orff, and Werner Egk, as well as the conductor Wilhelm Furtwängler. The latter two, in fact, accepted government assignments after 1933. Those musicians who were forced to emigrate had to do so less because of their work but because of their Jewish background or political convictions. These great interpreters were able to continue working comparatively undisturbed during the dictatorship because they had not been classified as enemies of the régime from the very beginning. Music could hardly be understood as a criticism of the régime even when it did not hue to the prevailing taste. A pianist, for example, could use classical compositions or those of the baroque or romantic periods in his repertoire, as long as they had not been classified as "Jewish." In this respect, a musician was able to survive the N.S. régime more easily without loss of quality than painters or writers. For these reasons, the majority of the 465 academically trained musicians mentioned earlier who emigrated to the United States did so because they were of Jewish background.

Although persons active in theater and film were equally able to retreat to interpreting literary classics, these fields of art remained dependent on communicating verbal content and, thus, liable to give offence to official N.S. cultural policy. Of course, the N.S. state emphatically rejected "political theater" like Erwin Piscator's and Bertolt Brecht's. The difficulties encountered especially by actors and, on the other hand, the opportunities which the N.S. state offered them, have already been mentioned. The more remarkable was the number of persons active in the theater who emigrated. 320 biographies of actors, directors, dramatic producers, theater managers, stage designers, dancers, cabaretists, choreographers, theater and music critics were selected for inclusion in the handbook. The greater part of the emigrants in these fields were personalities who had made the German-language theater of the twenties world-famous, or who had broken new ground in the field of theater or film by bold and original productions or acting performances. The most renowned directors among the emigrants were: Max Reinhardt, Erwin Piscator, Leopold Lindtberg, Fritz Jessner, Leopold Jessner. Helene Weigel, Bertolt Brecht, Peter Beauvais, Ernst Haeussermann, Falk Harnack, Kurt Hirschfeld, Fritz Lang, Heinrich Schnitzler, Leonhard Steckel, George Tabori, Berthold Viertel, Wolfgang Heinz, and Peter Zadeck, who only became active after 1945, also have to be mentioned. From the great number of emigrated actors the following shall be named here: Elisabeth Bergner, Ernst Deutsch, Tilla Durieux, Therese Giehse, Marlene Dietrich, Albert Bässermann, Maria Becker, Curt Bois, Ernst Busch, Eva Busch, Alexander Granach, Johanna Hofer, Lotte Lenya, Peter Lorre, Lucie Mannheim, Valérie von Martens, Grete Mosheim, Carola Neher, Max Pallenberg, Peggy Parnass, Karl Paryla, Maria and Maximilian Schlott, Lotte Stein (who became known after the war), Helen Vita, Kadidja Weckkind, and finally the dancers, choreographers and dance teachers, Yvonne Georgi, Valeksa Gert, and Hans Zilling, as well as the stage designer, Theo Otto. As in the case of the writers, the motives of the emigrants were more or less the same. Besides Jewish background, political reasons were often decisive for emigration, since the theater, as an integral part of Weimar culture, had a great share in its political vigor and many of the actors and directors were leftists.

In the realm of the theater, many of the most inspiring and provocative artists of the Weimar era were driven out of the country. It took many years until these traditions could be re-established after the end of N.S. rule. The Theater am Schiffbauerdamm in East Berlin — where Bertolt Brecht and Helene Weigel directed and performed, the Freie Volksbühne in West Berlin, where Erwin Piscator had worked until his death, the other stages in Berlin and Munich to which Fritz Kortner and Ernst Deutsch returned — all were part of this tradition. The Schaubühne am Halleschen Ufer in West Berlin, which recently moved to a building by Erich Mendelsohn on the Kurfürstendamm, in addition to the stages in Bochum and Bremen, has continued this tradition of the political theater since the sixties.

The renaissance of theatrical life after the end of the Second World War took place under a double precondition: The return of many theater people to Germany, and the above-mentioned theater tradition during the Third Reich which especially Gustaf Gründgens was able to uphold in Düsseldorf and Hamburg. The extremely innovative results documented in this volume permit a total representation of the history of the emigrated theater people for the first time and on the
strength of reliable information. It forms an important basis for a history of the German theater from the Weimar Republic to the postwar period.

The situation of the scientific and legal disciplines during the N.S. dictatorship and the specific preconditions for the emigration of their representatives cannot be described here in detail. Its most important aspects have been mentioned at the beginning of this essay.

A few of the most important reasons for the emigration of the scientists may be listed here. There was hardly a field of learning which did not suffer heavy losses through emigration. This is true also for fields that remained comparatively undisturbed, or survived the attacks of the cultural functionaries relatively well during the N.S. Reich. The number of the scientists and legal experts filed in the archives of I.f.Z. and R.F.J.I. amounts to about 6,250 — or more than one fourth of the 25,000 documented émigrés.

Among these émigrés were some of the most famous scientists of the 20th century: the physicists Albert Einstein, Max Born, James Franck, Lise Meitner and Erwin Schrödinger; the mathematician Arthur Pringsheim. Outstanding jurists to be mentioned were Karl Löwenther, Hermann Heller, Ernst Fraenkel, Hugo Sinzheimer, Franz Lehnhof, Otto Kahn-Freund, Arthur Nussbaum, Hans Kelsen, Fritz Morstein-Marx, Ernst Heinitz, Hans Nawiasky, Oscar Gans, Hermann Kantorowicz, Gerhard Leibholz, Werner von Simson, Hans von Hentig, and Fritz Pringsheim. Among the jurists were well-known constitutional lawyers or specialists in public law, while some of those named were experts in labor law. Emigration promoted comparative law approaches. Thus, Loewenstein and Fraenkel carried out fundamental analyses on the English and the American systems of government respectively, and Kahn-Freund did research on labor law and industrial relations in England, comparative studies of international civil law as well as of the methodology of the comparison of different legal systems.

These jurists are impressive examples for the way in which confrontations with legal developments in host countries was advantageous to emigrants. International discussion received a strong impetus from emigration. The documentation of lawyers in the present volume will make it possible to describe the internationalization of research related to constitutional, civil, and labor law which the emigrés helped bring about. Such analyses have influenced the legal discussion in the Federal Republic of Germany and the reception of comparative constitutional law in a political science that is situated between legal and historical scholarship.

Among the emigrated political economists were also some outstanding personalities whose work achieved similar international recognition, for example the legal theoretician on trade unions Goetz Briefs, whose fundamental analysis on the industrial proletariat appeared already in 1926. During his American emigration, he taught at first at Georgetown University, Washington D.C., then at Columbia University, New York. In the United States, he wrote further studies which advanced the industrial sociology he had founded, and continued his research on the social position of the unions for which his new experiences were of great advantage to him. Alexander Rüstow, author of the great work *Ortsbestimmung der Gegenwart* (1950—56), Wilhelm Roepke, and Friedrich August von Hayek are other representatives of the socio-philosophical economic neo-liberalism in exile which never broke its intellectual links with the Ordo-liberalism of Walter Eucken in Freiburg. Franz Oppenheimer, a teacher of the later Minister for Economic Affairs and Federal Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, also sought a way between capitalism and communism in his sociologically influenced system of political economy and propagated a "liberal socialism."

A look at the organization of the economic life of the Federal Republic of Germany shows to which degree the economic principles of the Freiburg School, which were developed during the last years of the war (Ludolf Herbst), were related to the reflexions on economic and social questions of the above-mentioned emigrants who became co-founders of the reconstruction of West Germany in this way. Thus, the experiences of German economic history after 1919 as formulated in the socio-economic analytic systems of the emigrants in the United States affected the direction of West German postwar economic policy in a decisive manner.

The Austrian Joseph Schumpeter, who taught at the University of Bonn until 1932 and then at Harvard University, also belonged to the political economists in American exile. Besides macro-socio-economic interpretations of the present which had a considerable impact in the United States and in Europe, he wrote *Capitalism, Socialism und Democracy*, which appeared in 1942 in New York and in a German translation in 1950, and fundamental analyses on the theory of business cycles. In his numerous works, Schumpeter advocated a highly individualistic socialism. He combined the "scientific methods of the German with the Anglo-American approach" and thus delivered "the first comprehensive and, at the same time, theoretical, historical, and statistical analysis of capitalist development" (Edgar Salin on Schumpeter's main work *Business Cycles*, 2 vols, New York 1939).

Because of their experiences in economic policy between the wars and their political impact after 1945, "economic" journalists like the Austrian Gustav Stolper also have to be added to this group of emigrants. As a political figure, Stolper was included in Vol. I of this Dictionary. As an economic historian and pure theoretician of economic liberalism, he also belongs into Vol. II. Stolper had close contact with important politicians; he helped to influence the revision of the extreme policy towards defeated Germany considered in the United States after World War II. In 1947, he became a member of the Hoover Mission. In 1966, Hans Peter Schwarz pointed out the positive influence of emigrants like Stolper and Roepke on public opinion in the U.S.A. and on its policy toward Germany. "Thus the comparative analysis of the development of ideas within and outside of Germany will have to acknowledge the important contribution of the emigrants, a contribution which was not only in the ideological realm but frequently of a very practical nature as well some emigrants performed important functions as mediators in one way or another — something which has not been appreciated enough so far."

The political economist Moritz Julius Bonn, who lived in England during his exile and who had played an important role in establishing international economic relations during the Weimar period, had a comparable influence. In 1919, he was
a member of the German delegation in Versailles, and afterwards an expert on reparations in the Reichskanzlei and a German member of delegations at important international economic policy conferences. At the same time, he was a full professor and, for a time, rector of the Handelshochschule in Berlin. After 1933 he began a second academic career at the London School of Economics and was invited repeatedly as guest professor at North American and Canadian universities between 1939 and 1946. After 1945 he proved to be one of those emigrants who had warned against equating Germany with the N.S. dictatorship and used his many international contacts in this direction. He had indirect influence on the economic and social policies of West Germany through friends and former students. Among his closer circle of friends were Theodor Heuss, Anton Pfeiffer, and Wilhelm Vocke, the president of the Bank deutscher Länder. Fritz Neumark, finally, was one of those political economists who returned from exile to assume important positions in Germany. He has described his experiences in Turkey in a very informative book.

Comparable to the above mentioned political economists are the social scientists in exile, although they did not exert as much influence on practical developments in West Germany and her relations to the Western democracies. A deep loss to research and teaching is to be noted especially in this field. Besides the already mentioned members of the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research — who represented a sociophilosophical and socio-critical method within the social sciences — a number of sociologists of other directions also emigrated. They represented one of the most important part of the emigration which occurred under the already discussed double impact of, first, political "undersirability" because of affiliation with the political left, and second, because of Jewish background.

Among the social scientists were Theodor Geiger, Emil Lederer, Emil Grünberg, Friedrich Pollok, Karl Mannheim, René König, Paul Lazarsfeld, Fritz R. Behrendt, Emil J. Gumbel, Norbert Elias, Siegfried Landslut, Helmuth Plessner, Otto Neurath, Alphons Silberman, Karl August Wittfogel, Hans Speier, Hans Gerth, Rudolf Heberle, Reinhard Bendix, Ernst Manheim. Depending on how broadly the terms "sociology" or "social sciences" can be interpreted, further persons can be counted among this group. M. Rainer Lepsius has pointed out in a recently published article on the "sociological" emigration, that the disciplines of sociology and political science were by no means clearly defined during the twenties, and that of the 151 members of the German Association of Sociology only a third can be called sociologists by a generous interpretation of the term. Indeed, the confrontation with American social scientists probably contributed to a clarification of the term. In any case, it is possible to include cultural sociologists and art historians like Arnold Hauser, or the German-speaking Hungarian philosopher and literary sociologist Georg Lukács, in this group. Erich Fromm and Bruno Bettelheim can be entered as psychologists or as sociologists. In the case of the social philosopher, Herbert Marcuse, the terms sociologist and philosopher are equally applicable. The differences in methods and approaches of the social scientists just mentioned point to a more general conclusion which has already been stated in respect to the emigration as a whole and its groupings. The "sociological emigration does not represent a homogeneous whole; it is heterogeneous by age, background, professional and political orientation. It exists only through one common biographical experience, the politically induced, if not compulsory emigration or flight from the sphere of the National-Socialist régime" (R. M. Lepsius).

Lepsius has analysed the consequences of emigration for German-language social science. Due to the emigration of socialist intellectuals, the macro-sociological structural analysis of capitalism, which had been characteristic for German sociology before World War I, was broken off and was only revived by the Frankfurt School during the sixties. In Nazi Germany, a sort of Volkssoziologie, in which not the "artificial" concept "society," but the "natural," "organic" forms, the people itself, had become the object of study, had been in vogue during the N.S. dictatorship. A flight into pre-industrial social forms and opposition to industrialization, urbanization, and the legalistic definition of social relations were characteristic for "German" sociology after 1933.

This regression conforms to the National-Socialist reaction to the Weimar Republic which has already been described. A number of emigrated sociologists distinguished themselves with empirical analyses of social stratification. These studies were aimed at a rational social analysis which was diametrically opposed to the harmonistic and integrationist social ideology of National-Socialism. The Frankfurt School analyzed the hierarchical structure of National-Socialism and its social patterns of identification. For this approach alone it was hated by the N.S. rulers.

Analyses of National-Socialism and its rise at the beginning of the thirties originated with the circle of emigrants. They were in the form of "diagnoses of the period," but to these were soon added empirical studies on its social history. Works of a very different character but of high interest for contemporary history were written at that time.

The analyses of Hitler and National-Socialism by Hermann Rauschning were critical of the period and N.S. ideology and belong to this category. He was a former intimate of Hitler and later wrote Revolution des Nihilismus: Kulisie und Wirklichkeit im Dritten Reich, which appeared in Oprecht's Europa publishing company in Zurich in 1938. In 1940, he published his Gespräche mit Hitler which have been translated into many languages at the same company. To this genre also belong the Hitler biography of the journalist Rudolf Olden which appeared at Querido in Amsterdam in 1935, the Hitler biography by Konrad Heiden published in Zurich in 1936/37, as well as his different works on the history of National-Socialism which had already been published in 1932.

On the other hand, sociologists tried to search for the causes of National-Socialism using sociological tools and methods. Their pioneer work in methodology has been well received in West Germany since the sixties. Among the earliest analyses of this kind was Rudolf Herberle's book Landbewohnerung und Nationalsozialismus am Beispiel Schleswig-Holsteins 1918—1932, which had been finished already in 1932 and which the I.F.Z. published in German in 1963. Further examples are Theodor Geiger's analyses of social strata and of Panik im Mittelstand which appeared already prior to 1933, Hans Speier's work on Soziologie der deutschen Angestelltenchaft (1933) which was published completely in the Federal Republic only in 1977 under the title Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus.
LVIII Introduction

Of a completely different kind, but of great methodological interest, are the Studien über Autorität und Familie, on the „authoritarian character“ by the Frankfurt Institute (then in Paris) of 1936, which initiated a sociological behavioral branch of learning on this subject. The study by Erich Fromm German Workers 1929. A Survey, its Methods and Results, which combined the socio-critical approach of the Frankfurt School with socio-psychological concepts, has only recently been published in the Federal Republic. In a broader sense, the first great structural analyses of the N.S. rule by political scientists, which were published in the United States first and then, in the sixties, in the Federal Republic, also belong to this subject: Franz Neumann’s Behemoth and Ernst Fraenkel’s The Dual State. The latter has been instrumental in providing a framework for research on National-Socialism. The questions posed were marked by the shock of personal experiences; the experiences of having lived in the socio-political systems of Western Europe and the U.S.A. benefited these analyses.

Work on methods of empirical and applied social research, which had begun at the end of the twenties, was broken off permanently in Germany and Austria by the emigration of its leading exponents. German sociology was cut off from this core of the modern social sciences. The results of the emigrants’ research have not been systematically acknowledged, as Lepsius observes: “The sociological emigration is not only an exodus of persons but also an exodus of specific sociological paradigms.” It is not surprising that the reverse side of this loss has been a tremendous influence of the innovative ideas of the emigrants on the American social sciences following the reception of Max Weber’s thought as introduced by Talcott Parsons in the twenties. The description of this impact, which also occurred in other fields, is not the task of this part of the introduction. Instead, we refer to studies whose empirical basis has been broadened by the documentation of the professional careers and the lists of publications of the exiles. In the future it will be possible to examine the benefit to the host countries in a systematic way, encompassing all important representatives of a discipline, and to undertake a historical comparison of the individual disciplines on the basis of this Diction- ary. The cultural gain for the host countries has doubtless been very large — at least for those states which opened themselves to the scholarly work of the immigrants. In some countries, the activities of emigrants led the way to the establishment of new scholarly disciplines, for instance, of musicology and art history in the United States. In the English and American understanding of social science, the influence of the “logical positivism” of the Wiener Kreis, to which many emigrants belonged, is still to be felt today. The theories of the philosopher Karl R. Popper — who at present lives in London — came into being as a result of the critical discussions of this school, and enjoy worldwide recognition to this day. Some of the natural Sciences, especially nuclear physics, were similarly influenced. The same is true for the psychoanalysts, almost all of whom were forced to leave Germany. Although these scientific disciplines had of course already been received into English and American culture before 1933, their importance increased through emigration. One immeasurably positive consequence of emigration, which the N.S. rulers had by no means desired, was the internationalization of science, especially in sociology, political science, psychology, law, and art history, to the detriment of scholarship in Germany and at the price of two decades of provincialism.

Proof of this can be found in the names of some of the most outstanding representatives of these fields: Among emigrated psychologists, aside from the psycho-analytical school of Sigmund Freud and his daughter, Anna Freud, mentioned earlier, other directions represented were: William Stern, Karl and Charlotte Bühler, Wilhelm Reich, Theodor Reich, Bruno Bettelheim, Erich Fromm, the former psychoanalyst and later founder of individual psychology Alfred Adler, and the Gestalt psychologists Wolfgang Köhler, Kurt Lewin, and Max Wertheimer.

The bloodletting of German philosophy was also quite considerable as far as number and rank of the emigrated scholars are concerned. In this field, many directions can be found, too, as only a few representative names will document: Ernst Bloch, Ernst Cassirer, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, Herbert Marcuse, Ludwig Marcuse, Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer, Georg Misch, Paul Ludwig Landsberg, Ludwig Landgrebe, Helmut Kuhn, Theodor Lessing, Arthur Liebert, Julius Lips, Arnold Metzger, Hans J. Wolff, Fritz Heinemann, Felix Kaufmann, Walter Kaufmann, Ulrich Sonnemann, Felix Weil, Julius Kraft, Richard Kroner, Hannah Arendt, Leo Strauss, E.F. Podach, Hermann Schmalenbach, Kurt Riezler (formerly on the staff of Reichskanzler Bethmann-Hollweg), and the logical positivists, Rudolf Carnap, Otto Neurath, and Karl R. Popper, and, finally, the internationally recognized Renaissance scholar Paul O. Kristeller. Kantians, Hegelians, Marxists, positivists, phenomenologists, Nietzscheans and existentialists from the schools of Martin Heidegger and Karl Jaspers, as well as individualists belonging to no school, and historians of philosophy, to most emigrating philosophers, the threat resulting from being of Jewish background was the factor deciding their leaving Germany or Austria. And yet, it has to be stated here, too, that outstanding philosophers remained in Germany during the Nazi dictatorship. Heidegger may have been politically one of the most problematical among them, but he was certainly the most important philosopher writing in Germany during these years. A whole range of behavior is encountered among the philosophers in the N.S. Reich: conformity, “inner” emigration, and more or less open opposition.

The philosophers in exile continued their work in their former ways as far as their professional and financial situations permitted. Thus, the continuity of philosophical thought was upheld much more in Germany after the war than the traditions of some other fields.

Among emigrating art historians were first-class scholars. One of them was Erwin Panofsky, who published his Dürer biography in Princeton in 1943 (it was translated into German only in 1977) and an impressive number of other works on Gothic architecture, the Renaissance, early Dutch painting, iconography, tomb sculptures, and, finally, art theory. From his American exile, he firmly established his worldwide reputation as the head of the Hamburg Schule der Kunstwissenschaft which had been founded by Aby Warburg. Another art historian of rank who becomes increasingly known in the Federal Republic was Ernst H. Gombrich — like Panofsky, author of many works on the history of art and member of the order “Pour le Mérite.” Among the older generation of important
art historians in exile were also Hans Kaufmann, Rudolf Wittkower, and Arnold Hauser — the latter a highly educated, independent-minded art sociologist influenced by Marxism, whose books *A Social History of Art, Methoden moderner Kunstbetrachtung* as well as *Der Manierismus — Krise der Renaissance und Ursprung der modernen Kunst*, interpreted art in its social environment. An unquestioned pioneer of architectural history was Nikolaus Pevsner — like the other art historians mentioned here a scholar with a broad grasp of his field, encompassing not only German and European but also non-European art history. Otto von Simson whose scientific renown was established only after World War II belongs to a younger generation. He wrote his study *The Gothic Cathedral. Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order* in exile, and, after his return to Germany, published a comprehensive medieval art history among other publications. In addition, he has rendered great services to his home country in the diplomatic and cultural field.

The list of important art historians can easily be expanded, for instance, by Walter Friedländer, Max J. Friedländer, Hans Huth, or the architectural historian, Julius Posener (Berlin), to mention only a few. Even this short list conveys an idea of the innovative significance of German art historians. They were not committed in method or contents to any single line of interpretation in art history.

A similar observation holds true for the theologians. The protestant emigrants Karl Barth and Paul Tillich, the Catholic emigrants Hubert Jedin, Hugo Rahner, Walter Mariaux, and the theologian Edith Stein — originally an important philosopher and student of Husserl — were very different personalities, although the two first-mentioned protestant theologians were influenced by "religious socialism" and influenced it in turn. In the case of the Catholic theologians, the possibility existed that, as members of a universal Church, they could be transferred to a foreign country when political difficulties arose. An appointment to an office at the Vatican, however, was not formally considered as emigration. Thus, the last chairman of the German Zentrumspartei, prelate Ludwig Kaas, did not return from Rome after the signing of the Reichskonkordat in 1933. Until his death in 1952, he held high office in the Vatican and served as secretary to the Congregation of Cardinals at St. Peter's. In addition, many theologians stayed in the N.S. Reich to care for their parishioners and enjoyed a certain institutional protection through their churches if they expressed limited opposition to the government. When difficulties arose, they did not have to face the régime alone. The churches, in turn, were required to make concessions to the government in order to retain their relative independence. Nevertheless, there were churches that openly objected to the government in order to retain their relative independence. Nevertheless, there were churches that openly objected to the government in order to retain their relative independence. Nevertheless, there were churches that openly objected to the government in order to retain their relative independence.

One of the academic disciplines that was most susceptible to ideological tampering was German philology. Thus, the number of emigrants who were not Jews or of Jewish descent as defined by N.S. legislation was rather small. Although this generalization holds, there were still renowned scholars in this field who were forced to leave Germany. Walter A. Berend-sohn was one of them, yet his emigration showed him a new purpose in his life's work: He became the pioneer of research on the "literary" emigration. Others included an expert on Novalis and expressionism, Richard Samuel; a researcher on Jean Paul, Eduard Berend; Richard Alewyn, an expert on the baroque period, and Hofmannsthal; a scholar of Old German, Friedrich Ranke; and literary scholars still working today, like Erich Heller, Oskar Seidlin or Käthe Hamburger, who writes, among other subjects, about Thomas Mann and romanticism and does methodological studies as well. Among the most famous of the literary scholars or critics were the following: the scholar of romance languages and literatures Erich Auerbach, the chronicler of literary expressionism Kurt Pintthus; the theater critic Alfred Kerr; and, above all, Walter Benjamin whose rich work has greatly influenced literature and the humanities in the Federal Republic for the past two decades. Classical scholars and archeologists of rank also emigrated. We cannot generalize here about the nature of their work, as it was quite varied. The one unifying common denominator was the threat posed by the N.S. régime. The following shall be named here as being representative: Fr. M. Heichelheim, Werner Jaeger, Paul Maas, Kurt von Fritz, Eduard Fraenkel, Hermann Fraenkel, and the archeologist, Karl Schefold.

History and political science are, by nature, disciplines closely related to politics. The proximity is greater the more the political history of the most recent periods becomes of central interest. Some of the political scientists have already been mentioned before, as many of them were originally lawyers or sociologists and political science was even less defined than sociology before 1933. Some of the emigrants who later became outstanding political scientists had originally been journalists; still others emigrated with their parents and were children at their time of emigration. This group became important only after the war. Among these political scientists of different backgrounds and, in part, of different political directions were: Ernst Fraenkel, Richard Löwenthal, Arnold Bergsträsser, Arnold Brecht, Ferdinand A. Hermens, Carl J. Friedrich, Karl J. Newman, Joseph Roovan, Kurt L. Shell, Franz Neumann, Ossip K. Flechtheim, Emmerich K. Francis, Eric Voegelin, Wolfgang Hirsch-Weber and Alfred Grosser, whose scientific and publicistic career began only in the fifties. Among this group was also a pioneer of research on political parties, Siegmund Neumann, whose diagnosis of the party system of the Weimar Republic of 1932 is to this day among the best books written on the subject. Neumann's experiences in exile are reflected in comprehensive works of comparative party research (*Modern Political Parties*, 1956). His own personal history and his having witnessed the N.S. seizure of power produced his powerful work as well as his analyses of the totalitarian N.S. dictatorship, *Permanent Revolution* (1942), and his interpretation of the world-political situation, *The Future in Perspective* (1946). The questions posed, the topics treated, and the methods applied by political science in exile have influenced this discipline in the Federal Republic for years.

There exists no systematic description of the emigration of historians. The present volume will make it possible to investigate this field in the future. After 1933, history was in a similar situation as the other disciplines. Among the emigrants there were a large number of people of Jewish background. During N.S. rule, highly sophisticated research in specialized fields
was continued in Germany. These were mostly in areas that, because of their specialist character, lay outside the interests and horizon of N.S. functionaries, or in fields which could avoid the direct influence of the régime. Conformity, withdrawal into private spheres, the dismissal of many scientists, resistance — this was the series of experiences that appeared with changing emphasis in all disciplines. Besides ideological, pseudo-historical concoctions, numerous works of high quality appeared, for instance Otto Brunner’s *Land und Herrschaft* (1943), which influenced research on late medieval constitutional history and the social history of concepts which is particularly topical today. Despite the fact that a number of prefaces were written by renowned historians that can only be read with embarrassment today, scholarly judgement has to concentrate on the actual value of these works. Here it can be shown frequently that formal gestures of submission to the régime which can be encountered in all totalitarian dictatorships do not necessarily prejudice the academic rank of a work. Disregarding the National-Socialist historian Walter Frank, whose *Reichsinstitut für Geschicchte des neuen Deutschlands*, Helmut Heiber has described in a comprehensive book, the following historians of high reputation lived in the N.S. Reich: Friedrich Meinecke, Otto Hintze, Percy Ernst Schramm, Heinrich Mitteis, Franz Schnabel, Karl Hampe, Johannes Haller, Gerd Tellenbach, Walter Kienast, Friedrich Baethgen, Hans Herzfeld, Karl Brandi, Willy Andreas, Fritz Hartung, Walter Goetz, Hermann Oncken, Johannes Zie- kursch, Carl Erdmann (who was prevented from accepting a professorship by being drafted into military service), Gerhard Ritter, who belonged to the conservative resistance against Hitler — to mention only a few. None of these men were National-Socialists, but some of them shared the tradition of a national ideology of German medieval history, or had a strict "national" way of thinking which had a certain affinity to N.S. ideology. This does not mean that they supported an interpretation of history as promoted by the National-Socialist rector of Heidelberg University Ernst Kriek. To him, "race" and "blood" were the driving forces in history. The majority of history professors did by no means agree with the historian Karl Alexander von Müller, either. He had become a full professor of medieval and modern history only after 1933, and belonged to the historians who remained unwavering National-Socialists till the very end. This did not prevent him from writing brilliant biographical essays on non-European history, however.

In most history departments the outright National-Socialists remained a minority. Walter Frank himself remained an outsider of the learned fraternity. In January, 1933, no full professor of medieval and modern history in Germany was a member of the N.S.D.A.P. Besides Heiber, primarily Karl Ferdinand Werner and, under different aspects, Gerhard Ritter, Theodor Schieder and — from a very critical point of view — the American, Georg Igers, as well as the Marxist historian, Hans Schleier, contributed to the clarification of the wide range of attitudes among German historians during the N.S. dictatorship. If one disregards those areas of the discipline that were of special interest to N.S. propaganda, including as Werner Philipp has shown, the considerably *gleichgeschaltete* presentation of Eastern European history, then it becomes obvious where the problem lay, that is, less in the number of opportunists or convinced partisans of the régime than in a *deutsch-national* way of thinking of a number of historians who had rejected Weimar democracy. Still, "between the conservative historians and the Nazis there existed basic weltanschauliche differences. The conception of history Hitler presented in *Mein Kampf*, or Alfred Rosenberg in *Der Mythos des 20. Jahrhunderts*, was determined by race, that of the historians by the state. The former was Pan-German, the latter dedicated to the continuity of Prussia" (G. Igers). That was, by the way, one of the reasons why quite a few Austrian historians were susceptible to "Pan-German" N.S. ideology.

The majority of the best of German historians were not National-Socialists. However, their concepts of history coincided, in part, with those promoted by N.S. historians, and found common areas of agreement with them. At times, this was true even for those who distinctly protested against the influence of N.S. ideology and its functionaries in other areas of scholarship. The less nationalistic their concept of history was, and the more they thought and worked in European contexts, the less susceptible even conservative or liberal-conservative historians were to N.S. ideology. Examples of these are Gerhard Ritter and Percy Ernst Schramm.

The prominence of the above-mentioned historians demonstrates that in this discipline, in contrast to the social sciences, no extensive emigration of innovative, creative, and original scholars can be observed. On the contrary, many historians remained in the Third Reich and contributed to the advancement of the discipline, for instance in constitutional history. Otto Hintze had combined it with social history long before 1933. How did emigrated historians rate in comparison to historians who stayed in Germany? A great number of the emigrated historians had very different political convictions. Next to conservatives stood liberals, social democrats, and communists, next to Marxist-oriented scholars like Arthur Rosenberg — the first historian of the Weimar Republic, who was originally a specialist in classical history and had been politically active in the K.P.D. — stood historians from the school of thought of Friedrich Meinecke, or scholars whose main field of study was political history, international relations, or economic and social history. A single common denominator of these emigrants is again the fact that they were mostly of Jewish background. The names of the most renowned historians indicate once again the extraordinary loss that German culture suffered after 1933: Veit Valentin, Ludwig Quidde, Felix Gilbert, Hans Rothfels, Dietrich Gerhard, Gerhard Masur, Francis L. Carstens, Hans Kohn, Robert A. Kann, Ismar Elbogen, Alfred Vagts, Gustav Mayer, Erich Eyck, Hajo Holborn, Ernst Kantorowicz, Walter Ullmann, Helmut Georg Koenigsberger, Viktor Ehrenberg, Eugen Taeubler, Simon Dubnow, Leonard Krieger, Ernst Simon, Arnold Berney, Heinrich Benedikt, Hans Ehrenberg, G. W. Hallgarten, Golo Mann, Gustav Mayer, Werner Richter, Guido Kisch, Carl Landauer, Selma Stern, Hans Liebeschütz, Hans Mottek, Jürgen Kuczynski, Karl Obermann, Walter Markov, Wolfgang Steinitz, Ernst Engelberg, Edgar R. Rosen, Albrecht von Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, Friedrich Engel-Janosi, Paul Isaac Bernays, Otto Maenchen-Helffen, Fritz T. Epstein, as well as the historian of civilization and sociologist, Alfred Weber. Among those emigrants who had to leave Germany or Austria at an early age and began their academic career only after the end of the N.S. rule were Fritz Stern, Carl Schorske, Klaus Epstein, Peter Gay, Georg Igers, Werner T. Angress, Klemens von Klempe-
The fields of research of the emigrants were far-reaching. In many cases they had already written important books before the Nazi seizure of power. Veit Valentin, for instance, had completed his history of the revolution of 1848, still considered a standard work. Gustav Mayer had written his great biography on Friedrich Engels and Ernst Kantorowicz his on the Staufen emperor, Frederick II, which had been influenced by the circle around Stefan George and which Hitler liked particularly well, much to the chagrin of its author. Arnold Berney also had finished the first volume of his biography of Frederick the Great. During emigration, new works were published. Among the important books of Erich Eycck, those that should be given special mention here are his critical Bismarck biography and his history of the Weimar Republic, which remained for many decades the only larger comprehensive description of the Republic. Hans Rosenberg's critical book on the history of the Prussian Civil Service since the 17th century and his work *Grosse Depression und Bismarckzeit*, Hajo Holborn's three volumes of *Deutsche Geschichte*, Rosenstock-Huessy's individualistic studies of the character of the European nations and their revolutions, Gerhard Masur's biography of Simon Bolivar — the list of impressive works with different themes and methods could go on and on.

But the studies done by the emigrated historians were not basically different from those of their colleagues living in Germany. Historiography of great style, profound knowledge of the sources, the formulation of new questions — all this can be found in Weimar as well as among the historians who lived under the N.S. dictatorship and among the emigrants too, yet really outstanding performances were the exception in all groups. Thus, the situation of the historians differs from that of the social or political sciences, where the innovative achievements in these fields were nearly without exception made by emigrants, either before or after 1933.

The reason for this was not only that the last-mentioned disciplines were closer to politics, or that there were more Jews in them, but also because of the political attitudes of the majority of historians before 1933. Although few historians of first rank conformed to the system after 1933 in a strict sense, many were skeptical of, or openly rejected, Weimar democracy. Before 1933, the majority came from the liberal-conservative or the deutchnational spectrum. Leftist liberals or even Social Democrats were the exception. Zentrum-affiliated historians were rare outside of the circle of Catholic church historians or the Konkordatslehrstühle. Despite some informative analyses of the political behavior of historians after World War I, more detailed studies of the whole group are necessary.

Apart from the few critics of deutchnational or monarchical tendencies, the historians did not count as a particularly endangered group if they were not of Jewish background. It has to be kept in mind that political attitudes and methodological principles are by no means the same. There were conservative historians who did pioneer work in methodology and in certain subject matter areas, and politically "progressive" historians who did traditional work. The same can be said of historians who emigrated. The whole political spectrum of Weimar was represented among them, albeit with characteristic differences. Among the emigrated historians were comparatively few Marxists, considerably less than in the other sectors of the Weimar cultural elite that had been compelled to leave Germany. With a predominant affiliation to the conservative-nationalist, but not yet National-Socialist political camp, the extremes which typified Weimar culture as a whole were not found among the historians. They were a-typical in the academic scene of the N.S. dictatorship and a-typical for the political structure of the "cultural" exile. The majority of the leading historians in Germany kept their distance from the Zeitgeist more rigidly than scholars in many other areas. If this was a disadvantage for the new Weimar democracy after 1918, it was by no means an advantage for the N.S. dictators after 1933. After 1945 this fact helped in the development of new historical research in the Federal Republic of Germany. Of course, there were exceptions to this generalization. There were also exceptions in certain fields of history which deviated from the average behavior of the historians, for instance the — paradoxically — better adaptation to "N.S. modernity" of many ancient historians, some of them renowned.

History may also serve to clarify additional aspects of the question "return to Germany (and Austria) — yes or no?" In regard to the historians, Georg Igers has concluded that only a few of the emigrated historians returned to Germany or Austria. This appraisal is at first sight correct, as the rate of return is considerably lower for historians than for some other disciplines. Yet, this observation refers to only one side of the problem. Thorough study will show that besides formal return, other criteria have to be considered to receive a satisfactory answer to the original question. Above all, it is necessary to include the influence of the emigrants on Germany after the end of N.S. rule in the evaluation. To influence the thought of a country does not necessarily require an actual physical presence. Prior to a quantitative analysis of the number of those who returned in the legal sense, the broader question of influence has to be considered.

A satisfactory assessment of the impact which the emigrated scientists had on Germany after the end of the N.S. dictatorship requires us to answer some basic questions. Was it possible to pick up the pieces of Weimar culture after 1945, was it possible to call back some of the "cultural émigrés"? Or is Carl Zuckmayer's depressing dictum valid that "the journey into exile is 'the journey of no return'?" Who ever sets out on it and dreams of return is lost. He may return, but the place which he then finds is no longer the same as it was when he had left it, and he is no longer the same person who had left. He may return to the people he missed, to places which he loved and did not forget, to his language which is his own. But he never returns home." No doubt the psychological problems which impeded a return from emigration are expressed in these sentences by Zuckmayer. Certainly a number of further reservations existed, among them the mistaken, although understandable identification of the German people with National-Socialism. Finally, it seemed uncertain, what would await the emigrants at their return. A number of external factors played a role, as, for example, to which degree a particular emigrant had succeeded or not succeeded in gaining a foothold in his host country in exile. In addition, it was of importance to which degree the opinion of many emigrants during the first years that the N.S. dictatorship would not last long had given way to a consciousness of the permanency of exile.
For emigrants of Jewish background much more was at stake than coming to terms with emigration than for non-Jews. Their shock about the mass murder of the Jews was more existential and more personal. A person’s motives for emigration also influenced his decision whether to return to Germany or not in a special way. The more politically-motivated he had been after 1933, the more likely was the possibility of his remigration. Particularly the politicians among the emigrants usually wanted to return, especially when they continued to have political aspirations. Similarly, many communist intellectuals went to the Soviet-occupied zone of Germany, the later G.D.R. In regard to other groups of the “cultural” emigration, especially for emigrants who did not have any party affiliations, the picture was more complex and cannot be painted with a few strokes. Remigrants of this kind, especially writers, were confronted with prejudices or had, at least, to reckon with the alienation of their former colleagues and friends. After 1945, a sharp controversy began, for which the public correspondence between Walter von Molo and Frank Thiess on one side, and Thomas Mann on the other, was symptomatic.

The central point of the controversy was the definition of the relationship between exile and “inner emigration.” The request issued to the emigrants to return to Germany was accompanied by a description of the sufferings under the Nazi dictatorship to which those writers who did not emigrate also had been exposed. These letters intimated: “We, who remained at home, have suffered the most.” Thomas Mann’s moving description of existence in exile, his statement, that it had been impossible “to make culture” in Germany after 1933, his announcement that he did not wish to return — all this seemed self-righteous and unjust to authors like Frank Thiess. He wrote a “farewell to Thomas Mann” in which he contrasted the misery of life in Germany to the life of luxury Thomas Mann had led, who now lectured the Germans on their fate from the American West Coast. Others, who did not have to reproach themselves for any collaboration with the N.S. régime and had been forbidden to publish, equally concluded, like Elisabeth Langgässer: “I believe that the despair of inner emigration has not been inferior to that of the outer emigration, no matter of what nature it may have been.”

Regardless of how one judges this post-war controversy, the relationship to remigrants, especially to “political” remigrants, in the Federal Republic of Germany has without a doubt been a problem for a long time. Each side had reservations toward the other. In addition, numerous left-oriented emigrants were reproached because their animosity toward Weimar democracy had contributed considerably to its downfall. This political destructiveness — despite their brilliance — of left and right prior to 1933 has already been touched upon previously, as was the inherent impossibility of continuing the cultural traditions of the Weimar period after 1945, as if nothing had happened, for instance in journalism.

But “intellectual” emigration and remigration also had another side. Through the emigration of so many intellectuals, the internationalization of science and culture was greatly advanced. “Cultural” emigration has not remained the one-way street which it seemed to be in the beginning and as it still appears as an “irreversible loss” today. Very early, many emigrants had tried to arouse attention in their home countries through publications and radio programs in order to counter N.S. cultural policy. After World War II, many intellectual emigrants eventually returned into German language areas. The remigrants — the majority of whom became “normal” citizens again — brought numerous experiences and new knowledge back to Germany and frequently retained their worldwide contacts. The result was a lasting intensification of exchange among scientists and scholars and of cultural exchange as a whole.

The effects of return and internationalization and their benefits to the cultural reconstitution of Germany after 1945 were much larger than the actual number of emigrants suggests. Numbers do not reveal that many emigrants — without formally returning — were present in the German-language world of their disciplines once again, through private visits and appointments as Honorarpfessoren, lecture tours, and research projects. The policy of the Federal Republic on the arts and sciences has promoted this process of intellectual reintegration for decades, with great success. The works of emigrated scholars have been published in Germany to great effect. One example: The historian Hans Rosenberg was for a long time at Brooklyn College before he became a professor at the renowned University of California at Berkeley where he worked until his retirement.

Only after his return to Germany in the middle of the seventies was he appointed Honorarpfessor at the University of Freiburg. Yet, he had actually been present in his field and in Germany since the beginning of the fifties, at first as a visiting professor at the Free University of Berlin, and then, and most importantly, as the leading exponent of the new social history area of research. Rosenberg established a school of thought, and a number of his (in the broader sense of the term) students received history chairs at universities in the Federal Republic. Indeed, one can say that he had reached his greatest influence in the Federal Republic while he was still teaching primarily in the United States.

Other historians who did not return also made their mark on postwar German thought, for instance Arthur Rosenberg. His critical interpretation of the revolution of 1918/19 has inspired numerous re-interpretations and monographs on the structure and the political function of workers’, soldiers’ and factory councils written by historians of the Federal Republic of Germany since the sixties. The books of leading emigrants were usually translated into German, and were thus accessible to a wider academic and historically interested public. There were surprising exceptions to this positive reception, for instance Hans Rosenberg’s much discussed, much criticized, and much praised book, Bureaucracy, Aristocracy and Autocracy. The Prussian Experience 1660—1815 (1958), or Leonard Krieger’s The German Idea of Freedom. History of a Political Tradition (1957). These exceptions should not lead to the premature conclusion that books critical of German history written by emigrants have not been published in Germany. On the contrary, a number of such works were sooner or later translated, among them studies by Hans Rosenberg, Hans Kohn, Fritz Stern, G.W. Hallgarten, and others.

Some of the remigrated historians became quite famous in German-language countries for their work. Above others Hans Rothfels should be mentioned here, who had helped to begin West German research on contemporary history during
the early fifties. He not only influenced it in the sense of the research he himself did, in connection with additional work on his book *Deutsche gegen Hitler* which he had written in exile, but through his organizational activity which he grounded on programmatic-methodological reflections on the possibilities and necessities of contemporary history. As chairman of the advisory board of the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* and co-editor of the *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, he had lasting national and international influence on this discipline and taught as a full professor at the University of Tübingen. Another emigrant, for whom it is hard to decide whether he should be classified as “returned” or not, since he lived at times in the Federal Republic and at times in the United States, established a new school of thought through the advancement of an important historical discipline, although he is probably known to specialists only: Dietrich Gerhard became one of the founders of early modern historical research on the estates (Stände) which has had considerable influence on the present understanding of European absolutism. Gerhard was able to inspire, or carry out by himself, numerous studies on this subject while he was the director at the Max-Planck-Institute for History in Göttingen.

Golo Mann had the greatest public success among remigrating historians. Although he lived in Switzerland most of the time, he worked part-time in Stuttgart fulfilling his duties as a full professor of political science, and was constantly present on the German cultural scene. His great books on German history of the 19th and 20th centuries (1958), and his biography on Wallenstein (1971) became standard works and bestsellers of their kind because of his profound knowledge of the sources and his problem-oriented style.

A look at the development of historiography in the G.D.R. shows a similar strong influence of remigrating historians. The *Geschichte der Lage der Arbeiter unter dem Kapitalismus*, a many-volume work written by the economic historian Jürgen Kuczynski (East Berlin), has become a basic work of G.D.R. historiography. The second most important G.D.R. economic historian was also an emigrant: Hans Mottek, author of an economic history of Germany in three volumes. Among historians analyzing revolutions, Karl Obermann, a specialist on 19th century German history, and Walter Markov, whose research was primarily devoted to the French revolution of 1789, as well as the methodologists Ernst Engelberg and Wolfgang Steinitz also played leading roles in their fields. The cultural-political activity of emigrants in the G.D.R. linked up with the ideas of some of the historians who had survived the N.S.-dictatorship in Germany, and with the ideas of a younger generation that had begun their careers only after the war. In contrast to the situation in the Federal Republic, the political orientation of the remigrants to the G.D.R. was homogeneous. Almost exclusively, communist historians went to the G.D.R. whereas conservatives, liberals, and Social Democrats — the latter few in number, as there were only very few Social Democratic historians before 1933 — returned to the Federal Republic.

In other disciplines, too, the impact of those who returned, or of those who did not return to Germany but whose works were read there, can be established. To mention only a few examples: The ideas, which political scientists like Ernst Fraenkel and Richard Löwenthal brought back with them from emigration to the *Deutsche Hochschule für Politik*, (later renamed Otto-Suhr-Institut) in Berlin, influenced a whole generation of political scientists. The Frankfurt School also returned to its original city, and individual members, like Herbert Marcuse, influenced the intellectual atmosphere of the Federal Republic from abroad from the mid-sixties on. Literary critics, like Hans Mayer, or art historians, like Otto von Simson, who had returned, also had a considerable impact beyond the limits of their particular disciplines. The remigrated constitutional lawyer, Hans Nawiasky, not only worked within his own discipline but put his mark on the constitution of the *Freistaat Bayern*; Gerhard Leibholz became a lawyer at the Federal Constitutional Court. More visible than in the Federal Republic is the political effect of the remigrés in the G.D.R where they influenced the reconstitution of the state from the beginning and where their ideology became part of the controlling state dogma. Those remigrants who went to the G.D.R. were usually communists. In contrast to this, the pluralism of the cultural life of the Federal Republic of Germany has resulted in part from the diversity of thought of those emigrants who returned there.

The question how many persons returned from the “cultural emigration” to the successor states of the German Reich may be answered in different ways depending on the criteria on which the evaluation of the material is based. The following considerations are limited to those scientists, artists, writers, and publicists who have been included in vols. I and II of the *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Émigrés* 1933–1945, and therefore encompass the cultural elite in its widest sense. The actual number of those emigrants belonging to the “cultural emigration” is much higher, but a precise determination of their number is not possible for the time being. Thus, with regard to the total “cultural emigration” the following determinations represent only trends. With regard to the cultural elite the figures given here are — cum grano salis — precise. This cultural elite is not limited to persons included in the present second volume of the dictionary, since volume one contains political publicists as well as a number of scholars and cultural publicists who were also politically active, for instance Richard Löwenthal, who later on became professor of political science but who had to be included in volume II because of his non-political research. For these reasons, the following evaluation has to consider both volumes. The question of numbers can only be answered sufficiently when the possibility of returning and the desire of returning as expressed by émigrés are included in the interpretation. For this reason, the age of the émigrés as well as the date of their death had to be considered where necessary.

A differentiation between the first and the second generation of émigrés is useful, because the acculturation of both generations in the last country of refuge differed significantly: While the first generation usually had completed their schooling or professional training in the German cultural sphere, most members of the second generation emigrated already at an age in which education and professional activities were still ahead. Therefore, learning the new language was not as problematical either for the second generation since they learned the language of the host country already in school. Thus to which generation an émigré belonged frequently had a decisive influence on the possibility or desire to return. Who had grown up in
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the host country, who had mastered its language, who had no
difficulty in entering professional life due to his being edu-
cated in the new country and, in addition, only had little per-
sonal recollection of his country of origin usually had only
little interest in returning.

Although some émigrés, by these criteria, were, so to speak,
between the generations, a quantitative evaluation cannot do
without limiting values. A possible inaccuracy through this
limitation must be accepted in favor of the verification of the
procedure and the categorization of the results.

Since in those times, an academic education, the most time-
consuming of all forms of education, could be absorbed by the
age of 25, and emigration from the German Reich began in
1933, those émigrés who were born prior to 1908 are counted
among the first generation. As far as Austria and the German
speaking areas of Czechoslovakia are concerned, a later birth
date has been used since these states fell under the National
Socialist sphere of power only in 1938 resp. in 1939.

The “possibility to remigrate” after the end of the N.S.-
dictatorship implies that an émigré was still alive. Those who
had died during their exile therefore have to be excluded from
the reference group in this context. The year 1948 has been
chosen as fixed date for the return.

Immediately after 1948 also those willing to return were fre-
cently faced with obstacles. They often had to wait for visas
which were granted slowly by the Western allies. In addition,
the émigrés did not know what would become of Germany.
Quite a few persons willing to return thus delayed their deci-
sion. They also had to wait whether they would be able to
find appropriate work in their homeland. Quite a few needed
time to overcome the psychic barriers to return. In any case,
during the first years after the end of the N.S.-dictatorship,
many émigrés who had decided to return could or did not
want to act on their decision, especially since many were
politically motivated, the complicity of large parts of the
German population in the crimes of the régime was beyond
question. To émigrés of Jewish background Germany was, af-
fer all, not only the land of their fathers, but primarily the
country, in which their fathers had been murdered.

On the other hand reservations, frequently also open rejection
of the émigrés existed in parts of the German population dur-
ing the first post-war years, for instance when the émigrés re-
turned as officers of the occupying forces like Alfred Döblin.
These and similar considerations suggested the use of a later
year than 1945 for date of return. From the group of possible
returnees those were excluded who had died prior to 1948. We
cannot decide for them whether they would have returned or
not.

In the first volume of the Biographical Dictionary, approxi-
mately 940 persons have been entered including rabbis and
priests, who besides their political work were also engaged as
scholars, artists, or publicists and therefore belong to the émi-
grés of the cultural sector. About 645 of them were born be-
fore 1908 resp. 1913 and still alive in 1948. About 245 returned
to the German successor states, that is about 38%. About 2%
went to Switzerland. Of those who returned, about 60% went
to the Western occupied zones, resp. the Federal Republic of
Germany, 21% went to the Eastern occupied zone, resp. the
German Democratic Republic, about 19% to Austria.

Approximately four fifth of this group of returnees may be as-
signed to the publicists in the widest sense, the rest are schol-
ars, theologians, and (very few) artists.

This ratio of return is clearly a result of the political activity
of the biографees of volume I. The return quota among “pol-
tical” émigrés is very high because their political creativity
from the beginning had been connected with the will to re-
turn to a Germany that had been delivered from N.S.-
dictatorship. For this reason, the return quota even in the sec-
ond generation was very high. About half of this age group
contained in volume I returned to the German cultural sphere.
Many of these political rémigrés reached great influence and
important positions, as Hartmut Mehringer, Werner Roeder,
and Dieter Marc Schneider have shown in a 1981 study.

Of the about 4,600 members of the cultural elite included in
volume II of the Biographical Dictionary, about 2,500 were
born before 1908 and 1913 respectively and still alive in 1948,
and about 26% returned to the successor states of the German
Reich. However, only 8% of the members of the second gene-
eration of émigrés who were not politically active returned.
The distribution as to the countries of return corresponds to
that part of the emigration of volume I which was culturally
as well as politically active. About four fifth, close to 80%,
gent to the Federal Republic of Germany resp. to Austria,
one fifth to the German Democratic Republic.

The rémigrés of the cultural emigration portrayed in volume
II belong to the following disciplines: The humanities as well
as writers and artists are the largest group with 27% each, fol-
lowed by actors and theater directors with 24%. 12% of the
rémigrés were scientists, engineers, and medical scientists, 9%
were publicists.

The cultural remigration of the G.D.R. differs insofar from its
Western counterpart as artists and writers had the highest
share and ranked before actors and theater directors. The pro-
nounced leftist orientation of many artists and writers already
before their emigration, as discussed above in the context of
the political situation of the Weimar Republic, explains this
concentration.

The differences in the distribution of returnees among the in-
dividual disciplines is based on professional facts: scholars and
artists whose work was dependent on language usually had a
greater interest in returning to the German cultural sphere.
What Theodor W. Adorno stated in a lecture on philosophy
is, mutatis mutandis, also valid for other sectors of cultural li-
f: “Language is essential to philosophy. Philosophical prob-
lems are to a large extent problems of its language, and the dis-
cance of its language from the thing, which you find in the
so-called positive sciences, does not hold true in the same way
for philosophy.”

Scholars are much more dependent on the expressive possibili-
ties of their language than scientists, engineers, and medical
specialists. Similar differences as in the sciences exist in the
arts: An actor or writer needs a perfect mastery of his language
for performing in his profession, while a painter, composer,
or pianist may be great in his field without being dependent
on his language. It is therefore not by chance that creative bi-
lingualism among the emigrated writers remains the exception
as in the case of Stefan Heym, for instance.
A summary of the cultural emigration of the first generation included in the two volumes of the *Biographical Dictionary* shows that among this group of persons — for whom the possibility and an interest in returning existed — the total of rémigrés was almost one third (32%). This percentage is much higher than so far assumed, but implies, on the other hand, that about two thirds of the members of the cultural elite forced to emigrate did not return permanently to the successor states of the German Reich, be it because they did not want to return, be it because a return was little attractive to them due to successful acculturation in the host country and in their professional careers. It was also of importance whether in case of their return they would encounter adequate professional possibilities which were at least equal to their career in the host country.

In this context it should be remembered that, in general, non-Jewish émigrés decided more often to return. It had to be more easy for them than for émigrés of Jewish background: To many of them, being Jewish meant an existential and social identification due to the barbarism of the N.S.-dictatorship, while to numerous non-Jewish émigrés the national identification with Germany remained decisive.

The return to the German cultural sphere after the end of the N.S.-dictatorship requires, of course, not only quantitative but also qualitative research, requires research on individual phases of emigration which cannot be accomplished in this framework. The results presented here refer to the total period, i.e. to the editorial deadline of the *Biographical Dictionary*. A more specialized study would certainly reveal a different impact of rémigrés on individual sectors of cultural life, as already mentioned above.

But also disciplines which have not been listed separately were able to re-integrate famous rémigrés, for instance the theater directors Erwin Piscator and Fritz Kortner, the actors Ernst Deutsch, Helene Weigel, and Therese Grohse, the choreographer Yvonne Georgi, the physicists Erwin Schrödinger and Max Born, the mathematician Carl Ludwig Siegel, the Germanist Richard Alewyn, the philosophers Ernst Bloch, Karl Löwith, Georg Misch, and Helmut Kuhn, the sociologists René König and Helmuth Plessner, the political economist Erich Schneider, the theologians Hubert Jedin and Hugo Distler, to mention only a few. There was probably no sector of cultural life, no scientific discipline, without rémigrés making important contributions to it. In the G.D.R. numerous rémigrés achieved similar recognition and influence, for instance Bertolt Brecht, Johannes R. Becher, and others.

If one asks about the willingness to receive the rémigrés in the successor states of the German Reich about the recognition of their achievement, one will have to differentiate between different phases and disciplines here, too. The frequently heard Marxist claim, that in the Federal Republic of Germany usually politically motivated prejudices had been prevalent towards the émigrés, cannot be upheld. The actual share of rémigrés, which is, as has been shown, much higher than in the G.D.R., the careers of those who returned and only a few of which have been enumerated here, but also other evidence, for instance honors and awards, contradict this argument. In the place of others, the "Orden pour le mérite für Wissenschaft und Künste" shall be named here. It was newly founded by Theodor Heuss and is sponsored by the Federal President. No doubt, it represents an elite association. Aside from the physicist Albert Einstein, who had been added to this organization already in 1923, and the chemist Richard Willstätter who joined it in 1924, there were between the years 1952 and 1980 not less than 25 émigrés among its 153 members. Ten of these émigrés returned to the German cultural sphere after the end of NS-rule. The order appointed the following emigrated scientists, writers, and artists since 1952:

- 1952: the lawyer Erich Kaufmann and the composer Paul Hindemith;
- 1955: the writer Thomas Mann, the classical philologist Werner Jäger, and the painters Hans Purrmann, and Oskar Kokoschka;
- 1956: the physicist Erwin Schrödinger and Lise Meitner;
- 1957: the architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe;
- 1961: the historian Hans Rothfels;
- 1963: the mathematician Carl Ludwig Siegel;
- 1966: the writer Anette Kolb;
- 1967: the art historian Erwin Panofsky, the conductor Otto Klemperer and the writer Carl Zuckmayer;
- 1970: the theater director Fritz Kortner;
- 1972: the biochemist Sir Hans Adolf Krebs;
- 1973: the historian and writer Golo Mann;
- 1974: the biochemist Fritz Lippmann;
- 1976: the art historian Richard Ettinghausen;
- 1977: the painter Hans Hartung;
- 1978: the art historian Ernst H. Gombrich;
- 1979: the physicists Victor Erich Weiskopf and Felix Bloch;

Three émigrés who did not return but had nevertheless great influence on cultural life in the Federal Republic as representatives of their disciplines shall be named here in place of others: the cultural sociologist and historian Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, the architect Walter Gropius and the writer Jean Améry. Rosenstock-Huessy was visiting professor at the universities Göttingen (1950), Münster (1957), Cologne (1962–63), director of the America-Institute of the University Cologne (1961–62), became Dr. h.c. of the universities Münster (1958) and Cologne (1961) and received the Great Federal Service Cross (1960).

Walter Gropius designed the apartment houses in the Berlin districts Britz-Buckow-Rudow from 1959 on. He received the Goethe Prize of the City of Hamburg (1956), the Ernst-Reuter-Medal of the City of Berlin (1956), the Great Federal Service Cross (1958) and the Great State Prize for Architecture in Düsseldorf (1960), the award of the German Academy for Municipal and Regional Planning (1962).

The Viennese writer Jean Améry, who emigrated to Belgium after 1938, worked regularly for German language radio and periodicals after 1945, became member of the PEN-Center of the Federal Republic of Germany, honorary president of the Austrian PEN, received the German Critics’ Prize for literature (1970), the Literary Prize of the Bavarian Academy of Fine Arts (1972), the Lessing Prize of the City of Hamburg, the Prize of the City of Vienna for Journalism (1977).
awards were given to Nelly Sachs, Max Tau, Walter Mehring, to mention only these.

These persons represent the 8—10% of those émigrés who belong to the group of potential returnees, but did not return permanently. Nevertheless they were represented in the cultural life of Germany and won influence. Visiting professorships, memberships in academies, invitations, regular lecture tours, permanent work in German or Austrian newspapers and magazines, exhibitions and other activities were characteristic for these émigrés.

Those émigrés who went to Switzerland during NS-rule or — like Thomas Mann — lived there after 1945, also influenced cultural developments in Germany or Austria. Clearly the intellectual reintegration of this group has to be considered too.

The literary and artistic works of most émigrés have been published in numerous single editions or as collected works in the Federal Republic and in the G.D.R. during the fifties, the sixties, the seventies and eighties, even if at times with considerable delay, as in the cases of Lion Feuchtwanger or Oskar Maria Graf, yet with great expenditure and success.

The combination of the facts enumerated here — share in re-migration, organizational influence without return, intellectual reintegration of the work — suggests a revision of the opinion prevailing so far, that the extremely severe loss to German culture through the emigration of large parts of the cultural elite after 1933 has been completely irreversible also after the end of the N.S. dictatorship: A considerable part of the cultural loss, which N.S. rule has caused through its persecution of Jewish but also non-Jewish members of the cultural elite since 1933, could slowly be restored during the decades after 1945, although with interruptions and delays. Numerous émigrés have sooner or later contributed to the reconstitution of the successor states of the German Reich after the end of N.S.-rule. It is time to recognize their achievement. This conclusion does not mean, that all losses could be reversed after 1945. The displacement had meant too many personal sacrifices. It should be remembered here that many persons committed suicide during exile, and that many did not succeed in settling down permanently and in continuing their scientific or artistic work. The above modification of the previous assessment of the cultural loss must not lead to a minimization of the barbarian injustice of the displacement, or the terrible and generally hard lot of the émigrés.

Our result rather means that the displacement of the German spirit which the N.S.-dictatorship began ended after 1945. Despite the fundamental interruption of major scholarly literary, and artistic traditions of German cultural life, N.S. cultural policy gained its objective only in part, and, in many sectors of cultural and scientific life, only for a limited time.