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The intellectuals and artists who suffered the persecutions described above reflected the diversity of the culture from which they had been displaced. This diversity of their origins persisted in their flight and emigration. The world of nation states and empires, to which they were forced to turn for shelter and a chance to begin anew, was not hospitable to newcomers. No country welcomed intellectual or artistic émigrés in large numbers. Those who gained admission faced numerous obstacles in securing jobs to maintain themselves and their families. The support they received from family members, especially their wives, forms a persistent theme in many biographies documented in this volume. Only the best-known among displaced scholars and artists found the doors of universities, institutes, or art organizations open when they sought to continue their work. For the others and for the young, starting at the proverbial bottom of their professions was the more characteristic experience. For émigrés whose large majority was formed by middle-class values and traditions, this was a new social experience.

The process by which the émigré related to the cultural stimuli of his country (or countries) of settlement is best summarized by the term acculturation. It denotes the unstable equilibrium which the fusion of diverse cultural traits brings about when a person or group comes into intimate and prolonged contact with persons or groups of another culture. It is characterized by changes in attitudes and values ("subjective factors:" self-image, identity) as well as observable behavior ("objective factors:" traits, habits, language behavior, sociability, etc.). Acculturation is a function of concrete situations as well as the generalized images, perceptions, and values the several cultures or personalities bring to bear upon the circumstances of the cultural encounter.

The concept acculturation thus describes also the two extreme situations found in cultural encounters as documented in this volume. For one significant group of primarily literary and political intellectual émigrés, being forced to flee and reside in another country constituted an exile. Upon close analysis, this did not, in most instances, exclude an "objective" and behavioral acculturation, and may have included use of the language of the host country, economic activities of the exile or his wife, schooling of children, active or passive participation in the political, intellectual, and entertainment aspects of the host culture, acquaintance with its literature and history, or sociability with neighbors and like-minded natives. Subjectively, however, and in professional and political activities, the exile identified with his home country, and maintained a national component in his self-understanding that was often sharpened by his absence from home or by active participation in exile politics. Such politics consisted primarily of the usually somewhat abstract planning, publicity, lobbying and writing for post-totalitarian reconstruction, and maintained intra-exile dissension along older party lines. The political divisions of the German and Austrian exile of the Nazi period influenced the activities of German writers who continued to write and publish in the German language. (Their outlines are presented in the essay preceding this section.) These writers, who had been established or were active prior to their emigration, and had made up a central segment of the Austrian and Weimar cultures referred to below, created a literature in exile — German Exilliteratur. Research has established that this literature, too, bears some influence, at least in its contents, of the exile, i.e. the acculturation experience.

At the other extreme stands the group consisting primarily of younger persons for whom acculturation constituted "full integration" into the culture and society of the country of settlement. Such integration, verifiable by objective indices such as education, military service, language habits, customs, leisure time activities, or marriage and child rearing patterns, and by "subjective factors" such as identification with national history and politics, may be characterized by minimal influences from parental cultures, at least on observable conscious or verbal levels of behavior, and in extreme ideal-typical cases.

For intellectual émigrés, the particular cultural traits of original and host cultures (including the complex pattern of acculturation derived from Jewish sub-cultures in home or settlement countries) were not correlated directly enough to allow predictions of individual behavior from group attitudes. The variety of historic situations in which intellectual émigrés experienced acculturation permits, none the less, some empirically verifiable generalizations about group behavior. Among the factors involved were age, political and professional activities and orientation, country of settlement, perception of historic experiences, Jewish ties, family ties, and/or economic and other interests.

That group identification is closely related to patterns of socialization and peer group relationships derives sufficiently from social and educational psychology so that it need not be detailed here. Observations of group behavior in the immigration situations of "second generations" are a commonplace of American immigration history. This pattern of second generation acculturation/integration is significant for the large group of younger émigrés included in this volume, and deserves a separate study. It also affects older generations, especially in Jewish and similar groups that accept family cohesion as a strong determinant of behavior. Withall, age by itself is not a
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stable or continuous factor, since attitudes towards the older parental generation and culture change as the cycle of life advances. The recent concern with "roots" among minority groups in the U.S.A. suggests further that cultural history and politics as provided by the media may affect group attitudes. Reversals in the language habits of aging persons and the increased European travel of older émigrés suggest other dimensions of age- or income-specific changes in the acculturation process.

Of major significance for émigrés of the Nazi period, including intellectual émigrés, was the generalized image of German and Jewish history and culture. For the Jewish group, Nazi persecution, adverse personal experiences with friends and neighbors during the Nazi period, the absence of effective German and Austrian resistance to anti-Semitism, and finally, genocide and the murder of close relatives had tended to strengthen the wish to cut identification and cultural ties with the country of origin, and to seek as much integration with the new homeland as the situation permitted. For some, this included a strengthened Jewish identification, and the acceptance of Jewish collective attitudes towards the generalized image of German culture and the German people. The foundation of the state of Israel and the political success of the Federal Republic of Germany and its policy of compensating victims for their material losses were additional influences on attitudes. They, too, deserve detailed investigation. It is further possible that the pattern of Jewish acculturation in Germany and Austria may have provided some models for the acculturation of émigrés.

Acculturation differed also with respect to the cultural expectations of the country of settlement. European nation states did not perceive themselves as immigration countries during the migration period under discussion, and in the majority do not see themselves as such today. Therefore, they do not have the collective memory or social habit of tolerating the coexistence of majority cultures with immigrant strains undergoing acculturation in a generational sequence. Even multinational states like Switzerland or prewar Czechoslovakia, or Poland have failed to develop social thought accounting for acculturation processes. Most, if not all of these states perceived the immigrant as a temporary sojourner or foreign laborer ("guest worker" in the postwar period). They exerted cultural pressures to either eliminate the alien through complete integration, or return him to his country of origin. Acculturation, or the process of combining features of several cultures, appeared as a "lower form" of the "pure" national culture, e.g. in countries like France or Great Britain whose cultures stress language behavior as an index of in-group belonging, or Greece or Latin America where religious uniformity is tied to the perception of the national culture. In the 1930s, economic factors and fears of émigré competition on labor markets, as well as xenophbic and anti-Semitic currents reenforced such perceptions.

The U.S.A., too, the prototype of a Western industrialized immigration country, looked back in the 1930s on a history of nativism, xenophobia, racism, and anti-Semitism. Such trends had emerged in public precisely during the period of large-scale immigration beginning in the second half of the 19th century, and had formed a reflex against such immigration. Earlier, this nativism was expressed as Protestant fear of Catholicism, white rejection of blacks, or rural rejection of urbanism. Empirical studies based on interviews and questionnaires, and public opinion polls taken during the 1930s and 1940s suggest a high degree of generalized rejection of immigrants from Central Europe. They also suggest that immigrant intellectuals teaching in American universities and colleges faced considerable pressures to "adjust" their behavior to prevailing standards in their professional activities and in human relations. Such attitudes were strongly reinforced by the economics of academic employment (as discussed below). Still, with the economic expansion following World War II and the arrival of new groups of immigrants, cultural pluralism as propagated earlier by liberal groups appeared to be more widely accepted, and became incorporated in the national ideology. As a result, immigrant subcultures reflecting changing equilibria of cultural elements became part of the national self-understanding. The intellectual immigrant, instead of meeting hostility and reserve, now turned into a national asset and reached the highest levels of government, intellectual life, or the academic world.

The culture in which the intellectuals and artists documented in this volume originated was the German-language culture of Central Europe between the two World Wars. It comprised the German Reich, a republic, the Austrian Bündnerrepublik, and the German-language areas of the Czechoslovak Republic. Each of these cultures left its imprint on their national scholars and artists. The central component called "Weimar culture" in postwar literature has given its name to the period. German intellectual life had been influenced strongly by foreign (including Austrian) intellectuals and artists who had migrated primarily to Berlin following the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. To be sure, singling out Weimar culture to reflect upon the original cultures of all émigré intellectuals disregards the refugees from Austria and Czechoslovakia, especially their writers and musicians. It appears justified, nonetheless, to see in Weimar culture the paradigm of German-language civilization and the major embodiment of the intellectual and artistic achievements and failures of the pre-Hitler period.

Long before the exodus of scholars and artists from Germany had become an international event in demographic and intellectual history, German culture had been part of, and influenced by, European cultural history, especially by personalities and trends originating in other countries. It has been pointed out correctly that most of the characteristic features of Weimar culture had been created in many countries prior to World War I. What characterized the post-World-War I period in Germany (and Austria) was the profusion and creative intensity with which its energies found release. The war had left Germany with a cauldron of political and social contradictions. Of the barely 15 years the Weimar Republic survived, only five years, 1924—1929, bore a semblance of normalcy. All others were years of political and economic turmoil, dissolution, and polarization. In the atmosphere of crisis, the polarities inherited from the prewar world not only sharpened, but also turned into intense political confrontations, especially when the Republic proved unable to solve the economic and social problems created by the World Depression, and took refuge in authoritarian government in 1930. As a result, Weimar culture became intensely politicized. Politicization extended not only to traditionally political branches of thought like political science and theory, economics, history, Literaturwissen-
Kulturpolitik — really the politicization of culture, its political interpretation and use — had, of course, antecedents in European cultural history. Conservatives had condemned literary trends like realism or naturalism, and innovators, in turn, had interpreted styles like social realism, expressionism, or Dadaism, as direct attacks on the prevailing "system." That socialist scholars had not been able to obtain university appointments in Germany prior to 1918 (and only sparingly afterwards) illustrates merely in an extreme example the finely tuned political uses of government controls over Kulturpolitik — which also had discriminated in major fields against Jews who failed to submit baptismal certificates to obtain professorships.

The background of this Kulturpolitik derived from the birth defect of the Republic: it had carried over in its government, business, social, and intellectual structures the achievements and thus the shortcomings represented by the prewar establishment of Imperial Germany. The already far-reaching bureaucratization of intellectual life — life-tenure provisions for the professoriate, even for actors and musicians, the civil-service mentality of cultural elites — had thus imprinted upon Weimar establishment culture a stamp of conservatism that was shared by wide segments of the educated middle classes, business, the teaching profession, and the social elites of middle and small towns across the country.

The churches, too, shared in conservative Kulturpolitik. The Catholic Church had long been active in defense of its moral and social teachings in German politics, and used its influence to ward off modernization or innovations that (it believed) might morally endanger its members. The Weimar constitution and German legal codes had provided accordingly, that literature and art could be censured as "Schund und Schmutz" — worthless and dirty — and its creators prosecuted in the courts. Protestant churches, while neglecting to found a party of Protestants to defend their interests, joined battles with modernism through the political channels of middle class and conservative-right-wing parties. As a result, the Weimar judiciary meted out harsh sentences to "cultural offenders" of the left while excusing "offenses" committed by those of the right. It also allowed itself to be used to censure works of art offensive to the churches, and works of literature that satirized official definitions of national interest and honor, German war service, generals, or public personages. It sought to suppress movements to liberalize laws against abortion and homosexuality (Sexualreform) while finding it hard, under law, to send pornographic anti-Semitic propagandists and liars to jail.

Academic scholarship and higher (university) education in the Weimar Republic continued to function on levels that had earned them a worldwide reputation prior to World War I. In some fields of science, in mathematics, sociology, Gestalt psychology, Weimar Germany became a recognized leader or participant in advancing knowledge through pioneer investigations. In many other fields, Weimar scholars enjoying worldwide recognition continued their work or started on their careers. The impact of universities such as Göttingen, Hamburg, Munich, or Berlin on the development of modern physics represents the most noted and influential example, and there are less noted parallels in other fields. Increasing numbers of students, including students of middle- and lower-class origin, attended universities to prepare for higher service careers, reflecting the changed social role of higher education in post-industrial society. Seeking to guard their professional and increasingly labor-divided standards of scholarship, university teachers sought to isolate the university from the partisan political currents swirling around them. Only a minuscule minority among the 7,000 university professors of the period participated in efforts to commit university professors to public loyalty declarations for the liberal-democratic Republik. Since Nazi decrees were to sever about 2,000 professors from their positions, it follows that those among them who would emigrate had shared, to a large extent, the turn to non-political professionalism characteristic of the period.

Significant exception to this general trend occurred both within and without established academic institutions. New departures in the social sciences took place within the university system. At the University of Frankfurt/Main, a young and thus less tradition-bound institution, Marxist scholars established an Institute for Social Research that promoted critical theoretical scholarship. Other universities also provided appointments for younger and critical scholars. A significant number of émigrés who, in retrospect, embodied the innovative aspects of Weimar culture in exile, began their careers in German universities in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Significant innovation also occurred in institutions engaged in research and teaching outside the formal framework of the universities. They included the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik (Academy of Political Science) in Berlin which attracted to its teaching staff not only outstanding future émigrés but also American liberals. In Hamburg, the Institute-Library founded by Aby M. Warburg created a center for a renewal of the classics as a cultural force in Western civilization. Re-introducing the comprehensive revisions in classical scholarship promoted by such 19th century scholars as Jacob Burckhardt and Friedrich Nietzsche and stressing Warburg's, interest in the non-rational aspects of culture, the Library stimulated new departures in research on Renaissance and Reformation thought, art history, and philosophy. The Bauhaus, founded in Weimar in 1919 and continued in Dessau in 1923, summarized inventive and integrative trends in European art. Its architects and designers would achieve worldwide recognition and pervasive influence as émigrés from Hitler Germany. Psychoanalysis, too, as organized in the Psychoanalytisches Institut Berlin developed outside the university framework. Its Viennese center as well as its German and Hungarian theoreticians joined as émigrés in making depth psychology a broad force in culture and scholarship.

Besides such institutionalized centers of innovation, Weimar culture was most typically represented in today's view by its intelligentsia — the nonbureaucratized intellectual and artist. He created the art, literature, architecture, and music that has, in part, enjoyed acceptance in the Western world as anticipating the sense of life and reality of the later 20th century.
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Joined with this group, although considerably more limited in their influence, were the writers and journalists that made up the cultural opposition to the “Weimar system” on the left of the political spectrum. In political orientation, these writers ranged from the liberal center to the Communist extreme, as yet, as a radical ally in the common cause of change and “revolution.” Like the Weimar parties and the intellectual Left elsewhere, they had split and subdivided into numerous ideological and political factions. Like the radical right, they fought the “system,” sought to transform society in the image of their Utopias, and rejected the accomodations of the Weimar Republik in the name of a “new Man,” and a “new Society.” Their political journals pointed out early, and correctly, the numerous nationalistic and civil rights violations of the constitution, or fought for world peace, Sexualreform, the nationalization of industry, disarmament, free speech, or new forms in communal life, art, or literature. Their novels reflected sharp analyses of social ills and oppression. Their most pervasive stylistic loyalty belonged to the expressionist school, seen as revealing the incoherent structures of modern society, the shock of discontinuity, the greater “realism” of distortion and violent color, the rejection of the pretty surface.

Many of these men and women were of Jewish background or ancestry although quite distant, in most instances, from the middle-class community of organized religious life. A variety of explanations have been offered at the time to account for the relative strength of such persons in this group: the spirit of Judaism and its prophetic ethics of care for the poor; identification of past Jewish oppression and suffering with the hunted and exploited; Jewish critical intellectualism and a search for new solutions.

Explanations such as these are, as yet, beyond proof for the group as a whole, although their correctness for individual biographies is acknowledged, as long as they avoid the circularity of “Volksgeist” explanations that have haunted German intellectual life since romanticism. More to the point, and subject to empirical study, would be a link between the course of acculturation, and its stages, on the one hand, and Jewish reactions to such stages, including their share in avant-garde art and literature, on the other. Such a study would have to be related to socio-economic conditions, urbanization, immigration, political images and self-perceptions, socialization and other factors. It would show that not one but a number of typical situations created a series of options for the Jewish intelligentsia of which avant-gardism would be only one. It might also show, however, as has been impressionistically asserted, that some of the most creative minds severed their connection with Judaism before or when they achieved distinction in the wider German culture and society.

Although this intelligentsia was set apart, in its social role, from the salaried university scholar and teacher, only a small minority represented the “free-floating” intellectual of Wissenschaftsziologie. Weimar freelance writers created their works for a cultural and political market that flourished in the pluralistic atmosphere of culture and counter-culture, primarily in Berlin. Their literary essays and political criticism were published in “newspapers, magazines, collections, or books by a variety of publishers serving clienteles (Gemeinden) of devotees of every style, taste, or shade of opinion” (Pachter). They were supported by theaters and academies, state prizes and book clubs. The political parties, following their own Kulturpolitik, absorbed and supported the works of fellow-travellers and party members. A substantial number of the best-selling writers of the period, by no means political extremists — Franz Werfel, Emil Ludwig, Stefan Zweig, Alfred Döblin, the Mann brothers are examples of future émigrés among them — enjoyed considerable public and financial success in the 1920s. For all of them, emigration ended all links with their informal networks of finely shaded political and cultural support. That such networks could not be established abroad was, in fact, one of the tragedies suffered by exile writers of the Nazi period.

Although a national culture open freely to other German-language influences, especially the Austrian, Weimar culture rested on the traditions of European internationalism. This internationalism had expressed itself not only in literature where superb translations of foreign writers had created a Weltliteratur, but rested also on the internationalism of musical life and the central position of art metropoleis like Paris for the plastic arts. In many other fields, especially the more nationally conceived humanities and social sciences, international cross-fertilization was as yet rare. Weimar culture represented a transitional stage in developing systems of international communications networks. By the evidence assembled in this volume, Weimar musicians and artists travelled extensively and had contacts with their foreign colleagues. Musical performers accepted engagements in foreign countries: the Salzburg festivals organized by later émigrés Max Reinhardt are one example of the trend. German musical scores were performed abroad. In literature, writers like Thomas Mann enjoyed international contacts and notoriety, and the Nobel Prize he received in 1929 was testimony to his worldwide reputation. Best-sellers by German writers found foreign publishers and translators, especially in the field of biography and the lighter novel (Unterhaltsungsliteratur). The developing motion picture industry also created international styles for German actors until the introduction of sound limited it to directors and other non-acting personnel. There were to be outstanding exceptions to this observation in the Hollywood of Marlene Dietrich in the 1930s and 1940s.

Internationally connected also were the Catholic Church and the world of Jewish learning, whose scholars and theologians benefited from study abroad. Although Protestant ecumenicism was still in its infancy, it had been inaugurated in time to afford social assistance to refugees from its developing headquarters in Geneva.

Soviet and Communist Kulturpolitik had started as an international movement open to experimentation and innovation. The bureaucratic controls that entered into Soviet society with the five-year plans under Stalin’s dominance ended experimentation in Soviet art and literature, and enforced conventions like social realism or architectural monumentalism as part of the party’s control mechanism. Communist innovations in the arts outside of the Soviet Union were redirected accordingly, as the Comintern asserted Soviet control over communist parties, and enforced compliance with Soviet policies. Protests by theoreticians like Ernst Bloch or George Lukács in the late 1920s against the sociological inappropriateness of applying Soviet styles in Kulturpolitik to the “class struggles” of Western industrial societies did not change this poli-
cy. Communist or "revolutionary" artists were encouraged instead to use accepted forms of "proletarian art" (e.g. in the theater, in "agitprop," in photocollages etc.) for their creative work.

The international exchange of scholarship occurred on several levels prior to Hitler's rise to power. Each of the fields in which scholarship had produced major innovators has its own history of the reception of such innovations in other countries. The prestige of German graduate study and scholarship e.g. in the U.S.A. prior to World War I derived from American perceptions of the excellence of German scholarship. Following World War I and during the depression years of the early 1930s, American philanthropic organizations like the Carnegie or Rockefeller foundations had encouraged the international exchange of scholars. (Some of their grantees would become émigrés following Hitler's rise to power.) The reception of Freud's depth psychology, of experimental and Gestalt psychology, or of Weberian and Simmelian sociology in the U.S.A. preceded the advent of the intellectual émigrés, and was characteristic of the developing internationalism.

The natural sciences, in contrast to such humanities as history, literature, and Germanistik, or to jurisprudence, may have been among the most effective in developing early international communications networks. Foreign students had early on attended lectures at German universities: in mathematics, for example, a survey of doctorates held in the U.S.A. published in 1936 disclosed that since 1862, 114 degree holders (both native and foreign born) had obtained degrees abroad compared to 1,286 American and Canadian graduates: "Göttingen, with 34 such degrees, far surpassed any other foreign source" (Reingold). Albert Einstein's career before and after World War I and prior to his emigration, and the careers of American physicists point to considerable international exchanges, studies, conferences, and personal contacts since the turn of the century. Modern physics exemplifies international interaction in the development of a discipline at its best. It formed the most noted and outstanding example of the internationalization of the sciences in personnel, exchange of information, and joint multinational organizations.

Yet, as the history of the intellectual migration made quite clear, this personnel and communications revolution did not lead to the undisputed admission and absorption of émigrés intellectuals from Nazi Germany or Austria. Internationalism had been institutionalized by national intellectual structures. It did not change the institutional imperatives or the national policies of these structures. Internationalism had never penetrated German intellectual life beyond the most successful top layers of the universities or the arts and literature. As a factor in intellectual migration, internationalism was effective if émigrés had belonged to the German (Austrian, Czech-German) branch of an international institution. Thus, Catholic organizations like the orders or theological seminaries, used their international organization to shift some of their property and being able to establish contact with the "American movement." Similar attractions created centers of other psychoanalytic schools, e.g. Alfred Adler's in New York, or of Gestalt psychology at Smith College, Bryn Mawr, and the New School, and the re-founded branch of Bauhaus in Chicago and at Harvard. Professors who emigrated would attract advanced student assistants wishing to continue their work in emigra-

The organizational structure of the intellectual Exil was, in part, linked with the political network of exile organizations. Political cohesion and, at times, coercion along party lines formed the background for this politically oriented segment of the Exilliteratur of the Nazi era. The Kulturpolitik emerging at international meetings of intellectual exiles followed the political currents of the period and continued basic Weimar groupings. In addition, Exilliteratur reflected new problems, such as the popular front policies of the mid-1930s, propaganda activities against the Third Reich, or the shape of postwar Allied policies towards Germany.

For the large majority of émigrés, political and ideological internationalism was of little help in establishing themselves abroad. The political activists among intellectual émigrés constituted only a small, if vocal and visible minority. Most intellectuals emigrated, like their fellow persecutees, by using the assistance of families, colleagues, or friends, the formal or informal small groupings they had related to before emigration. This explains in part the concentration of some schools of thought or of political friends and allies in certain countries and localities following emigration. Only Communist and fellow-travelling intellectuals and artists were permitted to live in the U.S.S.R., a small and select group in view of harsh Soviet restrictions on immigration. The New School for Social Research, New York, appointed a group of progressive German professors, most of whom had known each other as Social-Democrats or Liberals in universities or government service. Psychoanalysts concentrated in New York and Chicago on the strength of having been preceded by others before arrival, and being able to establish contact with the "American movement." Similar attractions created centers of other psychoanalytic schools, e.g. Alfred Adler's in New York, or of Gestalt psychology at Smith College, Bryn Mawr, and the New School, and the re-founded branch of Bauhaus in Chicago and at Harvard. Professors who emigrated would attract advanced student assistants wishing to continue their work in emigra-
tion. Such informal groupings are known from the natural sciences, some social sciences, labor law, and, of course, literature, and deserve detailed analysis as factors in emigration.

Aside from the Warburg Bibliothek (which had had close contacts with English scholars prior to Hitler’s rise, and transferred to London in 1933 to begin a brilliant international career) the outstanding example of international diversification through emigration was the Institut für Socialforschung directed by Max Horkheimer at the University of Frankfurt/M since 1931. Privately endowed, the Institut had transferred funds to, and established a branch office in, Switzerland prior to 1933, then moved to Paris, and finally, to New York’s Columbia University in 1934. President Nicholas Murray Butler arranged for a loose affiliation of the Institut with Columbia University. Most of its co-workers and students remained intellectual exiles interested in Marxism and psychoanalysis. That the Institut was refounded by Max Horkheimer in Frankfurt/M following World War II and gained new attention for its critical theory, represents a rare example of an institution closing a transatlantic circle of scholarly exchange and communication.

The corporate transfer of a Central European institution abroad and into emigration remained the exception in the pattern of intellectual emigration. For the political-literary émigré, advice and assistance was provided by fraternal organizations, newly established social agencies, and by the mutual assistance associations established by them in major centers of refuge in Prague, Paris, Switzerland, or the Netherlands. Many received help from fellow refugees. Artists and writers formed small colonies, e.g. in Sanary-sur-Mer (France) in the 1930s, and in New York and Hollywood in the 1940s, where exile art and literature were created and appreciated. As long as it was still possible, political intellectuals were helped in Germany by their political friends and associates. Within the churches, organizations to assist Christian “non-Aryans” sprang up in Germany, but failed to elicit major financial or moral support for their work from the established churches. Jewish persecutors benefited from the elaborate network of social agencies the Jewish Community had created to assist earlier migrants to Germany, overseas, or Palestine, or to provide social assistance to Jews abroad. For intellectuals and students financially and personally capable of preparing their emigration, these aid agencies provided the advice and help with which to start the search for positions in their fields abroad.

Just as migration in general faced increased restrictionism, intellectuals faced major obstacles in their search for employment. Few, if any, countries had included provisions for the immigration of university teachers, scientists, lawyers, writers, artists, or engineers in their immigration codes. Some countries, e.g. in Latin America, had excluded physicians and other professionals from their lists of desirable immigrants. In most countries, the placement of foreign university teachers in national institutions had been rare, and had not called for regulation by law. Only the American immigration code provided for the preferential non-quota immigration of university teachers (and their families) who had been appointed to teaching or research positions in a recognized institution of higher learning in the U.S.A. Mandate Palestine also provided for the admission of university personnel of some financial means. As a result, the search for a haven abroad became primarily a search for a position in which to continue one’s career, even after one had succeeded in obtaining the desired immigrant visa or residence permit.

The two main difficulties intellectual émigrés faced in this situation were economic and cultural. In the entire Western world, employment conditions for university graduates had worsened in the 1930s. The increase in the number of university graduates had created an “academic proletariat” of considerable size and had led to fears of political extremism in its wake. (For example, about half of the 25,000 graduates per annum of German universities had been unable to find positions in fields for which they had been trained.) With the lower birth cohorts of World War I entering schools and colleges, and shrinking endowments or incomes, teaching positions became scarce: in the U.S.A., about 2,000 college and university teachers lost their jobs between 1930 and 1933 — about as many persons as may have been dismissed from university positions in Nazi Germany in 1933–35. In the arts, too, unemployment was widespread. In Great Britain alone, 16,000 musicians received public support in 1933 (Lord Beveridge).

As a result, the traditional cultural nationalism with which a country’s higher education system was administered and perceived gained strong support and created additional obstacles to the placement of émigrés. National university systems, aware of academic unemployment and the need to produce native Nachwuchs impressed upon them by policy and interest groups, now faced the question of whether to make room for a substantial group of foreign colleagues. Even the emigration of “White Russians” after 1917 had not posed a similar challenge to Western universities, to scientific research centers in governments, and to private industry.

The wanton displacement of academic experts by Nazi Germany aroused not only fear of economic competition or national defense reactions, but was also perceived from early on as an attack on academic freedom and human rights everywhere. Albert Einstein and other less prominent refugees aroused the conscience of their colleagues in the Western, especially the English-speaking world, in well-attended and widely reported mass meetings. Political émigrés, for their part, propagated the brutalities and injustices affecting political and intellectual enemies of the Régime. In many countries, liberal intellectuals had long been on the defensive against conservative trends threatening academic freedom. Although the U.S.A. was not among the first major targets of academic emigration in 1933–35, its voluntary philanthropic agencies and its academic defense organizations joined their continental Western European colleagues and the major British center to support intellectual refugees.

The placement of academic intellectuals was thus the result of the efforts of an aroused liberal community of conscience pit- ted against economic realities and against national self-interests as perceived by conservative tradionalists in government and academic bureaucracies. Concerned university teachers set up organizations through which effective aid could be made available: the Comité des Sosants and the Foyer Henri Heine in France (Paris), the Academisch Stuifsonds in the Netherlands (Amsterdam), and, on a more international and lasting scale, the Comité International pour le Placement des Intellectuel Réfu-giés in Geneva (which established branches in Paris, Brussels,
and London, and cooperated closely with the High Commissioner for Refugees of the League of Nations). Similar committees sprang up in other continental European countries that were the first targets of refugee intellectual migration after 1933.

The history of these continental European committees has not yet been sufficiently analyzed to be placed into the context of the academic and political forces determining their successes or failures. In 1933, the French committees succeeded in placing 54 scholars, and the Dutch committee 44 scholars in temporary positions. Their work was financed partially by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation and Jewish agencies, but these funds were drying up as early as 1934. Relatively few academic intellectuals were placed permanently in continental European universities or other institutions.

Major assistance, on the other hand, came from the Academic Assistance Council founded in London by the (then) head of the London School of Economics, Sir (later Lord) William Beveridge. It was supported by the contributions of more than 2,000 subscribers in Great Britain, composed mainly of university teachers and professionals (1937), and worked closely with American funding and aid agencies. In 1933/34, the Council succeeded in placing 57 scholars in permanent positions in the United Kingdom, 155 in temporary positions. 56 of these were at the London School of Economics, 30 at Cambridge, 15 at Oxford, 7 in Scottish universities, the rest in other agencies and institutions. These temporary placements represented 46% of the total temporary placements (336 persons) effected during these first two years. The Council continued to assist refugees through the entire period of the Third Reich, extending its aid later to Austrian, Italian, and other refugees from Nazi-occupied Europe.

Still, already in 1933/34 the number of job seekers registered with the Council had amounted to more than three times the number of those placed, a total of 650 displaced scholars. European institutions proved unable to absorb the university scholars or the students seeking research or teaching careers.

Of overseas universities, the Hebrew University in Jerusalem was only 8 years old when Hitler was appointed chancellor. By 1933, its original three departments (Jewish studies, chemistry, parasitology/microbiology) had grown to 9, but its student body included only 151 matriculated, 20 non-matriculated and 17 research students. Unsure of its ultimate role in the developing Jewish society, and beset by internal crises concerning its governance structure, the university saw itself unable to use the talent set free by Nazi persecution for the construction of a full-fledged university. In addition, the Carnegie Foundation, a major potential source of funding, had not included Palestine, then a British mandate, in its definition of British Commonwealth countries whose development it stood ready to advance. Jewish attempts to raise funds for a larger number of displaced scholars proved disappointing. As a result, by 1937 only 8 professors, 3 lecturers, and 9 fellows or assistants had found employment with the university. They had grown to about 20 by 1939. An equally limited number of scientists, although of great significance for the institution's development, found employment with the Weizmann Institute of Science in the 1930s. (As indicated by this volume of the International Biographical Dictionary, however, by the 1970s the number of immigrants holding positions at these and other major Israeli institutions (Technion, Bar-Ilan University, Tel Aviv University) was considerable 8% of all persons listed are located at institutions in Israel.) A comprehensive analysis of the intellectual immigration to Palestine/Israel has not been undertaken to date -- a major gap in the account of Nazi period emigration and acculturation. Unique in the annals of intellectual migration was the appointment of about 100 displaced German and Austrian scholars to universities and institutes in Ankara and Istanbul, Turkey, between 1933 and 1938. Their appointment was carried out through the good offices of a mutual aid agency for academic refugees from Nazi Germany, the Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland. Paradoxically, the scholars displaced in Nazi Germany had benefited from long-standing intellectual and political connection between the German and Turkish governments. German influence had displaced the strong French connection in Turkish foreign policy in the 20th century, and had led the Turkish government as early as World War I to appoint 19 German professors to the University of Istanbul in 1915. With the seizure of power by Kemal Pasha, the long-standing attempts by Turkish rulers (beginning with reformed sultans in the 19th century) to secularize and Westernize Turkish society and education had received new impetus. In the late 1920s, a German advisory team recommended the establishment of an institute devoted to the agricultural sciences and veterinary medicine. It opened in 1933 with a staff of 20 German professors under a German Rektor (president) (Yüce-sek Ziraat Enstitüsü), the last of whom left Turkey for Germany in 1942. For the reform of the traditional university in Istanbul, where older forms of higher education persisted alongside a modern Islamic university, a Swiss pedagogue (Prof. Malche, University of Geneva) had submitted a plan in the early 1930s. He proposed to entrust the desired changes in research and teaching to a group of university teachers selected from several European universities in order to avoid control of Turkish higher education by a single country.

As a result of contacts between the founder of the Notgemeinschaft, Prof. Philipp Schwartz, formerly of the medical faculty of the University of Frankfurt/M and himself a refugee scholar, and Prof. Malche, the Turkish Ministry of Education under Reisit Galip, appointed 139 displaced scholars (including assistants) in universities and institutions of higher education in Ankara and Istanbul between 1933 and 1939. In what may well have been the most massive appointment process at one time in academic history, 30 professors were appointed in a short series of meetings between Prof. Schwartz and Minister Galip in mid-1933, and others were added subsequently.

The following tables 1 and 2 on page XXIV indicate the extent of these appointments:

The appointments at the University of Istanbul were accompanied by the foundation of 14 university institutes in medicine, 14 in mathematics and the natural sciences, 12 at the faculty of philosophy, and 5 in the faculty of law. 10 of 17 directors of medical institutes (1933-1945), and 7 of 17 directors of university clinics were refugees. In addition, 3 displaced scholars were appointed to the Technical Academy (Technical University 1944), and 3 to the Academy of Fine Arts. Displaced artists (including Paul Hindemith and Carl Ebert) were appointed to the music school (1935 conservatory) in Ankara to help with its modernization.
The faculties which included distinguished scholars in several fields enjoyed a unique position because they co-existed, without social or professional contacts, with a non-refugee German faculty in the agricultural school. In contrast to the German colony, they played a special, non-chauvinistic role as displaced scholars, and had the benefit of working closely with a sophisticated Turkish intelligentsia advancing Turkish modernization. Their stay in Turkey, presumably also as conceived by Turkish authorities, was temporary as indicated by the following Table 3:

Table 3: Emigration and Remigration from Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U.S.A. Profs.</th>
<th>Germany Profs.</th>
<th>Other countries Profs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1934-39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956–</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *idem.* 15 refugee academics died while in Turkey, three while travelling. By the mid-1970s, only six members of the original group remained in Turkey.

The United States of America took in more persecutees of the Third Reich than any other country. It also saved more refugee academics and intellectuals than any other country. Its immigration laws, as has been pointed out, permitted the non-quota immigration of academic teachers who had been engaged in teaching at the university level for at least two years, and secured positions in recognized American universities or colleges. Given the number of such academic institutions across the continental expanse, even the strict application of restrictive practices to immigration provisions failed to close America’s borders to the intellectual refugee.

America’s preeminent position in providing admission and new careers for the refugees is illustrated by the fact that 48% of all persons documented in this volume were immigrants to America, where, in large proportion, they achieved the levels of excellence required for inclusion in this Dictionary. That this large proportion includes persons of the younger generation of émigrés, who received most or all of their professional training following their emigration, documents the important changes in admission and appointment policies that had revolutionized American higher education since the World War I and, irreversibly, since World War II.

The admission of displaced scholars to the U.S.A. and their placement in academic positions took several forms. For a large majority, and for the younger generation, employment, training, or retraining for a position in a college or university was a personal initiative that followed immigration. Such persons arrived with their families as quota immigrants, especially during the large-scale immigration following November, 1938, and went through the stages of integration and acculturation characteristic of their fellow immigrants. The biographies of numerous university teachers of language and literature (especially German), of political science, sociology, economics, or history suggest successful retraining patterns for former lawyers, civil servants, high school teachers, or businessmen. Like those of the younger generation, their careers were made possible by the expansion of American higher education following World War II. Many received assistance from their families, especially wives, while preparing for those careers. For the younger generation, government support for veterans (the “G.I. Bill-of-Rights”) provided grants or loans for advanced training or study. Careers also began for some through training received while serving in the Armed Forces, e.g. in engineering, space, psychology/psychiatry, or information control/communications.

For the numerically most significant group of older and younger refugees, however, the aid they acknowledged receiving from voluntary organizations was decisive in establishing their careers. These organizations were set up primarily along denominational lines, and supported mostly by Jewish contributions. Also significant for refugees of the Nazi period in the U.S.A. were the numerous “self-help” and communal organizations set up by the refugee community in many localities across the country. Their record is beyond the purview of this introduction.*

Academic refugees displaced by Nazi legislation from established positions in Germany (and after 1938, Austria and Czechoslovakia) began to arrive in the U.S.A. in some number only after 1935. An agency to assist academic scholars, the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars, had been organized in 1933 by the Institute of International Education, an agency of the Rockefeller Foundation. By 1935, this Emergency Committee had placed 68 scholars in permanent, and 85 in temporary positions, numbers that fall considerably

---

below the figures for the United Kingdom, where resources were much smaller than those available to American institutions. The number of scholars placed by the Committee between 1933 and 1943 was 228, out of a total of 613 applicants. Only less than half of these 228 scholars had originated in Germany. The number of scholars placed by the Rockefeller Foundation in the U.S.A. between 1933 and 1945 was 313. After November 1938, numerous ad hoc committees sprang up across the United States to assist teachers or students among refugees from Germany and Austria. Following the fall of France in 1940, a non-denominational committee, the Emergency Rescue Committee, operated alongside agencies of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Unitarian Church in France, Spain and Portugal, to rescue intellectual and political leaders, especially trade unionists. Their admission to the U.S.A. outside the quota system was effected by the President’s Committee on Political Refugees, and by the political, religious, and labor organizations whose pressure had brought it into existence. 2,500 of the 3,258 visas issued with the authorization of the President’s Committee went to intellectual refugees, including academics.

The placement of refugee scholars from Germany was not popular either in Great Britain or the U.S.A. until by 1937/38, the public perception of the depth of the human crisis engendered by Nazism began to be changed by events. The motives for this lack of wide public support in the perception of the aid agencies concerned, were economic, intellectual, and social. In the U.S.A., younger scientists and academics opposed jobs for refugees since many young American scholars were out of work. Also, the university administrators directing the Emergency Committee feared that placing refugees in large numbers would damage the development of a new generation of productive American scholars. Voluntary Jewish aid agencies whose financial contributions, to a large extent, made the activities of the specialized and non-denominational agencies possible, saw increased anti-Semitism and further immigration restrictions result from a steep increase in the number of refugees in American universities, or in sharper competition between native professionals and the emigrés. The unwillingness of Congress to change immigration laws, and of the Roosevelt Administration to ease their application appear to lend credence to their caution. Immigration was opposed by a vocal conservative lobby. Numerous states and trade unions had long required U.S. citizenship or loyalty oaths as prerequisites for employment or membership.

Of equal influence had been the restrictions imposed by ivy league and other colleges and universities across the country since the 1920s on the admission of Jewish students, and the appointment and promotion of Jewish faculty members, even in departments of science and mathematics. Many of these restrictions had developed in opposition to the opening of admissions to gifted children of immigrants, placing obstacles in the paths of their search for jobs as college teachers. As a result of such social changes, and in defense against the intrusion of “modern doctrines” like evolutionism, religious and philosophical dissent, even abolitionism and bimetallism in the 19th century, American education had split into liberal and conservative factions. This split was reflected, for example, in faculty defense organizations like the American Association of University Professors (founded 1915), and in the increased vulnerability of faculty vis-a-vis administrators during the Depression years. A report by the American Historical Association in the late 1930s revealed substantial inroads into academic freedom. By the late 1930s, several state legislatures had invaded the colleges in search of subversives, and had intimidated faculties into conformity.

If these difficulties arose out of the conservative image of radicalism and pushiness impugned to immigrants and their children, especially the Jewish immigrant of the period, other images derived from changes in the educators’ image of German education. Although American intellectuals had shared in the strong anti-German moods of the First World War and repudiated the high esteem in which they had held German graduate studies as models for American universities, by the late 1920s German universities, once again, appeared to influential educational administrators as examples to be emulated, in contrast to what they perceived as the deterioration of American undergraduate education at the hands of the progressives, and its effect on graduate studies.

Crosscurrents such as these shaped the policies of agencies like the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German (Foreign) Scholars and the Rockefeller Foundation, and the numerous organizations established in the 19th century by distinguished German-Jewish immigrant families that now turned to assisting academic refugees. Their involvement, like that of American and British college and university professors, was sparked by the conviction that academic freedom and civil rights were in danger not only in Germany, but that it could happen here, too. To forestall right-wing and anti-Semitic turns in a situation they considered volatile, they refused to assist all but the elite among displaced scholars, did not solicit jobs among American institutions for fear of stirring up anti-Semitism, and strove to disperse refugee scholars among institutions across the entire expanse of the United States. (Contrary to this policy, refugee scholars clustered in institutions in the Middle Atlantic states and New England, the Midwest and California.) This cautious policy of American agencies soon met with the opposition of the British Academic Assistance Council (Society for the Protection of Science and Learning), which provided fares to refugee scholars for visits to the U.S.A., thus expediting the personal search for placement (frequently during speaking tours at colleges and universities), and disregarding the sharp protests of their American colleagues. U.S. placement agencies did not assist younger scholars until 1942, and it was only by the late 1940s that they began cautious solicitation of positions for displaced academics.

Although British academic leaders continued to chide the financial assistance provided for this work by e.g. the Rockefeller Foundation as inadequate, the record contained in this Biographical Dictionary suggests far-reaching success in placement, a testimony to the voluntarism and humanism of wide strata of the Jewish community, and of leading academics who sparked the aid effort.

The few postwar investigations available on the “adjustment” of refugee scholars in American undergraduate institutions appear to reflect, in part, the division among progressive and conservative educators and administrators. For the faculties of small, non-cosmopolitan colleges, the German graduate style
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of teaching, and the personal and social aloofness of refugee professors appeared grating precisely because it appeared to deny the teaching faculty's progressive and generous impulse to help in defense of academic freedom. Placing elite scholars in graduate positions at major universities, on the other hand, tied in with conservative aims to upgrade higher education. Yet, in placing refugee professors who were either Jewish or of Jewish family background in faculties across the country, a major step was taken towards breaking down anti-Jewish prejudice among faculty, while changed economic conditions and the expansion of higher education following World War II as well as the changed image of the Jew and the Jewish immigrant following the Holocaust permeated public consciousness.

The policy of dispersing refugee scholars across the country to avoid resentment was disregarded by institutions like the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research and the Bauhaus, which were transferred whole, or refounded by former members in New York and Chicago, or at the architectural school of Harvard University. Other scholars succeeded in opening up employment opportunities for fellow refugees at their institutions once they had established reputations with faculty, administration, or students. Similarly, faculties and administrators seeking strength in an area of research or teaching that had been introduced by the appointment of refugee scholars sometimes increased the number of refugees on the faculty. This was true, for example, at the University of Chicago where the educational reforms introduced in the humanities by Mortimer Adler and in the social sciences by President Hutchins stressed the kind of integrated learning that corresponded to Johnson's purposes — the upgrading of progressive education, or students. Similarly, faculties and administrators seeking strength in an area of research or teaching that had been introduced by the appointment of refugee scholars sometimes increased the number of refugees on the faculty. This was true, for example, at the University of Chicago where the educational reforms introduced in the humanities by Mortimer Adler and in the social sciences by President Hutchins stressed the kind of integrated learning that corresponded to their image of the "Bildungsideal" of the European elite university and its goal of combining professional training with an integrated world view. Refugee scholars appeared especially qualified to serve as models for such elitism.

Based on similar models and educational convictions was the unique Institute for Advanced Study founded in Princeton, N.J. by Abraham Flexner with funds provided by a private Jewish foundation. Flexner, long an educational conservative, admired prewar German universities for their alleged excellence, and saw the Institute as a frankly elitist and aristocratic statement that could stem the decline brought to American education by reformers and progressives. A number of refugee scholars from several countries, beginning with Albert Einstein, were appointed as life members of the Institute, and succeeded in making major intellectual contributions to American scholarship in fields including mathematics, physics, art history, computer science, economics, political science, and history. Other refugees obtained invitations to work at the Institute for limited periods. However, the results it produced did not differ in kind from work done at major universities across the country; the "democratization," or opening of American higher education to lower economic income groups or minorities, remained the secular trend.

If these appointments originated in conservative images of German education, the other best-known example of a group appointment of refugee scholars grew out of the more traditional German association of immigration with political radicalism. It took place at the New School for Social Research in New York City. Founded in 1919 by American progressives including John Dewey, Thorstein Veblen, Charles Beard, and James Harvey Robinson, the school was headed since 1923 by Alvin Johnson, an economist and radical-progressive who had served as one of the two editors-in-chief of the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, and had become acquainted with a number of its German and Austrian contributors in economics and political and social science. The New School differed in design from traditional American universities and colleges, in serving an adult population without imposing the strict qualifications and requirements leading to degrees, and in stressing a critical spirit of progressivism and social reform. Its closest German equivalent was represented by the Berlin Hochschule für Politik, where two of Johnson's close associates and colleagues, Charles Beard and Nicholas Murray Butler, had taught as Carnegie professors in the 1920s. By 1933, the New School had established a solid reputation for innovative research and teaching, and had introduced the American public to several new departures in the arts and social sciences.

Shocked like the rest of his academic colleagues by the Nazi dismissal of "the most creative and ablest scholars to be found anywhere," Johnson established a Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science at the New School — a "University in Exile." He secured its financing from Jewish philanthropists and the Rockefeller Foundation, often precariously. It was "to preserve the methods and character of a German faculty," and would be composed of well-known German university teachers who, in addition, had had practical experience in government, economics, politics, or the media. The 10 refugee social scientists with which he opened the Graduate Faculty in 1933 were selected with the help of refugee economist Emil Lederer, with Hans Speier serving as a go-between to London. They corresponded to Johnson's image of the Faculty. However, among the twenty tenured faculty members teaching at the Graduate Faculty during the first six years, the majority originated outside the German university establishment of Weimar, having taught at labor or business academies, the Hochschule für Politik (seven faculty members), pedagogical academies, or having served in high government positions. It was precisely this non-academic-establishment character of the faculty that had set them apart from their non-political German university colleagues in the 1920s, and fitted them into Johnson's purposes — the upgrading of progressive education, protest against Nazi barbarism, creation of a power center for social reform in the U.S.A., assistance to eminent liberal refugees, and development of the New School's academic standing.

As a result, the New School became a nationally recognized center for innovation. It attracted not only scholars, but also artists like Erwin Piscator, who opened a Theater Workshop there following his exit from the Soviet Union, or the composer Hanns Eisler, whose appointment on a Rockefeller Foundation grant for a study of film music subjected the New School to conservative attacks in Congress for "harboring known Communists" and subversive radicals. Johnson succeeded in giving almost 170 refugee scholars (from all Europe under Nazi or Axis domination, in addition to Germany and Italy) at least a first opportunity to start a career in the academic world: most of the refugees obtained more permanent positions at other colleges and universities following their term of service at "the School." The "Graduate Faculty" introduced new levels of adult education into American academic life, saw
faculty members participate in the war effort, or take influen-
tial government positions, and became another, possibly im-
portant, influence in breaking down American faculty prejudice against Jews. Faculty members remaining at the School
achieved respected and influential positions among New York
City's liberal establishment (Hannah Arendt, Hans Morgent-
thau, Albert Salomon, Hans Speier being among the more
widely known at the time), precisely as American radical reform
was pushed into a defense of New Deal achievements, and as
the Cold War broke up the tactical Communist-Liberal alli-
ance of the more innocent 1920s and 1930s. The Graduate Fa-
culty, the "University in Exile," had entered the mainstream
of American intellectual life and politics. Like other progressi-
ve experiments in American education, colleges like Bard,
Bennington or Reed, or like the more temporary and radically
experimental Black Mountain College, the progressive New
School, for its own reasons and purposes, had joined their hu-
mane or forward-looking colleagues at other established uni-
versities in welcoming the persecuted scholar.

It is beyond the scope of this introduction to summarize the
increasing number of studies dealing with the intellectual his-
tory of the academic immigrant, his role in research and high-
er education, and as an agent in the transfer and retransfer of
knowledge and methods between his country of origin and
the countries receiving him. This International Biographical
Dictionary provides the first firm basis for comprehensive
studies of various fields of knowledge, and of a generation —
the so-called "younger generation" — that has received scant
attention in the literature to date. In several fields, the record
suggests that international exchanges of personnel preceded
the arrival of these refugees, for example through the Rocke-
feller Foundation after World War I, through foreign students
attending continental universities, or, on another level, in the
translation and reception of ideas by developing international
communications networks. In some fields, most notably phy-
sics, mathematics, and some of the social sciences, research and
teaching institutes in immigration countries were ready to re-
cive their expelled German or Austrian colleagues because
disiplines were developed sufficiently to accommodate so-
phisticated contributions from foreigners. In some countries
and fields, important stimuli are said to have been provided by
the refugee experts, for example in art history, applied mathe-
matics, applied social research, archival training, architecture,
or Gestalt psychology. In most of the fields they chose to ent-
er, refugee scholars of the older and younger generations took
part in the explosive growth of higher education following
World War II, and by the testimony of this Dictionary, joined
their colleagues in advancing their disciplines through re-
search and writing. It is the hope of the editors of this Diction-
ary that the labors of their dedicated research teams and co-
workers on three continents over the last decade have prep-
ared the ground for a comprehensive, worldwide accounting of
the intellectual record of a period whose deep shadows are
offset by the courage and humanity of these men and women
whose achievements represent the will of the refugee commu-
nity — of all religions, politics, or occupations — to assert life
in the face of death.