

Storia della Storiografia
Histoire de l'Historiographie
History of Historiography
Geschichte der Geschichtsschreibung

Rivista internazionale · Revue internationale
International Review · Internationale Zeitschrift

69 · 1/2016



Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa · Roma

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Milano n. 310 del 26/07/1982

Direttore responsabile: Edoardo Tortarolo

*

A norma del codice civile italiano, è vietata la riproduzione, totale o parziale (compresi estratti, ecc.), di questa pubblicazione in qualsiasi forma e versione (comprese bozze, ecc.), originale o derivata, e con qualsiasi mezzo a stampa o internet (compresi siti web personali e istituzionali, academia.edu, ecc.), elettronico, digitale, meccanico, per mezzo di fotocopie, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner o altro, senza il permesso scritto della casa editrice.

Under Italian civil law this publication cannot be reproduced, wholly or in part (included offprints, etc.), in any form (included proofs, etc.), original or derived, or by any means: print, internet (included personal and institutional web sites, academia.edu, etc.), electronic, digital, mechanical, including photocopy, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner or any other medium, without permission in writing from the publisher.

*

Proprietà riservata · All rights reserved

© Copyright 2016 by Fabrizio Serra editore®, Pisa · Roma.

Fabrizio Serra editore incorporates the Imprints Accademia editoriale, Edizioni dell'Ateneo, Fabrizio Serra editore, Giardini editori e stampatori in Pisa, Gruppo editoriale internazionale and Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali.

www.libraweb.net

Stampato in Italia · Printed in Italy

ISSN 0392-8926

ISSN ELETTRONICO 2281-1141

Amministrazione e abbonamenti

Fabrizio Serra editore®

Casella postale n. 1, succursale n. 8, I 56123 Pisa,
tel. +39 050 542332, fax +39 050 574888, fse@libraweb.net

I prezzi ufficiali di abbonamento cartaceo e *Online* sono consultabili presso il sito Internet della casa editrice www.libraweb.net

Print and Online official subscription rates are available at Publisher's web-site www.libraweb.net

I pagamenti possono essere effettuati tramite versamento su c.c.p. n. 17154550 o tramite carta di credito (*American Express, CartaSi, Eurocard, Mastercard, Visa*)

*

Uffici di Pisa: Via Santa Bibbiana 28, I 56127 Pisa, fse@libraweb.net

Uffici di Roma: Via Carlo Emanuele I 48, I 00185 Roma, fse.roma@libraweb.net

Contents

WRITING HISTORY IN EXILE

Stefan Berger and Antoon De Baets, <i>Reflections on Exile Historiography</i>	11
Antoon De Baets, <i>Plutarch's Thesis: the Contribution of Refugee Historians to Historical Writing (1945-2015)</i>	27
Peter Burke, <i>Silver Lining: on Some Intellectual Benefits of Exile</i>	39
Ragnar Björk, <i>Re-Embedding the Historian: German-Language Refugee Scholars in Scandinavia, 1933-1945</i>	49
Joseba Agirreazkuenaga, <i>Reinterpreting the Basque Past in Exile: Scholars, Narratives and Agendas (1936-1977)</i>	65
Edoardo Tortarolo, <i>Salvemini: an Italian Historian as Political Refugee</i>	83
Pablo Buchbinder, <i>Argentine Historians in Exile: Emilio Ravignani and José Luis Romero in Uruguay (1948-1954)</i>	101
Volodymyr Kravchenko, <i>Ukrainian Historical Writing in Canada after the Second World War</i>	111
Marek Tamm, <i>Displaced History? A New "Regime of Historicity" among the Baltic Historians in Exile (1940s-1960s)</i>	129
Xin Fan, <i>The Anger of Ping-Ti Ho: the Chinese Nationalism of a Double Exile</i>	147
Georg G. Iggers, <i>An Afterword</i>	161
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS	165

© Copyright by Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa · Roma.

Reflections on Exile Historiography

Stefan Berger and Antoon De Baets

WHEN the planet is being torn apart by war and perpetual turmoil, and more refugees than ever seem to be crossing continents, as is presently the case, it is timely to ask how historians exercise their profession in conditions of exile. To that end, we collected in this Special Issue case studies of Argentine, Baltic, Basque, Chinese, German, Italian and Ukrainian exiles and émigrés that stand next to two thematic overviews regarding the topic of exile historiographies. These contributions are, in the main, the revised versions of papers first given at a lively round table on exile historiography held at the Twenty-Second International Congress of Historical Sciences in Jinan, PRC, in August 2015, under the auspices of the International Committee of Historical Sciences (ICHS) and the International Commission for the History and Theory of Historiography. The editors of this journal who attended and contributed to the panel were subsequently prepared to put their columns at our disposal, for which we are very grateful.

I. TIME AND SPACE

With one exception, this Special Issue deals exclusively with situations of exile produced by the dictatorships of the twentieth century.¹ Given that the professionalization and institutionalization of the historical sciences started much earlier in many places,² the theme could usefully be explored also for the previous centuries. In particular revolutions – such as the French Revolution of 1789 or those of 1832 and 1848 – made historians flee their home countries to endure situations of exile.³ Germaine de Staël penned her insightful history of the German lands from a position of double exclusion: as an exile and as a woman.⁴ The first socialist class histories were often written from a position of exile, for example Louis Blanc's class history of the French Revolution or Karl Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*.⁵ The same is true for historians associating themselves to national movements that opposed multinational empires. Thus, for instance, the first Byelorussian national histories were published by Adam Kirkor in Warsaw in 1875 and by Jafim Karski in Prague between 1903

¹ On twentieth-century exile historiography, compare E. Tortarolo, "Historians in the Storm: Émigré Historiography in the Twentieth Century", *Transnational Challenges to National History Writing*, eds M. Middell and L. Roura (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013), 377-403.

² *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession 1800-2005*, eds I. Porciani and L. Raphael (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010); *Setting the Standards. Institutions, Networks and Communities of National Historiography*, eds I. Porciani and J. Tollebeek (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012).

³ *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England*, ed. S. Freitag (Oxford: Bergahn, 2003).

⁴ M. Berger, "An Introduction to the Life and Thought of Madame de Staël", in G. de Staël, *Politics, Literature and National Character* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2000), 1-92.

⁵ L. Blanc, *History of the French Revolution of 1789* (Philadelphia: Lea & Blanchard, 1848); K. Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (originally German, 1852; New York: International Publishers, 1898).

and 1922.⁶ Following national insurrections, such as the ones in Poland in 1830 and 1863, historians who had supported those failed ‘national revolutions’ found themselves in exile. Joachim Lelewel had to leave his native Poland following the failed first Polish insurrection and spent the next thirty years in exile, first in Paris and after 1833 in Brussels. It was here that he developed his influential national narrative of Polish history – a prime example of Romantic history writing.⁷

Self-evidently, when we think about exile, *space* is the first dimension that springs to mind. Indeed, the semantic roots of the terms exile and displacement refer to this dimension. As refugees or exiles, historians are uprooted and forced to leave their customary spaces, cherished or not, and exchange them for alien and uncanny environments which may, after long tribulations, become new, often permanent, homes. As is obvious from this collection, many exile historians have testified to this by displaying a haunting obsession with their home countries. They often translated this compulsive obsession into historical and political programs in which nationalism frequently played a pivotal role. However, if it was the case that they fled strongly nationalist dictatorships, exile could also result in the opposite, namely a deep skepticism toward both historiographical and political nationalism. Yet, whichever way the dice fell, the situation of exile is closely related to the construction of a sense of space and place by the exiled.

But if we try to link the role of space to the role of time, that other crucial dimension with which historians struggle permanently, we are confronted with two classical but opposite time theories. The first of these is the well-known theory formulated by French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs in 1925, when he designed his pioneering views on the social frameworks of collective memory. Halbwachs maintained that in order to anchor collective memories, they necessarily needed a location.⁸ Memories in the abstract, so to say, were doomed to vanish. Exiles, uprooted from ‘their’ space, will still carry those anchored collective memory frames with them abroad. There they will confront, in their host countries, different, maybe overlapping, but never identical frameworks of collective memory, and it is arguably the painful tension between these frameworks which impacts on the historiographical and political positioning of exile historians.⁹ So the question is: if memory is tied to location, what happens to it after spatial dislocation? Does it transform to the point of disappearance, as Halbwachsian theory seems to predict?

Classical historical awareness theory gives opposite answers.¹⁰ According to this

⁶ R. Lindner, *Historiker und Herrschaft: Nationsbildung und Geschichtspolitik in Weissrussland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 1999), 71ff.

⁷ A. G. Kanka, *Joachim Lelewel: Poland's Romantic Historian* (Detroit, MI: 1955).

⁸ M. Halbwachs, *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (originally 1925; Paris: Albin Michel, 1994), 114-145.

⁹ Halbwachs, by the way, died in Buchenwald concentration camp in March 1945, not as an exile, but in the remotely similar situation of a war prisoner abroad. He passed away one day before the famous French sinologist and historian, Henri Maspero, perished on the same spot. A survivor of Buchenwald, the Spanish philosopher Jorge Semprún, in whose arms Halbwachs and Maspero practically died, has dedicated moving pages to both scholars. See J. Semprún, *L'Écriture ou la vie* (Paris: Gallimard, 1994).

¹⁰ See the views of H. Butterfield, “Historiography”, in *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*, ed. P. P. Wiener (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1973-1974), vol. 2, 464-498, and D. Woolf, “Historiography”, in *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. M. C. Horowitz (Detroit: Scribner's, 2005) – as discussed in A. De Baets, “The Grandeur of Historiography”, *Storia della Storiografia*, no. 51 (2007): 141-147. See also A. De Baets, “Democracy and Historical Writing”, *Historiografias*, no. 9 (June 2015): 31-43 (available online), especially 34-36 (‘Democracy and historical awareness’).

theory, exile is a situation of defeat in which collective memory frames do not wither away, but instead flourish. Indeed, one of the most widely shared tenets of historical awareness theory holds that those who are on the losing side of history – those defeated in war, those victimized by human rights violations and indeed those forced to leave their homelands – develop an acute sense of the past. This is so because they are tortured by the question why they lost and in a never-ending quest start to search for sparks of answers in the past and present. The obsession for the lost homeland is paralleled by the obsession for explaining that loss and by a passionate willingness to compare that experience with similar experiences in the past. So one of the paradoxes of exile is that, during that experience, memory explodes precisely because of its loss. We see the fruits of that explosion in minute detail in our collection. But what exactly are refugee and exile historians?

II. CONCEPTS

There are few fields in history where more clarification is needed in the conceptual jungle than exile historiography.¹¹ The definitions for ‘refugee historian’ and ‘exile historian’ can be inferred from the most widely-recognized definition for ‘refugee’, taken from the 1951 *United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees*:

[A historian who] owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country [...] ¹²

Technically, whereas exiled historians are *unable* to return because they have been expelled, banished or deported following official decrees, refugee historians are *unwilling* to return because, although in fear, they left without any specific measures decreed, or escaped ahead of pending decrees. Although, in principle, this distinction applies to many cases, to make it consistently is difficult, often owing to lack of data (and to the *trompe-l’œil* effect discussed below).

The categories of refugee and exile historians can be subdivided according to generation. Next to what we can call first-generation exile, we have second-generation exile. Those who were born in exile or exiled at a young age and decided later to study history in their parents’ host country, are second-generation exiles. They constitute a special segment of their age group. Many of them chose to study history precisely in order to understand their own and their parents’ fates, and, hence, their roots and migration history.¹³ They often specialized, not surprisingly, in the his-

¹¹ This paragraph is a revised version of pages 319-322 of A. De Baets, “Exile and Acculturation: Refugee Historians since the Second World War”, *International History Review*, 28 (2006): 316-349.

¹² United Nations (UN), *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees* (1951), article 1(A)(2). The convention includes arrangements made since 1926. See also *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948), articles 9, 13-15; *Geneva Convention IV* (1949), articles 44, 70, and its *Additional Protocol I* (1977), article 73; UN, *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement* (E/CN.4/1998/53/Add.2; 1998). For other definitions, see, e.g., G. Ionescu, “Introduction à un essai sur l’influence des exilés politiques au XXIème siècle”, *Liber amicorum Salvador de Madariaga* (Bruges: De Tempel, 1966), 339-344, and *Literary Exile in the Twentieth Century: An Analysis and Biographical Dictionary*, ed. M. Tucker (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1991), vii-xxiv.

¹³ For lists of second-generation refugee historians from Austria, China, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Israel, Poland, Romania, Spain and the Soviet Union, see A. De Baets, *Censorship of Historical Thought: A World Guide, 1945-2000* (Westport: Greenwood, 2002), 55, 127, 148, 216, 381, 412, 440, 480.

tory of their parents' home country, which was theirs only for a brief time or only in their imagination fired through their particular socialization as children of exiles.¹⁴ Between first- and second-generation exiles, there is a small middle group, the *in-between generation*: those historians whose education started in their country of origin, was interrupted by exile and then continued in their country of destination.¹⁵ A study into exile historians cannot be complete without considering those turned historians during exile. Exile twists the career patterns of many refugees upside down. Some scholars, who had trained in other disciplines before exile, had to give up their professions in their host countries and, consequently, turned to history writing as a back-up choice. To exclude this group from any analysis would be to miss a significant body of the exiles' output.¹⁶ Second-generation exiles and career changers who switched to history could also be called diaspora historians.

The twin concepts of 'refugee historians' and 'exile historians' are often confused with closely related categories, most notably internal displacement and voluntary emigration. Internal displacement or internal exile refers to those who fled their home but stayed inside their own country. Internal exile usually took the form of confinement to a village in a remote area, in which the historian was often supervised or spied upon.¹⁷ In a country like Russia and also the later Soviet Union, internal exile to Siberia was commonplace, and heavily influenced the regime's use of external exile.¹⁸ Although Tsarist Russia did exile history professors (such as Maksim Kovalevsky, who was professor of history at Moscow University, from where he voiced his oppositional views, for which he was ultimately dismissed) and although it operated one of the worst apparatuses of censorship that also controlled history, internal exile gave the tsars a powerful additional weapon in their ruthless attempts to silence oppositional voices, in history-writing and elsewhere.¹⁹ Whilst internally displaced persons often suffered from the disruption of their known social circles and consequent isolation in their internal exile, we also find cases, where they helped to set up refugee campuses in remote areas of their home countries, as several Chinese historians did during the Sino-Japanese war. Internal exile should not be confused with inner exile (the latter is discussed below).

Voluntary emigration is a phenomenon of all times and regions. In the course of history, many historians have emigrated voluntarily for economic or political reasons.

¹⁴ See, among many other sources, *An Interrupted Past: German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States*, eds H. Lehmann and J. Sheehan (Washington, D. C.: German Historical Institute; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), viii-ix, 2. There were, of course, many exceptions, such as Geoffrey Elton, son of the German-Czech historian of antiquity, Victor Ehrenberg. Elton specialized in British history during his entire career.

¹⁵ Francis Carsten (1911-1998, exiled 1936) is an example; see *Out of the Third Reich: Refugee Historians in Post-War Britain*, ed. P. Alter (London, New York: I. B. Tauris; London: German Historical Institute, 1998), 27-33.

¹⁶ See, among many others, F. Fellner, "The Special Case of Austrian Refugee Historians", *Interrupted Past*, 113.

¹⁷ L. Kolakowski, "In Praise of Exile", *Times Literary Supplement* (11 October 1985): 1133.

¹⁸ A systematic practice in the Soviet Union, internal exile was also known in Afghanistan, Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, Iran, Laos, Maldives, Mauritania, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and Vietnam.

¹⁹ C. A. Ruud, *Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982).

However, the line between émigrés and refugees can be thin. For example, the prospect of a life spent in poverty and without career perspectives at home may force young historians to seize opportunities abroad. Other, politically sensitive historians may feel so alienated from their government that they prefer to leave. In addition, a *trompe-l'œil* effect may be at work: many refugees initially left their countries disguised as tourists or émigrés to avoid arousing suspicion or to gain time for deciding whether to leave permanently. Once time had run out, they became refugees if by then they were still unwilling to return. This means that the distinct categories of exile and emigration are sometimes permeable. Therefore, the fact that categories such as internal displacement and voluntary emigration fall outside the strict scope of the core concepts does not mean that we exclude them from discussion in this Special Issue.

Apart from the above main categories, there are some smaller ones which are also worth mentioning. First of all, there is the situation where a historian planned an exile, but could not execute the plan. Some historians wishing to flee were either blocked, undertook their attempts too late, or gave up after failing to obtain a visa.²⁰ The French historian Marc Bloch, who eventually joined the Resistance and was executed in 1944 by the Gestapo, fits this category.²¹ A rather special case was German historian Hedwig Hintze (née Guggenheimer), who according to many committed suicide in 1942 because in the face of impending deportation she was in despair for being unable to move from her place of exile in the Netherlands to Switzerland.²²

Other minor categories cognate to exile but still essentially different are expulsion and imprisonment abroad. Some historians residing in a country as non-nationals can be *expelled* from there. From which moment such an expulsion become exile is hard to say. Those who have lived for more than a decade or so in a country can be assumed to have developed the same close ties to their host countries as nationals. Likewise, nationals living in a colony and caught up in the turmoil accompanying an independence movement, can be deported, expelled, or repatriated to the mother country. Even if repatriated to 'their' nations, they are exiles of sorts, given that they often feel a painful sense of dislocation from the places that had been home for them and their families for so long. This was the situation for Dutch history teachers who were expelled from Indonesia in the 1950s or British historians who underwent a similar fate in Southern Rhodesia in the early 1960s.

The case of *political imprisonment abroad* is also special. Historians who, as prisoners of war, were held in enemy camps in foreign countries – and sometimes died there – had lost their liberty and therefore belong to a distinct – and more severe – category of persecution. Wholly different are the *criminal escapees*. The *United Nations Refugee Convention* does:

not apply to any person with respect to whom there are serious reasons for considering that (a) He has committed a crime against peace, a war crime, or a crime against humanity ... ;

²⁰ J. Malagón, "Los historiadores y la historia", *El exilio español de 1939*, volume 5, *Arte y ciencia* (Madrid: Taurus, 1978), 326.

²¹ C. Fink, *Marc Bloch: A Life in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

²² C.-D. Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research* (originally German 1987; Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 89-90; P. T. Walther, "Die Zerstörung eines Projekts: Hedwig Hintze, Otto Hintze und Friedrich Meinecke nach 1933", in *Friedrich Meinecke in seiner Zeit*, eds G. Bock and D. Schönpflug (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2006), 119-143.

(b) He has committed a serious non-political crime outside the country of refuge prior to his admission to that country as a refugee ...²³

The clause refers in particular to those who committed genocide, crimes against humanity or war crimes and fled to avoid prosecution. Applying this so-called 1F-clause is not easy. Many innocent refugee historians fled their country to avoid political imprisonment or, when already abroad, were deprived of their citizenship or sentenced in absentia after trumped-up charges and show trials.

Finally, further removed from the kernel of our topic is metaphorical exile. The most important form of metaphorical exile is inner exile. Although inner exile is often used as exculpation for not speaking out against dictatorship and injustice, there were scores of historians who were discriminated against and isolated under dictatorial repression and subsequently withdrew into silence out of fear or protest.²⁴

There are other, looser variants. Some view intellectual nomadism, diaspora culture and cosmopolitanism as forms of exile. And those inspired by religion hold that human life on earth itself can be considered an exile from heaven.²⁵ However tempting it may be to portray exile in such metaphorical ways, it is risky if it idealizes exile and misrepresents the refugee experience.

III. THEMES

After providing some clarifications in the cluster of concepts surrounding exile historiography, let us now consider some of the themes that emerge prominently from the contributions assembled in this Special Issue. Antoon De Baets, in his contribution, picks up the question of the dual impact of exile historians, both on their countries of origin and their host countries. Assembling data on 764 historians from 63 countries, he comes to the conclusion that, on balance, exile was not a blessing in disguise, as maintained by Plutarch, but that instead it was often traumatic and disastrous for the people involved. Of course, exile historians gained in their ability to facilitate intercultural exchange, and they also were able to maintain, in exile, alternative historical narratives to the sanitized ones available in the dictatorships from which they had been expelled. De Baets identifies a number of cases where historians and their narratives gained significant historiographical and political influence, but overall those cases were exceptions. Many exile historians struggled economically and remained without a voice either in their home or in their host country. Nevertheless, this overview underlines the potential of exile for fostering innovation and cross-fertilization. Pavel Vinogradov's work at the University of Oxford and the *École russe de hautes études sociales de Paris* are both telling examples, from the pre-1914 world, of such innovatory perspectives on Russian national history produced in exile.²⁶

²³ UN, *Convention*, article 1(F).

²⁴ W. Schulze, "Refugee Historians and the German Historical Profession between 1950 and 1970", *Interrupted Past*, 221. Schulze mentions Ludwig Dehio as an example. See also I. Berlin, "Two Concepts of Liberty" (originally 1958), in I. Berlin, *Four Essays on Liberty* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), §3 ("The Retreat to the Inner Citadel"). The German term for inner exile, *innere Emigration*, has also gained currency.

²⁵ See Plutarch, *Moralia in Sixteen Volumes*, volume 7, translation P. de Lacy and B. Einarson (London and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959, reprint 1968), 568-571 (no. 607).

²⁶ W. S. Holdsworth, *Professor Sir Paul Vinogradoff 1854-1925: Proceedings of the British Academy* (London:

Such alliance between exile and innovation was often related to what Peter Burke, in his article, calls the close association of the experience of exile with deprovincialization and immunization against the view that one's own group stands at the center of everything. As Burke argues, exile triggered a process of double deprovincialization – it allowed the exiled historians to view the history of their home country with the lenses provided by their host country and they brought with them lenses from their home country that refocused the history of their host country.

Burke identifies several processes that he associates with such deprovincialization. One is mediation: exiles historians becoming bridge-builders between their home and host countries. Another is distanciation: greater distance to both the histories of their home and host countries could produce greater impartiality and a fresh look onto historical processes which indigenous historians took for granted. Distanciation made it easier for exile historians to break with traditional narratives and present new frameworks for historical facts. According to Burke, distance also facilitated a tendency to compare. The comparative perspective was encouraged through exile because historians often had to detach themselves from their specific objects of study. Overall, Burke concludes that situations of exile brought about cultural hybridity and bifocal views of history. They also led exiled historians to reflect on their own experience and produce histories of exile itself. Finally, Burke points to the phenomenon of displacement in exile historiographies, that is, historians writing about a phenomenon in the past while having in mind recent or contemporaneous events. History writing in this form often produced a functional past in order to make a contemporary argument in a political struggle that had led to the situation of exile in the first place. The historiography of the 'lost German East' during the Cold War is a good example of such functionalization, although it was written both by exiles and professional German historians – interestingly including those who had been involved in claiming Eastern European lands as German and justifying ethnic cleansing in Eastern Europe during the Second World War.²⁷

The latter point, as many others made by Burke and De Baets, are impressively underlined by the subsequent case studies of exile historiography. Ragnar Björk looks specifically at refugee historians from National Socialist Germany who settled in Scandinavia. He focuses on three cases of refugee historians from Nazi Germany and asks how successful they were in embedding themselves in Scandinavian academia and society. The results of his analysis are sobering: although they had not yet established themselves as academics when they left, none was successful in their host country. Hanna Kobylinski never got a position at the university or elsewhere in Denmark or Sweden. She got married to a Polish scientist, had no career of her own, and continued with her historical work in her free time. Erich Wittenberg did not manage to establish himself in Sweden – after a failed habilitation and a controversy with the Swedish historian Herbert Tingsten, he became 'damaged goods' and was

The British Academy, 1926); D. A. Gutnov, "L'École russe de hautes études sociales de Paris", *Cahiers du monde russe*, 43 (2002): 375-410.

²⁷ The mutual interrelationship of historical research on territories lost and gained between Poland and Germany is underlined by the articles in *Deutsche Ostforschung und polnische Westforschung im Spannungsfeld von Wissenschaft und Politik: Disziplinen im Vergleich*, eds J. M. Piskorski, J. Hackmann and R. Jaworski (Osnaabrück: fibre Verlag, 2002).

not appointable in Sweden anymore. Hans-Joachim Schoeps also did not become embedded in his host country. With the support of a meager scholarship and a small circle of Swedish friends, he continued his historical work in the university library of Uppsala, but he returned to Germany as soon as possible after the war. He was in fact one of the few who were invited back to Germany by a historical profession that tended to close ranks against refugee historians who were ironically regarded as not belonging to the profession proper.

Björk argues that the conservatism of Schoeps and Wittenberg did not fit the liberal academic climate in Sweden, but it seems doubtful that their lack of success can be explained by political orientation alone. After all, Wittenberg was destroyed by Swedish conservatives, and Swedish liberals helped Schoeps regardless of his political orientation. The traditional gender bias that was established together with the professionalization and institutionalization of the historical sciences, clearly did not help Kobylinski.²⁸ The Swedish example also shows that the size of the academic community mattered: in Sweden it may well have been not big enough to integrate exile historians. This may also explain why most cases of successful integration happened in countries with a sizeable academic community and considerable resources, most notably the United States.

But size and resources cannot explain everything. Cultural traditions mattered: as Björk points out, many German exiles came to Scandinavia with a developed sense of superiority, both professionally and culturally. In their self-perception they had moved from a 'higher' German culture to a 'lower' Scandinavian one. Such hubris rarely makes for successful integration. Individuals could make a difference. Björk points to the figure of Aage Friis in Denmark. Active in the ICHS, he had a range of international contacts which almost predestined him to help refugee scholars. Despite the fact that the ICHS barely acknowledged the existence of exile historiographies and always insisted on the nation-state principle of representation in the ICHS,²⁹ the lived transnationalism of individual historians active in it did help exiled historians. Yet Friis was, according to Björk, very much a lone figure in Scandinavia.

Björk's Swedish example does not support Burke's argument that exile histories were often written by exile historians. Rather it would appear that in Sweden it needed a generation of émigrés, that is, Germans who had voluntarily moved to post-war Sweden in pursuit of a career and made the German exile from National Socialism their topic in the 1970s and 1980s. In Germany it arguably needed the belated 'coming to terms with the National Socialist past' that started in the long 1960s to produce the awareness in a younger generation of historians that it was almost a moral duty to rediscover and write about those who had been exiled and subsequently often marginalized and forgotten in post-war Germany.³⁰ This moral impetus meant that biographies and the works produced by individuals stood in the center of exile historiographies. The biographical approach was combined with the notion that a redis-

²⁸ B. G. Smith, *The Gender of History: Men, Women and Historical Practice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).

²⁹ K. D. Erdmann, *Toward a Global Community: the International Historical Congresses and the International Committee of Historical Science, 1998-2000* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2005), 162-179.

³⁰ S. Berger, *The Search for Normality: National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Germany since 1800* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2nd edn, 2003).

covery of these individuals could contribute to important contemporary innovations in historical studies. The rediscovery of Eckart Kehr, who was not an exile strictly speaking (he had died whilst being on a research and lecturing tour in the United States in 1933), by Hans-Ulrich Wehler in the early 1970s is a case in point. It was combined with a claim of the Bielefeld school to establish a particular kind of social history in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the associated claim that it had discriminated and forgotten precursors in the history of German historiography.³¹ What remains far less analyzed are, first, collective biographies ('prosopographies') of scholars exiled by particular dictatorial or authoritarian regimes, and, secondly, the specific narratives produced in exile.³²

With regard to the bridge-building function, also referred to by Burke and De Baets, it would appear that commuting might have been a central issue. Kobylinski could partly fulfil such a bridge-building function because she commuted between Sweden and Germany in the 1930s. Commuting and spending time on both sides of the Atlantic may explain the sometimes extraordinary success of such bridge-building measures. Georg and Wilma Iggers have written movingly and lucidly about such an existence as bridge-builders between North America and Germany.³³ Hans Rosenberg's writings on Prussian history that he had penned in his American exile were to have a huge influence on the negative inversion of the Sonderweg in the FRG of the 1960s and formed one factor in the thorough denationalization of historical writing in Europe.³⁴

In comparison with National Socialist Germany, even fewer historians had to leave their posts in Italy when the Fascists came to power. As Edoardo Tortarolo points out in his contribution, the Italian Fascists were very careful at first to negotiate their positions with the universities. It was only from the late 1920s onward, when they felt more secure in power that they sought to tighten their control over higher education. This strategy culminated in the oath of allegiance to Fascism that all academics had to swear in 1931. It was a sign of how little resistance Fascism met at the universities that only thirteen academics refused to take that oath.³⁵ There were also few protests in 1938, when all Jewish professors at Italian universities were replaced. This closely resembled the situation in Germany in 1933.

Much of Tortarolo's article, however, deals with an exceptional figure among Italian historians. Gaetano Salvemini was unusual in his political commitment as a socialist and unionist, and it was this political activism that led to his early emigration in 1925. In exile, he continued the combination of historical scholarship and political

³¹ It could be argued that Wehler's collection of historical portraits in seven volumes, where he himself penned the entry on Kehr, was an attempt to redefine the historiographical landscape in the light of the historical social science that he and his allies at Bielefeld and elsewhere championed. See *Deutsche Historiker*, ed. H-U. Wehler (7 vols; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1973).

³² That, however, is hardly peculiar to exile historiographies. A detailed narratological analysis of historical writing, pace Hayden White, has only been carried out by a handful of historians.

³³ G. and W. Iggers, *Two Lives in Uncertain Times: Facing the Challenges of the 20th Century* (New York: Berghahn, 2006).

³⁴ H. A. Winkler, "Ein Erneuerer der Geschichtswissenschaft: Hans Rosenberg 1904-1988", *Historische Zeitschrift*, 248 (1989): 529-555.

³⁵ On those who did refuse to swear, see H. Goetz, *Der freie Geist und seine Widersacher: Die Eidverweigerer an den italienischen Universitäten im Jahre 1931* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Haag + Herchen, 1993).

activism that was characteristic of his work in Italy. Before he obtained an endowed chair at Harvard University in the mid-1930s, he had carved out a precarious existence through lecturing and publishing during nine years – a fate he shared with the vast majority of exiled historians and a stark reminder of the material difficulties that exile meant to most who endured this fate.

Tortarolo is particularly interested in exploring the implications of Salvemini's 'dual existence' as politician and historian in terms of his methodological reflections that can be traced through his inaugural lecture at the University of Messina in 1901 and the lectures he gave at the University of Chicago in 1938 under the title: 'Historian and Scientist'. Tortarolo points out that it was not so much Croce's argument about history being an art form that was the main target of Salvemini's 1901 lecture. Rather, he retained his strongest criticism for the scientific pretensions of a Lamprechtian cultural history, precisely because he himself saw history as a science, but one significantly different from Karl Lamprecht. Accusing Lamprecht of narrow positivism, he instead outlined a vision of a historical science that explained events in their historical context and allowed people to act politically in the present. In other words, he reasserted the scientific nature of history in order to bring about the close rapprochement between his two worlds of politics and scholarship. In some respects, this resembles Jürgen Kuczynski's attempt after the Second World War to define partisanship demanded by the Communist Party with a notion of 'scientificity' that argued that historical science itself was partisan toward the Communist aims. In other words, Communism did not need to twist history, but it should respect the 'scientificity' of the discipline, as it was already working on the side of the Communists. Kuczynski did not succeed in convincing those in power and had to recant his position after causing a major debate in the early GDR.³⁶ His problem was similar to Salvemini's: how to reconcile the scientificity of the historical sciences and the political commitment of the historian.

Delivering his 1938 lectures, Salvemini went out of his way to emphasize in a neo-empiricist manner the importance of factual correctness in recording the past. This he did in the context of ferocious debates in the American profession surrounding a perceived increased need to uphold 'that noble dream' of objectivity.³⁷ At the same time, as Tortarolo points out, Salvemini retained a vision of history as a tool helping people to understand better their present circumstances. Yet too much had happened between 1901 and 1938 to make him cautious of his own more direct link between scientificity and political commitment. In 1938 it seemed to Salvemini that exact historical knowledge was the best protection against the falsifications of the past committed in the name of both Communism and Fascism. It is particularly intriguing how Tortarolo looks at the development of Salvemini's methodological thinking in the context of other immigrants' writings and of debates taking place in the United States. The dialogue with other exiles was perhaps especially important in shaping one's historiographical and political choices. And in the United States and Britain,

³⁶ H. Feldner, "History in the Academy: Objectivity and Partisanship in the Marxist Historiography of the German Democratic Republic", *The Workers' and Peasants' State: Communism and Society in East Germany under Ulbricht 1945-1971*, eds P. Major and J. Osmond (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002), 262-279.

³⁷ P. Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

German exiles had a major influence on a new post-war generation of American and British historians of Germany who had often been trained by those German exile historians.³⁸ There still remains much to be done here, as a rich field of interlocking intellectual history awaits its historians.

Tortarolo judges Salvemini's exile to have been a blessing in disguise, as it made him engage with understanding Fascism, producing important work on this topic. In turn, this allowed him to assemble a group of younger people around him who together jumpstarted a new interest in modern Italian history in the post-war years. Salvemini contributed to denationalize and internationalize historical studies in Italy. And yet, when he returned to Italy in 1948, after twenty-three years in exile, he remained isolated within the historical profession and could not link to the political ideals he had in the 1920s. If his exile had been a blessing for the course of historiography in post-war Italy, it was a very mixed blessing in terms of his personal and professional development.

Yet Salvemini's case is not only interesting because of the peculiar mixture of politics and historiography. His life had been marked by a strong personal tragedy: he lost his wife and five children to a devastating earthquake in Messina in 1908. As Tortarolo emphasizes, henceforth he was ready to restart his life from scratch without fear of losing emotional bonds. The intimate details of his private life explain a lot about his behavior as a public personality. It is a good example of how the private can become the public and the political. Hence, Salvemini's case underlines the importance of studying the everyday of historical practice and to think together the private, the professional and the public lives of historians. Scholars such as Jo Tollebeek and Philipp Müller, to give just two examples, have in recent years pioneered this approach to the history of historiography,³⁹ and one can only hope that exile historiography will also soon find its anthropological turn. The anthropological turn should not be mistaken with a new biographical turn. The biographical approach to the history of historiography is also alive and well and has been so for a long time – it is often based on an individualizing approach to historical writing that fails to identify particular patterns and important similarities and differences. The anthropological turn goes beyond mere biography in that it illuminates historical practice – it is thus a praxeological approach to the writing of history that moves beyond a history of ideas and toward a history of practices.

Salvemini's case is by no means the only one of a historian impacting significantly on the historiography of his homeland. A range of German exile historians had a delayed but highly significant impact on the course of German historiography from the 1960s onward, supporting the critical turn and the social scientific turn of the West German historical sciences.⁴⁰ Joseba Agirreazkuenaga in this issue argues that in the

³⁸ *An Interrupted Past*; G. A. Ritter, "Meinecke's Protégés: German Émigré Historians between the Two World Wars", *Bulletin of the German Historical Institute Washington*, 39 (2006): 23-38; R. Evans, *Cosmopolitan Islanders: British Historians and the European Continent* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); *Out of the Third Reich*.

³⁹ J. Tollebeek, *Frederiq & zonen: Een antropologie van de moderne geschiedwetenschap* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2008); P. Mueller, "Doing Historical Research in the Early Nineteenth Century: Leopold Ranke, the Archive Policy and the Relations of the Venetian Republic", *Storia della Storiografia*, 56 (2009): 81-104.

⁴⁰ S. Berger with C. Conrad, *The Past as History: National Identity and Historical Consciousness in Modern Europe* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015), 278f.

Basque case, historians only began to develop a Basque national historical narrative when they lived in exile after 1939. After all, there had been no significant academic institutions in the Basque country before. Agirreazkuenaga points to the importance of provincial archivists in penning the first histories of the Basque country around the turn of the twentieth century. The first congress of Basque studies was held in 1918. But it was only in exile, in cities such as Bayonne, Buenos Aires and Caracas, that Basque historiography came fully into its own, launching a journal, *Eusko Jakintza* (Basque Studies), in 1947 and setting up a Basque Studies Program at the University of Nevada, Reno, in 1967. Many of the authors who are discussed in his article sought to legitimize a Basque state. Some of them put their pens at the disposal of the Basque government-in-exile seeking to underpin its claims; many, writing from geographical distance, provided a highly rose-tinted narrative full of nostalgia about and idealization of the past. The picture that emerged from those writings was by no means homogeneous: some authors idealized the Carlists whilst others sought their models in the British liberal and constitutional traditions. But the sum total of these exile writings meant that Basque history could provide a strong identitarian framework for the Basque people in the transition phase from Francoism to democracy in Spain.⁴¹

Right-wing authoritarian regimes did not only exile historians in Europe. Many prominent examples can also be found in Latin America. Pablo Buchbinder deals with the experiences of Emilio Ravignani and José Luis Romero during their work in Uruguay in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Months after Perón had come to power in Argentina in 1945, his government instigated a major purge at the universities: about one third of all university professors were dismissed, forcibly retired, or they resigned, as in the case of Ravignani, to preserve their professional dignity. Those who were persecuted were by no means a homogeneous political group – they included Communists and socialists but also arch-conservatives and liberals. By the time of the Peronist purges, historiography in Argentina or Uruguay was not yet fully professionalized. The two historians prominently discussed by Buchbinder fit this picture. Ravignani was not only a historian but also a practicing lawyer and a politician sitting in the National Parliament, whilst Romero was a school teacher who could gain a post in publishing after he had lost his position at the university. This at least meant that they did not fall financially on hard times.

What makes their cases so interesting is that here we have a situation of exile that combined with inter-state sensitivities.⁴² Peronism was much disliked and criticized in neighboring Uruguay where most politicians upheld the liberal traditions for which some of the pre-Peronist Argentinian governments also stood. Offering academics persecuted by Peronism a new intellectual home was one way of showing this criticism of the neighbor publicly. What is more, in Uruguay the humanities were still in the process of being established after the Second World War, so

⁴¹ For the explosion of national questions in post-Francoist Spain see X. M. Nuñez Seixas, *Historiographical Approaches to Nationalism in Spain* (Saarbrücken and Fort Lauderdale FL: Breitenbach, 1993).

⁴² The strong interconnectivity of Latin American historiographies is underlined by E. de Freitas Dutra, “The Mirror of History and Images of the Nation: The Invention of a National Identity in Brazil and its Contrasts with Similar Enterprises in Mexico and Argentina”, in *Writing the Nation: A Global Perspective*, ed. S. Berger (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 84-102.

that institutionally Uruguay could benefit from experienced exiles speaking the same language. Academics like Ravignani were seen as particularly valuable: he had long experience in organizing research and extensive research networks in Latin America, Europe and North America. The geographical proximity between Buenos Aires and Montevideo also greatly helped, as scholars could cover the distance in about six hours by boat. Hence, some scholars dismissed in Argentina led the existence of a half-exile, commuting in effect between Buenos Aires and Montevideo. The Peronist government, as Buchbinder analyzes, attempted to restrict such academic commuting through a variety of measures, which were in turn somehow undermined by countermeasures undertaken by the Uruguayan authorities.

The two cases discussed by Buchbinder are in fact quite different. Romero was a medievalist whose historical work had little direct political implications; Ravignani was a historian of modern Argentina focusing on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The latter's writings reasserted the traditions of a liberal and constitutional Argentina against the centralizing and authoritarian tendencies of Peronism. His politics of history writing attracted a lot of attention among contemporaries, but historiographically he was perhaps less influential. By contrast, Romero had less political impact but appeared to wield greater influence on the professional development in his field of expertise. The coup that removed Perón in 1955 saw Romero reinstated and made dean of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Buenos Aires. Some of the persecuted disciples of Ravignani became influential figures again. Ravignani himself had died in 1954, so that the reversals of political fortune came too late for him.

The remaining three articles in this collection deal with exile historiographies from Communism. European Fascism had produced a Communist exile that led to national historical narratives penned by Communist authors in exile in which they tended to merge national and class perspectives, often following models provided by Soviet historians.⁴³ Subsequently, during the Cold War, those historians who had to flee Communism, helped to set up a Central and Eastern European historiography in the West upholding alternative historical narratives to those prevalent behind the Iron Curtain.⁴⁴

Volodymyr Kravchenko is explicitly dealing with both the Ukrainian diaspora and exile historiographies in Canada. He does so, because exile as a mass phenomenon produced diaspora historians, that is, persons who became historians in a situation of diaspora rather than having themselves been exiled as historians. Diaspora historiographies are intriguing, as they do not only deal with the history of the 'home country' but frequently also with the history of diaspora itself, that is, in the case of the Ukrainian historiography in Canada, with the Ukrainian diaspora in Canada. The case of the Canadian-Ukrainian diaspora historiography is particularly interesting as it was strongly influenced by Ukrainian scholarship in the United States. Many more Ukrainian exile and diaspora historians practiced their profession in the United States when compared to Canada, whilst in literary and folklore studies the situation was reversed. Here we can find many more Ukrainian-Canadian rather than Ukrainian-

⁴³ Á. von Klimó, "Helden, Völker, Freiheitskämpfe: Zur Ästhetik stalinistischer Geschichtsschreibung in der Sowjetunion, der Volksrepublik Ungarn und der DDR", *Storia della Storiografia*, 52 (2007): 83-112.

⁴⁴ M. Mandelíková and I. Goddeeris, "Living in the Past: Historians in Exile", in *Setting the Standards*, 394-411.

American scholars. Kravchenko looks at the establishment of specific chairs and institutes to trace the institutionalization of Ukrainian studies in Canada. Eventually, Winnipeg and Toronto became important centers for Ukrainian studies in Canada.

According to Kravchenko, Ukrainian studies underwent three distinct phases: first, the 1950s and 1960s were characterized by relative ignorance about Ukraine in Canada. The Ukrainian exile and diaspora historiography was inward-looking, anti-Soviet and strongly nationalist, continuing the historical tropes to be found in the key national historiographical narrative of the Ukraine penned by Mykhailo Hrushevsky between 1898 and 1934.⁴⁵ Insofar as the Ukrainian-Canadian historians dealt with the diaspora itself, they narrated a heroic history stressing the vital contribution of Ukrainians to Canadian society. In the 1970s and 1980s, Kravchenko's second phase, the Ukrainian-Canadian historiography missed the international turn to social history and instead remained wedged to a nation-centric political history. Its reference point was not so much Western historiography but rather the Soviet-Ukrainian historiography that it sought to refute. In the third phase, after the fall of Communism, the national-statist and national-ethnic perspectives dominated even more. Overall then, the Ukrainian-Canadian historiography was methodologically conservative and in terms of themes locked in a seemingly perpetual struggle with the dominant Communist paradigms in the Ukraine during the Cold War. In comparison to the vibrant exchanges that exile historians from right-wing dictatorships had with historians from their host countries and other exile historians, the Ukrainian-Canadian historiography appears almost hermetically sealed against such influences and therefore almost stuck in a time warp.

This impression is confirmed by Marek Tamm's account of the Baltic and specifically Estonian exile historiography. Presenting a sophisticated argument about the role of time conceptions in exile historiography, he comes to the conclusion that the spatial dislocation produced by the experience of exile made time far more important as a marker of orientation in the present. In other words, exile produced a new 'regime of historicity'.⁴⁶ The article concentrates, first, on the writing of general national and Baltic histories, second, on histories of the Baltic States in World War II, and third, on new interpretations of Baltic prehistory. Tamm concludes that the institutions and personalities that wrote Baltic history from exile between the 1940s and the 1960s favored on the one hand contemporary history and on the other hand ancient history, because both time periods were instrumental in developing a narrative that was capable of opposing the official Communist narratives in the Baltic states. Arguably, the Baltic exiles were particularly successful in institutionalizing exile historiography in a number of Western states after 1945, from where they consistently opposed the Russification of Baltic history during the Cold War.⁴⁷

The example from Communist China confirms the impression that exile historiographies from Communist dictatorships were far more inward-looking and less interested in engaging with the historiographical worlds in their new host countries. Xin Fan analyzes the involvement of the Chinese exile historian Ping-ti Ho in the

⁴⁵ S. Plokhly, *Unmaking Imperial Russia: Mykhailo Hrushevsky and the Writing of Ukrainian History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005).

⁴⁶ On the importance of time conceptions for history-writing see *Breaking up Time: Negotiating the Borders between Present, Past and Future*, eds C. Lorenz and B. Bevernage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013).

⁴⁷ For Latvia, compare A. Šnē, "Latvia", in *Atlas*, 82.

ongoing debate surrounding the so-called New Qing history (a school of thought maintaining that during the Qing period of 1644-1911 Manchu and Han ethnicities never fully intermingled). Ho's case seems a good example of an exile remaining almost entirely nationalist in his orientation toward his country of origin. He forcefully rejected new interpretations that he denounced as either Western or Japanese, because they allegedly went against the ingrained nationalism of his sinicization thesis. Interestingly, the turbo-capitalist turn in China has strengthened trends of nationalist ethnocentrism (sometimes disguised as anti-imperialism) also in Chinese Communist historiography.

This is remarkable. Examining Russian exile historians after 1917, Mark Raeff concluded that they hardly ever reflected on the significance of the event that exiled them. The Russian Revolution and its aftermath did not interest them very much. They remained wedded to their traditional interpretations of Russian national history to the extent that they did not even engage with the emerging new interpretations of Russian history in the nascent Soviet Union. Traditional Russian high culture and church history were among the most popular topics of exile historians after 1917.⁴⁸

Like Tortarolo, Xin also points to the close interrelationship of personal experiences and professional development. Ho's traumatic experiences as a witness in the Sino-Japanese war created a hostility to Japan that also shines through his insistence that the Qing fully sinicized themselves after coming to power. As the New Qing position threw doubt on this, for Ho, this was too reminiscent of the interpretation of the Qing put forward by Japanese imperialist historians in the 1930s. Instead, Ho insisted that the superiority of Han Chinese culture, almost natural to him, led to full sinicization of the Qing and had real and mutually beneficial consequences for the Qing and China. There certainly is no deprovincialization visible in Ho along the lines that Tortarolo emphasized for Salvemini.

IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF EXILE HISTORIOGRAPHY

The articles collected here demonstrate the vitality and importance of the topic of exile historiography. Historians writing in exile played a major role in the development of their profession. Some were able to make major contributions to either or both of the historiographies in their home and host countries. Enforced transnationalism and a continued national attachment to their home countries both played a role in determining the positioning of exile historians vis-à-vis home and host countries.

Reviewing our cases here, it is striking that exile from Communist regimes produced a stronger orientation toward traditional national and nationalist narratives of the historians' home country. The emergence of a Eurasianist history writing among Russian exile historians is another good example of such historiographical nationalism. It justified Russian imperial ambitions and drew a stark dividing line between Russia and the West.⁴⁹ Exiles from Fascist or right-wing authoritarian regimes tend-

⁴⁸ M. Raeff, *Russia Abroad: A Cultural History of the Russian Emigration 1919-1939* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). See also E. Chinyeva, *Russians outside Russia: The Émigré Community in Czechoslovakia 1918-1938* (Munich: Oldenbourg Verlag, 2001).

⁴⁹ S. Wiederkehr, *Die eurasische Bewegung: Wissenschaft und Politik in der russischen Emigration der Zwischenkriegszeit und im postsowjetischen Russland* (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2007).

ed to be more internationalist and open to influences from their host countries which they at times transferred to their historical writing about their home countries. This might be due to the fact that those exiled from right-wing dictatorships tended to be more liberal or left-wing and therefore more willing to be internationalist, whereas those exiled from Communism tended to be nationalists, more focused on their home countries. Exiles from Communism were inclined to uphold alternative national historical narratives, whereas exiles from Fascist regimes had a tendency to become bridge-builders between the historiographical traditions of their host countries and their home countries after the end of these regimes.⁵⁰ Further research on exile historiographies is necessary to confirm or reject some of the tentative conclusions that we can draw from the examples discussed on the following pages and we hope that this Special Issue may indeed encourage such research.

⁵⁰ Curiously, in another context – of historians who were killed for political reasons – there were also stark differences between Communist and other dictatorships. See A. De Baets, “Political Murders of Historians (1945-2014)”, in *Historians as Engaged Intellectuals*, ed. S. Berger (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, forthcoming).

COMPOSTO IN CARATTERE SERRA DANTE DALLA
FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE, PISA · ROMA.
STAMPATO E RILEGATO NELLA
TIPOGRAFIA DI AGNANO, AGNANO PISANO (PISA).

★

Novembre 2016

(CZ2/FC3)



© Copyright by Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa · Roma.