

**GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**BULLETIN**

**Spring 1989**

Issue No. 4

**Editors:** Professor Hartmut Lehmann in conjunction  
with the Research Fellows of the Institute

**Editors  
responsible  
for this issue:** Catherine Epstein

**Address:** German Historical Institute  
1759 R Street, N.W.  
Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
Tel: (202) 387-3355

**Hours:** Monday - Friday 9:00 a.m. - 5:00. p.m.

**Library Hours:** Monday - Friday 10:00 a.m. - 5:00. p.m.

The next issue of the BULLETIN will appear in Fall 1989.

**GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE  
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

**BULLETIN**

**Spring 1989**

**Issue No. 4**

**Contents**

<b>I. Preface</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. Account of the Discussions at the Conference</b> <b>"German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States 1933–1970s"</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. Research Reports</b>	<b>20</b>
A. Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb: German-Speaking Refugee Scholars of the Thirties in Historically Black Colleges	20
B. Catherine Epstein: German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933	27
C. Sibylle Quack: Women in the Emigration: A Contribution to the Social History of German- Jewish Immigrant Women in New York after 1933	37
<b>IV. GHI Library Report: Holdings on Emigration</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>V. Institute News</b>	<b>44</b>
A. New Staff Members	44
B. New Scholarship Recipients	45
C. Upcoming Events in the Washington Area	46
D. Upcoming Conferences	47
E. Scholarships	48
F. Miscellaneous	49



## I. Preface

The fourth *Bulletin* of the German Historical Institute is devoted to the Institute's work on the German-speaking emigration to the United States after 1933. Our first major Conference held in December, 1988, entitled "German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States, 1933–1970s," honored the legacy of our colleagues who had to leave Germany after the Nazis seized power. An account of the Conference is found in the following pages.

American historians have long recognized that they owe much to those historians who came to the United States not by choice, but because they were forced to do so. When the American Historical Association organized a number of centennial sessions in 1984, several speakers addressed the relationship between German and American historiography since the founding of the AHA in 1884. They all agreed that the influence German-speaking refugee historians have had in the United States since the late 1930s cannot be overestimated. In 1984 Fritz Stern remarked that "Germany's articulate talent came here or to other havens ... they came at a time at once difficult and fortuitously propitious ... the effect of the immigration was immense." On the same occasion Charles McClelland pointed out that "for many German refugees the experience of America was a difficult one professionally and culturally," although, in his view, historians had by and large fewer difficulties than other professionals. Fritz Stern, Charles McClelland, Gerald Feldman, and Konrad Jarausch all stressed that the impact of the refugees on American historiography was profound in many areas, including intellectual, economic, and social history.

The speakers at the 1988 Conference "German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States 1933–1970s" attempted to answer some of the many questions concerning the direction, the quality, and the duration of this unique intellectual impact. In addition, we tried to analyze the ways in which some émigré historians influenced the German historical profession after 1945.

I wish to thank Jim Sheehan for his excellent advice and continuous support in organizing the Conference. Unfortunately, not everyone was able to accept our invitation. For some refugee historians the trip to Washington was too strenuous: among others, Paul Oskar Kristeller, Gerhard Ladner, Golo Mann, Edgar Rosen, and Martin Weinbaum. The Conference came too late for Hans Baron and Hans Rosenberg.

The German Historical Institute's first research focus is on areas of the German-speaking emigration which have been neglected in the past. Following the account of the Conference, we offer research reports by Institute staff members Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb, Catherine Epstein and Sibylle Quack.

Washington, D.C., March 1989

Hartmut Lehmann

## II. Account of the Discussions at the Conference "German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States 1933–1970s"

(Washington, D.C., December 1–3, 1988)

### Catherine Epstein

What follows is a summary of the main points raised during the discussions at the Conference. Not every speaker could be included in this account, and remarks attributed to speakers are not direct quotations, unless they appear in quotation marks. Because the formal conference papers will be published by the German Historical Institute in a separate volume, these have been described only to the extent necessary to make the commentary clear. The author apologizes for simplifications, omissions or any other misrepresentations of speakers' ideas.

After Hartmut Lehmann (German Historical Institute) welcomed participants to the first major conference of the German Historical Institute in Washington, Ernst Schulz (University of Freiburg) spoke on "German and American Historiography in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." He gave an overview of the contacts and the exchange of ideas between German and American historians in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The following morning, after brief opening remarks by James Sheehan (Stanford University), Wolfgang Mommsen (University of Düsseldorf) spoke on "The Role of the Future Refugee Historians in the German Historical Profession in the 1920s and Early 1930s." Mommsen argued that the emigration resulted in a significant "brain-drain" of German academics. This loss of historians, though numerically not large, skewed the political bias of German historiography. The historians who eventually emigrated were very diverse in their politics and in their fields of interest—some were outsiders in the German historical profession; others, a rather homogeneous group, were born around the turn of the century, were Meinecke students and were mostly *Vernunftsrepublikaner*, and a small group distinguished itself by examining the interplay of power politics and the politics of imperialism.

Vernon Lidtke (Johns Hopkins University), the discussion leader, drew attention to the issue of loss and gain: that is, what German academia lost,

and what American academia gained. Stephan Kuttner (Berkeley) suggested that historians of fields other than modern German history be investigated, in particular historians of legal and church history. Both the investigation of sources of canon and Roman law and the history of theological and ecclesiastical thought were greatly stimulated by refugee historians. Kuttner remembered that when he returned to visit Germany after 1945, German scholars regretted that the traditions of these historical fields had been lost in Germany. Carl Schorske (Princeton University) argued that focussing on losses ignores historians such as Franz Schnabel and Otto Brunner who stayed in Central Europe.

Bernd Faulenbach (University of Bochum) took issue with Mommsen's argument that the historians who emigrated were politically diverse. He argued that the historians' political positions were almost exclusively liberal, left-liberal, or socialist. There were only a few conservatives, such as Hans Rothfels and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy. Although the range of the historians' ages was wide, on the whole the middle and younger generations dominated. Faulenbach added that the future refugee historians had a more critical view of German history, and particularly of the Empire; they had strong interests in intellectual history; and they were more open to Western values than other German historians. Mommsen interjected that he too initially thought that all the future refugee historians were liberal or left-wing, but that further study had led him to believe this incorrect. Returning to the issue of losses, Mommsen said that he might have emphasized losses more than he had intended. He then added that German and Western historiography perhaps came closer together as a result of the emigration, which in turn was a gain for all. To Schorske's remark concerning Schnabel and Brunner, Mommsen answered that in the Weimar period Schnabel was quite uninfluential and that he only influenced his profession in the 1950s. Mommsen agreed that he should not have left medievalists such as Brunner out of his discussion, but explained that he did not feel competent to judge such historians. Generalizations about the historians are difficult and there are many studies to be done. For example, there is only Werner Conze's article on Hans Rothfels (*Historische Zeitschrift*, 237 (1983) 311–360).

Felix Gilbert (The Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton) spoke on "The Berlin Historical Seminar in the 1920s." He shared his memories of studying in Berlin with Friedrich Meinecke and other professors. A common spirit prevailed among the history students, a spirit based on pride in studying in the Berlin Seminar, an old institution long important in scholarship, and on the high expectations the students had for continuing the Seminar's work.



Gilbert was followed by Michael Kater (York University), who spoke on "The Harassment of Future Refugee Historians at German Universities 1932–1939." He talked about groups targeted for harassment, kinds of harassment, and documented cases of harassment. Towards the end of his analysis, Kater remarked that he was not clear why Hajo Holborn felt the need to leave Germany, a point taken up in subsequent discussion. Kater then presented the thesis that harassment was inversely related to an historian's degree of nationalistic feeling.

Fritz Fellner (University of Salzburg) gave the last paper of the morning session: "The Special Case of Austrian Refugee Historians." His talk centered on what was special about the Austrian historians. After outlining waves of Austrian intellectual migrations from the 1920s to the postwar period, he argued that Austrian refugee historians have received little attention in literature on the emigration because pre-1938 Austrian historiography was part of a German national tradition. Fellner categorized those historians forced to leave in 1938, and said that although many historians tried to return to Austria after 1945, few were able to do so. In conclusion, Fellner observed that there is no field of Austrian history where there is not an American expert - American scholarship is a "fifth column" of Austrian historiography.

A discussion followed these three papers. George Iggers (SUNY Buffalo) raised the question of whether there was a caesura in 1933. Iggers argued that a nationalistic consensus already prevailed among historians, and that a *Gleichschaltung* was thus unnecessary under Walter Frank. He then asked what might have happened in German historiography had the refugee historians stayed. There was, after all, already a trend toward social history with historians such as Eckart Kehr and Hans Rosenberg.

Margaret Anderson (Swarthmore College) suggested that the underrepresentation and almost complete absence of Jewish historians in the German historical profession in the 1920s and 1930s had its parallel in the American historical profession of the same period. Anti-semitism played a role in keeping the historical professions in both countries more elitist and less open to new ideas than other professions.

Fritz Stern (Columbia University) returned to the topic of harassment. Simply living in a country such as Nazi Germany, with considerable violations of human decency, was a form of harassment; thus Hajo Holborn was subject to harassment. Robert Wolfe (National Archives) concurred, stating that Holborn, as a liberal teacher in Berlin, could not but worry about potential SA excesses.

On the issue of continuity and caesura, Kater responded that one needed to go back to the nineteenth century to explain the Weimar historians' nationalism, and that, in effect, there was continuity from the nineteenth century until the 1960s when there was a caesura. He thought that Anderson's statement was important, and that one needed to compare national historiographies.

Felix Gilbert argued that Holborn was a left-liberal historian and simply could not go on in Germany after 1933. Gilbert also maintained that there was no doubt that the universities were anti-semitic, although earlier anti-semitism was religious. By 1933, anti-semitism had turned racist.

Mommsen addressed the issue of why few Jews were in the historical profession. If converted, it was not really difficult for individuals with Jewish origins to make careers; however, the Weimar period was short. The most important factor for a successful university career was adherence to the dominant nationalist paradigm. As for the question of caesura, Mommsen argued that 1933 was a caesura since the historians under discussion were excluded from German academia. For the profession as a whole, one might argue that there had been a shift of methods and mentality around 1910. The next caesura came in the late 1950s; thus from 1910–1950 the historical profession carried on more or less in the same vein. Nazi historiography had weak arguments, and so made few inroads into the historical profession. Mommsen mentioned Hans Rothfels to counter the argument that harassment was inversely related to nationalistic feeling.

Otto Pflanze (Bard College) remarked that Gilbert and Stern were completely correct in saying that Holborn's emigration was a political statement. Holborn's wife, Annemarie, stayed in Germany for a full year and only saw Holborn in Basel. For Holborn, emigration was a moral decision.

Peter Loewenberg (UCLA) argued that there was a distressing compartmentalization of historians and political scientists. Historians drew from political scientists, and from a general *Kulturwelt*. German refugees introduced Marxism to American social sciences, and in this way influenced the study of history.

Fellner asked Gilbert about the situation of women at German universities during the Weimar period. Gilbert answered that there were women in the German universities, but that their number was very small. As an

example, he noted that Dietrich Gerhard's sister, Melitta, was a lecturer (*Privatdozentin*) in literature in Kiel.

Volker Berghahn (Brown University), as discussion leader, opened the afternoon session on "Refugee Historians in America in the 1930s and 1940s." Catherine Epstein (German Historical Institute) gave a talk titled "Refugee Historians in the United States: A Research Report." Epstein described her work on a catalogue of the first generation émigré historians. To date, some 95 historians of this generation have been traced. Using the term *Schicksalsgeschichte*, she outlined various career patterns characteristic of refugee historians. Epstein was followed by Peter Walther (Berlin) who spoke on migration routes, places of refuge and emergency committees for the refugee historians. Walther set up a typology of six kinds of migration: movement within Germany; those historians already in foreign countries staying abroad; silent waiting in Germany; settling in other European countries; traveling back and forth between Germany and another country; and going to the United States. The first part of the afternoon session ended with Sibylle Quack (Bonn) speaking on "Everyday Life and Emigration: The Role of Women." Quack argued that the role of women in historians' families was typical of women in other educated refugee families. Quack said that although wives and sisters of historians frequently had their own academic careers, they tended to give them up in the emigration. Women often initially supported their families by finding unskilled work as domestics and housekeepers.

During the discussion, Gerhard Hirschfeld (German Historical Institute, London) asked when decisions to emigrate were taken. Henry Friedlander (Brooklyn College) noted that fear, and especially fear for the future of one's children, and the loss of one's job all played a role in encouraging people to emigrate. Many people, of course, died in concentration camps. Alfred Low (Marquette University) noted that the decision to emigrate had to be made much faster in Austria than in Germany.

Atina Grossman (Columbia University) suggested that women were discouraged from finding academic jobs, and cited Luise Holborn as an example. Marion Berghahn (Berg Publishers) stated that her research on refugees in England suggested that while marriages did not generally break up during the first years of emigration, they often broke up after the initial stress of emigration was over; sometimes they broke up over the question of whether or not to return to Germany. Marie Kann (Princeton, NJ), the widow of historian Robert A. Kann, described to what degree chance determined emigration, and told how lucky she and her husband

felt to receive an American visa. She emphasized that people left however and whenever they could, not how and when they wished. Quack's description of women's lives during the emigration very much mirrored her own. Eleanor Alexander (Berkeley, CA), the widow of historian Paul Alexander, concurred, and described taking on domestic and other unskilled jobs in order to support herself and her husband.

Karen Greenberg (Bard College) spoke on "US Foundations and Institutions which supported the Refugee Historians." She outlined four kinds of support which helped the historians: the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars, institutions of higher learning, the refugees themselves, and private foundations. Greenberg emphasized, however, that the historians' success in the United States was in large part due to solidarity among the refugee historians, the quality of their scholarly work, and their ambition.

Barry Katz (Stanford University) talked about "Historians in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS)." Katz called the work which historians did in OSS their equivalent of the "Manhattan Project." The historians' work in OSS was important for their government work and future academic careers: they experienced interdisciplinary interaction, gained an education in contemporary *Realpolitik*, and contributed and learned from the cross-fertilization of ideas between German and American trained scholars; they also supplied postgraduate training to younger Americans at OSS.

Carl Schorske, the last speaker of the day, gave a personal account of his interaction with refugee historians during his student days at Harvard, notably with Fritz Epstein. Schorske argued that American students of German history came to intellectual history in part because the refugees discussed problems facing Europe within this framework; this helped American students to wake up from their naive positivism. Schorske also argued against the idea that in OSS the émigrés taught and Americans learned; rather, everyone learned.

In the ensuing discussion, Klemens von Klemperer (Smith College) asked about the kind of political vision the historians and other German refugees had while in OSS. He mentioned that in British documents there are references to a "German lobby" in the US. Marion Kaplan (Graduate School and University Center CUNY) questioned the effectiveness of émigrés in OSS. Did anyone read material they prepared? Mommsen asked whether the knowledge which the Americans received from the refugees affected American occupation policies. Katz replied that the net

impact of the historians at the Research and Analysis branch was not nil, but neither was it very great. There are few examples where émigrés took positions against American policy and won. At any rate, OSS did not have a policy-making role. Schorske agreed with Katz, but added that the dynamics of strategic decision-making during wartime are incredibly complex. Renate Boehling (University of Dayton) joined the discussion saying that her research shows that much analysis was done, but little actually filtered into policy implementation.

A series of questions was posed to the panel. Franz Michael (George Washington University) asked about the role of OSS regarding Japan. He then suggested that the refugees may have had some influence on Morgenthau, since Morgenthau's German plan was never enacted. Frank Mecklenburg (Leo Baeck Institute) argued that people were confusing levels of policy-making. Why did the émigrés think that what they thought was important? Friedlander asked to what extent refugees could decide what to work on and who the highest-level person the émigrés reported to was. Friedlander also questioned the extent to which the refugees played a role at the Nuremberg trials, and how much the Research and Analysis Branch concerned itself with the Holocaust. Faulenbach asked whether there were differences within the Research and Analysis Branch in analyses of Nazi Germany. Gerhard Weinberg (University of North Carolina) asked to what extent Donovan, the head of OSS, was influenced by the émigrés. Robert Wolfe said that in order to get answers to all these questions one need look at the archives of other agencies and groups.

The three speakers then responded. Schorske said that he was unable to measure the impact of OSS on Japan policy. He stressed that the Central European section of the Research and Analysis branch was a very small part of a very large agency. He maintained that the refugees did reach Donovan. However, the premium on intelligence work was very low. There was no regular historian at the Nuremberg trials, but historians did help in preparing the prosecution. The refugees' work consisted of continuous general operations, although there were some special assignments. Katz stated that there is still a huge amount of material on OSS to be researched. He said that there was no question that by 1942 or 1943, Research and Analysis people were reporting on the Genocide. They knew plenty about the Holocaust, and wrote many reports on it.

In answer to a question posed by Hirschfeld on the role the American Association of University Professors played in the reception of refugee historians, Greenberg cited a Gallup poll of the late 1930s. This poll

suggested that American universities were "fed up," and that a "saturation" point of refugees in academic positions had been reached. In the late 1930s, there were apparently second thoughts about the value of the refugees at American universities. Greenberg stated that Harvard University was the worst of all major institutions in terms of hiring refugees.

The first session of the second full day of the Conference was titled "Refugee Historians in the American Historical Profession in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s." Konrad Jarausch (University of North Carolina), the discussion leader, opened the session with some general remarks concerning the impact of the émigré historians in the United States. After World War II, German history became established as a subfield of European history, but at the same time the subfields of French and Russian history were also established. What role, if any, did the refugees play in this process? Jarausch also stated that the study of political and military history gave way to the study of cultural and social history. What role did refugees play here? He drew attention to the different generations of historians—those who got Ph.D.s in Germany, those who were forced out of Germany as youths, those who left Germany after the War, and American students—and then questioned the effects of the interchange among these generations.

Kenneth Barkin (University of California, Riverside) spoke on the refugee historians in the United States from the 1950s on. Barkin argued that the refugees imparted to their American students the importance of original, unpublished sources. Although the émigrés did not introduce intellectual history to the United States, they did give it renewed vigor. Furthermore, the émigrés produced a very talented *Nachwuchs*. Barkin also argued that in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War, historians of German history focussed on ways of analyzing how Hitler had risen to power, and as such did not concern themselves with topics other national historians were concerned with, such as the interest of historians of France in the lives of Languedoc peasants. For German historians to have done so then would have been politically irresponsible. Barkin also maintained that refugee political scientists had greater influence than historians, and that no émigré historian's book rivaled Arendt's *Origins of Totalitarianism* in its importance. In effect, the historians had no exciting new message. The one field of history dramatically affected by the refugee historians was Renaissance history.

During the discussion, George Mosse (University of Wisconsin) stated that the new influence of cultural history stemmed from refugee art

historians, particularly those from the Warburg School. He argued against any clear-cut distinction between the fields of history and art history. Cultural history would not be the same without the émigré art historians. Barkin agreed that art historians influenced the study of cultural history. He added, however, that in Weimar Germany art historians did not influence historians. They existed in two very different worlds, and Barkin thought, came from different traditions.

Donald McCoy (University of Kansas) argued that the view of the American historical profession taken at the Conference was too limited. The contribution the émigrés made to transmitting information and cultural broadening was important for the United States. In the historical profession the émigrés did a great deal of "scut work." They were on many committees, a vital contribution. In addition, the attention refugee historians gave to original, unpublished sources was important. McCoy noted the role Ernst Posner played in shaping the National Archives.

Schorske returned to the question of historians of German history not addressing issues such as Languedoc peasants or everyday cultural history. Schorske thought that Barkin had trivialized the French historians. Barkin replied that the émigrés' preoccupation with National Socialism was necessary and understandable during the 1950s and 1960s. Thus they did not work on the same topics as their counterparts in English and French history. Schorske then observed that work on the *Befreiungskriege*, the pre-1848 period, and the Peasant Wars was done in East Germany during the first decades after the war. Meanwhile these subjects were neglected in main-stream German history in the United States. Barkin asked what would have happened had the émigrés not confronted the Nazi period and related issues. What if they had only talked about the *Bauernkriege*?

The second half of the morning session was devoted to talks on individual historians. Otto Pflanze spoke on Hajo Holborn, Hanna Schissler (German Historical Institute) on Hans Rosenberg, and Robert Lerner (Northwestern University) on Ernst Kantorowicz and Theodor E. Mommsen. All three outlined the major contributions of these historians.

Gerald Feldman (Berkeley) made the first comment in the discussion. He augmented Schissler's remarks on how critical Rosenberg could be about other scholars' work by telling how Rosenberg always remembered Martin Spahn's savage attacks on his *Habilitation* work in Cologne. Feldman added that Rosenberg was uneasy about coming to the United States because he thought his English was inadequate. Feldman then

returned to the Barkin-Schorske exchange, noting that Rosenberg was interested in the Peasant Wars at the end of his life. He added that there is a tradition on the right of German historiography interested in earlier history and agrarian politics. Feldman then offered the opinion that Rosenberg was more important in Germany than in the United States.

Mommsen argued that Pflanze overstated the influence of Ranke on Holborn, and that Pflanze should have mentioned Meinecke's influence more. Mommsen then remarked that Schissler had presented the progressive, radical Rosenberg, but not the early Rosenberg. After Rosenberg's departure from Germany, he focussed much more on economic issues. Why this shift?

Christhard Hoffmann (Technical University, Berlin) asked why Kantorowicz' views on nationalism changed after his emigration; what about his attitude towards American mass society? Michael Riff (Leo Baeck Institute) asked whether it was the Holocaust, or living in the United States, that affected Kantorowicz' views. Mosse entered the discussion saying that Kantorowicz destroyed all his early papers. He noted that Kantorowicz was closely associated with and was influenced by Olschky. Kantorowicz had difficulties establishing himself in the United States, in part because he was Jewish. Holborn's rise was in part due to his nonJewishness. Mosse then concluded his remarks saying that "we're not at funerals" and "we don't want eulogies, we want criticism of some of these historians." Their influence in the United States, after all, was rather small. Many persons, including himself, never studied with any refugee historians.

Pflanze replied that it was necessary to say how people affected one. Holborn was a model of personal conduct, and Pflanze had attempted to bring this aspect of Holborn's character across in his paper. With regard to Ranke's influence on Holborn, Pflanze stated that Holborn was irritated by use, or misuse, of *wie es eigentlich gewesen*.

Schissler addressed the comments on Rosenberg. She answered Mommsen's remark by arguing that Rosenberg's early work was rather uninteresting, and that thereafter he made the switch to modern social history fairly quickly. Although there are letters which show an interest in economic history at an early age, Rosenberg's emigration no doubt played a role in his intellectual development. Barkin added that American social scientists had some influence on Rosenberg.



Lerner answered the comments on Kantorowicz by saying that Kantorowicz' sister died in Theresienstadt, and his mother was shot crossing the Swiss border. Kantorowicz nonetheless remained elitist and opposed to mass society, and so, in his emigration years, expressed both old and new views.

Loewenberg returned to Rosenberg, saying that Rosenberg had been hurt by the fact that it wasn't possible for him to teach in Germany before his emigration. Rosenberg thus hated the Junkers because they had discriminated against him. Such personal hatreds perhaps made a difference between those historians of Germany who were trained in Germany, and those who were trained in the United States.

Hirschfeld said that Rosenberg was aware of anti-semitism in England and in the United States. He read a letter from Rosenberg proving this point.

Gilbert noted that the influence America had on the refugee historians had so far been neglected at the Conference.

The last session of the Conference, "Refugee Historians and the German Historical Profession between 1950 and 1970," opened with a general lecture by Winfried Schulze (University of Bochum). He maintained that West Germans tried hard to bring refugee historians back to West Germany, but that the great majority of émigrés did not return, largely for personal reasons. As for refugee historians' impact on the West German historical profession, Schulze argued that Hans Rothfels brought *Zeitgeschichte* to Germany, and Hans Rosenberg influenced many future leading German historians during his guest professorships in Berlin and West Germany. Apart from these two, however, the refugee historians did not have a significant impact on West German historiography.

During the discussion, Gerhard Weinberg stated that the premise of Schulze's lecture was that the refugees were effective only when physically present. Refugees were very helpful to German historians; Weinberg noted Hallgartheri's and Kohn's efforts to make documents available to German historians.

Marion Kaplan argued that German historiography was too narrowly defined by Schulze. Adolf Leschnitzer, an historian of Jewish history, went back to Germany every summer and trained a whole generation of historians of German-Jewish history. She then commented that the Holocaust might have affected the refugee historians even though this

did not surface in their correspondence. If one talked to individual historians, one might get a stronger sense of the importance of the Holocaust. The level of repression in discussing such issues was very high. Henry Friedlander added that the degree to which the Holocaust played a role in the decision to return or not to return to Germany was very difficult to measure. The attitude of refugees whose families died in concentration camps is still unexplored. He asked what efforts the Soviets or East Germans made to have refugees return.

Mommsen entered the discussion by saying that it would have been wonderful had more émigré historians come back after 1945. Instead there was a "restoration of conservatism" in the West German historical profession. He also observed that in the 1960s many German historians of his own generation spent time in the United States, and that the informal contacts they had with refugee historians were quite influential.

Schulze agreed with Weinberg that the refugees' efforts to make available archival materials were important for German historians. He then stated that Leschnitzer was a marginal figure and that he did not influence a whole generation. He was not involved with a fashionable historiographical approach. In return, Kaplan listed a number of German-Jewish historians who were trained by Leschnitzer. She then added that if one labels Leschnitzer marginal, one marginalizes German-Jewish history. Hartmut Lehmann interjected that the big gap in the Conference's program was the historians of German-Jewish history. He said, however, that filling this gap would have to wait for another Conference.

Schulze briefly replied to Friedlander's question: three or four historians went to the Soviet Zone, and they were all Communists.

Jarausch discussed ways in which the refugee historians were influential in the German historical profession. Their discussions with young German historians visiting the United States, their interest in exchange programs, and their presence in print all played a role. Jarausch brought up the issue of professional standards, and suggested that one ought to examine which émigré writings were and were not accepted by the German *Historikervereinigung*.

Jürgen Hess (Free University, Amsterdam) questioned what a "return to normalcy" in the German historical profession after 1945 meant. There was no normalcy. The profession's postwar establishment of the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* to study the recent past constituted a very different reaction from that of the historical profession after 1918. He also stated

that the approach taken in Schulze's talk—to discuss only high-level academics—was too limited. Theodor Heuss was a professor of history for six months before he became leader of the Free Democratic Party.

Fellner suggested that the term *Flüchtling*, or "refugee", was used as a term not to describe those who went to the United States or Great Britain, but rather those who came from the East—from Königsberg or Breslau—in the postwar period. Attempts to place these people in German universities took precedence over those to place individuals returning from the United States.

Iggers stated that proportionately more intellectuals went to East Germany than to West Germany. He noted that five or six refugee historians including Leo Stern from the Soviet Union, Karl Obermann from the United States, and Ernst Engelberg from Turkey went to the Soviet Zone. He then asked why more intellectuals went to the East rather than to the West.

Franz Michael described an invitation to return to Germany. The *Auswärtiges Amt* offered him an ambassadorship as well as a professorship at the University of Bonn. Yet Michael decided for personal reasons not to go back. He then added that he felt like a fifth wheel at the Conference. Refugees really brought something important to medieval history, Chinese history, and legal history, yet there was no discussion of these fields; the emphasis was much too much on German history. His training at a *humanistisches Gymnasium*, and his other pre-emigration experiences brought something special to American academia. The mixture found in his background really affected his teaching and his thinking about Chinese history.

Sybil Milton (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum) stated that the terms "refugee" and "émigré" require greater precision and that use of the terms must be more systematic.

Michael Geyer (University of Chicago) asked about the fate of the *Ostforscher* who had worked in Königsberg and Riga.

Mommsen, speaking of how refugee historians influenced him, said that Dietrich Gerhard first brought him American culture, and Felix Gilbert brought him to this country. Reinhard Koselleck (University of Bielefeld) added that in Heidelberg, where he was studying, many refugee scholars came to the America House to give lectures.

Following a break, the general discussion opened, with Sheehan and Lehmann as discussion leaders. Sheehan suggested that certain "bundles" of questions had been discussed. These bundles included: the varieties of experiences of emigration; the German situation of the Weimar period as a point of departure, as well as caesuras such as 1945; the impact and influence of emigration on refugees' scholarly work and their influence on historiography; and the contrast between the experiences and influence of refugee historians and other professional groups such as art historians or political scientists.

Renate Bridenthal (Brooklyn College) spoke of the "daughters" of the refugees, those women who are the children of refugees and now teach history. They have made an important contribution to the study of women's history and have made the term *Doktormutter* current.

Fritz Stern said he felt a certain intellectual unease nearing the Conference's end. One could leave the Conference thinking that there was a type of refugee historian. In fact, there were enormous varieties in the historians, differences in both their styles and quality. Stern then went on to say that the initial trauma of harassment was the refugees' one common experience. The attempts of historians to *verstehen*—and to make a bridge to Germany—were really quite impressive after the War.

Mommsen picked up on this theme, saying that the refugees were an aspect of a larger acculturation. The émigrés made Europe more understandable to Americans and the United States more understandable to Europeans. Geyer suggested that the refugees were in a sense strangers as insiders.

Hans Trefousse (Brooklyn College) argued that a dimension was missing at the Conference, namely comparing this migration with other migrations. Jörg Nagler (German Historical Institute) suggested that much research was being done on the 1848ers, and that it would be fruitful to compare their migration with that of the 1930s.

Volker Berghahn argued that the preoccupation with the impact and influence of the refugee historians was nothing very new and that the questions were quite conventional. He suggested that studies move into the area of comparative academic cultures. The two academic cultures are very different, and the refugees are in a unique position to tell us something about these academic cultures.

Michael Meyer (California State University, Northridge) brought the discussion back to the issue of the Holocaust. In his research on refugee musicians, he has found comments in their letters suggesting that the Holocaust was a reason for not returning to Germany.

Iggers agreed on the heterogeneity of the refugee historians. Harassment, however, was not the only common denominator. The group was quite selective and had some common origins. He asked why so few historians returned to Germany.

Jerry Muller (The Catholic University of America) emphasized the *Zunft* aspect of the Conference. He suggested that there was much of importance in the academic emigration not found among the historians. He noted the importance of Arendt in general, but also the importance of such figures as Karl Wittfogel.

Wolfe suggested that work be done on the émigrés who went back to postwar Germany as soldiers in the American Army.

Kaplan noted that it would be interesting to examine the group of historians who came over as children, the second generation. Schorske, continuing in this vein, added that it might be useful to analyze the effect which emigration as a child or adolescent had on the historiography of the second generation. He then stated that there was a long-term trend towards national histories, and that historians such as Franklin Ford, whose work is multinational, are increasingly unusual. He then concluded his remarks saying that another category of refugees had not been discussed, namely the "Hamburg" school—the Warburg Institute—of thinking, which included such individuals as Cassirer and Panofsky.

Lehmann and Sheehan then closed the Conference. Lehmann gave general thanks to the speakers and participants. Sheehan noted that it was very appropriate that the German Historical Institute had chosen the topic of refugee historians for its first conference.

### **III. Research Reports**

#### **A. Gabrielle Simon Edcomb**

##### **Project: "German-Speaking Refugee Scholars of the Thirties in Historically Black Colleges"**

The project "German-Speaking Refugee Scholars of the Thirties in Historically Black Colleges" captures a singular instance of cross-cultural interaction in immigrant and minority history. Approximately fifty German-speaking scholars who taught at eighteen historically black institutions after their emigration from Central Europe have been identified (see appendix). This encounter has gone unnoticed in the copious literature on emigration. Its significance lies in the very varied ways in which the Europeans, as well as the Americans involved, were affected. It must be remembered that the encounter between refugee scholars and black institutions was played out with the background of the Depression and anti-semitic and racial prejudice. In addition, virtually no one expected the Nazi regime to stay in power, and thus the refugees were considered temporary visitors.

##### **Progress of Project**

My project on the refugee scholars at historically black colleges was initially backed by the Smithsonian Institution's Office of Symposia and Seminars (now The Office of Interdisciplinary Studies), with Director Dr. Wilton Dillon's steadfast support, in 1984. In this phase of the work, Ms. Carla Borden, associate director of the Office and editor of the book *The Muses Flee Hitler*, was my co-investigator. Backing was given to explore the extent to which émigré scholars found positions in historically black colleges after 1933. We found sufficient numbers of both individuals and institutions in our category to warrant further study. After the Smithsonian's active involvement ceased, the Anson Phelps Stokes Institute appointed me Resident Scholar to continue my research. I proceeded with the work: collecting documentation and doing interviews with a few surviving refugee scholars, their one-time students, family members and friends.

The German Historical Institute supported my work from May to December, 1988. My first priority was to complete the research; that is, to gather

all the documentary material available from the colleges identified, and to trace surviving scholars for possible interviews. At this time, the identification and documentation of individuals and institutions is practically complete. I would be surprised to discover any more refugee scholars who taught at historically black colleges.

In addition to documentary materials, I have assembled a collection of some twenty audio-taped interviews with individuals involved with the encounter between refugee scholars and black institutions. These collections have been forwarded to the following institutions: The Amistad Research Center (New Orleans), The Moorland-Spingarn Research Center (Washington, D.C.), The Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture (New York City), and The Smithsonian Archives (Washington, D.C.).

In May, 1988, I travelled to Houston, Texas to interview one of the most significant people in this study, Professor John Biggers, a major painter who studied with Viktor Lowenfeld, from Vienna, at Hampton Institute (now Hampton University). Biggers transferred his studies from plumbing to the fine arts because of his contact with Lowenfeld, who transformed Hampton's Industrial Arts Department into an Art Department.

In November, 1988, I spent two days at the Rockefeller Archive Center in Pocantico Hills, New York, where I found a treasure trove of archival materials of interest to all researchers of the emigration from Nazi Germany. I hope to return to the Rockefeller Archives for a week's stay to explore their collections further. In November I also spoke on my subject at the Leo Baeck Institute in New York City.

## **Research Results**

The research work has been extremely slow and time consuming. Many colleges lack the necessary records, and few have archivists or other personnel for such research. In one instance, I had been given the names of several faculty members who turned out not to have been refugees at all. This, after many letters, telephone calls and more than three years! For some individuals, however, I have copious material from a large variety of sources. In other cases, there are only the recollections of a single individual on hand. Thus the documentation remains very uneven. At this time there are few loose ends left to research. As in much historical work, however, there are many paths one could pursue. The completion of the investigation must also be determined by extraneous factors, such

as the fact that few principals are still alive, and the scarcity and difficulty of obtaining records.

One of the central questions I attempted to answer was how the refugee scholars came to find faculty positions in the black colleges. The evidence points to several ways. An identical letter was sent to at least seven of these institutions by the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Scholars, suggesting these placements; this letter was sent as late as 1941, several years after a number of scholars had begun their tenures. There was word of mouth, of course, and other informal referrals. I have not succeeded in identifying a central source of these placements. Perhaps there was none, or the sources can not be documented because the refugees were placed as a result of oral communications. I shall continue to be on the lookout for the answer to this question.

On the whole, the encounter between refugee scholars and members of the black institutions proved of considerable value to both sides—the Americans were exposed, for the first time, to a more cosmopolitan approach to education, as opposed to the more compartmentalized methods in the United States. The newcomers, on the other hand, found themselves in a part of the country segregated and oppressed, socially and economically, so that their new lives had to be experienced in a doubly alien environment. Their reception was cordial, and while only a minority of the émigrés remained in the black colleges for many years, nearly all of the émigrés had a positive impact on students, and, not infrequently, on colleagues and others on the campus as well. Without exception the knowledge of their new country was immeasurably enriched by their experiences at the black institutions despite, or perhaps because of, the poor conditions they sometimes encountered.

### **Future Plans**

The D.C. Community Humanities Council is funding a panel discussion on the topic of German-speaking refugee scholars at historically black institutions at Howard University on April 11, 1989. Participating scholars include myself, Russell L. Adams (Afro-American Studies Department, Howard University), Hartmut Lehmann (German Historical Institute), and Max Ticktin (Judaic Studies Department, George Washington University).

On April 21 I shall participate in a panel at the National Conference on Blacks in Higher Education, organized by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education.



## Appendix

The following list contains the names of German-speaking refugee scholars who taught at historically black institutions following their emigration to the United States after 1933. The list is organized by the institutions at which the refugee scholars taught. I ask that the names of any refugee scholars missing from my list be brought to my attention. If you have any information, please contact:

Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb  
German Historical Institute  
1759 R St. NW Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
Telephone: (202) 387-3355

### **List of German-speaking refugee scholars who taught at historically black institutions:**

#### *Atlanta University, Atlanta, GA:*

Ossip Flechtheim: History, Political Science; 1940–1943  
Hilda Weiss: German, Social Science; 1941–1943

#### *Bennet College, Greensboro, NC:*

Beate Berwin: German, Geography, Philosophy; 1942–1950

#### *Coppin State College, Baltimore, MD:*

Eric Fischer: Geography; 1965–1969

#### *Dillard University, New Orleans, LA:*

Georg Iggers: History; 1957–1963  
Wilma Iggers: French, German; 1957–1963

*Fisk University, Nashville, TN:*

Werner Cahnmann: Sociology; 1943–1945  
Elsbeth Einstein Treitel: German; 1943–1946  
Otto Treitel: Mathematics, Physics; 1943–1946

*Hampton Institute (now University), Hampton, VA:*

Margaret Altman: Animal Husbandry, Genetics, Biology; 1941–1956  
Peter Kahn: Art; 1953–1957  
Karla Longree: Home Economics; 1941–1950  
Ernst Lothar: Art; 1948–1950  
Marianne Lothar: German; 1948–1950  
Viktor Lowenfeld: Art; 1939–1946  
Hans Mahler: Music; 1941–1943  
Fritz Neumann: History; 1946–1947  
Anna Stein: Mathematics; 1942–1944

*Howard University, Washington, D.C.:*

Ernest L. Abrahamson: Romance Languages, Latin; 1939–1941  
Kurt Braun: Economics; 1943–1969  
Johann Caspari: German; 1946–1953  
Karl Darmstadter: German Language and Literature, Russian; 1945–1965  
John Hertz: Political Science; 1941–1943, 1948–1952  
Gerhard Ladner: Art History; 1951–1952  
Julius Ernst Lips: Anthropology; 1937–1939  
Erna Magnus: Social Work; 1947–1966  
Otto Nathan: Economics; 1946–1952  
Franz Julius Rapp: Art History; 1945–1951  
Hugo B. Schiff: Jewish Literature and Cultural History; 1943–1950  
Wolfgang Seiferth: German, Russian; 1937–1968  
Erika Thimey: Dance; 1944–1955

*Knoxville College, Knoxville, TN:*

Gerard M. Mertens: Chemistry, Romance Languages; 1957–1962

*LeMoyne-Owen College, Memphis, TN:*

Boris Alexander: Political Science, Economics; 1934–1939

*Lincoln University, Lincoln, PA:*

Walter Fales (Feilchenfeld): Philosophy; 1946–1953

Josef Herbert Furth: Economics, Sociology; 1939–1944

Simon Green (Gruenzweig): Mathematics; 1948–1950

*North Central University, Durham, NC:*

Adolf Furth: Chemistry; 1952–1962

Christa Furth: German; 1961–1962

Ernst Manasse: German, Latin, Philosophy; 1939–1973

Marianne Manasse: German; 1948–1949, 1956–1972

Hilda Weiss: Social Studies; 1940–1941

*Paine College, Augusta, GA:*

Simon D. Messing: Anthropology; 1956–1958

*Philander Smith College, Little Rock, AR:*

Simon Green (Gruenzweig): Mathematics; dates unknown

Georg Iggers: History; 1950–1956

Wilma Iggers: French, German; 1950–1956

*Spelman College, Atlanta, GA:*

Hilda Weiss: Social Studies; 1941–1943

*Saint Augustine College, Raleigh, NC:*

Adolf Furth: Chemistry; dates unknown

Christa Furth: German; dates unknown

*Talladega College, Talladega, AL:*

Gustav Ichheiser: Social Psychology, Economics; 1944–1948

Herman Kranold: Economics; 1936–1943

Gerard M. Mertens: Chemistry; 1952–1953

Fritz Pappenheim: German, Economics; 1944–1952

Lore May Rasmussen: Elementary Education; 1949–1955

*Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, MS:*

Ernst Borinski: Sociology; 1947–1983

*West Virginia State College, Institute, WV:*

Frederick Lehner: French, German; 1939–1961

*Xavier University, New Orleans, LA:*

Katherine Radke: Social Service (Director, School of); 1935–1938

Wolfgang Johann Weilgarth: German; 1945–1949

Erwin Wexberg: Social Psychiatry; 1936–1940

## **B. Catherine Epstein**

### **Project: "German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933"**

The project "German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933" will record all historians who emigrated to the United States as a result of Hitler's policies. The research will be presented in a catalogue which will document the lives and works of the refugee historians. This catalogue will consist of biographical information on the historians, complete bibliographies of their books and articles, and listings of the locations of their archival papers.

In keeping with recent trends in emigration history, I intend to document not only the famous émigrés who made important contributions to the study of history in the United States, but also those individuals who, although involved with the historical profession before and/or after their emigration, are less well-known. Such an approach, which I call *Schicksalsgeschichte*, not only highlights the varieties of the emigration experience, but also gives a more accurate picture of the emigration of historians as a professional group. Beyond that, an effort to record the life stories of all refugee historians is good bookkeeping, and ultimately, a recognition of the hardship and displacement every historian, indeed every refugee, faced.

### **Scope of the Project**

The historians who are included in this catalogue are some eighty to a hundred "first generation" historians; a list of these historians is found in the appendix to this report. "First generation" individuals are those who came to the United States as adults after studying and working in the German-speaking parts of Central Europe. A study involving all "second generation" historians - those who left Germany as children or adolescents—would perhaps be more comprehensive, but the sheer numbers involved would change the focus of the catalogue. In particular, such a study would obfuscate the trials, tribulations and successes associated with the experience of emigration as an adult.

For the purposes of the catalogue, history has been defined fairly broadly. I am including historians of Jewish and other religions' histories, historians of economics and law, historians of medicine and other sci-

ences, and historians of Oriental and ancient peoples. However, I am not documenting the historians of art, literature and music.

The major criterion for including an historian in this study is that he or she had received a Ph.D., or *Promotion*, in some field at a German-speaking university prior to emigration. I have attached importance to the *Promotion* because it suggests that the individual concerned had some commitment to the historical or other profession. While a *Promotion* in history by no means ensured an academic career in Central Europe, it was a first step towards professionalization, and as such opened some and closed other career paths. The same is true of those individuals who held advanced degrees in fields other than history; for them, becoming professional historians in the United States entailed a caesura in their professional lives. Thus, possession of a doctoral degree, often suggesting professional specialization, meant that the adult emigrating to the United States would almost certainly face professional upheaval.

Using the *Promotion* as a formal criterion has proved rather useful; I know of only a very few individuals who may belong in this study who did not have German or Austrian Ph.D.s. Several other individuals who were born about the same time as those in my study but who received their formal training in the United States can easily be incorporated into work on "second generation" refugee historians.

In studying the transfer of knowledge—a popular topic among those involved in emigration studies—using the criterion of a Ph.D. is also helpful: a *Doktor* meant perhaps a more thorough immersion in the academic milieu of Pre-World War II Central Europe. Those refugees who completed higher degrees in Central Europe experienced and reacted differently to American academia than those émigrés who received their formal training in history here.

To be included in the catalogue, a historian must have immigrated to the United States by 1950. Although many individuals were unable to come to the United States before 1945, by 1950 those who wished to come and belonged to the 1933 wave of migration had managed to do so. Thereafter, as before 1933, the immigration of German-speaking historians to the United States was primarily due to economic or career motivations, rather than to anti-semitic or political harassment.

So far I have also included those individuals who received Ph.D.s in history in Germany, but who then did not, for whatever reasons, pursue professional careers in history in the United States. Individuals who fall

into this category are the most difficult to trace, since it is virtually impossible to find them in any systematic way. At this time, I know of a number of individuals who fall into this category, but there are almost certainly many, many more. I have not yet decided to what extent such individuals will be documented in the catalogue.

### **Progress of Project**

I began work on this project in December, 1987. During 1988 I collected published documentation on the refugee historians, compiled my present list of historians, and did some of the library work necessary to prepare bibliographies of the works of the refugee historians. In order to find the names of refugee historians, I worked through lists of displaced scholars, biographical dictionaries, and lists of refugee scholars which other students of the emigration have compiled. I also commenced a large correspondence with the families of refugee historians, the institutions at which the refugee historians taught, and various archives to collect information on the refugee historians, and in particular, to determine the locations of their archival papers. Although most of the research has been done in Washington area libraries, I have also visited the Research Foundation for Jewish Immigration and the Leo Baeck Institute in New York City, the archives at SUNY Albany, and libraries in West Berlin.

I hope that the publication of the list of historians at the end of this report will bring me the names of a few more historians. I will then complete the gathering of information and finish bibliographical work on the historians. I hope that in the last months of 1989 work can begin on the final presentation—on the actual catalogue—of my research findings.

### **Research Results**

To date my research has highlighted three aspects of the emigration of historians: the diversity of the refugee historians, the career patterns of the émigré historians, and the opportunities which the American historical profession offered to refugees.

My research suggests that the "first generation" of refugee historians in the United States constituted a larger and more diverse group of individuals than originally thought. Who the refugee historians were, where and what they taught, their career patterns, the levels of professional success

they attained, their every-day lives, in short, their *Schicksale*, differed tremendously. The refugee historians who left Germany and Austria after 1933 surely were not all Friedrich Meinecke students who later enjoyed great professional success in the United States. On the contrary, a large number of refugee historians lived out their lives in small town college communities, without much recognition from the historical profession. The compilation of the life stories of all the refugee historians brings to light the variety of their experiences in the emigration; it also shows the variety of environments in which these émigrés exerted some influence.

Although there are many "classical" cases of historians who emigrated from Central Europe and continued their profession here, there are at least as many cases of individuals who underwent career changes and became professional historians only in the United States. This suggests that the effects of emigration in and of itself on the lives and careers of those who migrated must be studied. On another level, however, the many cases of career changes indicate that the issue of loss and gain, generally posed as a zero-sum game of what German scholarship lost, American scholarship gained, must be rethought. The academic emigration of historians, at least, was more complicated than a simple loss/gain dichotomy. What Germany or Austria lost differed from what the United States gained. Thus, for example, where Germany lost a journalist or Austria a lawyer, the United States gained historians with backgrounds in journalism or law. The compilation of the life stories of historians shows that the emigration quite dramatically affected the *Schicksale*, or lives and careers, of those involved; this, in turn, affected what the émigrés brought to their new country.

Finally, the teaching of history seems to have been a small, yet nonetheless significant "catch-all" profession for refugees in the United States, especially after World War II. Some lawyers and journalists, who had particularly difficult times finding work in the United States, turned to the teaching of history. In addition, some individuals, unable to teach history in Central Europe because of their Jewish origins or their political leanings, became professional historians in the United States. Finally, some individuals who had taught history at the secondary school level and some who had been on the fringes of the historical profession in Central Europe became professors of history here.

The American historical profession provided career opportunities to many refugees, both historians and those of other professions, for a variety of reasons. In the late 1940s, when the G.I. Bill provided funds for



war veterans to go to college, many academic jobs opened up. History positions thus became available to qualified émigrés. The new "World-power" role which the United States took on demanded that Americans have a broader education in European and other histories. Since European and some other specialized histories were not strong points of the American educational system, small colleges needed to find persons outside of traditional American academic channels to teach European history. In addition, because the college system was less rigid in the United States, individuals who hadn't been academics previously were given jobs in history. Finally, the awe with which many Americans viewed the German educational system no doubt helped many well-educated refugees, who were not professional historians, nonetheless fill college and university jobs in history.

## **Summary**

The catalogue "German-Speaking Refugee Historians in the United States after 1933" will not only document the lives of the refugee historians and confirm the research results presented above, but will also provide a foundation for the further study of the refugee historians. The listings of the location(s) of the archival papers of each of the historians will facilitate scholars' research. In addition, the bibliographies of the historians' works will serve as a starting point for analyses of the refugee historians' scholarly influence, not only on the study of German and other histories in the United States, but through their books and articles, on the study of history generally. The catalogue will also be the first to document an entire professional group in the emigration, and as such should serve scholars of the academic and professional emigration from Central Europe after 1933.

## **Appendix**

The following list of refugee historians is a list of those historians whom I know enough about to be fairly certain that they belong in this catalogue; the list also contains the names of those individuals who received Ph.D.s in history in Central Europe, but who did not teach history in the United States. I would particularly appreciate any information on those historians whose names are preceded by an asterix (\*). In addition, I ask that the

names of any refugee historians missing from my list be brought to my attention. If you have any information, please contact:

Catherine Epstein  
German Historical Institute  
1759 R St. NW Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
Telephone: (202) 387-3355

**List of German-speaking refugee historians who emigrated to the United States after 1933:**

Erwin Ackerknecht (1906–1988)

Paul Julius Alexander (1910–1977)

\*Berthold Altmann (1902– )

Hans Baron (1900–1988)

Adolf Berger (1882–1962)

Elias Joseph Bickerman (1897–1981)

Rosi Bodenheimer (1900– )

\*Ernst Breisacher (1889–deceased, date unknown)

Eberhard Friedrich Bruck (1877–1960)

John Hans Buchsbaum (1910–) Fritz Caspari (1914– )

Frederick Henry Cramer (1906–1954)

Hermann Dicker (1914– )

Henry Gustav Dittmar (1913–)

Andreas Dorpalen (1911–1982)  
Ludwig Edelstein (1902–1965)  
Ismar Elbogen (1874–1943)  
Friedrich Engel-Janosi (1893–1978)  
Fritz Theodor Epstein (1898–1979)  
Eric Fischer (1898–1985)  
Aron Freimann (1871–1948)  
Robert Friedmann (1891–1970)  
Frederick Ernest Gaupp (1897–1979)  
Dietrich Gerhard (1896–1985)  
Alexander Gerschenkron (1909–1978)  
Felix Gilbert (1905– )  
Rudolf Glanz (1892–1978)  
Frederick Hahn (1906– )  
George Wolfgang Hallgarten (1901–1975)  
\*Emmy Heller (1886–1956)  
Frederick Gotthold Heymann (1900–1983)  
Elisabeth Feist Hirsch (1904– )  
Felix Edward Hirsch (1902–1982)  
Hajo Holborn (1902–1969)  
Ernest I. Jacob (1899–1974)  
Robert A. Kann (1906–1981)

Ernst Hartwig Kantorowicz (1895–1963)

Eckart Kehr (1902–1933)

Guido Kisch (1889–1985)

Adolf Kober (1879–1958)

Hans Kohn (1891–1971)

Eric C. Kollman (1903–1981)

Paul Oskar Kristeller (1905–)

Erik Ritter von Kuehnelt-Leddihn (1909–)

Stephan George Kuttner (1907–)

Gerhart M.A.B. Ladner (1905–)

Carl Landauer (1891–1983)

Richard Albrecht Laqueur (1881–1959)

Edith Lenel (1909–)

Adolf Friedrich Leschnitzer (1899–1980)

Ernst Levy (1881–1968)

\*Paul von Lilienfeld-Toal (1897–)

Charlotte Littauer-Blaschke (1897–)

Alfred David Low (1913–)

Christian Wilhelm Mackauer (1897–1970)

Otto J. Maenchen-Helfen (1894–1969)

Golo Mann (1909–)

Gerhard Masur (1901–1975)

Franz Henry Michael (1907– )  
Carl Misch (1896–1965)  
Theodor E. Mommsen (1905–1958)  
Otto Eduard Neugebauer (1899– )  
\*Fritz C. Neumann (1897– )  
Peter Hans Olden (1905– )  
Heinz (Henry Maximilian) Pachter (1907–1980)  
Ernst M. Posner (1892–1980)  
Fritz Leonhard Redlich (1892–1978)  
Harms Günther Reissner (1902–1977)  
Werner Richter (1888–1969)  
Edgar Robert Rosen (1911– )  
Arthur Rosenberg (1889–1943)  
Hans Willibald Rosenberg (1904–1988)  
Eugen Rosenstock-Huussy (1888–1973)  
Hans Rothfels (1891–1976)  
Richard Salomon (1884–1966)  
\*Franz Schehl (1898– )  
Charlotte Sempell (1909– )  
Erika Spivakovsky (1909– )  
Selma Stern-Täubler (1890–1981)  
Raphael Straus (1887–1947)

Bruno Strauss (1889–1969)  
Eugen Täubler (1879–1953)  
George Urdang (1882–1960)  
Alfred Hermann Friedrich Vagts (1892–1986)  
Veit Valentin (1885–1947)  
Luitpold Wallach (1910–deceased, date unknown)  
Martin Albert Weinbaum (1902– )  
Bernard Dov Weinryb (1905–1982)  
Helene Wieruszowski (1893–1978)  
Hellmut Wilhelm (1905–)  
Mark Wischnitzer (1882–1955)  
Arnold Aharon Wiznitzer (1899–1972)  
Hans Julius Wolff (1902–deceased, date unknown)  
Sergius O. Yakobson (1901–1979)

### C. Sibylle Quack

#### **Project: "Women in the Emigration: A Contribution to the Social History of German-Jewish Immigrant Women in New York after 1933"**

In the past few years West German research on exile and emigration has changed. For many years, research projects focussed on elites: on elite politicians, authors, artists and academics. The circumstances of notable refugees from Nazi Germany and other European countries were studied, and their contributions to literature, the arts, and sciences were analyzed. However, many scholars now seek to integrate the special experiences of refugees of the thirties and forties into the more general context of immigration, assimilation, and acculturation in host countries. There are new studies on immigrants in different professions and countries. At the same time, the term *Emigrationsforschung* has begun to supersede *Exilforschung*. Researchers no longer focus solely on the period 1933–1945 but have broadened their studies to include the emigration, immigration or re-migration after 1945.

When I started my research project in 1986, I had two goals: first, to locate the experiences of German-Jewish immigrant women after 1933—taking New York as an example; second, to contribute to the study of *Alltagsgeschichte*. I wanted my study to deal with the lives of "average people," and I wanted to learn about those women who had not been able to write about their emigration experiences in novels, articles, or memoirs. However, I have not ignored published or unpublished books or articles by women authors. On the contrary, these written materials have been very helpful for my study.

I have tried to include immigrant women from all social classes, occupations, levels of education, and family situations. I wanted to learn about immigrant women's relationships with their husbands, children and mothers, and I wanted to find out whether women played a specific role in the emigration and immigration. Their process of acculturation is also a part of my study.

I soon recognized that research on the emigration from Nazi Germany showed a pattern similar to other areas of history: it is taken for granted that the experiences of men and male perspectives can be applied everywhere. To be sure, there is literature on outstanding women such as Hannah Arendt, but literature on women is the exception. Emigration research has single-mindedly neglected women. To focus on them and to

ask about their fate, however, is no side aspect or fragment of the emigration; it promises a totally new inside look into the emigration in general. My focus illuminates the everyday lives of women and men driven out of Germany to other countries by Hitler after 1933. My inquiry emphasizes the situation of refugee families. This is important, because the emigration was a migration of families, often including several generations. My study shows what characterized the daily life of the German-Jewish emigration; what kinds of difficulties, problems, and demands the émigrés faced. It describes the assumptions with which refugee women came to the United States and how, with these assumptions, they confronted difficulties brought on by the emigration. My work documents the decisive role women played in their families' survival during the first years of emigration and immigration and shows what strategies women employed in this effort.

The two goals referred to above are interrelated. Studies concerned with the history of women necessarily deal with everyday life, far more than those in which the subjects are men. Researchers in women's history commonly face difficulties in finding traces of women—even when the events occurred only fifty years ago. For instance, *The International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Émigrés 1933–1945* contains thousands of biographies, but there are many fewer biographies of women than of men. Women are mostly found in their husbands' biographies and their names are frequently not listed in the indexes. Needless to say, I had to find other sources. All "subjective sources" were helpful: personal papers, letters, unpublished and published memoirs, autobiographies, biographies, and, last but not least, interviews. I had decided early on to work not only with archival material but also to make full use of interviews. I not only found interviews in oral history collections, but also did many myself.

The *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* supported my project for two years, 1987–1989. During this time I worked in several archives in West Germany and in the United States. I advertised in *Aufbau* (New York) for interview subjects. Thirty women responded, saying they would like to talk with me. Eventually I had to set some limits on my study. I have already noted that I chose to emphasize the experience of women immigrants in New York. I also decided to focus mainly on Jewish women, although I am not entirely excluding the experiences of Gentile refugee women. An interesting question is whether there were differences in how Jewish and non-Jewish women were treated in the United States and whether they underwent different processes of acculturation.



I could not examine women who emigrated from parts of Central Europe other than Germany or those women who immigrated after 1945. I decided to include only women who were born between 1875 and 1921. Thus, at least two generations of mothers and daughters are included. Age proved important in terms of a woman's background in Germany, as well as in the process of acculturation in the United States. Naturally, I was unable to interview the older generation (my oldest interview partner was born in 1895), but sometimes I could find their memoirs in archives. In addition, certain questions in my interviews asked for daughters' views of their mothers.

One of the most important sources for my study was the Leo Baeck Institute in New York, where I found a large number of unpublished memoirs, diaries, and letters written by women émigrés. Some papers contained very interesting material concerning living conditions of German-Jewish women before and after their emigration. But despite these excellent sources, I still had to collect information on the lives of female immigrants who had not written anything and whose papers were unavailable for research. Here the archives of refugee aid organizations were extremely important. I found much information in the archives of organizations which had existed long before 1933, such as the *National Council of Jewish Women*, as well as those established by the German-speaking emigration after 1933.

The records of *Selfhelp of Émigrés from Central Europe*, a refugee aid organization founded by Paul Tillich, Else and Hans Staudinger, Toni Stolper and others in New York in 1936, which is still a large social agency, show how women organized all refugee aid and reconstruction in the first years. For instance, in 1939 thirty-seven women and six men worked for *Selfhelp*. They advised newly arrived refugees, helped them to find apartments and English lessons and above all, they provided jobs, mostly in domestic work, for women. The records clearly show that in those years *Selfhelp* was essentially an employment service for women. It was also much harder for men to find jobs, although it was not unusual for married couples to get jobs together as domestics.

The archives of the New York Section of the *Council of Jewish Women* further support the view that the hard and often degrading labor of women was the chief means of support for families in the early years of immigration, a period of great instability.

Thanks to the records of *Selfhelp*, the Council of Jewish Women, and the National Refugee Service preserved at the YIVO Institute for Jewish Re-

search in New York, it was possible to learn about émigré conditions not otherwise documented.

In general I have not been permitted to work with personal case files for legal reasons. Nevertheless, I have had access to general business records of most of the refugee aid organizations. I worked with the minutes of committee meetings, correspondence, statistical materials and sociological studies undertaken by the organizations. The material offered sufficient information so that I could draw conclusions about the economic, psychological, health, and social situation of women refugees.

Another revealing source of information was interviews with members, past and present, of refugee aid organizations, or with women active in organizations with specific aims such as *Blue Card*, which specialized in the collecting of funds for refugees, or *Help and Reconstruction*, which established daycare centers and summer camps for refugee children. These organizations are still active in New York, but the circle of the needy has changed. I intend to conduct further interviews with women members of organizations such as *New World Club* and the women's group of *Aufbau*.

The collection of interviews with prominent members of the German-speaking immigrant community in New York done by Herbert Strauss and others has been helpful. The interviews are kept at the *American Federation of Jews from Central Europe*. There are several other oral history collections. Some are not well known; for example, the Holocaust collections of the Yeshiva University Museum and the Queensborough Community Center, both initiated and carried out by students, have interesting holdings.

My own interviews with women immigrants, the "heart" of my work, continues. I have developed a survey of 29 questions regarding family history, childhood, youth, education, and mother-daughter relations. I ask my interview partners about their occupations and their situations prior to emigration. I then ask about flight paths, living and working conditions in the first countries of exile, and the first years in New York. My interviews contain questions on attitudes and feelings, problems of language and identity, religion, political perspectives, views on Germany today, and travel and contacts in Germany after 1945. I then ask about the life situations of children and grandchildren. I end my interviews asking the women how they think their lives would have looked if Hitler had not come to power—a speculative question, but one which often brings forth interesting opinions.

I wish to interview as large and heterogeneous a group of women as possible. But I do not think highly of interviews confined to a single meeting, since they threaten to degenerate into interrogations, and so I have had to limit the number of my interviewees. It takes several meetings to create trust between the interviewee and the interviewer; this trust frees processes of thought and memory. Matters once forgotten may be recalled. Dialogue and readiness to communicate must be developed over time. One must remember that the material evokes painful experiences.

Some of my interview partners have become friends; to all my interviewees I wish to express my profound gratitude.

My work will continue for some time, and so I would be thankful for any and all references concerning my subject. All manuscripts, memoirs, diaries, and letters of women forced to leave Germany during the Nazi period are of great interest to me.

## IV. GHI Library Report

**Gaby Müller-Oelrichs**

### **Holdings on Emigration**

A collection of books and periodicals on the German-speaking emigration after 1933 is currently being developed in the German Historical Institute's library. We intend to have a substantial collection of memoirs, monographs, reference works, and periodicals published in German and English on the emigration from Central Europe. We are interested in primary and secondary works on the academic and professional emigration, on the German-Jewish and the political emigration, and on the emigration to the United States as well as to other parts of the world. We are not, however, collecting works of fiction by exiled authors; these works are easily found in many American libraries.

Our library already has most of the standard monographs on the academic and professional emigration. In addition, our reference collection on the emigration includes all standard reference handbooks such as the *International Biographical Dictionary of Central European Émigrés 1933–1945* (edited by Herbert A. Strauss et al, 1980–1983), *Jewish Immigrants of the Nazi Period in the USA* (edited by Herbert A. Strauss, 1978–1986), and *Guide to the Archival Materials of the German-Speaking Emigration to the United States after 1933* (John Spalek, 1978). We also have less common reference works such as *Expatriation Lists as Published in the "Reichsanzeiger" 1933–1945* (edited by Michael Hepp, 1985–1988), and *Handbook of the German Exile Press 1933–1945* (Liselotte Maas, 1976–1981).

We have the following periodicals concerned with the German-speaking emigration: *Aufbau* (1989–), *Exil* (1985–), *Exilforschung* (1983– ), *Yearbook of the Leo Baeck Institute* (1974–), and the *Simon Wiesenthal Center Annual* (1984–).

In the future, because of the German Historical Institute's particular interest in refugee historians, we intend to collect all works published by the refugee historians both before and after their emigration. This collection is still in the planning stages; we are interested in buying such works from private collectors.

Starting in 1990, the German Historical Institute's library will be part of the Interlibrary Loan System, and it will be possible to borrow books from the Institute not available in local libraries. For further questions on the Institute's collections, please contact Ms. Gaby Müller-Oelrichs at (202) 387-3355.

## V. Institute News

### A. New Staff Members

**Jacqueline Taylor-Freckmann**, copy-editor and assistant librarian, left the GHI-USA in January, 1989.

Four staff members have joined the Institute since November, 1988:

**Winfried Haubold**, Administrator, born 1935 in Leipzig, Germany; studied Administration at the Federal Academy for Public Administration, 1963–1965; Administrative Officer, Ministry of Defense, Bonn, 1963–1974, 1977–1984; Administrative Officer, Consulate General of the Federal Republic of Germany, Rio de Janeiro, 1975–1977; Administrative Officer, German Military Administrative Agency USA/Canada, Washington, D.C. 1984–1989; with the GHI-USA since February, 1989.

**Gerit Lewis**, Receptionist, born in Bütow, Germany; studied English and Spanish, University of Heidelberg, 1957–1959; came to United States, 1960; Teacher and Translator, Berlitz School, Wellesley, MA, 1981–1982; completed Introduction to Computer Science, Massachusetts Bay Community College, Wellesley, MA, 1983; with the GHI-USA since April, 1989.

**Luzie Nahr**, Assistant Librarian, born in Alsfeld, Germany; Nursing degree, University of Giessen, 1966; Staff nurse, Bürgerspital, Basel, Switzerland, 1967–1968; came to United States, 1973; B.A. Modern Languages and Linguistics, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, 1987; Receptionist, GHI-USA, November-March, 1988–1989; Assistant Librarian GHI-USA since April, 1989.

**Sibylle Quack**, Research Fellow, born in Gießen, West Germany, 1951; studied political science, sociology, philosophy and German literature at the universities of Gießen, Berlin and Hannover. *Staatsexamen*, Hannover, 1975; *Dr. phil.*, Hannover, 1982. Since 1979 employed as a senior civil servant at the Press and Information Office of the Federal Republic

of Germany (currently on leave). Fellowship from the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* to complete research for *Habilitation*, 1987–1989. Research in New York City, 1987–1988. At GHI-USA since February, 1989. Current Research: German-Jewish Immigrant Women in the United States after 1933.

Main publication: *Geistig frei und niemandes Knecht. Paul Levi - Rosa Luxemburg. Politische Arbeit und persönliche Beziehung*. Mit 50 unveröffentlichten Briefen, Köln, 1983.

Editor of Luxemburg Letters: *Internationale Wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, West Berlin, H.2,1987.

Articles on the German labor movement and on the West German women's movement. Member of the *Gesellschaft für Exilforschung/Society for Exile Studies*.

## **B. New Scholarship Recipients**

### **Johannes-Heinrich Jansen**

Topic: "Der NATO-Beitritt der Bundesrepublik Deutschland." Doctoral Advisor: Professor Marie-Luise Recker, University of Münster.

### **Thomas Müller**

Topic: "Der Aufbau der lutheranischen Kirche in Pennsylvania." Doctoral Advisor: Professor Hermann Wellenreuther, University of Göttingen.

### **Thomas Welskopp**

Topic: "Kooperationsformen, Qualifikationsstrukturen und Sozialbeziehungen in Betrieben der U.S. Eisen- und Stahlindustrie von den 1860er Jahren bis in die 1930er Jahre." Doctoral Advisor: Professor Jürgen Kocka, Free University of Berlin.

## **C. Upcoming Events in the Washington Area**

For information on the times and locations of the following events, please call the German Historical Institute: (202) 387-3355.

### **1. Annual Lecture**

On November 1, 1989 the annual lecture will be delivered by Kathleen Conzen (University of Chicago).

### **2. Spring Lecture Series 1989**

February 9: Volker Berghahn, Brown University: Germany and America - The Industrial Connection 1918-1970.

March 2: Jane Caplan, Bryn Mawr College: Profession as Vocation: The Plan of Bureaucracy in Germany in the 19th and 20th Centuries.

March 16: Deborah Hertz, State University of New York, Binghamton: The Meaning of Conversion in the German-Jewish Past.

April 14: Geoffrey Eley, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor: *Sammlungspolitik* Revisited: Conservatism, Popular Politics and the German Right 1860-1933.

May 9: Mack Walker, Johns Hopkins University: The Salzburg Protestant Exiles: Text and Context.

June 1: Ronnie Po-Chia Hsia, University of Massachusetts at Amherst: Religious and Ethnic Minorities in the 16th and 17th Century German Society.

### **3. Other Events**

As a contribution to the Bicentennial of Georgetown University, the Institute will sponsor a one-day conference on April 25, 1989, on "Catholicism and Politics in Nineteenth Century Germany and America." Speakers will be Professors Ellen Evans (Georgia State University), Michael F. Holt (University of Virginia), and Hartmut Lehmann (German Historical Institute).



On May 23, 1989 the German Historical Institute will commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the signing of the Basic Law of the Federal Republic of Germany. The speakers will be Professors Gordon Craig (Stanford University) and Peter Graf Kielmansegg (University of Mannheim).

#### **D. Upcoming Conferences**

The *Grundgesetz* of 1949: A Reappraisal after Forty Years. Sponsored by the Center for West European Studies, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; the German Marshall Fund, Washington, D.C.; Goethe House, New York; and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C. Conveners: Thomas Childers (University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia) and Peter Krüger (University of Marburg). Philadelphia, April 6–9, 1989.

Genoa/Rapallo and the Reconstruction of Europe 1922. Sponsored by the Association International d'Histoire Contemporaine de l'Europe and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C. Convener: Carole Fink (University of North Carolina, Wilmington). Washington, D.C., June 15–17, 1989.

American Policy Towards Germany, 1949–1955. Sponsored by the History Department, University of Marburg and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C. Conveners: Jeffry M. Diefendorf (University of New Hampshire, Durham) and Hermann Josef Rupieper (University of Marburg). Marburg, September 26–28, 1989.

Emigration and Settlement Patterns of German Communities in North America. Sponsored by the German Department, Indiana University, the Indiana German Heritage Society, the Society for German-American Studies, and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C. New Harmony, Indiana, September 28 – October 1, 1989.

Women in Post-War Germany: Culture, Society, and Politics. Sponsored by DAAD; North Carolina Humanities Council; North Carolina State University, Raleigh; German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C. Raleigh, North Carolina, September 30 – October 1, 1989.

1949–1989: The Federal Republic as History. Sponsored by the Center for European Studies, Harvard University, and the German Historical Institute, Washington, D.C. Cambridge, Massachusetts, October 27–29, 1989.

At the 1989 German Studies Association Conference (October 5–8), the German Historical Institute will sponsor the panel "New Research on the German Academic Emigration: Historians, Political Scientists and Germanists in the United States after 1933." Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 7, 1989.

## **E. Scholarships**

The Institute offers scholarships to doctoral students working on topics related to the Institute's general scope of interest. Applications should be sent to the Director with the following information:

- curriculum vitae
- study plan, including research proposal, time frame, and locations in the United States where research is to be carried out
- letter of recommendation from the doctoral advisor

Americans applying for these scholarships should be working on German history topics for which they need to evaluate source material located in the United States.

Copies of the *German-American Scholarship Guide for Historians and Social Scientists* are available from the German Historical Institute. The *Guide*, compiled by Jürgen Heideking, Anne Hope, and Ralf Stegner, includes information on some 93 scholarships, 56 of which provide funding for United States residents.

## F. Miscellaneous

Copies of the 1987 annual lectures by Bernard Bailyn and Heinrich August Winkler are available from the German Historical Institute free of charge. Copies of the 1988 annual lecture by Carl Degler, and comments on his lecture by Marshall Hyatt and Barbara Duden, should be available by the end of May.

The Volkswagen Foundation has given the German Historical Institute a grant for two related programs. One program will introduce American historians to archives in the Federal Republic and in West-Berlin. The other will allow American historians to familiarize themselves with German archives and libraries, and to learn German script at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel. Both programs will begin in the summer of 1990 and are funded for three years. Details will be announced in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

Willi Paul Adams and Wolfgang J. Helbich compiled and edited the *Directory of European Historians of North America* in 1987. The *Directory* includes the addresses, publications, and research in progress of European historians of North America. It is available from the John F. Kennedy-Institut für Nordamerikastudien, Freie Universität Berlin, Lansstr. 5–9, D – 1000 Berlin 33.