



The Importance of Knowing Greek

Reflections on Immigration and the Philosophy of Transferable Values

Inessa Medzhibovskaya

Dedicated to the bright memory
of Ágnes Heller (1929–2019)
and Ann Snitow (1943–2019).

Love extends to all people in the *civitas Dei*,
just as interdependence extended equally to
all in the *civitas terrena*. This love makes
human relations definite and explicit.
—Arendt, *Love and St. Augustine*¹

1.

In 1934–1935, two young Jewish Germans, a woman and a man, filled out an identical questionnaire distributed by the Emergency Community for German Scholars Abroad (Die Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland). She was twenty-eight, and he was thirty-one years old. They were acquainted but not close. Each held a doctorate in philosophy—she from Heidelberg University with a dissertation on St. Augustine, published in 1929, and he from Goethe University Frankfurt with a dissertation on Husserl, completed in 1924.² Even though he was a mere Privatdozent, thanks to his Marxist studies in the new field of the sociology of music, the young man was already well established in the intellectual circles of his hometown, Frankfurt.³ Indeed, these essays had earned him increasing prominence at the city's new Institute for Social Research. Despite his professed Marxism, he lived comfortably off his family's substantial means and was even hoping to marry soon, notwithstanding his lack of a stable salary (see AB 55–60).⁴ The young woman, meanwhile, who was originally from Lower Saxony, had studied

ontology and theology at the University of Marburg and the University of Freiburg before finishing her degree at Heidelberg University.⁵ In the same year as she received her doctorate, she married Günther Stern, an aspiring philosopher of music, and they relocated to Frankfurt from the intellectually licentious Berlin where they had begun their relationship (HA 78). In Frankfurt, Stern's non-sociological and apolitical account of music met with the opprobrium of the aforementioned Marxist star, and the two young philosophers resolved to never cross paths again (see HA 80).⁶ This was especially startling to Stern's new wife, since, despite her aversion to various Marxisms, she *had* to write and publish for a living.

The reader has surely guessed that the young woman was Hannah Arendt (Arendt-Stern at the time) and the young man was Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno. The five years that passed between when these two young philosophers first met in 1929 and when they both filled in the aforementioned questionnaire were a time of busy scholarly maturation for both (see HA 77–110; and AB 150–5). Adorno had made notable contributions to the *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*. Meanwhile, before her return to Berlin in 1930 and eventual separation from Stern,⁷ Arendt had delved deeper and deeper into the study of German romantic philosophy (see HA 68) and the life of Rahel Varnhagen.⁸

The great Protestant theologian Paul Tillich knew, and was fond of, these two young talents, even though they were both practically irreligious. Indeed, Arendt and Adorno were assimilated to the secular intellectual context of their time, the difference being that he downplayed the effect of his Jewish 'difference' on his work (see AB 93–4), whereas she highlighted it (see HA 80–2, 164, 241).⁹ But after January 1933, with the relentless implementation of Aryan and other National Socialist laws in Germany, the *venia legendi* of these two Jewish scholars became effectively forfeited. While Tillich was swiftly hired by Union Theological Seminary in New York City, in November 1933,¹⁰ his Jewish protégés were less well known in Germany and had practically no international reputation. The questionnaire that the two filled out—she from Paris where she had fled with her mother via Prague and Geneva, and he from Oxford University where he found himself enrolled through the support of some of his rich relatives in London—was a means to solicit something concrete for their futures, even if their prospective new homes and jobs would come at the expense of a change in the language in which they would both have to write from then on, not to mention a change of continent.

My aim in this essay is not to recap the well-known facts about Arendt's and Adorno's lives or to juxtapose their clearly different reactions to the conditions of their new life in America in the form of a Twainian parable of the "good" and "bad" immigrant.¹¹ The modest role of this essay is,

indeed, not to dig up new historical documents to add controversy to the diametrically opposed approaches to conducting life and practicing philosophy that these biographies reveal: the engaged and forward-oriented *vita activa* in her case, and the “damaged life” of negative dialectics in his.¹² Instead, the purpose of these reflections is to summarize and interpret my impressions of reading the personal files of Arendt, Adorno, and numerous other refugee intellectuals that were submitted to rescue agencies working with displaced scholars, writers, artists, and thinkers on the eve of, and during, the Second World War. It did not make sense for these refugees to insist on their ‘otherness.’ Indeed, as we shall see, some of the bureaucrats reading the files of these refugees believed that it did not behoove refugees to present themselves as different, as this might undermine their appeal to potentially adoptive countries. But what catches the eye as one reads the files is the steadiness of the mutual support among these refugees despite the scarcity of available funds and the terrible personal tribulations that many of them suffered. We also notice their high-minded reliance on classical exemplars of nobility and courage, and their loyalty to ἀλήθεια during these catastrophic years. What is equally striking is their command of Greek and Latin, which, for many of these refugees, went without saying, and which contrasted with what many of them admitted to be an infelicitous grasp of English.¹³

The previously unexamined documents that I will discuss in this essay were discovered within the non-grantee section of the archives of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars, held at the Manuscripts and Archives Division of The New York Public Library (NYPL).¹⁴ Both Adorno’s and Arendt’s applications in 1934–1935 were rejected, but here they were in excellent company. Alongside their rejected files at NYPL are the dossiers of the following scholars (along with the years of their applications): “Auerbach, Erich: 1934–1943”; “Berdiaev, Nikolai: 1940”; “Benjamin, W [sic]: 1934”; “Bettelheim, Bruno: 1939”; “Bloch, Marc Léopold Benjamin: 1940–1941”; “Broch, Hermann: 1940–1943”; “Kraus, Karl: 1934, 1938–1940”;¹⁴ “Huizinga, Johan: 1940”; “Löwenthal, Leo: 1939”; “Löwith, Karl: 1933–1936, 1939–1942”; “Piscator, Erwin: 1934, 1940”; “Wunderlich, Frieda: 1933–1937, 1940–1944”; “Zadkine, Ossip: 1941–1942.”¹⁵ Reading the very long list of rejected applications, which includes many other illustrious names, creates a profound sense of painful bewilderment, not least because several of these scholars lost their lives during the War.¹⁶ However, most—albeit not all—of the scholars whose applications for funding were unsuccessful found other ways to support their writing and teaching during this period. Among those assisted by the Emergency Committee were Martin Buber, Richard Courant, Kurt Gödel, Thomas Mann, Roman Jakobson, Adorno’s friend Herbert Marcuse, and Ferdinand Bruckner.¹⁷

The massive humanitarian crisis at many of the world's borders today, and at the United States' borders in particular, offers no clear prospect of being resolved by political measures alone. The lessons we can learn today from the anguish of reading these old files are extremely edifying, and are not limited to the formats, contents, framing, and modes of self-presentation of these pleas for support from so many decades ago. We can also learn much from the interactions among the people involved in the emergency rescue of scholars for which decisions often needed to be made spontaneously, for which one could gain no training at the time, and which relied upon a general sense of professional preparedness, integrity, civic responsibility, and human readiness. On the occasion of the Centennial of The New School, the analysis of this archival trove is essential. This is not simply because 2019 is the year when we remember and honor the role that The New School played in the cause of the rescue of humanity and scholarship under the unparalleled directorship of Alvin Johnson—the founder of the University in Exile on October 1, 1933—but also because we are living in times when neither the right of human mobility nor the performance of the duty of humanistic scholarship are indisputably guaranteed or sufficiently promoted in the classroom. Before analyzing the files, let me say a few words about the agencies that administered these files and how the Emergency Committee and The New School were inextricably connected.

2.

As a result of the Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service, passed in Germany in April 1933, an estimated thirty-nine percent of the country's university faculty lost their jobs within the following five years, the number rising to forty-three percent in the humanities.¹⁸ A short month following the passing of this law, Stephen Duggan, the Director of the Institute of International Education (IIE), formed the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars, which was based at the Institute's existing address at 2 West 45th Street in New York City.¹⁹ Historians of the Emergency Committee agree that it saw its role "as a 'clearing house' operating as a go-between for universities, donors, émigré scholars, government institutions, and the public."²⁰ The Committee was not controlled by corporate or national security interests; rather, it was propelled by the extraordinary efforts of Duggan and his selfless colleague Betty Drury, the Executive Secretary. After outbreaks of new hostilities and the ongoing displacement of European scholars, the Committee changed its name in 1938 to the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars (RSL 7n.2).²¹ Duggan and Drury's book-long account detailing the activities of the Emergency Committee, which ceased opera-

tions only with the conclusion of the War in 1945, appeared three years later. Speaking of the men and women applicants in their charge, they wrote: “The hero of the book is the Displaced Scholar with his experiences during his exile and search for a place where he might again teach and pursue his researches” (RSL viii).²²

During the Second World War, the files held at the Emergency Committee in which we are interested were also handled by its domestic and international rescue counterparts: the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees Coming from Germany (1933–1936), of which James G. McDonald was Chair; the Emergency Society of German Scholars Abroad (Die Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland [NWA]); the Academic Assistance Council (AAC) in Great Britain; the American Christian Committee for Refugees; the Conference on Jewish Relations; the National Refugee Service; and the President’s Advisory Committee on Political Refugees (1938–1945), to name only the most important and active ones.²³ Since the Emergency Committee was a hub through which all the paperwork from the partner organizations across Europe and North America had to pass, I shall limit my purview to its papers held at the NYPL. Their collection of files is extraordinarily well preserved, thanks to Drury, who was truly the Emergency Committee’s chief administrative taskmistress. (All of her correspondence—letters and cables alike—included a pre-printed request: “Please address all communications to the Secretary” [EC 38.15 (16)]). The well-known List of Displaced Foreign Scholars, which was published with the support of the Rockefeller Foundation, was also shared among the aforementioned organizations, as were its updated versions.²⁴ This list was forwarded to Johnson every month of any calendar year, and its copies are preserved in boxes 148, 179, and 190 of the Emergency Committee papers (EC 148.1 [36–7], 179.10 [10–1, 14, 18], 190.8 [24]).

Johnson’s prompt involvement with the Emergency Committee from its inception, bound the history of the University in Exile to the core mission of the Emergency Committee, and is arguably the University’s greatest, most indisputable success story (see RSL 78–81). It is important to note that a mere six months separated the moment when Johnson’s University in Exile was launched (gaining momentum with every new semester as part of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science) and the passing of Hitler’s restoration law.²⁵ Johnson ascended to the very exclusive Executive Committee of the Emergency Committee in August 1940, thereby solidifying the University’s commitment to rescuing endangered scholars, and enabling him to do more (see EC 190.8 [1]; RSL 92). Endangered scholars and new academic immigrants without a home coveted receiving a notice stamped by the Graduate Faculty Placement

Bureau on a special form that Johnson instituted, which assured them of the receipt of their application (see, e.g., EC 148.4 [47]).

Johnson's signal contributions while on the Emergency Committee are too many to mention. Included among those contributions are the frameworks he created for the efficient management of individual cases, which involved his forwarding inquiries directly to members of the faculty, rather than deans and institutions. In a note from September 9, 1940, Johnson asks: "(1) How many scholars and teachers has your institution placed in our institutions of learning? (2) How many of them have been absorbed? (3) In which institution?" (EC 190.8 [4]). In a letter to Duggan on October 22, 1940, Johnson advises him of the undesirability of approaching presidents and deans of universities and colleges directly; he had been informed that one President Conant "has notified the departments that they should not take additional refugees" (EC 190.8 [10]). Johnson was involved in discussing an ultimately unrealized though intriguing plan to establish "University Centers for Eminent Displaced Scholars" (which he discussed with Duggan on January 13 and 15, 1941) (EC 190.8 [14–5]). He also excelled at keeping tabs on scholars who had started at The New School but moved on to other institutions. This is evidenced by the fact that, on October 31, 1941, Drury sent Johnson a list of seventeen such scholars, to thank him for his assistance (EC 190.8 [25]). Although not particularly famous, all of these scholars found employment at distinguished schools in the United States and Canada.

To understand how and why these successful placements were possible, it helps to look at their detailed dossiers, which were kept in perfect order by Johnson and his office.²⁶ This is how he put it in one of the hundreds, if not thousands, of letters and memos he wrote to Duggan over the years:

I am submitting herewith the material you will need for The New School part of the "blueprint" of our cooperative action to meet the crisis that has fallen upon European scholarship. I subjoin some suggestions as to the general set-up of the rescue work as a whole. (EC 179.10 [32])

The "general suggestions" appended on two leaves regarding a pledge to take in "an indefinite number" of refugee scholars, and give them *bona fide* teaching work for two years—guaranteed either at The New School or at another recommended organization—, indeed represent an excellent blueprint for academic cooperation and cultural sharing in any historical era or circumstance (EC 179.10 [33]). As a worst case scenario, Johnson mentions that "the number contemplated may involve a doubling of the courses offered by The New School." This, he notes, would be "no serious problem, as the educational field of the School is very elastic" (EC 179.10 [36]).

3.

Scholars, however, had a long way to go between first submitting an application to the Emergency Committee and when they received a decision. As a first step, the NWA would forward the questionnaire (the one that Arendt and Adorno filled out) to the attention of the individuals and agencies that could connect the questionnaire with the right applicant. The questions asked about standard biographical facts on the first page, but became more delicate and intrusive on pages 2 and 3, which were thus classified as “confidential.” To gain some understanding of the process that endangered scholars went through, it helps to see the questionnaire in full. Here is the first page, titled “General Information” (*Allgemeine Auskunft*):²⁷

Name

Permanent Address (*Dauernde Adresse*)

Rank (*Stand*)²⁸

Institution Where Last Position Held (*Wo waren Sie zuletzt angestellt?*)

Subject of Academic Activity (*Fach der akademischen Tätigkeit*)

Special Fields within Subject (*Spezialgebiete*)

Names and Addresses of References in Germany and Other Countries
(*Namen und Adressen von Referenzen in Deutschland und anderen Ländern*)²⁹

Date of Birth (*Geburtsdatum*)

Place of Birth (*Geburtsort*)

Nationality (*Staatsangehörigkeit*)

Are you married? (*Verheiratet?*)

Number of Dependent Children (*Anzahl der abhängigen Kinder*)

Ages of Dependent Children (*Alter der abhängigen Kindern*)

Other Dependents (*Andere von Ihnen abhängige Personen*)

Languages (*Welche Fremdsprachen*)

Speaking Knowledge (*können Sie sprechen?*)

Reading Knowledge (*können Sie lesen?*)

The second page of the questionnaire, which is headed “confidential information” (*Vertrauliche Auskunft*), is prefaced as follows: “For the use of committees dealing with the problem of displaced scholars” (*Für den Gebrauch der Komitees, welche sich mit den entlassenen Wissenschaftlern befassen*). Here are the questions in it:

Have you been officially dismissed? (*Sind Sie offiziell entlassen?*)

Grounds of dismissal (*Gründe der Entlassung*)

Date of Notification (*Datum der Benachrichtigung*)

Date of which dismissal becomes effective (*Wann tritt die Entlassung in Kraft?*)

Sources of Income (*Einkommensquellen*)

Rate of Income 1932–1933 (*Höhe des Einkommens in 1932–1933*)³⁰

For what period longer will the means at present at your disposal last? (*Wie lange werden die Mittel, die Sie momentan zur Verfügung haben, ausreichen?*)

Are you entitled to a pension? (*Sind Sie pensionsberechtigt?*)

Have you a temporary Position, Scholarship or Maintenance Grant? If so, state where and give date of expiry. (*Haben Sie eine vorübergehende Stellung, ein Stipendium oder eine Unterhaltungsstützung? Wenn ja, gebe an wo und Datum der Beendigung.*)

Have you unpaid facilities at an Institution? If so, state where (*Haben Sie eine unbezahlte Möglichkeit an einem Institut zu arbeiten? Wenn ja, geben an wo.*)

[This is the end of page 2; The “confidential” section of the file continues on page 3]:

Would you be willing to accept an Industrial or Commercial Position? If “Yes,” state type of Industrial or Commercial Position which would be suitable (*Würden Sie eine industrielle oder eine kaufmännische Stellung annehmen? Wenn ja, beschreibe welche Art von industrieller oder kaufmännischer Stellung für Sie geeignet wäre.*)

Are you willing that religious communities be approached on your behalf? If so, write “Yes” against the name of religion to which you belong (*Willigen Sie ein, dass wir für Sie an religiöse Gemeinschaften herantreten? Wenn ja, schreiben Sie ‘Ja’ neben den Namen der Religion, der Sie angehören.*)

Jewish Orthodox (*Orthodox jüdisch*)

Jewish Reformed (*Liberal jüdisch*)

Protestant (state denomination) (*Protestantisch [Gebe Sekte an]*)

Catholic (*Katholisch*)

Other (*Andere Religionen*)

How well can you read English? (*Wie gut können Sie Englisch lesen?*)

How well can you speak English? (*Wie gut können Sie Englisch sprechen?*)

How well can you write English? (*Wie gut können Sie Englisch schreiben?*)

How many dependents are you obliged to take with you wherever you go? (*Wie viele von Ihnen abhängige Personen müssen Sie mit sich nehmen wohin Sie auch gehen?*)

Adults (*Erwachsene*)

Children (*Kinder*)

Countries you prefer to go? (*Nach welchen Ländern würden Sie vor-ziehen zu gehen?*)

Countries you are not willing to go to? (*Nach welchen Ländern würden Sie nicht gehen?*)

Would you go to: / If not, state reasons (*Würden Sie nach den folgenden Ländern gehen: / Wenn nicht, bitte die Gründe anzugeben*)

Tropical Countries? (*Tropen?*)

The Far East? (*Fernen Osten?*)

U.S.S.R.? (*Soviet Russland?*)

South America? (*Südamerika?*)

To all these questions, Arendt responded very succinctly in her application in 1935. She provided her Paris address, “Paris 8e 9 rue Toullier, Hotel Soufflet,” and her rank, “Dr. Philos” (EC 38.15 [4]). Concerning her work, she only listed the subfields of her then ongoing projects, rather than the more general fields of her specialization: “History of christianity [*sic*] till Augustinus. Social history of the German literature from Lessing till 1848. History of Jewish emancipation and assimilation. History of modern antisemitism” (ibid.). She noted that she was married, and she listed no dependents (ibid.). In response to the questionnaire’s request for three names and addresses of references in Germany and other countries, she lists “Professor Karl Jaspers, Heidelberg,” “Professor Karl Mannheim, London,” and “Arnold Zweig, Haifa, Palestine, Mount Carmel, House Dr. Moses” (ibid.). With the exception of Jaspers, her dissertation advisor at Heidelberg University, the referees that Arendt gave in 1935 are very different from those that she had used for her previous applications to the forerunner of the NWA, the Emergency Association of German Science (Die Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft [NG]), which is now the German Research Foundation (Die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft).³¹ Before the Nazi takeover of Germany, and immediately after her marriage to Stern, Arendt had applied to the NG for funding to support her study of Varnhagen. In fact, she wrote a series of letters to Jaspers in 1929 and 1930, from Neubabelsberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, and finally, Frankfurt, regarding these applications.³² In a

letter from June 16, 1929, a very paternal Jaspers, anxious for Arendt to publish her dissertation with Springer as soon as possible, wrote her back:

Please do use my letter for the Notgemeinschaft. But please wait a while yet. If I can, I would like to get recommendations for you from Heidegger and Dibelius. The Notgemeinschaft has turned down so many excellent applications that we must do all we possibly can.³³

As it happens, all of the relevant letters for Arendt's 1929 and 1935 applications were saved in her NWA dossier (which was later shared with the Emergency Committee), and so are preserved to this day. Separated by only six years, these sets of letters reveal the realities of two different eras—showing the freedom of the Weimar Republic, on the one hand, and the totalitarian control of the Nazi era, on the other. I will say more about these letters very shortly. We should first complete the account of Arendt's responses to the NWA questionnaire.

From one of Arendt's responses, scant as they are, we learn that she did receive NG support, but that it was cut off in 1932: "Sources of income:—cf. Curriculum vitae: Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft till 1932: Rm 150—monthly."³⁴ Moreover, she freely shared information about her command of languages, both in the general and confidential sections of the questionnaire, mentioning French as a foreign language she could speak, and listing French, English, Latin, and Greek as languages in which she had reading proficiency (EC 38.15 [4–6]). In response to the question about how well she could read English, Arendt wrote "fluently"; in response to the question about how well she could speak English, she wrote "I have no practice"; and in response to the question about how well she could write in English, she put simply, "better than speaking" (EC 38.15 [4–6]). Aside from her unequivocal identification with reformed Judaism—"Jewish Reformed (*Liberal jüdisch*): YES"—and her choice of "England, United States of America, Palestine" as the preferred areas of transfer for work and domicile, she left blanks next to all the other questions, at one stage referring the Committee to details on her husband's file: "cf. the confidential Information of my husband Günther Anders" (EC 38.15 [4–6]).

Adorno's responses were more explanatory, detailed, and concrete. His file was sent to the Emergency Committee from the NWA, via the AAC, and his name showed up on the list of "Displaced German Scholars Available for Academic Positions" in philosophy from April to November 1934. His entry on the list reads as follows: "Wiesengrund-Adorno, Theodor Ludwig; Age 31; Single; Formerly: Privat-Dozent at Frankfurt University; Aesthetics; Theory of Knowledge; neo-Kantian; Music" (EC 37.17 [7]).³⁵ On the questionnaire attached to this bureaucratic profile, Adorno provided customized answers: he lists his Oxford address—"Oxford,

Merton Colleg [*sic*] 47 Bunbury [*sic*] Road”—, and “Esthetics, (Musical Esth. [Esthetics]), Epistemology, Philosophy of History” as his specializations (*ibid.*). His list of recommenders was impressive:

Prof. Dr. Max Horkheimer, Director of the Institute for Social Research, Geneva (rue de Lausanne, Switzerland); Prof. Dr. Paul Tillich, Columbia University, New York (his present address may be obtained from Frankfurt University).—These two gentlemen, former Philosophy Professors of Frankfurt University, know me best, as I was their collaborator for many years. Prof. Dr. Ernst Cassirer, All Souls College, Oxford; Professor Charles [*sic*] Mannheim, The London School of Economics. Prof. Dr. Walter Otto—Prof. Rheinhardt, Frankfurt University, Prof. Dr. W. Dubislav, Technische Hochschule, Berlin-Charlottenberg. (*Ibid.*)

Moreover, in addition to not having dependents (which, presumably, would have made him an easier hire), Adorno noted that he had the following linguistic skills: an ability to speak and read in French and English, and, he added in parentheses, “*of course* Latin and Greek” (EC 37.17 [8–10]; emphasis added).

Adorno identified his “Not pure ‘Aryan’ descent [*sic*]” as the reason for his dismissal (he was given the note on September 3, 1933) (*ibid.*). He wrote, “I could not more [*sic*] lecture since summer term 1933,” adding that he relied on “parents” and “English relations,” especially for his financial support (*ibid.*).³⁶ He was not entitled to a pension, he continued to explain, reporting that he “lived in the household of [his] parents who paid [his] life expenses” (*ibid.*). He planned to remain “in England at least until the end of next term” (*ibid.*). In addition, he noted that he lacked a permanent position at the University of Oxford and so was living there with a view to taking the last two years of the D.Phil, “in the hope then to get an academical [*sic*] Position” (*ibid.*).

Adorno categorically refused to consider commercial or industrial work opportunities, and he rejected any help from religious communities. In response to the question about the former, he wrote, “I am without any Commercial experiences and knowledges and not in a situation which would compell [*sic*] me to look for such a job” (*ibid.*). In response to the question about receiving help from religious institutions, he simply put “—Pleas [*sic*] no” (*ibid.*). In a postscript, he explained that he had no connections to (“any touch with”) “‘positive’ religion” (EC 37.17 [10]). To “Other (*Andere Religionen*),” he also added a postscript: “N.B. It may be of some interest that my mother, born Cavalli-Adorno, was, before her marriage, of French Nationality. She is the daughter of a French ex-officer, member of an old Aristocratic family of Corsica” (*ibid.*). Adorno was less than modest about his English: “I am able to read also difficult philosophical writers like Bradley, etc.” (*ibid.*).³⁷ To the question, “How well can you

speak English?," he acknowledged that his spoken English was imperfect, but claimed that he could get his meaning across ("enough to make me understand [*sic*] but not without mistakes"), and that he could write English, "Still rather badly" (EC 37.17 [8–10]). He shared his plan to get married, noting that in the event that he was awarded a position, "it would be important [*sic*] for me to have the possibility to marry" (*ibid.*). In response to the question about to which countries he would prefer to be sent, Adorno listed England and "dominions or colonies" of the United States of America or the Soviet Union, though adding that he had no knowledge of the Russian language (*ibid.*). He objected to a potential move to the Far East ("if possible no") and was unwilling to go to Japan (for "political reasons") (*ibid.*). He responded affirmatively to a potential move to tropical countries ("if the climate is convenient") and South America (*ibid.*). Shockingly, Adorno reaffirmed his willingness to move to the Soviet Union by writing "yes" next to the option (*ibid.*).

4.

Why were Adorno's and Arendt's applications to the Emergency Committee not successful? One reason may be that Tillich recommended too many competing candidates. Adorno was only his second choice. In a letter from February 15, 1934 (sent from Tillich's home at 605 West 122nd Street in New York City, addressed to the Secretary of the President of Wesleyan University), which has been preserved in Adorno's dossier, we discover who Tillich's first choice was:³⁸

In first place, I would recommend the Privatdozent of philosophy in Marburg, Dr. Karl K. Löwith, Marburg a/Lahn, Kirchhainer Weg 22. He is a Jew, but he has not yet been dismissed because he was an officer on active duty during the War. His position, however, is becoming more and more untenable and there is no possibility of his being called to a professorship. Perhaps he is the most intelligent of the younger generation of philosophers in Germany. He is the pupil of the most famous German philosopher, Martin Heidegger, and he has written a very illuminating book, *Das Ich in der Rolle der Umwelt*, which deals with the relations of persons to each other. In his latest research, he has written some very important articles about the young Hegelians. He is a very exactful [*sic*] teacher. In second place, I would recommend to you Dr. Theodor Wiesengrund, Frankfurt a/Main-Oberrad . . . former Privatdozent and assistant of mine at the University of Frankfurt. He is one of the most intelligent men in Germany—not only a philosopher but also a musical composer and artist. He also has the faculty of being able to teach music. He is half Jewish and was therefore dismissed. He has written an important book on Sören [*sic*] Kierkegaard as philosopher. Furthermore, he has written many articles on the philosophy of music. (EC 37.17 [2])³⁹

It is well known that, despite his outspoken Marxism, Horkheimer ended up being Adorno's chief guarantor in his relocation to America (see AB 240–1). By this time, Adorno's other distinguished recommenders had already relocated outside of the United States. Adorno's stated willingness to live in the Soviet Union might have also worked against him—given that, following Sergei Kirov's assassination in 1934, diplomatically unprotected foreigners living under Stalin had started to be arrested on fabricated charges, and the first wave of purges and show trials was unfolding.⁴⁰ That Adorno was seemingly unaware of this, or did not appreciate the relevance of such events, adds to the overall tone of his responses as self-centered and sybaritic.

Arendt's dossier is more complicated. Only Mannheim's letter, on his London School of Economics letterhead, addressed to AAC directors under the heading "Hannah Stern-Arendt OPINIONS," was written in English:

I know her, since she was a student of mine in Heidelberg and Frankfurt. Dr. Stern-Arendt is one of the most gifted persons among the young generation. She has had a round training in philosophy, the history of culture (*Geistesgeschichte*) and has a competent knowledge of Sociology. I should therefore strongly recommend that you help her in finishing her work, in so far as you are able to do so. Yours faithfully,
K. Mannheim. (EC 38.15 [9])

Zweig's letter in support of Arendt, which is dated December 13, 1933, and sent from France, was written in German. He referred to Arendt as an expert on the Jewish pale and on the life of Jewish people in Europe during the Enlightenment and the romantic period, and complimented her work on Varnhagen and the Berlin Circle (EC 38.15 [9]). He also noted his appreciation of her elucidation of the essential details of Jewish existence in the Galuth (*ibid.*). He envisioned her having a good chance and saw her as poised to become an "independent author" (*selbständigen Verfasser*) (*ibid.*).⁴¹

Positive as they are, these opinions and testimonials from Zweig and Mannheim are more self-congratulatory than they are rousing endorsements of their candidate. They do, however, offer priceless insights into the process of the rescue efforts. Earlier letters contained within Arendt's dossier from Jaspers, Heidegger, and Martin Dibelius in 1929, by which time Arendt had completed her dissertation and graduated *magna cum laude*, are formulaic, dry, and somewhat condescending. These letters did, however, achieve the desired result of helping Arendt receive a two-year scholarship from the pre-1933 Notgemeinschaft.

Jaspers wrote that Arendt's work was philosophically sophisticated and that she was proficient in ancient philosophy as well as in New Testament studies (*ibid.*). He saw greater promise in Arendt's new work on Varnhagen.⁴² In one short paragraph written from the University of

Freiburg, where he had succeeded Husserl as Chair in 1928, Heidegger underscored Arendt's "extraordinary intelligence" and her "instinct" for discerning "meaningful issues" in the study of intellectual history, complimenting her undoubtable literary talent and her ability to ask deep questions and to grow with them intellectually (*ibid.*).⁴³ Dibelius' letter, meanwhile, is merely a dry summary, with a nod of approval to the gifts of Arendt's intelligence and her undeniably "spiritual frame," as he put it (*ibid.*). He also wrote that he was impressed with her ability for analysis and historical comparison (*ibid.*).⁴⁴

Except for the letter from Jaspers, who was himself imperiled in virtue of his humanistic views and because of his Jewish wife, the letters from Heidegger, the new pro-Nazi Rector at the University of Freiburg, and from Dibelius, originally a Nazi sympathizer, must have raised red flags from the perspective of the Emergency Committee. We realize this because of the existence of a secret file among Arendt's papers with the Emergency Committee. In addition to Dibelius' name, Otto Regenbogen, a theologian who was among Arendt's teachers at Heidelberg University and an unapologetic National Socialist, is listed on her record.⁴⁵

Nevertheless, despite having significantly different experiences with the Emergency Committee, both Adorno and Arendt ended up in the United States, as is well known—Adorno arriving in 1938 and Arendt in 1941. After one year of funding, Adorno's file was not renewed with the Emergency Committee, however, because of his speedy transfer from his position as an assistant to Paul Lazarsfeld—at which he proved unsatisfactory—to the paradise of "German California" (see AB 270–2).⁴⁶ Arendt, by contrast, fostered a better relationship with the Emergency Committee, making it a point to meet Drury in 1942, upon whom Arendt seems to have made a good impression.⁴⁷ Her application to the Emergency Committee was given a second chance through the intervention of important religious and Jewish organizations, and humanities scholars including Tillich, Salo Baron, Waldemar Gurian, and Paul Oskar Kristeller. In Arendt's revised application, all four supporting letters spoke not only of Arendt's considerable promise but also of her proven academic and personal achievements.⁴⁸ However, Arendt's application was again rejected, this time perhaps—ironically—because of a more pronounced "Jewish link" in her profile. To understand why Arendt's second application was unsuccessful, it helps to know a bit about what was going on at the Emergency Committee during these years.

In 1944, Frances Fenton Park succeeded Drury as the new Executive Secretary of the Emergency Committee (RSL 179). Fenton Park diligently cleaned the backlog of old cases and checked on the location and extant placement of candidates with the American Christian Committee for Refugees (EC 38.15 [26–37]). In October 1944, she revisited the July 1942

documents, prompted by a petition from British-born Theodor Gaster—an extraordinary Semitist, and the Executive Secretary of the Council on Jewish Relations—on behalf of Arendt and two other Jewish scholars, Raphael Mahler, an historian of Hasidism, and Hugo Bieber, a literary scholar and a student of Yiddish literature.⁴⁹ The Council shared with the Emergency Committee its plan for the reconstruction of Jewish life in Europe after the War, starting with territories that had already been liberated.⁵⁰ Existing funds, Gaster explained, would be reserved “for the actual work of rebuilding and reconstruction”:

This means that other support will have to be found to finance some of the initial work of research, and it is in this connection that the Commission ventures to solicit your sympathetic interest. It ventures to believe that your Committee may well wish to assist this constructive contribution toward the rehabilitation of displaced scholars. The Commission has decided, as the indispensable first step, to compile detailed information about the contents, services, assets, budget and administration of all Jewish cultural and educational institutions (including schools) in Axis and Axis-occupied countries, as of 1938 or the date of their liquidation. To accomplish this task, it proposes to appoint two or three qualified research workers on a fellowship basis who would be in charge of this project. Two [*sic*] or three scholarly and clerical assistants would be made available from other sources. It is for the award of these fellowships that the Commission wishes now to apply to your Committee. It has determined, after careful examination, that the best qualified candidates for the proposed fellowships are:

1. Dr. Hannah Arendt
2. Dr. Raphael Mahler
3. Dr. Hugo Bieber. (EC 38.15 [29–30])

These candidates came up for consideration with the Board at the next meeting of the Emergency Committee. On November 3, 1944, Fenton Park wrote back:

Dear Dr. Gaster:

At a recent meeting of the Emergency Committee in Aid for the Displaced Foreign Scholars I discussed with members of the Committee your application from the Commission on Jewish Cultural Reconstruction for fellowships for three candidates, Dr. Hannah Arendt, Dr. Raphael Mahler and Dr. Hugo Bieber.

The committee decided, unfortunately, that this type of application did not come within their program at all and advised me not to go any further in processing the application. I am extremely sorry to have to write you this and I hope very much that you will find other ways of financing your program and engaging these scholars.

Sincerely yours,
Frances Fenton Park. (EC 38.15 [31])

On November 9, 1944, Gaster responded from the Council's address at 1841 Broadway, New York City. The letter deserves to be quoted in full:

Dear Mrs. Park:

Thank you for your kind letter of November 3rd. Your Committee's decision is, of course, a disappointment to us, not only because the three candidates whom we named have made and are making such useful contribution to scholarship that we feel they should be encouraged and helped, but also because the project we outlined appears to us a *particularly constructive way of opening doors* for other scholars after the war. However, we are very grateful for your interest; and our disappointment is counterbalanced in no small measure by our deep appreciation of what your Committee has done for so many of our displaced European colleagues. Jewish scholarship must always be grateful to it.

Yours sincerely,
Theodor H. Gaster, Executive Secretary. (EC 38.15 [32]; emphasis added)

5.

Gaster's reference to "opening doors" brings us to the conclusion of this long archival reflection. What are the transferable values of philosophy? Cicero once wrote, "all that is mine, I carry with me" (*omnia mea mecum porto*).⁵¹ If that is the case, then what is it that philosophers carry with them—that which cannot be jettisoned or left behind? What is it that we cannot afford to lose?

In its aforesaid decision, the Emergency Committee concluded that reconstruction and rebuilding were not the kind of work that qualified for emergency status. Instead, their emphasis was on rescuing scholars and scholarship. And what predominate in this history are the innumerable decisions and acts of grace and selfless humanity by both the Committee and by those it rescued—many of whom clearly contradict the myth of the ungrateful immigrant. For example, among the first things that Adorno did upon his arrival at Princeton University was to write to Drury on November 6, 1938, informing her of the need to rescue Siegfried Kracauer, Adorno's first mentor in philosophy and intellectual history.⁵² Or, to take another example, consider the actions of a colleague of Adorno's at Princeton, Abraham Flexner. Flexner, who was based at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and was a long-term member of the Emergency Committee (and would later join its Executive Board), urged the Committee not to rescind support of scholars who were unable to arrive in America by the beginning of a given fiscal year.⁵³

Nevertheless, there was periodic hostility toward rescued scholars, and arguments along the lines of “they are stealing our jobs” were put forward. In one unpleasant instance, on October 18, 1938, the President of Reed College, the economist Dexter M. Keezer, wrote a rancorous letter to Sydnor H. Walker, Acting Director of the Social Sciences at The Rockefeller Foundation, asking for the rescinding of a grant issued by the Foundation to Theodor Geiger, the famed founder of the concept of social stratification and an influential sociologist of education, industrial organization, and class mobility.⁵⁴ Perhaps unsurprisingly, Geiger chose to move to Aarhus, Denmark, instead of Reed College.⁵⁵ In recounting the history of the rescue of European scholars during this period, we should be careful not to neglect discussing the prejudices and errors that were sometimes rife, even if they were more than counterbalanced by acts of grace and humanity.⁵⁶

Johnson understood the importance of repudiating outbursts against newcomers. In a piece published in the *New York Times* on November 17, 1940, entitled “The Refugee Scholars,” Johnson explains that the displaced scholars “will not be a threat to our own and will not displace them” in their turn.⁵⁷ His more famous protest dated back to June 24, 1934, when he wrote an objection to an op-ed that had appeared in the *New York Times* on May 27, 1934, signed by Diana Rice, in which she attributes to Johnson the claim that “a foreign professor who spends two years at an American university is in line for promotion with increased salary,” before pointedly raising the question of “whether the foreign teacher should take what would naturally go to an American teacher of the faculty.”⁵⁸ In his rejoinder, Johnson explained that

Eventually these foreign scholars will be absorbed into our educational system as regular faculty members, to the great benefit of our system. They will not be taking anything that should go to Americans, but they will be creating new values that will strengthen our educational system.⁵⁹

Furthermore, a heart-warming series of exchanges exists between Johnson, Drury, and Walter Naumburg, a specialist in labor and copyright law. Naumburg first wrote to Duggan on July 13, 1933, asking for clarification regarding the charitable nature of the Emergency Committee—specifically, whether it was non-commercial, and whether contributors to it might deduct contributions from their income taxes (EC 148.1 [2]). Naumburg had no legal status in America and happened to be visiting with a relative (who, based on Naumburg’s letters, appears to have had a business at 48 Wall Street named E. Naumburg & Co.) when the Emergency Committee first announced its activities (*ibid.*). Naumburg wrote:

Furthermore, may I ask what the relation is between this committee and the movement which is on foot to place German scholars in the

New School? Some of my friends have expressed an opinion that they disapprove of the New School idea because the concentration of so many foreigners in one organization might tend to cause a lot of unfavorable comment and create prejudices. As I am about to sail for Europe a prompt reply will be appreciated. (EC 148.1 [2]).

Seven years later, in October 1940, and with five members of his family to support, Naumburg was still without clear prospects of employment. So, Johnson pleaded his case with Drury (EC 179.10 [38]). Unfortunately, as Drury explained, “the law is just about the most difficult field in which to find places for foreign scholars. It is difficult even for top-notchers to establish themselves here” (EC 179.10 [38]).

Aside from these painful difficulties with placing even top-notch specialists, it must be acknowledged that the Committee had some lapses of judgment when interceding for displaced scholars—some of whom happened to be pre-War acquaintances of the Committee leadership. On August 27, 1934, a cable was written from the University in Exile and shared with the Emergency Committee. Addressed to none other than the Chancellery of Adolf Hitler, it was a plea for clemency in relation to Rudolf Küstermeier, a scholar and member of the resistance group Roter Stoßtrupp, who had been arrested on charges of crimes against the Third Reich and whose imminent execution was feared.⁶⁰ The composed text (rendered, telegram-style, in all caps, without punctuation in the original) reads as follows:

To the Office of the Lord Reichsführer

Berlin

We, the undersigned educators and scholars, respectfully petition Your Excellency to exercise clemency in the case of Rudolf Küstermeier, condemned to death by the People’s Tribunal in August [date blank]. Our petition implies no criticism of the action of the court nor of the law upon which this action is based. We are actuated solely by a concern for the interests of scholarship which we conceive to be a world interest transcending national boundaries. We are aware that in asking the German Government to consider our petition we are asking it to set a precedent in international comity, but we feel justified in asking this of a country with a long record of leadership in the field of scholarship. Dr. Küstermeier is known internationally as a brilliant young scholar who is capable of making many contributions to science. We feel that it would be tragic for the world to lose this contribution through the failure of Dr. Küstermeier to become adjusted to the new political situation in Germany. (EC 148.2 [8])

Relatedly, an unsigned letter from the “Assistant Director” of The New School, dated February 15, 1934, and found within The New School Archives, reiterates that the University in Exile intended “no criticism” of

Germany's political regime. In the letter, the author attempts to placate an old friend, "Karl" (Grünewald) in Berlin, who was enraged by mission statements concerning the University in Exile, which had been published in a bulletin from the Institute of International Education:

The articles contained in that bulletin are not, by any means, an expression of the Institute's opinion and Professor Duggan has repeatedly referred to his own editorials as merely an expression of personal opinion. As I told you in confidence here in New York, I personally considered the establishment of the so-called University in Exile an unfortunate move. However, this News Bulletin of ours is designed to report, in condensed form, happenings and events that are of interest to those interested in international educational affairs. The establishment of that institution and the reasons for such action were, to my mind at least, of considerable interest to our readers. . . . Our activities in connection with the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars have been of a purely scholarly nature and at no time has that organization participated in criticism or condemnation of the political regime in Germany. (EC 148.2 [34])

These comments speak poorly of their author. Fortunately, other bad ideas concerning the methods and rationale of rescue efforts were not allowed to go ahead, frequently thanks to Johnson. At first, Johnson expressed support for the idea of creating residential compounds or processing centers for displaced scholars in transit—in Ohio, Princeton, and in the Washington D.C. area (EC 179.10 [7]). This, however, would have been tantamount to creating a replica of the camps from which many newcomers had fled in Europe, and which Stalin had exploited during the War to utilize the best talent of the country by concentrating it in an enclosed and monitored zone.⁶¹ Fortunately, no such proposal was enacted.

It is also fortunate that no action was ever taken on the ill-informed proposal to create tiers of "A List" and "B List" scholars based on their "desirability," which was drawn up by the Office of the Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish.⁶² Although this proposal was not quite as bad as the idea to create "scholarly camps" that Johnson, Duggan, and other leading members of the Emergency Committee discussed for a short while, it was certainly imprudent. These lists were proposed in 1940, following the German occupation of Belgium and France. The goal was to place the ablest among the displaced in key areas of national interest, so that they could work as assistant librarians, cataloguing books. Apparently, the idea that people like Jacques Maritain, Henri Focillon, Kathi G. Moyer-Baer, and Johan Huizinga—who were among the A-listers—, and Nikolai Berdiaev, Vladimir Jankélévitch, and Nicholas Nabokov (first cousin of the writer Vladimir)—who were among the B-listers—(see EC 42.17 [4–5]), would make excellent specialty cataloguers

working with the many languages that they knew, struck a certain bureaucrat as fair exchange for American hospitality.

Johnson had a better idea. He secured funding for the creation of the so-called Dramatic Workshop in 1940, to be under the directorship of Erwin Piscator, and he also procured financial support for vastly expanding the humanities, art history, and philosophy course offerings at The New School by instituting the École Libre des Hautes Études (see EC 148.9–11). Until the end of the War, and depending on transfers and placements, one could find Roman Jakobson, Alexandre Koyré, Claude Lévi-Strauss, Waclaw Lednicki, and Erich Fromm lecturing here on the same day (EC 148.5–11).⁶³ And yet, Arendt would not become involved in The New School until many years later. While her second husband, Heinrich Blücher, came to teach courses at The New School in 1950 on art history (after drawing considerable audiences at the School on earlier speaking engagements), it would not be until 1967 that Arendt joined the faculty. During the War, her applications for funding from the Emergency Committee in 1942–1944 were all rejected, with a certain Emergency Committee bureaucrat classifying her as a “swarthy” philosopher (EC 38.15 [24]). An unidentified author wrote in ink to create what looks like a catalogue card: “Hannah Arendt-Blücher 7.2.42. Swarthy, intelligent. Sparing of words. Courteous. Efficient. Is publishing a long article on Dreyfus for *Jewish Social Studies* of July 1942. Wants fellowship to enable her to finish and publish her researches on Jewish question. Nov. 10, 1943. No recent contact. Close” (EC 38.15 [24]).

6.

There is a letter in The New School folders of the Emergency Committee papers from none other than Albert Einstein. Written from his studio cottage retreat in Watch Hill, Rhode Island, on June 24, 1934, the letter is addressed to the then Committee Director, Edward R. Murrow, in defense of a brilliant philologist specializing in the study of antiquity, Obather Zunts, “about whom Alvin Johnson can tell you” (EC 148.2 [53]). Einstein reminds Murrow about his and Johnson’s consensus, namely that “to restrict help to ex-university teacher[s] is to work a grave injustice” (ibid.).

Over the years, Johnson demonstrated his visionary power by repeatedly recommending the right job for the right candidate. He would find one such person in every list that passed through his hands: from Max Weinreich, whom Johnson recommended to The Yiddish Scientific Institute (YIVO) (EC 148.5 [42]), to the then completely unknown Jascha Horenstein, whom Johnson was excited to discover and found work for at The New School (EC 179.10 [96]). Horenstein, a musicologist working on a project entitled, “Television: A Decisive Factor in the Development of Music,

Musicians, and Musical Audiences in the Post-War Period,” would of course go on to become a household name in classical music and a famous American conductor. But, before that, and thanks to Johnson, Horenstein came to teach at The New School in 1941.⁶⁴ It appears that the big strides and advancements of The New School under Johnson owed much to his capacity to combine idealism with pragmatism: he managed to respect the traditional values of humanistic scholarship while also looking forward to technological innovation.⁶⁵

If, as I have suggested in this essay, the importance of knowing Greek was paramount for scholars fleeing Europe at this time, then the question inevitably arises about the extent of Johnson’s own interest in the Greeks. During Erwin Piscator and Maria Ley Piscator’s decisive interview in Johnson’s office when the question of their being hired to create and lead the Dramatic Workshop was hanging in the balance, they noticed, uneasily, that his gaze was hovering above their heads:

Facing him across the desk, we soon had an unsettling sensation that we were sharing his attention with someone else. We looked around the room. The circular walls were a striking Byzantine red. At the center of the ceiling was an overhead light, and under the light an antique statue of white marble. Realizing our surprise, Dr. Johnson explained that he had received the statue as a gift from a friend, Joseph Urban, the architect who had designed his school. He had received it on condition that he would never let it go out of his possession. “It is the Aphrodite of Cyrene,” he continued. “It was found in 1914 by Italian soldiers digging a ditch on the site of ancient Crete. It was kept underground during the first World War and was set up after the war in a special alcove of the Museo delle Terme in Naples. I think she is the most beautiful of all the Aphrodites.” She was more than that. She had a living quality, as if she were some kind of a medium that could activate the mutual understanding of this important hour, fill that spaceless space which has no body, that empty space of unsaid things. . . . Johnson seemed to be stretching himself inwardly.⁶⁶

Johnson’s own memoir, *The Pioneer’s Progress*, has more to say about the Aphrodite of Cyrene and his passion for antiquity and beauty that coexisted harmoniously with his tireless struggle for liberal values and social justice.⁶⁷ About his Aphrodite, Johnson wrote:

That is my statue. When I gave up my office in the New School building I took the statue to my house in Nyack. For these many years the statue has been a part of my life. In the presence of the statue I have a serene sense of the values that endure.⁶⁸

In reflecting on the transferable values of the humanities after reading the eighty-year-old files of the Emergency Committee, I was reminded of the inaugural lecture that Huizinga, a future “non-grantee” of the

Emergency Committee, had delivered at Leiden University in 1915. In it, he attempted to justify study of the traditions of culture during the unspeakable loss and destruction of the First World War.⁶⁹ Relatedly, Virginia Woolf, ten years later, contemplated the reasons behind our abiding interest in the Greeks, given that, as moderns, we are unable to know Greek as it should be. She writes,

Between this foreign people and ourselves there is not only difference of race and tongue but a tremendous breach of tradition. All the more strange, then, is it that we should wish to know Greek, try to know Greek, feel for ever drawn back to Greek, and be forever making up some notion of the meaning of Greek.⁷⁰

Beginning with Socrates, Woolf contends, we embarked on an impossible quest to reach truth:

Are pleasure and good the same? Can virtue be taught? Is virtue knowledge? The tired or feeble mind may easily lapse as the remorseless questioning proceeds; but no one, however weak, can fail, even if he does not learn more from Plato, to love knowledge better. . . .

But truth is various; truth comes to us in different disguises; it is not with the intellect alone that we perceive it. . . . Truth is to be pursued with all our faculties.

It is to the Greeks that we turn when we are sick of vagueness, of the confusion, of the Christianity and its consolations, of our own age.⁷¹

Truth can come in many guises, and it can be falsified. From 1933 onward, the work of the de-Nazification of ἀλήθεια, its liberation from the instrumentalism of mass society and totalitarianism was, in most cases, the work of transplants and migrants—the porters and rescuers of ἀρχή who were not afraid of changing its soil and culture. At least, this is what the case studies in the archives of the Emergency Committee repeatedly inform us, as do the philosophers whose names the files in question bear.⁷² Arendt writes of how, through the embrace of immigrants (her choice of word, which she uses to denote self-determination as opposed to “refugees,” who lack rights), a given polity gains more than it gives when it exercises tolerance.⁷³ Tolerance is the force that leads to, and solidifies, societal fellowship, allowing the latter to strengthen itself through acts of “civic friendship.”⁷⁴

NOTES

I would like to express my gratitude to Ceciel Meiborg and Joel de Lara for inviting me to submit this essay, and to the *Graduate Faculty Philosophy Journal* for its resolute publishing standards. My very special thanks are due to Greg Bartels

for his rigorous fact-checking, and to Krishna Boddapati for all the superb editorial suggestions and helpful commentary. I would also like to thank the research staff at the Manuscript and Archives Division at the New York Public Library for allowing me access to the collections of the Emergency Committee, starting in 2014, when I began this project.

1. Hannah Arendt, *Love and St. Augustine*, trans. The Literary Trust of Hannah Arendt Blücher, ed. Joanna Vecchiarelli Scott and Judith Chelius Stark (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1996), p. 111. This was Arendt's doctoral dissertation, originally published as *Der Liebesbegriff bei Augustin: Versuch einer philosophischen Interpretation* (Berlin: Julius Springer, 1929).
2. See Theodor W. Adorno, "Die Transzendenz des Dinglichen und Noematischen in Husserls Phänomenologie" (Ph.D. diss., Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, 1924).
3. Adorno's most notable publications on music during this period are "On the Social Situation of Music," in *Essays on Music*, trans. Susan H. Gillespie, ed. Richard Leppert (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), pp. 391–436; "Zur gesellschaftlichen Lage der Musik," *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* 1:1 (1932), pp. 103–24; "Farewell to Jazz," in *Essays on Music*, pp. 496–500; and "Abschied vom Jazz," *Europäische Revue* 9:5 (1933), pp. 313–6. For a detailed biographical account of Adorno's life during this time, including his work as a Privatdozent and his burgeoning reputation in the early '30s, see Stefan Müller-Doohm, "A Second Anomaly in Frankfurt: The Institute of Social Research," chap. 10 of *Adorno: A Biography*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Cambridge: Polity, 2005), pp. 132–65, esp. 145–55; henceforth AB, followed by page number.
4. Adorno was to marry Gretel Karplus in 1937 (AB 55).
5. For a detailed biographical account of Arendt's early life, see Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, "1906–1933," pt. 1 of *Hannah Arendt: For Love of the World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), pp. 1–110; henceforth HA, followed by page number. For an account of Arendt's university education, see pp. 62–71.
6. Günther Stern (1902–1992), better known today by his pen name, Günther Anders, would go on to become an influential critic of televisual media and a leading figure in the antinuclear movement. He was the author of groundbreaking works such as *Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1956), and *Wir Eichmannsöhne: Offener Brief an Klaus Eichmann* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1964). Ironically, in 1983, he was awarded the Adorno prize (see "Theodor W. Adorno Prize," Das Kulturportal der Stadt Frankfurt am Main, <https://www.kultur-frankfurt.de/portal/en/CultureDepartment/Theodor-W.-Adorno-Prize/1720/1722/0/0/1452.aspx> [accessed November 12, 2019]).
7. Stern and Arendt parted ways while in Paris and divorced amicably in 1937 (HA 115). In the spring of 1936, while in Paris, Arendt met Heinrich Blücher, whom she married in 1940 (HA 122–4). After Hitler's invasion of France in 1941, they escaped and arrived in New York on a ship from Lisbon on May 22, 1941—Stern and Varian Fry had helped them with entry permits (see The Hannah Arendt Center, "Turning Ourselves into Outlaws," January 29, 2017, <https://medium.com/amor-mundi/turning-ourselves-into-outlaws-37c4e735405b>

[accessed January 21, 2020]). Arendt's mother arrived from Lisbon on June 21, 1941 (see HA 158–9), and they rented apartments in the same building (HA 164). Arendt was quickly able to find employment as an au pair in Winchester, Massachusetts, and lived there from July 18 to August 15, 1941, leaving her husband and mother behind in the city (HA 165). Arendt's and Blücher's letters to one another during this period provide interesting insights into their thoughts and feelings about immigration (see *Within Four Walls: The Correspondence between Hannah Arendt and Heinrich Blücher, 1936–1968*, trans. Peter Constantine, ed. Lotte Kohler [New York: Harcourt, 1996], pp. ix–x, 58–76).

8. In her introduction to Arendt's book on Varnhagen, Liliane Weissberg writes that Arendt completed a draft of this book in 1933, even though it was not published until 1958 (Liliane Weissberg, introduction to Hannah Arendt, *Rahel Varnhagen: The Life of a Jewess*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston, ed. Liliane Weissberg [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997], pp. 4–5).
9. For further discussion of how Adorno framed his Jewishness in relation to his work, see Martin Jay, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), pp. 24, 66.
10. See Werner Schüßler, "Tillich's Life and Works," trans. Alexandra Wörn and David Leech, in *The Cambridge Companion to Paul Tillich*, ed. Russell Re Manning (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 3n. 1, 10–1.
11. For an appraisal of Twain's writings on the subject of immigrants and immigration, see Thomas Peyser, "Mark Twain and the American Narrative," *ELH* 79:4 (2012), pp. 1013–37. While Arendt had started as a diligent au pair in Massachusetts, Adorno was fired from his post as a research subsidiary for Lazarsfeld at Princeton for dereliction of duty (see AB 244–54; and Jay, *Adorno*, p. 34). For Adorno's own account of this period of his life, see "Scientific Experiences of a European Scholar in America," trans. Donald Fleming, in *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930–1960*, ed. Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969], pp. 338–70). From the perspective of Lazarsfeld, the dissatisfied superior and an old Frankfurt acquaintance of Adorno's, the latter gave little attention to the radio project to which he was assigned upon his arrival at Princeton: "He looks exactly as you would imagine a very absent-minded German professor," Lazarsfeld recorded, "and he behaves so foreign that I feel like a member of the Mayflower Society" (see Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "An Episode in the History of Social Research: A Memoir," in *The Intellectual Migration*, p. 301).

The contribution of refugee intellectuals in their adoptive country is a question that has long interested scholars. Not counting the literature on The New School's University in Exile, which is referenced copiously elsewhere in this essay, see especially Lewis A. Coser, *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experience* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984); Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb, *From Swastika to Jim Crow: Refugee Scholars at Black Colleges* (Malabar, Florida: Krieger, 1993); Anthony Heilbut, *Exiled in Paradise: German Refugee Artists and Intellectuals in America from the 1930s to the Present* (Berkeley: University of California

- Press, 1997); and Stuart Jeffries, *Grand Hotel Abyss: The Lives of the Frankfurt School* (London: Verso, 2017). On refugees' fears, see Anthony Heilbut, "The Intellectuals' Migration: The Emigré's Conquest of American Academia," *Change* 16:5 (1984), pp. 24–5, 32–6; and "Left and Right," chap. 5 of *Exiled in Paradise*, pp. 101–16.
12. For Arendt's most focussed discussion of the concept of *vita activa*, see Hannah Arendt, "*Vita Activa* and the Human Condition," chap. 1 of *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), pp. 7–11. For Adorno's account of the "damaged life" of negative dialectics, see Theodor W. Adorno, *Minima Moralia: Reflections from Damaged Life*, trans. E.F.N. Jephcott (New York: Verso, 1978).
 13. At the time of Adorno's application to the Emergency Committee, for example, he admitted that his English was still quite basic, whereas his Latin and Greek, he reported in a matter of course way, were excellent (see "Adorno, Theodor W.," in "Series IB: Non-Grantees" of Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records, Manuscripts and Archives Division, The New York Public Library, Astor, Lenox, and Tilden Foundations, New York, box 37, folder 17, leaf 8; henceforth EC, followed by box number, folder number, and leaf number in brackets, wherever applicable). In many records contained within this manuscript collection, German words are rendered without diacritical marks. I suspect that this was due to the unavailability of typewriters with the necessary symbols. However, it is a matter of speculation as to whether this was because of location, technological eccentricities, or simply because of the stresses of travel to new places with new languages. In any case, I have preserved original spellings, where possible. The leaves in the respective folders were unnumbered; leaf numbers cited in this paper reflect my own counting of the order in which they are maintained in each folder. All translations of these archival materials are mine, unless otherwise indicated.
 14. The 1938–1940 year range in Karl Kraus' file refers to the paperwork conducted to close his case (see EC 83.17). Kraus had died in Vienna of natural causes in 1936, two years before the Anschluss.
 15. For a full list of rejected applications, see "Series IB: Non-grantees, 1927–45," in *Guide to the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records*, The New York Public Library Manuscripts and Archives Division, http://archives.nypl.org/uploads/collection/generated_finding_aids/mss922.pdf (accessed November 12, 2019), pp. 10–142. For an excellent general account of the reception of foreign scholars in America, see Marjorie Lamberti, "The Reception of Refugee Scholars from Nazi Germany in America: Philanthropy and Social Change in Higher Education," *Jewish Social Studies* 12:3 (2006), pp. 157–92. For a comprehensive account of German emigration, see Klaus-Dieter Krohn et al., eds., *Handbuch der deutschsprachigen Emigration, 1933–1945* (Darmstadt: Primus, 1998). On the history specifically of Marc Bloch's files, see Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of The New School for Social Research* (New York: The Free Press, 1986), p. 133.
 16. The aforementioned "Series IB: Non-grantees, 1927–45" includes information about applicants who died during the War, including Benjamin and Bloch.

17. For a full list of successful applications to the Emergency Committee, see “Series IA: Grantees, 1933–46,” *Guide to the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records*, pp. 1–10.
18. For more about the restoration law, see “Law for the Restoration of the Professional Civil Service,” Timeline of Events, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, <https://ww-w.ushmm.org/learn/timeline-of-events/1933-1938/law-for-the-restoration-of-the-professional-civil-service> (accessed November 23, 2019). For statistics and further information about university faculty job losses during this period, see Isabella Löhr, “Building Transatlantic Networks in Science and Learning,” Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars, *Transatlantic Perspectives*, <http://www.transatlanticperspectives.org/entry.php?rec=153> (accessed September 8, 2019).
19. See Stephen Duggan and Betty Drury, *The Rescue of Science and Learning: The Story of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948), pp. 173–7; henceforth RSL, followed by page number.
20. See Löhr, “Building Transatlantic Networks in Science and Learning.” For brief but informative mentions of the Emergency Committee’s activities in relation to the history of The New School, see also Judith Friedlander, *A Light in Dark Times: The New School for Social Research and Its University in Exile* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2018), pp. 91–2, 116, 133; Claus-Dieter Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and The New School for Social Research* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), pp. 21, 26–9, 32, 63, 68, 74; and Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, pp. 93, 129–37. Foundational sources on the “mechanics of the organization,” to use Duggan and Drury’s term (RSL viii), can be found in the papers of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records (1927–1949) held at the New York Public Library, Manuscripts and Archives Division. Annual reports by the Committee are also invaluable sources of information. The first such report is dated January 1, 1934. Longer reports, such as the report for 1933–1937, were published under the Committee’s original name, the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars. The reports between 1938 and 1942 appeared under the title, Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars (see “Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars: report,” United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, <https://collections.ushmm.org/search/catalog/bib77555> [accessed November 17, 2019]).
21. The organization also used the acronym ECADFS on some of its official records, to reflect this name change. The Institute’s telephone number, “Vanderbilt 6-1471,” and cable address, “Emercom New York,” were also used on the Emergency Committee’s letterheads (see, for example, a letter that Drury sent to Flexner, contained within the following archival file: “Windelband, Wolfgang, 1939–1940,” Director’s Office General Files, box 70, Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey, https://library.ias.edu/sites/library.ias.edu/files/page/DO_Gen_Box_70_Windelband_Sept%2023_39.pdf [accessed November 2, 2019]).

Prior to 1933, and, in fact, starting with its founding in 1919 (the same year as The New School), the major institution coordinating the rescue of

scholars fleeing persecution in Europe had been the Institute of International Education: it operated the Russian Student Fund from 1921–1933 and coordinated the rescue of scholars from fascist Italy in 1922–1924 (see “Our History,” Scholar Rescue Fund, *Institute of International Education*, <https://www.scholarrescuefund.org/about-us/our-history> [accessed November 24, 2019]). On the Russian Student Fund, see R.E. Bowers, “The Origins of the Russian Student Fund,” *The Russian Review* 16:3 (1957), pp. 45–52; and RSL 6.

22. I should note here that they followed the conventions of the time in their use of pronouns.
23. For a general account of the cooperation between the Emergency Committee and its various counterparts, see “Series II: Educational and Research Institutions, 1932–1945,” in *Guide to the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records*, pp. 160, 163; and Löhrr, “Building Transatlantic Networks in Science and Learning.” Duggan and Drury also discuss the cooperation between the Emergency Committee and the American Christian Committee for Refugees, the NWA, the AAC, and the High Commission for Refugees Coming from Germany (RSL 94, 185). Young-Bruehl gives a brief account of the Conference on Jewish Relations (later known as the Conference on Jewish Social Studies) (HA 186). For the history of the National Refugee Service and its collaboration with the Emergency Committee, see “Historical Note,” *Guide to the Records of the National Refugee Service: 1934–1952*, YIVO Institute for Jewish Research, Center for Jewish History, New York, <https://digifindingaids.cjh.org/?pID=1865416> (accessed November 23, 2019).
24. The list in question, authored by the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars, was first published as *List of Displaced German Scholars* (London: Speedee Press, 1936). For the role of the Rockefeller Foundation in supporting this publication, see Raymond B. Fosdick, “President’s Review,” in *The Rockefeller Foundation Annual Report, 1936*, The Rockefeller Foundation, <http://assets.rockefellerfoundation.org/app/uploads/20150530122125/Annual-Report-1936.pdf> (accessed November 19, 2019), p. 57.
25. The Restoration Law was passed on April 7, 1933, and the first group of scholars at the University of Exile began teaching on October 1 of that year (see Friedlander, *A Light in Dark Times*, pp. 116–7). According to Duggan and Drury, “No reader will want to miss learning of the indebtedness of the Emergency Committee to the university scholars and administrators who rallied with enthusiasm to the relief of the Displaced Foreign Scholars” (RSL viii). On Johnson’s role specifically, see RSL 78–82. Note especially this comment: “It is too early to appraise the effectiveness of the New School plan for American scholarship. If the publication of books and articles in scientific magazines is taken as a criterion, the New School plan of an organic Faculty has worked well. If its appeal to students is a criterion, it has also worked well. The University in Exile, now known as the Graduate Faculty, has more students than most university faculties in America” (RSL 81). For other discussions of Johnson, see RSL 92, 178. Among the first scholars to accept appointments at the University in Exile were Emil Lederer, Hans Speier, Max Wertheimer, and Frieda Wunderlich

(see Friedlander, *A Light in Dark Times*, p. 217). Among those who turned down offers to work at The New School were Mannheim, Tillich, and Cassirer (see EC 148.1 [41]).

26. Johnson joined the Executive Committee of the Emergency Committee in August 1940, according to a note of congratulations from Duggan, dated August 31, 1940 (EC 190.8 [1]). As we can see from Johnson's folder in the Emergency Committee records, he punctiliously answered every invitation to the monthly luncheon of the Board at the Chemists' Club at 52 East 41st Street in New York City (see EC 190.8). Of the two choices—"I shall" or "I shall not attend"—he invariably underscored the first option (*ibid.*). We can also see from his file that he worked closely with Duggan, Drury, Flexner (of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton), and Nelson P. Mead (Secretary of the Executive Committee). Apparently, he missed only one meeting, on December 10, 1943, due to illness (EC 190.8 [47])—Duggan wrote him immediately afterwards saying that without his presence the discussion had been inconclusive (EC 190.8 [47]). The last leaf in the folder is a note from Johnson (addressed from The New School at 66 West 12th Street, Gramercy [*sic*], 7-8464) informing Duggan (at 2 West 45 Street, NYC, 19) that it would be impossible for Duggan to arrive on Thursday, January 25, 1945, and that he should come instead on Monday, January 29, 1945 (EC 190.8 [57]). Duggan and Flexner frequently consulted with Johnson on delicate matters. For example, they asked Johnson for advice about procuring a modest stipend of \$1000 for Klaus Pringsheim Sr., brother-in-law of Thomas Mann (see Drury's letter in this folder dated September 7, 1940 [EC 190.8 (3)]). Chairman Duggan sent regular inquiries to Johnson regarding the means of support and salary details procured for some of the Emergency Committee grantees, paying special attention to term fellowships approaching expiration and non-guaranteed, non-pending renewals (March 16, 1942) (EC 190.8 [33]).

Even as the Allies started to win the war in Europe, the Committee did not slow down. Indeed, before the end of the War had been officially declared, we can see that Duggan worked closely with Johnson to procure a subvention from the National War Fund, so that the grants-in-aid program could continue (see Duggan's letter to Johnson on June 27, 1944 [EC 190.8 (33)]). (Many envelopes and cards from these years in the archives bear the same stamp: "Buy War Savings Bonds and Stamps.") Based on a perusal of the Committee's archives, the General Committee members over the years of its operation included the following powerful figures based in major American think tanks and within the academy: Thomas S. Baker; Lotus D. Coffman; Sir Arthur Currie; Harold Willis Dodds; Sidney B. Fay; Abraham Flexner; Harry A. Garfield; Robert M. Hutchins; James H. Kirkland; Henry N. MacCracken; Robert A. Millikan; Wesley C. Mitchell; Harold G. Moulton; William A. Nelson; George Norlin; Marion Edwards Park; Walter Dill Scott; Harlow Shapley; Robert G. Sproul; Oswald Veblen; Ray Lyman Wilbur; Ernest H. Wilkins; and Mary E. Woolley. The Executive Committee consisted of Stephen Duggan (who was the Committee's Secretary from 1933–39, but became Chairman in 1939, replacing Livingston Farrand, who had served from 1933 until his death in 1939) (see RSL 94–5); Nelson P. Mead (who was the Secretary from 1939 onward) (see RSL 178); Fred M. Stein, Treasurer; Alfred E. Cohn, Assistant Treasurer; Franks Aydelotte; L

- C. Dunn; Bernard Flexner (who died in 1945); Johnson; Hertha Kraus; Charles J Liebman; Henry Allen Moe; and Harlow Shapley (see “Creator History,” and “Names,” in *Guide to the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars Records*, pp. i–iii).
27. I reproduced this questionnaire from Adorno’s and Arendt’s individual files in the Emergency Committee collection at the NYPL (EC 37.17 [8–10]; and EC 38.15 [3–8]).
 28. At this point in the questionnaire, a footnote was added to the following effect: “If Professor, state whether ‘ordentlich’ [*ordinarius*] or ‘ausserordentlich’ [*extraordinarius*]; if ‘ausserordentlich’ [*extraordinarius*] state whether ‘official’ or ‘not official’” (“Wenn Professor, bitte anzugeben ob ‘ordentlich’ oder ‘ausserordentlich’; wenn ‘ausserordentlich,’ gebe an ob ‘beamtet’ oder ‘nicht beamtet’”) (see EC 37.17 [8–10]; and EC 38.15 [3–8]). These titles were based on a now defunct academic ranking system in Germany (see Thomas Finkenstaedt, “Teachers,” chap. 5 of *Universities since 1945*, vol. 4 of *A History of the University in Europe*, ed. Walter Rüegg [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011], pp. 167–8, 179, 184–5).
 29. Here too, a footnote was added: “Give at least three names of German referees, if possible” (“Gebe, wenn möglich, mindestens 3 Namen von deutschen Referenzen an”) (see EC 37.17 [8–10]; and EC 38.15 [3–8]).
 30. A footnote here reads: “State amount of income from university position and amount from other sources” (“Gebe den Betrag des Einkommens von der Universitätsstellung und desjenigen von anderen Quellen”) (ibid.).
 31. Starting in the early 1930s, the Emergency Association of German Science (Die Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft) (henceforth NG) was already leaning in favor of Hitlerism and ethnic-oriented research. In 1937, it was renamed the German Association for the Support and Advancement of Scientific Research (Die Deutsche Gemeinschaft zur Erhaltung und Förderung der Forschung). The foundation became the German Research Foundation (Die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) in 1951 and still operates under this name (see “History of the DFG,” Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, https://www.dfg.de/en/dfg_profile/history/ [accessed November 19, 2019]).
 32. On June 13, 1929, Arendt wrote to Jaspers from Neubabelsberg: “Unfortunately, the Jewish Academy turned down my application because it (1) is short of funds and (2) feels it would be more appropriate for the Notgemeinschaft to support my Rahel study” (Hannah Arendt to Karl Jaspers, June 13, 1929, in *Hannah Arendt/Karl Jaspers Correspondence, 1926–1969*, trans. Robert Kimber and Rita Kimber, ed. Lotte Kohler and Hans Saner [San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1992], p. 5).
 33. Karl Jaspers to Hannah Arendt, June 16, 1929, in *Hannah Arendt/Karl Jaspers Correspondence*, p. 6.
 34. In a one-paragraph curriculum vitae narrative, Arendt explained that her award, based on the merit of her dissertation completed under the directorship of Jaspers and Heidegger, was for a two-year period: “I, Hannah Stern, née Arendt, born October 14, 1906, in Hannover, studied in Königsberg for my diploma in the humanities; between 1924 and 1928, I

studied philosophy, ancient philology, and sociology at the Universities of Marburg, Freiburg, and Heidelberg. In 1928, I obtained my Ph.D. from Heidelberg under the supervision of Professor Karl Jaspers with a thesis on Augustine. Thanks to the publication of this work and the favorable opinions of Professors Jaspers and Heidegger, I received a two-year scholarship from the 'Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaft.' I left Germany in 1933 and have since lived in Paris where I have been active in different aid organizations for Jewish people in pedagogical and organizational roles" ("Ich, Hannah Stern geb. Arendt, geboren den 14.10.06 in Hannover, studierte nach Absolvierung des humanistischen Abiturs in Königsberg, an den Universitäten Marburg, Freiburg und Heidelberg von 1924–1928 die Fächer: Philosophie, Altphilologie und Soziologie. 1928 promovierte ich bei Professor Karls Jaspers in Heidelberg mit einer Dissertation ueber Augustin. Auf Grund der Publikation dieser Arbeit und den Gutachten der Herren Professoren Jaspers und Heidegger erhielt ich dann ein zweijähriges Stipendium der 'Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaft.'—Im Jahre 1933 verließ ich Deutschland und lebe seither in Paris, wo ich in verschiedenen jüdischen Hilfsorganisationen pädagogisch [sic] und organisatorisch tätig war") (EC 38.15 [6–7]).

35. The original text on the first page reads as follows: "Name: Wiesengrund-Adorno, T.L.; Age: 31; Rank: PD [Privatdozent] Field: Philosophy—Aesthetics, Music; Source of information: Academic Assistance Council, 4.3.34 [April 3, 1934] (EC 37.17 [4]). It appears that Adorno's statements underwent an additional stage of verification because an additional card was added to his Emergency Committee file, which contains the same information except that it lists Adorno's field as "music philosophy," adds his home institution as Frankfurt, and indicates that he had been appointed for tenure (EC 37.17 [5]). However, it could not have been the case that Adorno had been granted tenure at this stage: his habilitation thesis, a study on Kierkegaard, was only published in 1933—incidentally, on the same day as Hitler came to power in 1933 (see Jay, *Adorno*, pp. 30–1). Adorno's habilitation thesis was published in English as Theodor W. Adorno, *Kierkegaard: Construction of the Aesthetic*, trans. and ed. Robert Hullot-Kentor (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989).
36. Unfortunately, Adorno's response to the question about his income in 1932–33 is smudged. Adorno writes, "Without a real income; only about . . .," after which he has written a figure that has been smudged, which could be 1200, 1300, or 1800. Adorno also does not indicate the currency for the illegible number—whether British pounds or German Reichsmarks.
37. Here, Adorno is presumably referring to the Oxford Professor Francis Herbert Bradley (1846–1920), the British philosopher who made the case for neo-Platonism and German Idealism over utilitarianism and pragmatism. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality: A Metaphysical Essay* (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1897) was quite influential (see Leslie Armour, "F.H. Bradley and Later Idealism: From Disarray to Reconstruction," in *Philosophy after F.H. Bradley: A Collection of Essays*, ed. James Bradley [Bristol, UK: Thoemmes Press, 1996], pp. 1–30). His other two main works were *Principles of Logic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1922), and *Essays on Truth and Reality* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914).

38. It is worth noting that Tillich recommended Heidegger's students before Marxists. His first recommendation, Löwith, escaped from Germany to Italy, and in 1936, to Japan, which he left in 1941 (see Karl Löwith, *My Life in Germany before and after 1933: A Report* [London: Athlone, 1994], p. 162). From there, he moved to the United States where he taught at the Hartford Theological Seminary and The New School for Social Research, until his return to Germany in 1952 to teach at Heidelberg University, where he would die (*ibid.*). For further discussion of Löwith's life during the War, see Matthias Bormuth, "Meaning in History: A Comparison between the Works of Karl Löwith and Erich Auerbach," *Religions* 3:2 (2012), pp. 151–2; Otto Immanuel Spear, "Löwith, Karl," *Encyclopædia Judaica*, ed. Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik (Detroit: Macmillan, 2007), vol. 13, pp. 171–2; and Bryan S. Turner, preface to Karl Löwith, *Max Weber and Karl Marx*, trans. Hans Fantel, ed. Tom Bottomore and William Outhwaite (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 10–3. For an account of Löwith's relationship with Heidegger, see Richard Wolin, *Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), pp. 79–80.
39. The monograph of Löwith's to which Tillich is referring is Karl Löwith, *Das Individuum in der Rolle des Mitmenschen: Ein Beitrag zur anthropologischen Grundlegung der ethischen Probleme* (München: Drei Masken, 1928). Adorno's book, *Kierkegaard: Construction of the Aesthetic*, which Tillich mentions, was originally published in 1933 as *Kierkegaard: Konstruktion des Ästhetischen* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1933).
40. Robert Conquest's *The Great Terror* remains the most authoritative critical survey of Stalin's "great purge" in English. For his account of the Kirov assassination and the surrounding context, see "The Kirov Murder," chap. 2 of *The Great Terror: A Reassessment*, rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 37–52. On the participation of Soviet citizens and bureaucrats in denouncing foreign specialists and foreign-born communists in the Soviet Union, see Wendy Z. Goldman, *Terror and Democracy in the Age of Stalin: The Social Dynamics of Repression* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), and her later volume, *Inventing the Enemy: Denunciation and Terror in Stalin's Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011). On Stalin's purges of German intellectuals in particular, see David Pike, "The German Ezhovshchina: Stalin's Purge of Germans," chap. 11 of *German Writers in Soviet Exile, 1933–1945* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), pp. 307–57.
41. Zweig's letter has not been well preserved, and many parts of the carbon copy have faded. Here, I have only transcribed clearly legible parts of the letter about whose phrasing I can be certain, and I have preserved the original punctuation. The discernible part of the letter reads as follows: "Professor Hannah Stern-Arendt was already well known to me in Berlin as a deeply knowledgeable expert on Jewish living conditions during the Enlightenment and the Romantic era. Her first-rate work on Rahel Levin-Varnhagen and her [Varnhagen's] Berlin circle—work from which she now and then read excerpts to me—made me aware of her talent" ("Frau Dr. Hannah Stern-Arendt war mir schon in Berlin als gründliche Ken[n]erin der jüdischen Lebensumstände zur Zeit der Aufklärung und der Romantik

bekannt. Ihre vorzügliche Arbeit über Rahel Levin-Varnhagen und ihrer Berliner Kreis, aus der sie mir gelegentlich Stücke vorlas machten mich nachhaltig auf ihre Eignung aufmerksam”) (EC 38.15 [9]). After acknowledging Arendt’s help researching his new book on anti-Semitism, Zweig added: “This proved that she had an exceptionally clear understanding of the essence of modern anti-Semitism” (“Es erwies sich dabei, das sie das eigentümliche Wesen des modernen Antisemitismus besonders klar erfasst hatte”) (ibid.). He also added that of those involved in the work at the Jewish Radio Station (*Jüdische Rundschau*), she was a rare asset thanks to her being an “academically trained coworker” (*wissenschaftlich geschulten Mitarbeiter*) (ibid.).

42. Jasper’s letter reads as follows: “Mrs. H. Stern-Arendt completed her doctorate under my supervision in Fall 1928, with a final grade of 2 (*magna cum laude*). She submitted an outstanding dissertation on the concept of love in Augustine in which her gift for philosophically substantial and resolutely precise thinking was clearly demonstrated. Her minor [subjects] were Ancient Greek and New Testament Studies. I have known Mrs. Stern-Arendt for years, since she has been a participant in my seminar” (“Frau H. Stern-Arendt hat im Herbst 1928 bei mir mit der Note 2 [*magna cum laude*], promoviert. Sie legte eine hervorragende Dissertation ueber den Liebesbegriff bei Augustin vor, in der sie ebenso sehr den Sinn für philosophisch Wesentliches wie praegnanten entschiedenem Denken dokumentierte. Nebenfächer waren Griechisch und Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Frau Stern-Arendt ist mir seit Jahren durch ihre Teilnahme am Seminar bekannt”) (EC 38.15 [8]). Speaking of her personality, Jaspers noted how unusually powerful Arendt’s thirst for exploration was, for her age: “Considering the energy of her theoretical interests and the results already achieved at such a young age, we can hope for significant development. Her intent, based on her philosophical and historical education, to write a biography on Rahel, is, for anyone who knows Mrs. H. Stern-Arendt well, very compelling . . . I am convinced that by supporting her, science will be provided an essential service, which means, at the same time, such support will open up the possibility of her meaningful participation in the spiritual life of the future, in which she will distinguish herself. Heidelberg, December 21, 1929. K. Jaspers” (“Sieht man die Energie ihrer geistigen Interessen und die jetzt schon-in so jungen Jahren-vorliegende geistige Leistung, so darf man auf eine bedeutende Entwicklung hoffen. Ihre Absicht, auf Grund ihrer philosophischen und historischen Bildung eine Biographie Rahels zu schreiben, hat für jemanden, der Frau Stern-Arendt kennt, etwas Überzeugendes. . . . Ich bin ueberzeugt, dass durch ihre Unterstuetzung der Wissenschaft ein wesentlicher Dienst erwiesen wird, was hier zugleich bedeutet, fuer eine Persönlichkeit von Rang den Weg zu oeffnen zur aktiven Teilnahme am geistigen Leben der Zukunft. Heidelberg, den 21 Dezember 1929. K. Jaspers”) (ibid.).
43. Heidegger’s letter reads as follows: “Mrs. H. Stern-Arendt attended my lectures during her first few semesters and contributed to my tutorials. From the very beginning, she exhibited a dedication that was a pleasure to find, along with a level of interest that is uncommon. Her assured instinct for discerning meaningful issues and her extraordinary intelligence have led to a significant deepening of the questions [with which she is dealing]. Her understanding of the latter, as well as her comprehensive education and

talent for literary exposition, will allow Mrs. Stern-Arendt to make a significant contribution to the field of intellectual history. Indeed, only few people enter this field with adequate philosophical training. Freiburg, December 23, 1929. M. Heidegger" ("Frau H. Stern-Arendt hat bei mir in ihren ersten Semestern gehoert und in den Uebungen mitgearbeitet. Sie bekundete von Anfang an einen erfreulichen Arbeitseifer und ein ungewoehnliches Interesse. Der sichere Instinkt fuer das Wertvolle und eine ausserordentliche Klugheit bewirkten alsbald ein gruendliches Hineinwachsen in die Probleme. Das Verstandnis dieser, zusammen mit einer umfassenden Bildung und der Begabung fuer Literarische Darstellung, werden Frau Stern-Arendt befahigen auf dem Gebiet der Geistesgeschichte wertvoll Arbeit zu leisten. Es sind heute nur Wenige, die dieses Gebiet mit einer hinreichenden philosophischen Vorbereitung betreten. Freiburg, i[m.]. J[ahr] 23. 12. 29 gez M. Heidegger") (EC 38.15 [8]).

44. Dibelius' letter, in full, reads as follows: "I got to know Miss. Hannah Arendt through seminar sessions on the New Testament and through personal conversations. In my opinion, she is a gifted person of an undoubtedly spiritual frame. As far as I can judge, her main interests revolve around the field of intellectual history. During seminar discussions, which focused on problems of intellectual history and its developments, she made valuable contributions. It does not seem that she is as interested in other topics of history. Her ability to analyze and to compare different things has stood out as above average, both during the seminar as well as during her doctoral defense. Heidelberg, June 29, 1929. Martin Dibelius. Full Professor of Theology at Heidelberg University" ("Fraulein Hannah Arendt ist mir aus den Sitzungen des neutestamentlichen Seminars und personlichen Gesprachen bekannt. Sie ist m.E. [meines Erachtens] ein sehr begabter Mensch von unbedingt geistigen Format. Ihr Hauptinteresse liegt, soweit ich beurteilen kann, auf dem Gebiet der Geistesgeschichte. In den Diskussionen, die geistesgeschichtliche Probleme und Entwicklungen zum Gegenstand hatten, hat sie in den Seminarsitzungen fuehrend mitgewirkt. Themen anderer Art aus der Geschichte scheinen ihr weniger zu liegen. Ihre Faehigkeit zu analysieren sowie zu vergleichen ist sowohl im Seminar wie bei der Dektorpruefung als eine wesentlich ueberdurchschnittliche hervorgetreten. Heidelberg, 29 Juni 1929 gez. Martin Dibelius, Ordentlicher Professor der Theologie an der Universitaet Heidelberg") (EC 38.15 [8]).

Dibelius (1883–1947) held a doctorate in Semitic Philology from the renowned department in this specialty at the University of Tübingen. He held the Chair of New Testament Exegesis and Criticism at Heidelberg University until his death (1915–1947). For a short biography of Dibelius, see Bertram Lee Woolf, "Biographical Note," in Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935), pp. vii–xi. Through Tillich, Dibelius established good connections in America (see Stefan Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld: Studien zu Martin Dibelius* [Münster: LIT, 2001], pp. 66–70). Though initially in support of the Nazi party, he and his cousin Otto quickly became irreconcilable religious enemies of the Hitler regime (see Arthur C. Cochrane, *The Church's Confession under Hitler* [Pittsburg: Pickwick Press, 1976], pp. 52–3; and Geiser, *Verantwortung und Schuld*, pp. 1–9, 131). The Dibelius cousins' growing resistance to Hitler was apparently one reason that Hitler never

trusted the Protestant Church in Germany (see Richard Steigmann-Gall, *The Holy Reich: Nazi Conceptions of Christianity, 1919–1945* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003], pp. 186, 265–7).

In 1937, Dibelius delivered the Shaffer Lectures at Yale Divinity School (published as Martin Dibelius, *The Sermon on the Mount* [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1940]). He was the founder of the form criticism (*Formgeschichte* method) school of theology. In lieu of hermeneutics, this school of thought allowed more liberally for the literary criticism of the forms in which ideas, thoughts, reports, descriptions, and so on are passed on orally or in writing. In Dibelius' words, this method "seeks to help in answering the historical questions as to the nature and trustworthiness of our knowledge of Jesus" (Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, p. vi), and, "by reconstruction and analysis, it seeks to explain the origin of the tradition about Jesus" (p. v). Form criticism analyzes the sayings of Jesus and the intentions of the churches that collected them and "passed them from mouth to mouth" (*ibid.*; see also pp. 133–72). It should be noted that even in the later editions of his book *Jesus*, we can see remnants of his theological anti-Semitism. For example, at one stage in that text, he writes, "It was upon the basis of the history of Jesus that Judaism once decided its own fate" (Martin Dibelius, *Jesus*, trans. Charles B. Hendrick and Frederick C. Grant [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1949], p. 147). For an analysis of anti-Semitism in Dibelius' theology, especially in *Jesus*, see Anders Gerdmar, "Martin Dibelius: Ambivalence to Jews and Judaism," in *Roots of Theological Anti-semitism: German Biblical Interpretations and the Jews, from Herder and Semler to Kittel and Bultmann* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 347–71.

45. Regenbogen's name appears on a copy of Arendt's CV that the Emergency Committee kept on file, the opening of which reads as follows: "Arendt, Hannah; born October 14, 1906 in Hanover/Germany (married to Blücher, Heinrich, military writer); graduated from college for liberal arts. Studied philosophy as major with Husserl, Heidegger, Jaspers; Greek philosophy and Protestant theology as minors. Ph.D. in Heidelberg with Jaspers, Regenbogen, and Dibelius, 1929. Fellowship from the 'Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft,' sponsored by Jaspers, Heidegger, and Dibelius in 1930; research subject: German romanticism. Published: *Der Liebesbegriff bei Augustin, Versuch einer philosophischen Interpretation* (Berlin: Springer, 1929). Articles 1930–32: 'Philosophie und Soziologie' (*Die Gesellschaft*); 'Rilke's Duineser Elegien' (*Neue Schweizer Rundschau*); 'Der Salon' (*Reklam-Almanach*); 'Aufklärung und Judenfrage' (*Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland*); Other articles and book reviews in: *Kölnische Zeitung*, *Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft*" (EC 38.15 [10–1]).

Regenbogen (1891–1966) was a philosopher, classicist, and a historian of literature and ancient medicine, who published on Seneca and Thucydides, among others (see, respectively, his *Schmerz und Tod in den Tragödien Senecas* [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftlichen Buchgesellschaft, 1963], first published in 1930; and *Thukydides' politische Reden* [Leipzig: Köhler und Amelang, 1949]). Regenbogen bought into, and helped propagate, the illusion of Nazism as a cultural force that would recreate the old dream of German *Bildung* and restore the harmonic ideal of Greece in twentieth-century Germany, thereby ensuring the eternal rule of the Third Reich (see, in

particular, his essay, “Original oder Übersetzung?,” in *Das Gymnasium: Im Auftrage des Zentralinstituts für Erziehung und Unterricht*, ed. Otto Morgenstern [Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1926], pp. 57–66; see also Barbara Stiewe, *Der “Dritte Humanismus”: Aspekte deutscher Griechenrezeption vom George-Kreis bis zum Nationalsozialismus* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011], p. 43). We see the germination of these ideas in his Ph.D. dissertation, which he defended in the first year of the First World War (see Otto Regenbogen, “Symbola Hippocratea” [Ph.D. diss., Friedrich Wilhelm University, 1914]). In 1944, the eminent Werner Jaeger’s *The Ideals of Greek Culture* completely undermined Regenbogen’s interpretations of the relationship between Greek and German culture (see, in particular, Werner Jaeger, *The Conflict of Cultural Ideals in the Age of Plato*, vol. 3 of *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, trans. Gilbert Highet [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1944]).

46. On Adorno’s life in “German California,” see Detlev Claussen, *Theodor Adorno: One Last Genius*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), pp. 116–22. In a document dated May 4, 1939, the IIE recorded a list of foreign scholars holding positions in the United States, excluding grantees of the Emergency Committee, which provides some insight into Adorno’s intellectual circle during these years. The list reads as follows: “In the International Institute of Social Research: (a) Erich Fromm; Henryk Grossman; Max Horkheimer; Otto Kirchheimer; Leo Löwenthal; Herbert Marcuse; Franz Neumann; Frederick Pollock; Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno; Karl August Wittfogel; (b) former foreign members of this institute placed in other institutions: Konrad Bekker (Brookings Institute); Paul F. Lazarsfeld (Princeton University); Gerhard Meyer (University of Chicago)” (EC 37.17 [1]).
47. On June 24, 1942, Arendt wrote the following to Drury: “My dear Miss Drury: Dr. Kristeller of Columbia University suggested to me some time ago that I write to you and request an appointment, in order to receive your advice in reference to my professional problem. I hope you may be able to grant me this appointment. Very truly yours, Hannah Arendt” (EC 38.15 [11]). Drury responded: “Dear Dr. Arendt, Let me acknowledge your letter of June 24 in which you request an appointment. I shall be glad to meet you on Thursday of this week, July 2, at 2:30 pm. If it so happens that this time is not convenient for you, please let me hear from you and we will set another time. Sincerely yours, Betty Drury, Executive Secretary” (EC 38.15 [11–2]). As a result of the meeting, on July 6, 1942, Drury sent requests for letters of recommendation to evaluate “the scholarly ability and personal qualifications of [Arendt]” to Baron, Gurian, Kristeller, and Tillich (EC 38.15 [17]).
48. On July 10, 1942, Tillich sent a handwritten letter from Bar Harbor, Maine, where he was vacationing: “Dear Miss Drury: I answer your question concerning Miss Arendt-Blücher quite informally, being on vacation, without typewriter and secretary. I have known her since about 1930 when I was Professor of Philosophy at the University Frankfurt/Main. As soon as she arrived in this country I got in touch with her and have met her several times. She is an absolutely outstanding personality. In Frankfurt she excelled amongst all the studying women as the most learned and able one. After the discussion I had here with her I had the impression that she has not changed at all, but that beyond that she has become a mature, cultivated

and strong personality. I also have met her husband who impressed me deeply. May I add that I have heard similar judgments about Mrs. Blücher from other very reliable persons. She deserves any kind of help you can give her. Very sincerely yours. Professor Paul Tillich" (EC 38.15 [18]).

The following letter, dated July 8, 1942, arrived from Gurian, a well-respected authority on Bolshevism who taught political science at Notre Dame University, and was Arendt's friend from her days in Paris: "Dear Miss Drury: I am very glad to recommend to you Mrs. Hannah Arendt-Blücher. For more than 10 years I have been aware of her scholarly work. Even as a student she was regarded as one of the most promising disciples of Heidegger (Freiburg) and Jaspers (Heidelberg). Her study of the Idea of Love [*sic*] in St. Augustine's work has been highly praised as an important contribution. Several articles—among them an impressive analysis of Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* [*sic*—have substantiated her real ability in the history of Ideas and in sociological interpretation. Unfortunately, difficulties occurring after her departure from Germany prevented the completion and publication of a book on political and social trends in German Romanticism. I read her study on the Dreyfuss [*sic*] Affair (which will be published soon by the *Jewish Social Studies*; it is an important contribution to the study of Nationalism and Antisemitism). Briefly and summarily: Dr. Hannah Arendt-Blücher could make very valuable contributions to the understanding of modern times. She is a particularly gifted student of History of Ideas, combining a thorough training in history of philosophy, a gift for interpretation of social movements, and a clear manner of presentation. She deserves any help your group can give her. Very sincerely yours, Waldemar Gurian, Editor of *The Review of Politics*, Associate Professor of Politics, University of Notre Dame, Indiana" (EC 38.15 [20]).

There is not enough space here to give a full account of Arendt's friendship with Gurian. He was a kindred spirit in things sacred to her, especially when it came to the meaning of immigration and being Jewish. Arendt immortalized this spirit in a beautiful tribute to Gurian following his untimely death in 1955: "He was a man of many friends and a friend to all of them, men and women, priests and laymen, people in many countries and from practically all walks of life" (Hannah Arendt, "The Personality of Waldemar Gurian," *The Review of Politics* 17:1 [1955], pp. 33–42).

In 1942, Baron was a new acquaintance of Arendt's. However, his editorship of *Jewish Social Studies*, the highly respected quarterly, his tenured full Professor status at the History Department at Columbia University, coupled with his prominence as a published scholar from the late 1920s onward meant that his endorsement of Arendt was powerful. In his letter, Baron wrote: "My dear Miss Drury: I have met Dr. Hannah Arendt-Blücher only a few months ago, after her arrival in this country. But I have known some of her publications which appeared while she was still in Germany. While here, she submitted to the quarterly, *Jewish Social Studies*, of which I am one of the editors, an extensive essay on the Dreyfus Affair. This essay, which is scheduled to appear in the July issue of that journal—expected to come off the press within two or three weeks—offers a keen and original analysis of this much discussed but still little understood episode in French history. I have also seen Dr. Arendt-Blücher's review of a recent volume of Gentz and an outline of another extensive essay. On this basis I have no doubt that she is very competent

to write a comprehensive history of modern Antisemitism which undoubtedly will be a major contribution to the understanding of this complex phenomenon. For this reason, I do not hesitate to recommend her warmly for a grant by the Emergency Committee. Very truly yours, signature. Salo W. Baron” (EC 38.15 [21]). Arendt’s essay on the Dreyfus Affair was published as “From the Dreyfus Affair to France Today,” *Jewish Social Studies* 4:3 (1942), pp. 195–240.

Lastly, Kristeller was a fellow student of Arendt’s at Heidelberg University, with whom Arendt reconnected upon her arrival in New York (for more on Kristeller’s relationship with Arendt, see Martin Woessner, *Heidegger in America* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011], pp. 44–6). At this stage, Kristeller was not yet the Columbia University star and famous scholar of the Renaissance humanism that he would later become, nor had he yet become the Editor of the of the magnificent journal, *Iter Italicum*. However, his testimony was the most personal of Arendt’s recommendations. He wrote: “On the basis of my own impression and of what I have heard from others, I am convinced that Mrs. Arendt is well qualified to do scholarly work in the field of her chosen studies. She has an excellent background and training, unusual intelligence, and great vivacity. I would think her capable not only of doing careful research work, but also of approaching her material with interesting, original ideas. Her conversation is pleasant and stimulating. Her approach to people is friendly and open-minded. I understand that she has some experience in social work. I have not seen her work and would not even be able to judge it competently. But I may add that I heard favorable comments on her doctoral dissertation. I really think that she would deserve the interest and help of your committee and hope very much that you will be able to do something for her” (EC 38.15 [22]).

49. See Elisabeth Gallas, *A Mortuary of Books: The Rescue of Jewish Culture after the Holocaust* (New York: New York University Press, 2019), p. 80.
50. Baron was Chairman of the Commission on European Jewish Cultural Reconstruction (see *ibid.*, p. 81). For more on Baron, see Arthur Hertzberg, “Baron, Salo [Shalom] Wittmayer,” in *Encyclopædia Judaica*, vol. 3, pp. 172–3).
51. Cicero, *Paradoxa Stoicorum*, paradox 1, §8. Cicero attributes this quote to Bias of Priene.
52. We know that Adorno elicited help for Kracauer from a thank you letter that Drury wrote to Adorno on November 7, 1938, which is preserved in his Emergency Committee file. In the note, she writes: “Your recommendations [which include Kracauer] of course will be placed before the Committee at its Executive meeting on Wednesday” (EC 37.17 [2]). Kracauer, ultimately, was not among those selected for funding.
53. We learn about this resolution from a letter received by Flexner from Drury in 1939 concerning Wolfgang Windelband (1886–1945), son of the famous neo-Kantian, Wilhelm Windelband (1848–1915): “The Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars, at its executive meeting on September 21 discussed the cases of current grantees who were still in Europe at the opening of the academic year, and who might be expected to be unable to reach their college or university in time to take up their

work during this present period—among them, Wolfgang Windelband. The Committee knows that questions of emigration are of course very difficult to handle at this time and it is by no means certain which scholars may be allowed to leave Europe. The Committee did not wish, at this time, however, to cancel any of its grants in support of scholars who were unavoidably detained in Europe. These cases will be taken up again at a later meeting when more information has been obtained about the emigration problem involved” (Betty Drury, letter to Abraham Flexner, https://library.ias.edu/sites/library.ias.edu/files/page/DO_Gen_Box_70_Windelband_Sept%2023_39.pdf [accessed November 2, 2019]). The younger Windelband was the editor of his father’s works and was formerly the Prussian Minister of Science, Art, and Education.

54. Keezer wrote to Walker complaining that Geiger “prompted me to pester many busy people in Washington and New York with the request that the immigration troubles be eliminated. In light of this experience I am something less than broken-hearted that Dr. Geiger is not coming to Reed. And fortunately we have been able to make what promises to be satisfactory arrangements for the handling of the work which he would have done. However, I do regret exceedingly the burden which has fruitlessly been placed upon you and the members of your staff in generously arranging for a grant to help with Dr. Geiger’s salary at Reed, as I regret the large amount of labor which was inflicted upon Dr. Alvin Johnson and the staff of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars to no avail. Since Dr. Geiger has now officially informed me that he does not intend to come to Reed College, I request that the grant on this [*sic*] behalf approved by the Rockefeller Foundation be rescinded. In doing so I assure you of our deep appreciation of your approval of the grant” (EC 179.10 [5]). Without suggesting that Keezer was racially or xenophobically prejudiced against refugees who did not fit into his preconceived scheme of what they should be like, we can say that this overly emotional letter, with resounding volumes of administrative annoyance, provides a good picture of what the rescue effort looked like on a daily basis.
55. See *ibid.*
56. The Emergency Committee were clearly sensitive to concerns about displaced scholars taking jobs from Americans, and thus published many disclaimers and explanations in support and justification of its actions. Consider this statement on its invitations to refugee specialists in medicine written by George Baehr, Secretary of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Physicians, a section of the Emergency Committee: “An unfortunate aspect of the present situation in Germany is that it has brought misfortune to many of her scholars. These include the physicians and surgeons in professional and academic positions, who are being forced to leave the country and seem doomed to forfeit their carefully prepared careers and opportunity for carrying on research. To save their services for the common good, organizations in several countries of Europe are working to secure for them positions outside Germany” (George Baehr, “Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Physicians,” *JAMA* 101:24 [1933], p. 1900). To dispel the fears of domestic physicians about possible competition, Baehr added: “The Committee will keep in mind the necessity of avoiding recommendations that might

- result in injury to American physicians or introduce competition with them” (ibid.). Any stipends, he concluded, will be for “full-time service” (ibid.).
57. Alvin Johnson, “The Refugee Scholars,” the *New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/1940/11/17/archives/the-refugee-scholars-dr-alvin-johnson-explains-thought-back-of-his.html> (accessed November 24, 2019).
 58. Diana Rice, “Exiles Aid Study Here: German Scholars Placed on American Campuses through Two Plans,” the *New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/1934/05/27/archives/exiles-aid-study-here-german-scholars-placed-on-american-campuses.html?searchResultPosition=1> (accessed December 5, 2019).
 59. Alvin Johnson, “German Scholars’ Future as Seen by Dr. Johnson,” the *New York Times*, <https://www.nytimes.com/1934/06/24/archives/german-scholars-future-as-seen-by-dr-johnson.html?searchResultPosition=1> (accessed December 5, 2019).
 60. Rudolf Küstermeier, who was a Bielefeld native, was thirty-one at the time of his arrest. He survived years of custody in various concentration camps and was liberated in Bergen-Belsen in 1945 (see Eberhard Kolb, *Bergen-Belsen: Vom “Aufenthaltslager” zum Konzentrationslager, 1943–45* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2002], p. 120). He became the Editor-in-Chief of *Die Welt*—a German newspaper—in 1946, and eventually moved to Israel where he worked as a foreign correspondent for twenty years, before dying there in 1977 (see Dennis Egginger-Gonzalez, *Der Rote Stoßtrupp: Eine frühe linkssozialistische Widerstandsgruppe gegen den Nationalsozialismus* [Berlin: Lukas, 2018], p. 168).
 61. For an image of how such camps might have been envisaged, we might recall Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s *The First Circle*, trans. Harry Willets (New York: Harper Perennial, 2009).
 62. A record of these lists shared, which was with Duggan, can be found in Berdiaev’s file of the Emergency Committee records (EC 42.17 [4–5]).
 63. Details about negotiations concerning the hiring of non-German scholars can be found in EC 148.5–7. For the catalogues of for-credit courses offered through the École Libre des Hautes Études, and its lecture schedules and announcements, see EC 148.9–11.
 64. See the correspondence between Duggan and Johnson on January 22, 1943 (EC 179.10 [96]).
 65. Gerald Steinacher and Brian Barmettler are working on a new biography of Johnson that will address his versatile contributions to American learning. It will be based on the supplement to his papers at Yale University donated by Johnson’s estate to the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. Steinacher and Barmettler have already published a brief account of Johnson’s role in the University in Exile in their essay, “The University in Exile and the Garden of Eden: Alvin Johnson and His Rescue Efforts for European Jews and Intellectuals,” in *Reassessing History from Two Continents: Festschrift Günter Bischof*, ed. Martin Eichtinger, Stefan Karner, Mark Kramer, and Peter Ruggenthaler (Innsbruck, AT: Innsbruck University Press, 2013), pp. 49–68.

66. Maria Ley-Piscator, *The Piscator Experiment: The Political Theater* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1967), pp. 46–7. Ley-Piscator further reflected about Johnson thus: “What made him a glamorous figure was the fact that since 1933 he had been a sort of Scarlet Pimpernel, snatching anti-Fascist and Jewish scholars from the grip of the Hitlerites, just as the fictional gentleman rescued French aristocrats from the guillotine. The result was the establishment of a University in Exile, acclaimed by President Roosevelt as a demonstration of ‘American adherence to the principle of intellectual freedom’” (ibid., p. 46).
67. Reflecting on his youth, Johnson writes: “I knew Latin and Greek. I read them like modern languages. In a long cold winter evening, before my potbelly soft coal stove, I might read fifty pages of Tacitus or Thucydides. These were two friends of mine. They were honest as the day is long, but they were Optimates, Elite, judging all events from the elite standpoint. But because they were honest you could look through them to the common humanity, my kind of people, whom they hated and distrusted yet permitted to exist in their thought” (Alvin Johnson, *The Pioneer’s Progress: An Autobiography* [Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1952], pp. 96–7). Seeing Johnson’s obsession with the classics, Professor Lees, “a noble classical scholar” gave him the following advice: “You are a good Greek scholar. . . . You are a better Greek than I am, Johnson, but Greek is gone. They are cutting it out at Harvard and Yale. Soon there will be no colleges requiring Greek. Latin is going the same way” (p. 98). As the Director of The New School for Social Research, and as an Emergency Committee member, Johnson never allowed the cutting of either Greek or Latin, nor did he tolerate any disrespect toward expert immigrant scholars who sought employment in these specialties. Moreover, *Pioneer’s Progress* honors the same love for Greek art and literature of Joseph Urban, the designer of the landmark New School building at 66 West 12th Street, who passed away in July 1933, just three years after the building had been finished, and three months before the opening of the University in Exile (see pp. 332, 338, 345). Johnson and Urban had various conversations about the Hellenic and neo-Hellenic attributes of the ongoing design of this building (see p. 323). Urban, Johnson recalls, upon finishing the designs for the New School building, presented him with a marble copy of the antique Aphrodite of Cyrene statue, and remarked humorously, “That statue will be happy with you” (p. 325). Johnson made efforts to find work for scholars with expertise in Greek and Latin, such as for the famous classical philologist and comparative-historical linguist Boris Unbegaun (see EC 148.7 [419]), and the Franco-Belgian Latinist Léon Herrmann, formerly of the University of Brussels, who edited and translated texts by Seneca and other, mostly Roman, authors (see EC 179.10 [85–90] for correspondence between Johnson and Duggan about procuring a visa and work for Herrmann). In the latter connection, see in particular a postcard from Johnson to Duggan in New York, postmarked April 13, 1942, in which Johnson writes that he “had heard, eventually, Léon Herrmann had received a visa,” and added an excited inscription in pencil: “Léon Herrmann! (classicist—grantee of ours)” (EC 179.10 [85]). In a response to Duggan on July 8, 1942, Johnson wrote: “You have noted that the professor of Latin in Iowa State University died recently. I wonder whether they would not be glad to take Herrmann.

He contemplates returning to Brussels after the war, and we need not make any stipulations as to the permanence. He is a French citizen and was an officer in the unhappy campaign which ended with the fall of France. I am much impressed with Herrmann. He is certainly one of the most distinguished Latinists of Europe. He was a professor at the University of Brussels for some fifteen years, and has an exciting record of publications. He speaks English very well, and his talk bristles with interesting ideas" (EC 179.10 [90])

68. Ibid.
69. In this lecture, Huizinga argues that the *παιδεία* of the Greeks and the culture of Roman antiquity were history's most abiding ideals, even surviving through bloody times, such as the Terror of the French Revolution, which was wrapped in its own symbols (see Johan Huizinga, "Historical Ideals of Life," in *Men and Ideas: History, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance*, trans. James S. Holmes and Hans van Marle [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984], pp. 89–92). He writes, "liberation is to be found not in the abandonment of culture, but in the abandonment of one's own ego" (p. 96).
70. Virginia Woolf, "On Not Knowing Greek," in *The Common Reader: First Series*, ed. Andrew McNeillie (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1925), p. 23.
71. Ibid., pp. 32–3, 38.
72. Adorno writes, "All philosophy, even philosophy that intends freedom, drags unfreedom along in its wake, an unfreedom in which society prolongs itself. The neo-ontological projects have all resisted this, but their thrust was that of a regression to true or fictitious ἀρχαί, origins, which are nothing but the principle of coercion. . . . Thought contains coercion within itself" (Theodor W. Adorno, *Lectures on Negative Dialectics: Fragments of a Lecture Course, 1965/1966*, trans. Rodney Livingstone, ed. Rolf Tiedemann [Cambridge: Polity, 2008], p. 164). Elsewhere, in another post-War reflection, he writes, "We do not first define ourselves as individuals by watering ourselves like plants in order to become universally cultured personalities" (Adorno, "A European Scholar in America," in *The Intellectual Migration*, p. 368). Transplants and immigrants are those necessary adjusters, who repair the imbalance between thought and τέχνη, between the traditions of ἀρχή and the mobility necessitating adjustment.

Arendt agrees that the Greeks were better producers than they were preservers. Therefore, she argues that the concept of "culture," which is dependent on traditions of cultivation and preserving, is a Roman invention: "As humanists, we can rise above these conflicts between the statesman and the artist as we can rise in freedom above the specialties which we all must learn and pursue. . . . We shall be able to understand that even if all the criticism about Plato is right, Plato may still be better company than his critics. At any rate, we may remember what the Romans—the first people that took culture seriously the way we do—thought a cultivated person ought to be: one who knows how to choose his company among men, among things, among thought, in the present as well as in the past" (Hannah Arendt, "The Crisis in Culture: Its Social and Political Significance," in *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought* [New York: Viking Press, 1961], pp. 225–6).

73. See Hannah Arendt, “A Christian Word about the Jewish Question (This Means You),” and “We Refugees,” in *The Jewish Writings*, ed. Jerome Kohn and Ron H. Feldman (New York: Schocken Books, 2007), pp. 160–62, and 264–74, respectively.
74. Arendt, “A Christian Word about the Jewish Question,” p. 161.