

Histories of knowledge translation

Exile in a translational mode

Safeguarding German scholarship in Turkey and the United States during the Nazi reign

Azade Seyhan

To write this German book, I had to emigrate in 1933 from a Germany whose stifling atmosphere after Hitler's conquest left me no air to breathe. The most important and pressing task imposed by the catastrophic world situation upon historian and sociologist alike, it seemed to me, was to determine just what had really happened and just what position we really occupy in the historical continuum.

Alexander Rüstow (1980, xxiii)

Alexander Rüstow, a classicist by training and a Socialist by calling, and one of the key political figures of the Weimar Republic, narrowly escaped to Istanbul, when his efforts to stop Adolf Hitler from seizing power in 1933 failed and his family home in Berlin was ransacked by the Gestapo. He was almost 50 at the time, and during his 16-year exile in Turkey, he joined nearly 200 German-Jewish and antifascist academics and intellectuals, who were offered positions at the University of Istanbul and the University of Ankara. They taught in several fields, and their multiple areas of expertise embodied the epitome of the German ideal of *Bildung*,¹ a training that is almost impossible to receive today. As the above quote from the foreword to the abbreviated English translation of his multidisciplinary magnum opus *Ortsbestimmung der Gegenwart. Eine universalgeschichtliche Kulturkritik* (Situating the Present. A Universal Historical Critique of Civilization, 1950, 1952, 1957) indicates,

¹ I am referring here to the concept of *Humboldtisches Bildungsideal*, literally, the Humboldtian educational ideal, that emerged in the early nineteenth century and saw as its goal the achievement of both comprehensive general learning (including Latin and ancient Greek) and cultural knowledge.

Rüstow saw his enforced exile as a necessary condition for the comprehension and critique of the temporal forces that determine our situatedness in history. The overarching question of this momentous work was: How did we arrive at this catastrophic moment in time?

The first part of my inquiry concerns the historical conditions that necessitated the exodus of German culture to an unlikely destination. When Hitler seized power (*Machtergreifung*) in 1933 in a Germany besieged by political and financial crises, he swiftly moved to expel all scholars of Jewish heritage from their posts and effectively suspended every form of autonomy at the university. Among those dismissed from their jobs was the Hungarian-born Frankfurt pathologist, Dr. Philipp Schwartz, who fled with his family to Switzerland. In March 1933, Schwartz established the Zürich-based *Notgemeinschaft deutscher Wissenschaftler im Ausland* (Emergency Assistance Organization for German Scientists Abroad) to help Jewish and other persecuted German scholars secure employment in countries prepared to receive German refugees. The main focus of this chapter is the unique encounter in various translational modalities between academics exiled from the Third Reich and the Turkish institutions of higher learning that offered them refuge.² While a major part of my inquiry centers on the relatively unknown work of the German intellectual exiles in Turkey, I selectively compare their experience with that of the German scholars who immigrated to the US, not so much to stress similarities or differences, but rather to establish a heuristic premise that illustrates the different paths that intellectual transport and translation take. However, the fortunes of a virtually forgotten group of German scholars, who did not have the connections and clout of such well-known figures as Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt, or Herbert Marcuse, resemble those of the German émigré academics in Turkey. Like their compatriot exiles in Turkey, who landed in uncharted cultural territory, this group found refuge and employment in the “other” US, that is, the American South, which is not only geographically separated from the North by the Mason-Dixon line but was and, to some extent, still is also culturally, socially, and politically positioned against it. The story of these

2 For a comprehensive historical and critical account of the German academic exile to Turkey from Nazi Germany, see the memoirs of the exiles, such as Neumark (1980) and Hirsch (1982). An early academic study by Horst Widmann (1973) provides a full list of German-speaking academic exiles at the universities of Istanbul and Ankara with short biographies and comprehensive bibliographic sources.

émigré scholars, who took positions in traditionally Black colleges, needs to be remembered in the larger history of academic exiles. Therefore, I add an excursus on these scholars, who went “From the Swastika to Jim Crow.”

The virtually unstoppable phenomenon of refugee flow to Western Europe and particularly to Germany bears witness to a historical irony, for during most of the last century Europe itself was a site of exodus, embroiled as it was in the inferno of two world wars. Of all European countries, Germany arguably represents the most radical transformation of a geography of emigration into one of immigration within the span of a few decades. Since most current academic research has concentrated predominantly on the immigration to Germany from the Middle East and the countries of the Mediterranean basin and on the challenges of non-integration and faltering acculturation, the archive of exile histories in and out of Germany remains incongruous and often incomplete. A more complete history would interconnect communities of research to negotiate the limitations as well as the inclusiveness of the archive. To that end, I examine the impact of German émigré scholars on Turkish and American academia and politics through a limited comparative assessment that highlights the correspondences between forms of exilic scholarship on opposite cultural shores as well as the different conditions in which exiled academics sought to preserve an intellectual legacy under threat.

While the critical gains of postcolonial theory and discourses on identity politics afford valuable insights into the unprecedented scale of migratory movements of our time, the historical contexts of displacement and deportation cannot only or consistently be abstracted from late twentieth and early twenty-first century narratives of exile. It behooves the critic and the historian to expand the domain of exile studies not only geographically but also historically, where acts of transport and translation across borders and epochs offer critical insight into the current large-scale population displacements. While languages and cultures in multidirectional movements destabilize paradigmatic unities, this instability enables the entry of once obscured texts into the archive, thus contributing to a new conceptualization of the transnational.

Redressing the archive of exile scholarship

Although the exodus of German scholars and writers to other European countries and particularly to the US has been extensively studied, the

long-term sojourn of many noted academics and artists in Turkey has received scant critical attention. This situation changed somewhat when exile scholarship “discovered” that Erich Auerbach, who in 1935 was dismissed from his chair in Romance Philology at the University of Marburg, had written his magnum opus, *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur* (1946) during the 12 years of exile he spent in Istanbul. The 50th anniversary edition of the English translation, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Auerbach, 1953), was issued in 2003 with an introduction by Edward W. Said.³ Its publication generated some interest in and curiosity about other exiled German professors in Istanbul. There are notable publications, even documentaries, on individual figures such as Rüstow, Ernst Reuter, who before his exile was the Socialist mayor of Marburg and after his return to Germany, twice the mayor of Berlin, and the iconic Berlin architect Bruno Taut. However, there is as yet no critical study of the collective contribution of exiled professors to the sociocultural fabric of the host country. Among the other German academic exiles in Turkey during the 12 years of what was supposed to be a Thousand Year Reich, were the Romanist Leo Spitzer; philosopher Hans Reichenbach; Fritz Neumark, a prominent economist who taught at the University of Istanbul and served twice as *rektor* of the University of Frankfurt upon his return to Germany; Ernst E. Hirsch, professor of commercial law and a widely published legal expert, who was elected *rektor* of the Berlin Free University after his return to Germany; Georg Rohde, classical philologist, who played an important advisory role in the *Dünya Edebiyatından Tercümeler* (Translations from World Literature) series, inaugurated by the Turkish Minister of Education Hasan Âli Yücel⁴; the renowned sculptor Rudolf Belling, who had been fired from

3 This edition includes a long introductory essay by Edward W. Said, as well as an essay, translated into English for the first time, by Auerbach in response to his critics.

4 Yücel was the Turkish Minister of Education from December 1938 to August 1946. A linguist, philosopher, educator, and parliamentarian, he was considered a leading Turkish humanist. He is credited with establishing the *Köy Enstitüleri* (Village Institutes), which enabled the village youth to train as elementary school teachers close to home. Since Yücel oversaw the “Translations from World Literature” book series, which issued translations of both Western and Eastern classics, students at the Village Institutes were required to read 25 classical novels a year. The curriculum of the Village Institutes combined traditional educational subjects, including music instruction, with practical courses, such as farming, husbandry, carpentry, and home economics. Many noted writers and intellectuals were educated at these institutes,

his position at the Berlin Academy of Fine Arts for being a representative of *entartete Kunst* (degenerate art) and then appointed by Atatürk himself as chair of the sculpture department of the Istanbul Academy of Fine Arts; Rudolf Nissen, formerly professor of surgery at the University of Berlin, who headed the surgery department of the Medical School of the University of Istanbul from 1933 to 1939 and trained numerous Turkish professors and physicians; Paul Hindemith, musician and composer, who helped establish the Ankara State Conservatory; Carl Ebert, theatrical producer and director, who founded and directed the Ankara State Opera Company; and Eduard Zuckmeyer, a legendary music pedagogue. The list goes on and contains many other names, mostly scientists and medical doctors. This chapter of German intellectual history and its role in instituting a prescient transcultural and translational field of knowledge still awaits critical remembrance.

The dismissal of German-Jewish and antifascist professors from their posts coincided with the radical reform movements Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938), the founder of the modern Turkish republic and its first president, had undertaken in an ambitious modernization project, which included a top-to-bottom university reform. Along with Rudolf Nissen and Pedagogy Professor Albert Malche of Geneva, Schwartz visited Turkey in July 1933 and convinced the young Minister of Education, Reşit Galip, that the distinguished refugee professors would be instrumental to the success of the Turkish university reform. The visiting committee compiled a list of names for Galip, who persuaded Atatürk to personally support the project. As a result, a legion of anti-Nazi German, German-Jewish, and Austrian-Jewish scholars, artists, librarians, and teachers left Germany to accept various positions in the education sector in Turkey. Since Germany would have been reluctant to allow a massive exodus of scholars, it was decided that the contracts would be signed in a neutral country, in this case, Switzerland. The refugee professors were given long-term (up to five years) renewable contracts, which stipulated that they learn Turkish within three years and lecture in Turkish. However, in most cases, these requirements were not enforced.

which were closed in 1954 due to political pressure on the grounds that they were perpetuating left-wing ideas.

Conceptual premise

Historical conditions that necessitate the preservation of intellectual heritages through transport and translation contribute to a renewed understanding of texts that shape cultural movements across borders. In exile, the wandering culture is subject to translation in many senses of the term. Starting from this premise, I analyze exile scholarship in and as translation; the role of translation in the economies of a national culture; the imperative of cross-disciplinary work in exile; and the conditions for the emergence of an alternative critique of modernity at a non-European site. An investigation of how linguistic and cultural disparities between the home and the host lands can be negotiated may yield a model of successful integration of exiles and refugees in their respective lands of immigration.

What is of significance about the German academic exodus to Turkey is that the émigré professors were not considered displaced persons but reformers, and their role in the transformation of the university went beyond academic walls, leaving an enduring legacy in Turkish sociocultural life. Although the possibility of a humanist practice of *Bildung* was foreclosed by the Nazi takeover in Germany, this intellectual inheritance was kept in trust and safeguarded in translation both in Turkey and the US. The German and German-Jewish scholars, especially those associated with the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, who found a safe intellectual harbor in the US, transported and translated a long legacy of German philosophical erudition into American academia. The careers of a considerable number of Frankfurt School members, such as the philosophers Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer; sociologist, psychoanalyst, and humanist philosopher Erich Fromm; philosopher Herbert Marcuse; sociologist and philosopher Leo Löwenthal; and journalist, sociologist, cultural critic, and film theorist Siegfried Kracauer, who is sometimes associated with the Frankfurt School, were spared thanks to the American institutions that welcomed them. At the end of the war, from the Frankfurt School in American exile, only Adorno and Horkheimer returned to Germany. Fromm spent his career at American universities and institutions and also taught at the National Autonomous University of Mexico. Only in the final years of his life did he return to Switzerland. I reiterate that I discuss the work of the exiled German scholars in the US only occasionally for purposes of establishing a broader critical framework, since there is already a substantial archive of scholarship on

the German academic and artistic émigrés, who permanently or temporarily settled in the US.

Cultural exodus and the experience of the foreign

I contend that as opposed to contemporary and predominantly self-exiled scholars in the US, whose work reflects on their position as exiled subjects and engages in exilic politics, the German academics exiled from Nazi Germany are remembered for their lasting contributions to the host countries' educational systems and sociopolitical life. Since an analysis of cultural and symbolic values of translational acts requires a longitudinal range, I stress the enduring impact of those exiles, who spent all or most of their lives in the host country and integrated their cultural selves into the host institutions, while simultaneously reforming these. Although the number of natural scientists and professors of medicine in Turkish exile exceeded that of the humanists and their contributions to scientific research were considerable, the most visible legacy of the German academic émigrés in Turkey remains the establishment of a culture of translation in the broadest sense and the display of modern architecture as an allegory of the young nation. Therefore, I hope to foreground, in addition to Rüstow's work, the lesser studied contributions of Georg Rohde, the philosopher and psychologist Ernst von Aster, Ernst Reuter, and Bruno Taut. The last two city builders may not have name recognition beyond German and Turkish borders but are memorialized in the edifices they built in their Turkish exile. In the US, Hannah Arendt, Herbert Marcuse, Leo Löwenthal, and Siegfried Kracauer remained in their host country until the end of their lives and left an enduring impact on the cultural map of their respective fields. Before I discuss the lasting contributions of the émigré scholars to the sociocultural fabric of Turkey and the US, I would like to open a short parenthesis to describe the different routes the academic émigrés took to reach safe harbors. Such historical detail may or may not be relevant for displaced scholars of today but could prove useful as a precedent in assisting academics at risk.

Paths of exile

The realization of cultural transfer took two distinctly different paths to Turkey and the US. The exiled academics arrived in the US through circuitous routes and with the help of refugee agencies. Their journey was mediated by several different organizations, and the individual scholars and artists sought their fortune at different gates. In a great number of cases, their journeys were stalled at various stations of transit and their careers disrupted by multiple migrations. Hannah Arendt, for example, fled first to Czechoslovakia and then to Switzerland before settling in Paris. When France was invaded by the Germans, Arendt, her husband Heinrich Blücher, and her mother were able to escape to Portugal. At the time, one of the best-known illegal escape routes operated out of Marseilles, where the American Vice-Consul Hiram Bingham and the journalist Varian Fry helped refugees by raising money and bribing officials. Bingham and Fry secured exit papers and American visas for thousands, which included Arendt and her family. They first traveled through Spain to Portugal and from there sailed to New York City. Arendt taught at several institutions but predominantly at the New School for Social Research in New York City as an untenured professor. Alvin Johnson, Director of the New School, was one of the first higher education administrators to realize the danger Jewish and antifascist scholars were facing in Nazi Germany and Europe. At the New School, he founded a “University in Exile,” and within a period of ten years, recruited 178 academics from Europe. Among them were art and film theorist Rudolf Arnheim, Austrian composer Hans Eisler, and theater director Erwin Piscator.

Although there are certain similarities between the respective knowledge transfer to the US and Turkey by the émigré scholars, the difference between living and working in a Western society and landing in a radically different culture and language limits the analogy. The German academics in Turkey were officially invited by the state and, therefore, unlike their colleagues or compatriots, did not have to navigate circuitous and often perilous routes to safety. They did not need to seek employment once they arrived at their destination, since they came with contract in hand. They were assigned to institutions where their expertise was needed and had a free hand in developing curricula. The academic infrastructure and niveau of knowledge in the respective host lands differed greatly. While the American universities already had qualified faculty in all disciplines and an established structure of higher education, in the Turkish case, the need was for a complex

restructuring of the existing educational system that amounted to founding a modern university. On July 31, 1933, the old *Darülfünûn* (House of Sciences) closed down and reopened on August 1, 1933 as *İstanbul Üniversitesi* (University of Istanbul). Thus, in addition to imparting knowledge, the émigré professors were tasked with organizational assignments, involving the establishment of institutes and faculties and raising the existing disciplines—law, medicine, natural sciences, dentistry, social sciences, and literature—to a high scientific niveau. They trained generations of professionals and academics. Such a multitasking endeavor could not be realized without translation. This was not the case in the US, where the émigré professors, except for those teaching modern and ancient languages such as French, German, and Latin, had to teach in English (which only a few of them had mastered). At the Turkish universities, each professor had an assistant or a student, who performed a consecutive translation from German and sometimes from French into Turkish. The students then took notes in Turkish; however, a good number of them wrote these in the Ottoman Arabic script and not the Roman alphabet, which had been introduced in 1928 as part of Atatürk's modernization reforms, only five years before the arrival of the German professors. Thus, students of the émigré professors had already been subjected to a translational imperative (Seyhan, 2005).

Safeguarding knowledge: The imperative to translate

In spite of its challenges, translation was a medium that students embraced to ensure the afterlife of their professors' work. In fact, it is through translation into Turkish of high-quality academic lectures that we can now appreciate the intellectual rigor the German professors brought to the classroom. Ernst von Aster, a polymath philosopher, natural scientist, and psychologist who first left for Swedish exile in 1933 and then came to Turkey in 1936, taught History of Philosophy in the Faculty of Literature; Philosophy of Law in the Faculty of Law; and Methodology in the Faculty of Economics at the University of Istanbul. His multiple areas of expertise were further enhanced during his Turkish exile and expanded to include the philosophical legacy of the Turks in the History of Philosophy course (von Aster, 1937). Macit Gökberk, who was von Aster's assistant and translator, is recognized as one of the most prominent Turkish philosophers. Gökberk translated much of von Aster's lectures on the history of philosophy, *Vorlesungen über Geschichte der Philosophie*,

as *Felsefe Tarihi Dersleri* (Lectures on the History of Philosophy, von Aster, 1943). A relatively recent article on the Istanbul University lectures of Ernst von Aster once again underlines how translation performs a decisive role in retrieving knowledge that may otherwise be lost to time. The article, “Ernst von Aster’in Çağdaş Felsefe Ders Notları” (“Ernst von Aster’s Contemporary Philosophy Class Notes”), illustrates how von Aster’s oversubscribed lectures, delivered during the academic year 1943–1944, were copiously taken in long hand and in Ottoman-Turkish script by Cahit Tanyol, a student in the philosophy department at the time. Years later, the lecture notes were discovered by a new generation of philosophy majors. Over the years, one or more individuals attempted to transliterate these into the Roman alphabet. The article, which includes the full text of the transliterated lectures and a short intellectual biography of von Aster, is a tribute to his interdisciplinary range and pedagogical gift (Özkul & Şahin, 2019). The stunning clarity of lectures that cover the history of modern philosophy from Descartes to the relation between Newtonian physics and Kantian philosophy all the way to Hans Driesch’s Vitalism and Henri Bergson’s Spiritualism makes them an indispensable reading for today’s philosophy students.

Translation and the afterlife of scholarship in exile

The early years of the Turkish Republic were marked by the experience of a momentous transition and transformation, literally from one civilization to another. During this time, translation in both a literal and figurative sense became a key pillar of the architecture of modernization. The major reform acts of the era, such as the alphabet reform and the language reform, which involved replacing Arabic and Persian words with pre-Ottoman Turkish words and neologisms, and the university reform represented interlinked modalities of translational practice. Translation became not only a *modus operandi* of knowledge transfer and reform, but it also secured the *Nachleben* (afterlife; à la Benjamin) of scholarship undertaken in exile. In the US and, to a greater extent, in Turkey, academics who participated actively in translational activity by becoming translated agents themselves, that is, by lecturing and publishing in the language of the host country, left an enduring intellectual legacy. Hannah Arendt, Herbert Marcuse, and Erich Fromm, who settled in the US and published in English, became household names in academic and literary circles. Arendt’s *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951), Fromm’s *Escape*

from *Freedom* (1941) and *The Art of Loving* (1956), Marcuse's *Eros and Civilization* (1964), *One-Dimensional Man* (1964), and *An Essay on Liberation* (1971), among their many other books, were academic and trade bestsellers, which are still in print, and their ideas remain relevant for the ongoing trials of modernity. On a personal note, Marcuse's *An Essay on Liberation* is a staple of my Readings in German Intellectual History course syllabus and remains a timely and relevant text that has continued to inspire my nineteen- and twenty-year-old college students.

The influence of the exiles in their respective host lands coincided with times of major historical transition in both Turkey and the US. Whereas this period corresponded roughly to the late 1930s and early 1940s in Turkey, the impact of the permanent exiles in the US was most pronounced during the Cold War and Vietnam War years, as Arendt, Marcuse, Fromm, and Leo Löwenthal participated in the then current history of their adopted land and published works that analyzed the historical roots of discontent, authoritarianism, populism, anti-Semitism, and the twilight of reason in the Western world. What the lives and careers of émigré professors in the US have shown is that those who adapted to linguistic and cultural change transformed the American academic and cultural landscape and continue to remain relevant in the sociocultural life of their adopted country.

The work of German professors in Turkish exile, who like their fellow émigrés in the US, mastered the language of their adopted land and became deeply involved in its cultural milieu, has left an enduring impact on Turkish educational, social, and even political institutions. Georg Rohde, Ernst Reuter, Ernst E. Hirsh, and Fritz Neumark demonstrated a herculean feat in mastering a language radically different from their native one. They continued to publish both in German and Turkish and occasionally in French. Alexander Rüstow, known primarily as the father of neoliberalism—he coined the term—stayed in Istanbul for twelve years but did not learn Turkish. Nevertheless, he established close bonds with his students, colleagues, and assistants, who translated his lecture notes into Turkish, which were then published in book form (Rüstow, 1939, 1944). He was able to participate in many international conferences and maintain a level of academic productivity that would not have been possible had he stayed in Germany. He acknowledged his debt to Atatürk's Turkey in the foreword to *Freedom and Domination* (Rüstow, 1980, xxiii). His three-volume *Ortsbestimmung der Gegenwart*, written in Istanbul, is arguably on par with Marcuse's or Fromm's oeuvres. Rüstow's son, Dankwart Rüstow, a political scientist who spent his

childhood in Istanbul and was fluent in Turkish, became a renowned scholar of Middle Eastern and Turkish studies.⁵ He had *Ortsbestimmung* translated in an abbreviated English version. The shorter version condensed the original 1,795 pages with hundreds of pages of footnotes into 752 pages. The abridged English translation was then retranslated back into German as *Freiheit und Herrschaft: Eine Kritik der Zivilization* (Freedom and Domination. A Critique of Civilization, Rüstow, 2006) and led to an ever-growing interest in Rüstow scholarship, as attested by a number of critical commentaries on his very timely ideas and the popularity of condensed anthologies of his works.⁶

The retranslation of a book originally published in German from its abbreviated English translation—with thousands of footnotes cut, edited, and streamlined—back into German once again brings up questions of minor versus major languages, translatability, accessibility, and the politics of translation. It is only several years after its English translation was issued by Princeton University Press in 1953 that *Mimesis* came to be regarded by critics as the towering achievement of Western literary criticism. After the 50th anniversary edition of the English translation was published in 2003, literary critics, including Kader Konuk (2010)⁷ and Emily Apter (2003),⁸ analyzed the book as the foundational text of humanist legacy and comparative literature, respectively. While *Ortsbestimmung* and *Mimesis*, both written during their authors' Istanbul exile, have enjoyed a healthy afterlife in translation, books of arguably similar importance in their respective fields by exiled professors in Istanbul and Ankara remain undervalued. I contend that multidirectional translations in knowledge transfer are of invaluable importance for research

-
- 5 Dankwart A. Rüstow (1924–1996) was a German American scholar, who had an illustrious academic career in the US. He was the author of several books, notably, *Turkey, America's Forgotten Ally* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1989) and *Politics and Westernization in the Near East* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1956), and co-editor of a volume on comparative politics, *Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964). His last name is anglicized with the omission of the umlaut.
- 6 See, for example, *Herrschaft oder Freiheit. Ein Alexander Rüstow Brevier* (Domination or Freedom. An Alexander Rüstow Breviary, 2007).
- 7 Konuk's extensively researched and illustrated work has been instrumental in drawing critical attention to the work of German academic exiles in Istanbul.
- 8 See, for example, Apter's (2003) "Global *translatio*: The 'Invention' of Comparative Literature, Istanbul, 1933," which appeared around the same time as the anniversary edition of *Mimesis*, and Apter's *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature* (2006), where she also discusses Edward Said's interpretation of Auerbach's *Mimesis*.

in exile. However, today, only translation into English, the modern lingua franca, insures the afterlife of a work.

Competing mandates in translation

Although translation has become a regulative and cosmopolitan modality of our time and of shifting borders and populations on the move, it has also caused anxiety about the economy of equitable exchange between dominant (high status) and “minor” languages. Milan Kundera, the multilingual Czech writer who has been living in Parisian exile since 1975 and publishing his later works in French, is keenly aware of the risk that lack of accessibility or translation poses to languages and cultures of “small” nations. The smallness, in his words, is not one of scale but of destiny, the destiny of nations that “have all, at some point or another in their history, passed through the antechamber of death; always faced with the arrogance of the large nations” (Kundera, 1993, p. 192). Kundera’s specific examples of “the small European nations” are Central European nations, such as Czechoslovakia, Poland, or Hungary, but the concept applies to all nations “secluded behind their inaccessible languages,” (p. 193) and whose cultures are excluded from international recognition. I believe that this exclusion is not so much a result of inaccessibility—Why should Czech be less accessible than Russian in a linguistic sense?—as it is that of a nation’s geopolitical standing and, to some extent, the unavailability of a nation’s language(s) in translation. While Kundera does not mention lack of translation as a reason for inaccessibility, he has been obsessive about his own work, especially his books in Czech, being properly translated.

The Turkish experiment in translation defies the conventional wisdom that the translation of a “minor” language (Turkish) into a high status one (German) ensures the former’s survival. The modernization of the educational institutions via the mediation of the émigré scholars shows how translation from a major language such as German into Turkish preserved a banished intellectual culture and insured its afterlife and survival. The translation work of Turkish and German scholars in Istanbul and Ankara confirms Walter Benjamin’s observation that in translation, both the source and the target language encounter one another on an equalizing plane, where each is reciprocally enriched and expanded (Benjamin, 1977, pp. 50–62).

Ankara: The new capital as locus of sociocultural sea change

Unlike their fellow exiles in the US, the German émigrés in Turkey were seen as architects of a new national culture, which was to be freed from its Islamic past. In fact, modern architecture itself became an emblem of the new nation's Westernization project. German architects in Turkey were commissioned to create a culture of architecture that defined Turkey's debut into the Western world. One of the reasons Ankara was chosen as the site of the new capital city was that unlike Istanbul, where the past is literally memorialized in Byzantine and Ottoman monuments, in sultans' palaces, and in magnificent mosques, it did not carry the burden of the past. It was a small provincial town, resting on a steppe and could be built from the bottom up. The German architects and city planners had a free hand in designing a modern capital city, where government buildings and educational institutions would reflect the ethos of a modern, secular new nation. Therefore, it is perhaps no coincidence that Ernst Reuter and renowned architects Ernst Egli, Clemens Holzmeister, and Bruno Taut, among many others, were called to Ankara.

There is neither time nor space to do justice to the larger narrative of a singular cultural transfer in the humanistic work of Ernst Reuter or Bruno Taut, which not only stamped Turkish higher education with the seal of an enlightened modernity but also intervened in political policy. Balancing the critical archive with a renewed evaluation of their intellectual and political contribution will bring the work carried out by many intellectual exiles in this century and the last into a more sustained and nuanced dialogue across communities of research. That is the subject of my larger work. I will only mention the significance of the work of Reuter and Taut briefly, whose respective works in urban planning and architectural design became their most enduring legacy.

The German signature in city planning and architecture

Ernst Reuter's life was a most exemplary one, not only in terms of his intellectual prowess and the educational miracle he performed at the University of Ankara, but also his unflagging commitment to the restoration

of a new Germany after the war (Möckelmann, 2013).⁹ Removed from his office of the mayor of Magdeburg and sent twice to the Lichtenberg concentration camp by the Nazis, he ultimately arrived in Turkey and first took positions in the Ministry of Transportation and then the Ministry of Economics in Ankara. Fluent in Russian, due to his imprisonment as a prisoner of war during the First World War, and other languages, he learned Turkish in record time and began lecturing and publishing in Turkish. He taught an interdisciplinary arrangement of subjects, including city planning, municipal affairs, and municipal finance. As a professor at the *Siyasal Bilgiler Yüksek Okulu* (School of Political Science) at the University of Ankara, he established the discipline of Urban Planning, where today the Ernst Reuter *İskân ve Şehircilik Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi* (Ernst Reuter Center for Research in Urban Settlements) carries on his work. His *Komün Bilgisi. Şehirciliğe Giriş* (Communal Study. Introduction to Urbanism), published in 1940, still counts as a foundational text of urban studies in Turkey. Although Reuter returned to Germany as soon as the war was over, his intellectual legacy still remains very much alive in the city, where more than eighty of his works, published during the years of his Turkish exile (1938–1946) are catalogued at the Ernst Reuter Center.

Bruno Taut was already a renowned architect before he arrived in Turkey, his last station of exile. Taut's magnificent *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi* (Faculty of Language and History-Geography) building at the University of Ankara and his design of the Ankara Opera, and Ernst Egli's İsmet Paşa Women's Institute, School of Aviation, and other educational institutions symbolized the dream of the modern nation. Taut, Egli and Clemens Holzmeister put their signature on buildings, designed to reflect a modern national identity in the new capital city. Although Taut died prematurely in 1938 after a two-year stay in Turkey, he was the principal architect of fifty schools and institutes, in addition to the Faculty of Language and History-Geography building. Today, this faculty is still one of the last strongholds of secular higher education. At the entrance, there is a memorial stone for Taut. The entrance was paved by using stone and brick together, a nod to the famous Ottoman architect Sinan, whose statue actually adorns the green field in front of the building. Taut's admiration for Sinan was so great that he claimed Sinan's Süleymaniye Mosque, from the perspective of harmony and beauty, was superior to the Hagia Sophia (Taut, 2007, p. 249). He was

9 For an extremely well-researched and arguably the best critical biography of Reuter, see Möckelmann (2013).

known to have a penchant for the architecture of the East. In August 1916, when he first sighted Istanbul, he exclaimed enthusiastically, “Der Orient ist die wahre Mutter Europas, und unsere schlummernde Sehnsucht geht immer dorthin” (The Orient is the true mother of Europe, and our slumbering longing always moves thereto) (Taut, 2007, p. 73). His enthusiasm reminds us of the early German Romantic Novalis’s (Friedrich von Hardenberg) idealization of the Orient. However, his romanticized image was not a mere image. He saw in the architecture of Turkish mosques the realization or concretization of a philosophical sense of life.

A paper by Christoph Ehmann, the former *Staatssekretär* (Deputy Minister) of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research, who has provided me with valuable information, interprets Taut’s brilliant architectural designs less as an expression of his craft than a confirmation of his *unparteiisch* (impartial) yet politically left-leaning sympathies. His career at various stations of exile strongly confirms this view. He was first a *Revoluzzer*, which in the words of Erich Mühsam characterized those with socialist sympathies before the First World War, and then a reformer. As a marked leftist, he was “forgotten” for years and was only restored to architectural history as the West German public slowly freed itself from the reactionary tendencies that persisted for two decades after WWII (Ehmann, 2013, p. 2). Surprisingly, this humanist creator originally chose to go to Russia to realize his utopian vision, only to return to Germany in 1933 after a year without having undertaken a single project. Landing on the pogrom lists shortly after his return to Germany, he fled to Switzerland and then to Japan. However, the political circumstances in Japan, thirst for war, and an imperialistic fever were in total opposition to his beliefs. Despite the fact he was treated as a celebrity, he could not build but ended up having to design ashtrays, lamps, and small pieces of furniture (Ehmann, 2013, p. 24). He soldiered on because he loved Japan. Finally leaving Japan, he came to Turkey in 1936, where his dreams of building were fulfilled. He was finally able to design schools, which totally departed from the foreboding Prussian ethos and were bathed in light that he considered conducive to learning. He built feverishly, putting his signature on numerous cultural edifices. And in a sad parting gesture, even designed Atatürk’s catafalque, shortly before his own death (Ehmann, 2013, p. 29).¹⁰

10 I thank Prof. Dr. Christoph Ehmann for giving me his unpublished lecture, held on December 24, 2013 on the occasion of Taut’s 75th Death Anniversary, “Vertreibung aus Deutschland-Berlin 1933 und Exil in Japan und der Türkei bis zu seinem Tode am

From hamlet to *Hamlet*

I would like to note that the professors who went to Ankara did not enjoy the city, as it lacked the more urban and cosmopolitan atmosphere of Istanbul, not to mention the mild climate and natural beauty of the city astride two continents. While Auerbach and many other professors appointed to faculties at the University of Istanbul lived in the upscale neighborhood of Bebek on the Bosphorus shore, those appointed to positions at the University of Ankara and government agencies found themselves literally in a village, where housing was scarce, the climate arid with cold winters and hot summers, and retail stores few and far between. On the other hand, the émigré scholars and artists in Ankara did not have to defer to “old school” academics, a history that had to be preserved, or a blueprint for any institute or foundation. Thus, a unique faculty like Language and History-Geography, an Urban Studies Center, and centers for innovative research were established without the benefit (or the detriment) of a precedent. Renowned names in the arts such as Carl Ebert, Paul Hindemith, and the legendary music teacher Eduard Zuckmeyer, who integrated the principles of German *Jugendmusikbewegung* into Turkish music pedagogy (Widmann, 1973, pp. 141–142)¹¹ transformed an Anatolian hamlet into a capital of fine arts. Zuckmeyer stayed in Ankara until the end of his life, even though his wife Gisela Jockisch and her daughter, whom he adopted, remigrated to Germany in 1950. His life, music, and permanent Turkish exile would be the subject of another book. Ebert, a prominent actor and stage director who had trained under Max Reinhardt, was a strong opponent of the National Socialists. Upon Hitler’s seizure of power in 1933, he left Germany, and after a successful career at many stations of exile, he was invited in the fall of 1939 to Ankara by Atatürk. During his Ankara sojourn from 1939 to 1947, Ebert established the theater and opera schools at the Ankara Conservatory and trained some of the most well-known actor-directors of the Turkish stage, among them, Cüneyt Gökçer, a virtuoso interpreter of Shakespeare.

24.12.1938” (“Expulsion from Germany-Berlin 1933 and exile in Japan and Turkey until his death on December 24, 1938”).

- 11 Zuckmeyer is the subject of a 2015 documentary, *Eduard Zuckmeyer – Ein Musiker in der Türkei* (Eduard Zuckmeyer-A musician in Turkey) by Barbara Trottnow. The documentary can be viewed on YouTube at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r-LV7KWb664>. *Jugendmusikbewegung* (youth music movement) was a pedagogical music trend in the early twentieth century. It was influenced by the youth movement and aimed to preserve traditional folk songs.

Georg Rohde: Architect of an East-West humanism

George Rohde is one of the few prominent émigré scholars whose involvement in the promotion of classical studies in Turkey, contribution to a universal translation project, and training of accomplished classicists and translators attest to his enduring legacy. In 1931, he became a lecturer in Latin at the University of Marburg, replacing Paul Friedländer, who before him was ousted by the Nazi regime and went on to become a distinguished faculty member at the University of California in Los Angeles. In 1935, Rohde was invited to assume a professorship of Classical Philology in the Faculty of Language and History-Geography in Ankara. He founded the Institute of Classical Philology and single-handedly built its library. The introduction of Latin lessons to the Turkish secondary school curriculum was a first, as well as the appointment of a foreign national to the post of superintendent of Latin instruction. Unlike the US, where Latin was regularly taught in high school, especially at Catholic schools, and where most universities had established departments of classics, in Turkey, where the use of the Roman alphabet was a relative novelty and students were still being weaned from the use of Arabic and Persian loan words, introducing Latin into the curriculum would have been a challenge for any educator. But Rohde was not just any educator.

Rohde's daughter Silvia Giese shared details of Rohde's family's life in Ankara with me.

Her father wasted no time in getting the family acclimatized to life in Ankara. Silvia and her brother Firman were sent to Turkish schools, where they became star students. With his assistant Samim Sinanoğlu, who became a leading Turkish classicist, Rohde co-wrote *Lingua Latina: Lâtince Ders Kitabı* (Lingua Latina: Latin Textbook) Part I (1948) and Part II (1950). The textbooks included selections from Caesar and Ovid and were reissued many times. Plato's *The Republic* was translated into Turkish by Rohde and his assistants at the Faculty of Language and History-Geography. Both Samim Sinanoğlu and his brother Sait, a scholar of Ancient Greek, were Rohde's assistants. They are among the most renowned scholars to emerge from Turkish academia. Another of Rohde's assistants was Ekrem Akurgal, alumnus of the University of Berlin and one of the most prominent Turkish archaeologists, who has been honored with the Goethe Medal and the *French Légion d'honneur Officier*, among many other national and international honors.

Azra Erhat, another assistant and co-translator of Rohde's, is now remembered as a writer and scholar who popularized classical studies and

unearthed the histories of ancient Anatolian sites in her best-selling books. Erhat was a student of Leo Spitzer at the University of Istanbul, who recommended her to Rohde to translate his lectures from German and French as well as his works in Latin and Greek to Turkish. Rohde inspired his Turkish students to blend Western classics with the legacies of Ottoman-Turkish culture to create the basis for Turkish humanism. Erhat embodied this distinctive humanism by synthesizing Western and Anatolian myths and legends not only in her scholarly translations, but also in her popular books. Her linguistically and formally accomplished translations, which also reflected an Anatolian identity she cherished, remain a gift to Turkish readers, who otherwise would have had little access to the founding works of Western humanism. The objective of Suat Sinanoğlu's *L'humanisme à venir* (The coming humanism, 1960) and his three-volume *Türk Hümanizmi* (Turkish Humanism, 1980), which is a philosophically grounded interpretation of Atatürk's modernization reforms, was to introduce "classical thought" as the foundation of Western civilization, not only to the Turkish nation, but also to cultures beyond the Christian world through the mediation of a new Turkish humanism. In *L'humanisme à venir*, Sinanoğlu maintains that "Atatürkism," in its physical as well as spiritual and intellectual aspects, was synonymous with a genuine Westernization that would raise society from the imitation of the modern to the application and implementation of the modern (Sinanoğlu, 1960).

Some of Rohde's major contributions to the establishment of Turkish humanism were his organization of conferences outside the university at various community centers, thus joining town and gown, and his participation in the translation projects of the series "Translations from World Literature" under the auspices of the Turkish Ministry of Culture. In this series, Rohde translated Plato's *The Republic*, Books I and II, and Azra Erhat translated Book III (Widmann, 1973, p. 286). Unlike some of his émigré colleagues at the University of Istanbul, who preserved the aura of the ivory tower professor, biding their time until an invitation came from greener Western pastures, Rohde remained committed to a mandate of "translating" genuine humanism into Turkish education, long after his original assignment was completed. His students and assistants, now also all gone, valiantly carried his legacy forward, educating successive generations of classicists. What still remains of this foundational "classical thought" of humanism under the current regime that is advocating a return to political, not humanist Islam, as Suat Sinanoğlu had envisioned it, is indebted to the work of

Rohde and his mentees. While Auerbach and Spitzer at the University of Istanbul were beloved mentors to a generation of Turkish philologists, their influence beyond the walls of academia remained limited due to a language barrier. Rohde, Reuter, and Zuckmeyer understood that communication is best achieved if language speakers meet halfway. They studied the host country's language and worked with translators, often as co-translators – a process that advanced their own knowledge of the target language – or translated their own works. In the now defunct Ankara newspaper *Ulus* in his daughter's archive, Rohde is shown with the Turkish President İsmet İnönü, supervising an exam. In fact, the Ankara cadre of exiled scholars was often in the news, as they were fluent in Turkish and were major cultural players in the capital city. I focus on the Ankara group to foreground the important role they played, like their American émigré counterparts, in real life or even the Realpolitik of the host nation. Auerbach was certainly a great mentor, even uncharacteristically close for a German professor to his students (Urgan, 1998, pp. 175–176).¹² However, *Mimesis* has to this day not been translated into Turkish. And that is a great loss for Turkish students and readers. Its fame rests on the original language and its translation into English. Auerbach and Spitzer taught French literature and the great works of Western literature, but unlike Rohde or Zuckmeyer, they did not draw on the linguistic and cultural capital of the host country. It is arguably in Rohde, his students, and assistants' work at the University of Ankara that a humanistic legacy, which a young secular republic aspired to embrace, was most directly introduced into Turkish educational curricula. Thus, I maintain that Rohde helped create a Turkish humanism that reached beyond the book and Turkish borders and still endures under the antihumanist regime of today that keeps hundreds of writers and journalists in prison on fabricated charges of terrorism and treason.

12 See, Mina Urgan, *Bir Dinozorun Anıları* (Memories of a dinosaur, 1998). Urgan studied French philology with both Spitzer and Auerbach. She was a professor of English literature at the University of Istanbul and a human rights activist. Her memoir reveals Auerbach's very close bond with his students, with whom he went on skiing trips to Uludağ, near the city of Bursa, even though due to a permanent foot injury he suffered as a soldier in the First World War, he could not ski.

Excursus: Displaced scholars at traditionally Black colleges

As I mentioned in my introductory section, the story of the German academic émigrés, who taught at the traditionally Black colleges in the American South, needs to be remembered in the larger history of academic exiles. In my view, their life and work in American exile bears little, if any, resemblance to the privileged positions of their fellow German writers and scholars at prestigious institutions. In terms of their contribution to the social and intellectual life of their communities, they stand much closer to their compatriots in Turkish exile, who contributed much to the sociopolitical fabric of the host land. Their spirit and ingenuity in a culturally alien and even, to some extent, hostile environment may provide both inspiration and consolation to today's displaced academics. Thus, I hope to retrieve from historical obscurity the memory of these lesser-known names, who settled in the American South and valiantly participated in the Civil Rights Movement.

This group of refugee scholars included such noteworthy figures as philosopher and literary critic Beate Berwin, philosopher and legal scholar Ernst Borinski, historian Georg Iggers, philosopher and classicist Ernst Moritz Manasse, and Marxist philosopher and economist Fritz Pappenheim. Their stories bear witness to the resilience and resourcefulness of scholars committed to preserving and sharing a humanist legacy at all costs. Thanks to a little-known book, *From Swastika to Jim Crow* (1993) by Gabrielle Simon Edgcomb, a refugee from Nazi Germany herself, the names and remarkable life stories of these émigré scholars have been preserved for the archive of modern intellectual exile. When Jewish academics were forced to flee Nazi Germany, American institutions embraced only well-known names with connections in high places, like Albert Einstein, Hannah Arendt, and Theodor Adorno. Lesser-known figures, though lucky to have escaped to the US, struggled to gain a foothold, not only because of the Great Depression, which had depleted jobs, but also because of the prevalent anti-Semitism and anti-German sentiments. Although the traditionally Black colleges, Howard University in Washington, D.C., Lincoln University in Chester County, Pennsylvania, Fisk University in Nashville, Tennessee, and Hampton Institute in Hampton, Virginia, among others, could not offer the émigrés a prestigious address, they welcomed them as friends in fate. The common experience of persecution bonded the deposed German-Jewish scholars with the Black Americans and created a haven of interracial, intercultural, and intellectual comradeship. Many émigré scholars, such as Georg Iggers and sociologist

Ernst Borinski, who taught at Tougaloo College, Mississippi, became active in undermining Jim Crow laws. Before arriving in the US, Borinski had also earned a doctor of philosophy degree at the University of Berlin in 1928 and an international law degree from the Academy of International Law in The Hague, Netherlands in 1930. Georg Iggers, who became one of the most distinguished scholars of European history, fled Germany with his family only a few weeks before *Kristallnacht* (Night of Broken Glass). He taught for several years, first at the Philander Smith College in Little Rock, Arkansas, and then at Dillard University in New Orleans. In 1951, he and his wife joined the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). He played an active role in efforts to desegregate public schools in Arkansas. After a committed career as educator and activist, Iggers was appointed as a faculty member at the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1965 and named Distinguished Professor there in 1977. In the words of the late John Hope Franklin, James B. Duke Professor of History at Duke University, the German-Jewish professors were “a remarkable group of men and women,” who reminded “us that in the human family there are those who can transcend the Nazi swastika as well as Jim Crow, and set an example of human relations that their students and colleagues would do well to emulate” (Franklin, 1993, p. xi). Like their fellow émigrés in Turkey, these scholars found themselves in an unfamiliar world yet put their vast knowledge and interdisciplinary teaching skills at the service of the host institutions.

Because there was a shortage of qualified teaching staff both at the Turkish universities and in the traditional Black colleges in the American South, the émigré professors, who found teaching positions at these institutions, taught not only subjects in their fields but in related as well as different fields. In addition to chairing the Sociology Department at Tougalou College, Borinski taught German and Russian. He was also a recognized expert in constitutional law. Beate Berwin had earned a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Heidelberg with a dissertation entitled *Das Unendlichkeitsproblem in Schellings Ästhetik* (“The Problem of the Infinite in Schelling’s Aesthetics”) as well as a *Dottore phil.* in literary studies from the University of Bologna in Italy (Sohst, 2003). At Bennett College in Greensboro, North Carolina, where she spent her whole career, she also taught in addition to philosophy, German and geography. Her critical monographs on Moses Mendelssohn, Friedrich Hölderlin, and Heinrich von Kleist were published in a collected edition in 2003, 33 years after her death (Berwin, 2003). The theoretical rigor as well as the sociohistorical contexts of these monographs

insure their enduring critical relevance. Even though her work is arguably on par with or superior to that of her fellow academic émigrés, such as Liselotte and Herbert Dieckmann, Frieda Wunderlich, and Willie Rey, who found employment at major research universities, she remains an unknown name in intellectual history. Her Hölderlin essay is required reading in my German Intellectual History class. I maintain that the absence of a *Nachleben* for her work – as is the case with the works of other accomplished émigré scholars – is a consequence of its unavailability in English translation and not of her employment at Bennett rather than at Yale or Berkeley.

Conclusion

Although the subjects of this essay were for the most part fortunate to have found refuge in host lands, their lives were far from perfect, albeit in different ways. Andrea Deciu Ritivoi's *Intimate Strangers: Arendt, Marcuse, Solzhenitsyn, and Said in American Political Discourse* recounts the somewhat marginalized situation of the four "intimate strangers," who despite their respected scholarship and best-selling books in English, were always considered "foreigners," since among other factors, their accents always gave them away as such (Deciu Ritivoi, 2014). The German scholars in Turkish exile, on the other hand, were admired precisely because they were foreigners, since they represented the other, cherished Western way of life. Their mandate was to set the cultural course of a secular nationalist agenda, when their own lives were disrupted by a nationalism run amok. Despite the sad irony of their task, their collective work emerges as a meditation on the emancipatory possibility of an enlightened modernity against the backdrop of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer's scathing depiction in the first chapter of *Dialektik der Aufklärung (Dialectic of Enlightenment)* of the wholly enlightened world "radiating triumphant disaster" ("*strahlt im Zeichen triumphalen Unheils*") (Horkheimer & Adorno, 1969, p. 9). While Auerbach remained skeptical of an incipient Turkish nationalism, academics such as Neumark, Rohde, Zuckmeyer, and especially Ernst Hirsch, who became fully conversant in Turkish culture and politics, understood the historical necessity of establishing some sense of national unity in a new nation state built on the ruins of a multiethnic empire that in its final years of decline had become ethnically, culturally, and religiously very divided. Like Jürgen Habermas after them, they regarded the Enlightenment as an unfinished, ongoing project.

Unlike Adorno, they saw in the ideals of the Enlightenment the possibility of rehabilitating the inheritors of the “sick man of Europe,” as the Ottoman Empire came to be known during its decline.

In the final analysis, the exile of German academics in Turkey and the US shows how a certain order of cultural configurations acquires meaning in translation in the broadest sense and by its prospective arrangement. A series of conjectural events in the US, that is, the Civil Rights Movement, the assassination of John F. Kennedy, the Vietnam War, and student unrest and shootings, created the need not only for the lessons of the German émigré professors’ experience of traumatic memory but also their ways of confronting and overcoming it in the power of language, as they translated agony into corrective remembrance. What began as an exodus of German exiles to Turkey led to a radical transformation of the university system, which in turn became a symbolic fortress of secular modernization. Under the constant threat of political Islam and despite being overrun by administrators and rectors appointed by the Islamist government, the university reform undertaken by the German émigré professors endures as the symbol of Turkey’s once successful debut into Western modernity.

In our day, academics leave or are forced to flee their homelands for different reasons, including censorship, persecution, escape from oppressive regimes, and simply for personal and academic freedom. What we learn from the experience of exiled academics in Turkey and the US confirms what Rüstow wrote in the foreword to *Freedom and Domination*. He made the point that to make sense of the cataclysmic events of an age –referring to the trauma of the Third Reich – one discipline is insufficient (Rüstow, 1980, p. xxiv). While he did not use the as yet uncoined term interdisciplinarity, that is what he advocated and practiced. Exile demands retooling of resources. Teaching across disciplines and revising extant knowledge are modalities of translation. Thus, drawing on the critical and empirical issues that frame this volume, I posit two questions that may not be answered any time soon but urge serious contemplation: How can translation, broadly conceived as a transport of ideas, technology, images, and information, safeguard intellectual capital that is threatened, censored, silenced, and banished? and Can historical strategies to safeguard intellectual inheritance be repeatable in the face of current crises of awakening neofascism, surveillance states, financial inequality, and precarity? While we cannot answer these questions with any certainty, crises provide access to history and a working framework for investigation.

References

- Apter, E. (2003). Global *translatio*: The 'Invention' of Comparative Literature, Istanbul, 1933. *Critical Inquiry*, 29(2), 253–281.
- Apter, E. (2006). *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Auerbach, E. (1946). *Mimesis. Dargestellte Wirklichkeit in der abendländischen Literatur*. Bern: Francke Verlag.
- Auerbach, E. (1953, 2003). *Mimesis: The representation of reality in Western literature* (W. R. Trask, Trans.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1977). Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers. In W. Benjamin, *Illuminationen* (pp. 50–62). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Berwin, B. (2003). *Mendelssohn. Hölderlin. Kleist. Drei Monographien zur Einführung*, (W. Sohst, Vorwort). Berlin: Xenemos Verlag.
- Deciu Ritivoi, A. (2014). *Intimate strangers: Arendt, Marcuse, Solzhenitsyn, and Said in American political discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ehmann, C. (2013). Bruno Taut zum 75. Todestag. Vertreibung aus Deutschland-Berlin 1933 und Exil in Japan und der Türkei bis zu seinem Tode am 24.12. 1938. (Unpublished manuscript).
- Franklin, J.H. (1993). Foreword. In G. Simon Edgcomb, *From Swastika to Jim Crow: Refugee scholars at Black Colleges*. (pp. ix–xi). Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Hirsch, E.E. (1982). *Aus des Kaisers Zeiten durch die Weimarer Republik in das Land Atatürks*. München: J. Schweitzer Verlag.
- Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T.W. (1969). *Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente*. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer Verlag.
- Konuk, K. (2010). *East West Mimesis: Auerbach in Istanbul*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kundera, M. (1993). *Testaments betrayed; An essay in nine parts* (Linda Asher, Trans.). New York: Harper Perennial.
- Möckelmann, R. (2013). *Wartesaal Ankara. Ernst Reuter-Exil und Rückkehr nach Berlin*. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschaftsverlag.
- Neumark, F. (1980). *Zuflucht am Bosphorus. Deutsche Gelehrte, Politiker und Künstler in der Emigration 1933-1953*. Frankfurt am Main: Knecht.
- Özkuş, O., & Şahin, Y. (2019). Ernst von Aster ve Çağdaş Felsefe Tarihi Notları. *Beytulhikme. An International Journal of Philosophy*, 9(I), 231–277.
- Reuter, E. (1940). *Komün bilgisi. Şehirciliğe giriş [Kommunalwissenschaft. Einführung in das Städtewesen]*. Ankara: SBYO.

- Rohde, G. (1948, 1950). *Lingua Latina. Lâtince Ders Kitabı* (2 Vols.) (S. Sinanoğlu, Trans.). Ankara: MEB.
- Rüstow, A. (1939, 1944). *İktisadi Coğrafya* (Vol. 1, R. Ş. Savla, Trans.; Vol. 2, H. İlteber, Trans.). İstanbul: İstanbul Üniv. İktisat Fakültesi.
- Rüstow, A. (1950, 1952, 1957). *Ortsbestimmung der Gegenwart. Eine universalgeschichtliche Kulturkritik* (3 Vols.). Erlench-Zürich & Stuttgart: Eugen Rentsch Verlag.
- Rüstow, A. (1980). *Freedom and domination. A historical critique of civilization* (S. Attanasio, Trans.). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rüstow, A. (2006). *Freiheit und Herrschaft. Eine Kritik der Zivilization*. Münster: LIT.
- Rüstow, A. (2007). *Herrschaft oder Freiheit. Ein Alexander Rüstow Brevier*. (Michael von Prellius, Ed.) Bern: Ott Verlag.
- Seyhan, A. (2005). German academic exiles in Istanbul: Translation as the *Bildung* of the Other. In S. Bermann & M. Wood (Eds.), *Nation, language, and the ethics of translation* (pp. 274–288). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Simon Edgcomb, G. (1993). *From Swastika to Jim Crow: Refugee scholars at Black Colleges*. Malabar: Krieger Publishing Company.
- Sinanoğlu, S. (1960). *L'humanisme à venir*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil, Tarih- Coğrafya Fakültesi.
- Sinanoğlu, S. (1980). *Türk hümanizmi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu.
- Sohst, W. (2003). Vorwort. In B. Berwin, *Mendelssohn. Hölderlin. Kleist. Drei Monographien zur Einführung*. (pp. III–XIV). Berlin: Xenemos Verlag.
- Taut, B. (2007). Reiseeindrücke aus Konstantinopel 1916. In M. Speidel (Ed.), *Ex Oriente Lux. Die Wirklichkeit einer Idee* (pp. 73–78). Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag.
- Urgan, M. (1998). *Bir Dinozorun Anıları*. İstanbul: YKK.
- von Aster, E. (1937). *Die Türken in der Geschichte der Philosophie*. İstanbul: Devlet Basımevi.
- von Aster, E. (1943). *Felsefe tarihi dersleri* (M. Gökberk, Trans.). İstanbul: Ahmet İhsan Matbaası.
- Widmann, H. (1973). *Exil und Bildungshilfe. Die deutschsprachige akademische Emigration in die Türkei nach 1933*. Bern: Herbert Lang & Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.