

The Exile and Return of Writers from East-Central Europe



The Exile and Return of Writers from East-Central Europe

A Compendium

Edited by
John Neubauer and Borbála Zsuzsanna Török

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines
of the ANSI to ensure permanence and durability.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the Library
of Congress.

ISBN 978-3-11-021773-5

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© Copyright 2009 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 10785 Berlin
All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this
book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mech-
anical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system,
without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany
Typesetting: Dörlemann Satz GmbH & Co. KG, Lemförde
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

Table of Contents

Preface	XI
---------------	----

Chapter I

Introduction	3
Exile: Home of the Twentieth Century (JOHN NEUBAUER)	4
1. Who is an Exile?	4
2. Exile and Writing	11
3. The Home Cultures	13
4. The Dialectics of Exile and Homecoming	19
The Nineteenth-Century Exile Traditions	20
Exodus from Hungary in 1919	24
Fleeing the Nazis: 1938–39	27
Escaping and Homecoming in 1944–45	31
Racing against the Dropping Iron Curtain: 1947–50	38
1956	38
1968 and Beyond	40
Homecoming and New Forms of Exile after 1989	43
5. Sites of Exile Culture	44
Istanbul	46
Vienna	47
Berlin: Intermezzo in the 1920s	55
Moscow: Exile under Stalin	58
Paris: its Exile Cultures	72
London	81
Munich	83
Other European Cities	84
New York and Academia	86
Toronto	91
Buenos Aires	94
Palestine/Israel	96

Chapter II: Exile Cultures Abroad:
Publishing Ventures, Exiles Associations, and Audiences

Introduction	107
In the Vacuum of Exile: The Hungarian Activists in Vienna 1919–1926 (ÉVA FORGÁCS)	109
Cosmopolitans without a Polis: Towards a Hermeneutics of the East-East Exilic Experience (1929–1945) (GALIN TIHANOV)	123
Introduction	123
1. Cosmopolitans without a Polis	125
2. A Brief Case Study: <i>Young Hegel</i> and Lukács's Options in the 1930s	133
3. Homecoming: The Boomerang Doesn't Always Return	136
<i>Kultura</i> (1946–2000) (WŁODZIMIERZ BOLECKI)	144
1. Genesis and Beginnings of <i>Kultura</i>	144
The Beginnings of <i>Kultura</i> (Italy)	145
Genesis: The Historical Tradition of <i>Kultura</i>	146
<i>Kultura</i> in France	147
2. The Editorial Staff	148
Jerzy Giedroyc's Profile	148
The Contributors	149
3. <i>Kultura</i> 's Program	151
The First Assessment: The 1940s	151
<i>Kultura</i> 's Relation to the "Emigration"	152
<i>Kultura</i> 's Relation to the People's Republic of Poland	154
4. The So-called <i>Kultura</i> Line	155
1947–55	156
1956	160
1965–1980	161
1980–1989: Solidarity	164
<i>Kultura</i> 's Main Ideas	166
5. <i>Kultura</i> : Writers and Literature	168
6. <i>Kultura</i> 's Achievements	177

Polish World War II Veteran Émigré Writers in the US:	
Danuta Mostwin and Others (BOGUSŁAW WRÓBLEWSKI)	189
1. The Émigré Veteran Generation	189
2. The East-Coast Novelists	193
3. Chicago and California Poets	195
4. The Third Value	197
<i>Irodalmi Újság</i> in Exile: 1957–1989 (JOHN NEUBAUER)	
1. History	204
2. Contributors	210
3. Orientation: Politics and Readership	213
4. Contacts with Literary Life in Hungary	216
5. Modern World Literature	219
6. The East-Central European Literatures	222
7. Cultural Trends in Western Societies	225
The Hungarian <i>Mikes Kör</i> and <i>Magyar Műhely</i> :	
Personal Recollections (ÁRON KIBÉDI VARGA)	230
1. Refugee Groups and their Cultural Life, 1945–1956	230
2. The <i>Hollandiai Mikes Kelemen Kör</i> (1951) and the <i>Magyar Műhely</i> (1962)	233
“We did not want an émigré journal”:	
Pavel Tigrid and <i>Svědectví</i> (NEIL STEWART)	242
1. Biography	244
2. Pavel Tigrid: the Writer	247
3. Exile and “Gradualism”	248
4. <i>Svědectví</i> : Poetics, Composition, and Historical Development	252
5. <i>Svědectví</i> : Finances and Logistics	264
6. The Empire Writes Back	268
Monica Lovinescu at Radio Free Europe (CAMELIA CRĂCIUN)	
1. Personal Background	278
2. Media Position and Political Discourse	281
3. Networking	291
4. Lovinescu and the Network in Action: the Tudoran Case	296
5. Concluding Remarks	299

Chapter III: Individual Trajectories

Introduction	307
Miloš Crnjanski in Exile (GUIDO SNEL)	309
1. Exercises in Homelessness	312
2. A Novel about London	316
3. Once more on Cooden Beach	321
4. Post Scriptum	322
Gombrowicz, the Émigré (JERZY JARZĘBSKI)	325
Paul Goma: the Permanence of Dissidence and Exile (MARCEL-CORNIS-POPE)	342
Writing and Internal Exile in Eastern Europe: The Example of Imre Kertész (SUSAN RUBIN SULEIMAN)	368
1. Shapes of Exile	370
2. Auschwitz and the Kádár Regime: Kertész on Internal Exile	374
3. After Communism	379
Kundera's Paradise Lost: Paradigm of the Circle (VLADIMÍR PAPOUŠEK)	384

Chapter IV: Autobiographical Exile Writing

Introduction	397
Life in Translation: Exile in the Autobiographical Works of Kazimierz Brandys and Andrzej Bobkowski (KATARZYNA JERZAK)	400
1. Life in Translation	404
2. Uninvited Comparisons	409
From Diary to Novel: Sándor Márai's <i>San Gennaro vére</i> and <i>Ítélet Canudosban</i> (JOHN NEUBAUER)	416
<i>San Gennaro vére</i> (Saint Gennaro's Blood)	418
<i>Ítélet Canudosban</i> (Judgment in Canudos)	418

Exile Diaries: Sándor Márai, Gustaw Herling-Grudziński, and Others (WŁODZIMIERZ BOLECKI)	422
Eight Issues of Comparison	424
“Is There a Place Like Home?” Jewish Narratives of Exile and Homecoming in Late Twentieth-Century East-Central Europe (KSENIA POLOUEKTOVA)	432

Chapter V: The 1990s:
Homecoming, (Re)Canonization, New Exiles

Introduction	473
Herta Müller: Between Myths of Belonging (THOMAS COOPER)	475
Post-Yugoslav Theater Exile: Transitory, Partial and Digital (DRAGAN KLAIC)	497
1. Historic Antecedents	498
2. Pre-exilic Theater Life in former Yugoslavia	499
3. Squandered Opportunities: the Roma Theater Pralipe	501
4. From Exile to Integration: Théâtre Tattoo	503
5. Between Music and the Stage	505
6. Career Shifts and Turns	506
7. Double Track	508
8. Excursions, not Returns	509
9. In the Internet Exile	512
10. Exiles as Mediators	513
11. Reconstruction and Normalization	516
12. The Fading of Exile	517
Losing Touch, Keeping in Touch, Out of Touch: The Reintegration of Hungarian Literary Exile after 1989 (SÁNDOR HITES)	521
1. Closely Watched Connections	523
2. Encounter of an Ambivalent Kind: Inside and Outside in the 1990s	528
3. Redefining Exile, Redefining the Canon	533

Albert Wass: Rebirth and Apotheosis of a Transylvanian-Hungarian Writer (JOHN NEUBAUER)	538
1. Immigration, and Literary Debut in the US: 1951–52	538
2. Transylvanian Decline and Resistance: 1934–40	546
3. Against the “Intruders”: 1940–1945	549
4. Perspectives from Exile in Europe: 1945–1951	556
5. Fiction, Academia, Publishing: Florida 1957–98	561
6. Legacy, Resurrection, and Apotheosis	568

Chapter VI

Instead of Conclusion: East Central Literary Exile and its Representation (BORBÁLA ZSUZSANNA TÖRÖK)	579
Arrows into the Playfield	579
Transnational Perspectives	584
Times and Themes of Literary Exile	586
Grundbegriffe und Autoren ostmitteleuropäischer Exilliteraturen 1945–1989	591
 A Timeline of Exile Movements, 1919–2000	597
 List of Contributors	605
 Index of East-Central European Names	613

Preface

The present volume has been prepared with a generous grant from the Fritz Thyssen Foundation in Germany, which financed in 2007 research fellowships at the Collegium Budapest for most contributors of this volume. The editors wish to express their deep gratitude to both the Foundation and the Collegium for helping us making the book possible.

Our project started with an exciting workshop on September 11–13, 2006 at the Collegium in Budapest, titled “Between Home and Host Cultures: Twentieth-Century East European Writers in Exile,” which was accompanied by a series of literary readings and discussions for the public at large. The purpose of this workshop was to establish the basic ideas of the planned research. We wish to thank Fred Girod, Secretary of the Institute at that time, who was the motor behind the project in its early phases, as well as all those participants of the workshop who helped launching the project but were for various reasons unable to participate in its later phases. They include Eva Hoffman, Seth Wolitz, and Mihály Szegedy-Maszák. Pasts, Inc., Center for Historical Studies at the Central European University in Budapest was the earliest laboratory to test hypotheses that Sorin Antohi, its first director, has put forward.

The conveners of the workshop and organizers of the project envisioned at the very outset a coherent set of studies instead of a mere collection of essays. The contributions were coordinated and placed into a broad social and historical view of exile in the “home” and the “host” countries. Several of our original hypotheses and generalizations rapidly became questionable as we came to face a profusion of empirical data. We anticipated, of course, great differences between the experiences of those who fled the Nazis and the communist dictatorships. However, we have also discovered deep differences between national traditions of exile, traditions that kept on shifting, mostly in an asynchronous manner. Furthermore, it became gradually clear that we would have to devote considerable attention to what Galin Tihanov calls the “East-East Exilic Experience,” namely the exiles fleeing to Moscow rather than Paris or London, and, equally important, that many exiles who fled a suppression were at one point themselves suppressors. For these and a host of other reasons we tried to avoid idealizing exiles as stereotypical heroes, and

attempted to include a broad scene that included personal and ideological conflicts between those in exile, between exiled writers and their home countries, and between exiles and their new environment.

Given these premises, we have focused mostly on the personal and social experiences of exile, which find complicated records in diaries, letters, and memoirs, next to oblique reflections in fiction. After extended discussions, we agreed to read the formal and linguistic aspects of writing as indices of psychological, social, and historical states of mind.

We should mention here two other aspects of the project's evolution. The first is indicated by our very title, in which, at a rather late stage of the project, we have included "homecoming." Though not all contributions deal with it, the topic has gradually become a second focal point: we felt the need to consider the problems of returning writers after World War II (both from Moscow and from the West), and, even more, to consider the repatriation of exile writers and their works, which has been an ongoing problem ever since 1989. The second aspect is one of terminology. Although we were from the very outset aware that "exile" was a historically and ideologically loaded term, we realized only gradually how complicated it is to distinguish between exile in our strict sense of the word and various forms of modern alienation, for which "exile" is a frequent metaphor. We became particularly sensitive to the discursive fact that the exilic phenomena we discuss are unique as well as symbols of modern existential situations. We want to keep alive the latter quasi-universal significance, but we wish also to resist an abuse of the term, as, we think, one should resist calling all modern systematic killings a "Holocaust."

We would like to take this opportunity to express our gratitude, next to the Fritz Thyssen Foundation and the Collegium Budapest, to a number of people who helped us along. Gábor Klaniczay, the Permanent Humanities Fellow at the Collegium was an important mediator between the project and the Collegium; Éva Gönczi, the new Secretary took a very kind interest in our project and was always an excellent discussion partner; Imre Kondor, the Collegium's former Rector, often played the devil's advocate and stimulated us thereby. Rita Páva did enthusiastic research for us and Diana Kuprel prepared an excellent translation of Włodzimierz Bolecki's article on *Kultura*. László Boka, Research Director at the Hungarian National Library repeatedly helped us both within and outside his library. Ted Anton (Chicago) kindly provided us material on the Culianu affair, and Mária Korász at the Somogyi Library made available for us a crucial document on Albert Wass.

Last but not least, the editors would like to thank the contributors to this volume. They all showed great enthusiasm for the project and patiently

responded to the avalanche of questions and suggestions concerning both their own work and those of the others. We are proud of having their innovative, informative, and well-written contributions.

Chapter I

Introduction

The following essay explores the concept of exile, delineates the specific features of literary exile from twentieth-century East-Central Europe, and offers an outline of its historical, geographical, and institutional dimensions. It provides a general map for the specialized essays that follow it.

Though conceived and written by John Neubauer, the text owes much to the other contributors. Some participated in weekly discussions at the Collegium during the fellowship year, with others I have been engaged in e-mail exchanges. Their help was crucial in overcoming my own linguistic and cultural limitations, which will remain, of course, solely responsible for my errors and misinterpretations.

A few persons I would especially like to thank. Borbála Zsuzsanna Török, co-editor of this volume, contributed in many fruitful discussions more than I can list here; in particular, I wish to single out her contribution to the section on “internal exile.” Włodzimierz Bolecki kindly allowed me to include his text on the complex figure of Józef Mackiewicz. Marcel Cornis-Pope contributed important passages and ideas on Mircea Eliade, Romania, and East-Central Europe. Darko Suvin’s eloquent reflections on exile gave my article, and the whole project, important impulses, especially concerning terminology and theoretical reflection.

Exile: Home of the Twentieth Century

JOHN NEUBAUER

1. Who is an Exile?

“‘I’m not an emigrant,’ she says almost gaily, ‘I’m an exile.’ [...] ‘What’s the difference?’ ‘Elementary [...] I can’t go back home. Emigrant girls can’” (Škvorecký, *The Engineer of Human Souls* 187)

Dieu est né en exil (God Was Born in Exile) claimed a book published in 1960, though the subtitle clarified that this was a fictional diary of Ovid. The title was meant seriously, however, because the diaries record not just Ovid’s yearning to return to Rome, but also his gradual alienation from his metropolitan home, which he now comes to see as a decadent, dictatorial, and irreligious society, doomed to decline and fall. The fictional Ovid gradually opens himself towards the culture of his Getae hosts, above all through his servant Dokia, who does not become his concubine because, as Ovid learns towards the end of the story, her secret lover is the garrison’s Roman commander, from whom she has a child. With the help of Dokia’s friends and relatives, Ovid takes an extensive trip in the region south of the Danube delta and he gets to know there peaceful, industrious, and humane “barbarians” who regard Zalmoxis, a legendary social and religious reformer, as their only true god. For the Getae, death means the return of the immortal soul to Zalmoxis. Discarding gradually the Greco-Roman deities, the fictional Ovid slowly converts to a god born to him in exile, a curious blend of Zalmoxis and a new Messiah-child from Bethlehem, about whom he receives an eyewitness report. The double figure of Zalmoxis/Jesus rises on two margins of the Roman Empire, as it were in exile, and Ovid foresees that a monotheistic god will ultimately topple Rome’s rule and religion, which are now in the hands of Augustus, an emperor who had declared himself divine. In a both personal and cultural sense, the novel implies that a morally good life is impossible under a dictator; only exile can offer hope for a renewal. Ovid’s own hope is tempered by his awareness that his decline will prevent him from seeing the new world. Much of the book’s attraction lies in its poignant psychological portrayal of

hope and resignation in Ovid. What role, if any, his personal and literary eroticism may have in the coming new world, is left open. Towards the end of the book, Dokia marries her Roman commandant and, imaging the biblical flight to Egypt, they flee with their daughter to the Dacian/Getae country north of the Danube.

In this case, as in so many other works written in exile, the “novel of the novel’s history” is as interesting and relevant as the book itself. *Dieu est né en exil* won the coveted French Prix Goncourt in 1961, but Vintilă Horia, a Romanian exile writer then living in Madrid, was finally forced to decline the honor when it became known that in Romania he had been sentenced in absentia to a life term in prison because of his war-time political engagement. Knowing this, we recognize in Ovid’s admiration for the superior Daco-Roman tradition a tempered reflection of Horia’s former right-wing ideology: modern Romania embodies Ovid’s hope for a Christian/pagan belief in Zalmoxis/Jesus and a new world beyond Rome.

Should Horia’s past have mattered in selecting his book for the award? Were the members of the jury simply naïve or neglectful in carrying out a “security check?” Were those who attacked Horia and the jury, led by the French communist daily *l’Humanité* and joined by Jean-Paul Sartre, perhaps blind to the fact that communist court condemnations were “show trials?”

These and other questions were raised in a thoughtful article of the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* on April 2, 2007 by the novelist and essayist Richard Wagner, himself a Banat-Swabian exile from Romania, who was allowed to leave Ceaușescu’s empire in the 1980s, together with other members of the *Aktionsgruppe Banat*. The article was occasioned by a petition that Horia be rehabilitated, submitted by a number of respected Romanian writers and intellectuals, both in the country and abroad, among them Ana Blandiana, Paul Goma, and Monica Lovinescu.

The Horia case, as well as the comparable one of the Hungarian-Transylvanian writer Albert Wass (see the article on him below), indicates that studying exiled twentieth-century writers is no mere exercise in historical scholarship, for the often unfathomable and unimaginable past of East-Central Europe continues to cast a shadow on its present culture, politics, and cultural politics. Though few writers go into exile today, the past of the exiles and the region’s exilic past are haunting revenants, old repressions that surface under new conditions. We hope to shed some light on exile as well as on the region by taking a historical approach to the phenomenon.

As a fundamental human experience, exile is inscribed into the Bible’s banishment from Paradise, as well as into untold other religious and secular myths. In the history of Europe, people have been repeatedly forced to leave

their home due to religious persecution, ethnic and minority suppression, capricious rulers, petty local politics, and many other acts of violence. Next to forced displacements of whole groups, many forms of individual ejections existed, from the Greek practice of ostracism (a temporary banishment by popular vote without trial or special accusation), through Roman, medieval, and Renaissance practices of banishment (see Randolph Starn). In *Webster's Third* and other dictionaries of the English language, exile is defined, therefore, primarily a "forced removal from one's native country: expulsion from home." This expulsion from home need not mean removal to another country: it also includes internal exile, the forced removal of a person to some remote part of an empire, as was the case with Ovid's banishment to Tomis, Napoleon's to Elba, or Dostoevsky's to Siberia. In the twentieth century, various countries sent their people into an internal exile that involved confinement to a certain village but not to a camp.

The twentieth-century forms of exile differ from its earlier manifestations. In a history of mentalities, we may employ here the term *transcendentale Obdachlosigkeit* (transcendental homelessness) that the Hungarian philosopher György Lukács coined in 1916, amidst a war in which most people, including Lukács's close friend Béla Balázs, enthusiastically offered their blood for their national and ethnic *Heimat*. For Lukács, *Obdachlosigkeit* went well beyond the war and typified modern existence in general: according to *Die Theorie des Romans*, homelessness meant banishment from a transcendental home, as well as from ancient Greece, where, so Lukács claimed, the transcendental had been immanent in the social structure. Following the German idealist tradition, Lukács believed that in ancient Greece individuals had substantial relations to their family and state, because these were "more general, more philosophical, closer and more intimately related to the archetypal *Heimat*" (26). However, following Hegel, Lukács believed that the security Greece had offered to its citizens became suffocating later: "We can no longer breathe in a closed world" (27). If the epic world of Homer embodied a transcendental *Geborgenheit* (shelteredness), the modern novel manifested homelessness: "The form of the novel is, like no other one, an expression of transcendental homelessness" (35).

While Lukács's theory and historical interpretation are open to criticism, he was surely right in claiming that a sense of homelessness has permeated the worldview of many modern European writers and intellectuals, who became alienated from their native culture, and frequently departed from it all but voluntarily. Lukács's personal sense of transcendental homelessness led him a few years later to join the Communist Party, and subsequently to flee from Hungary. In the Party and its ideology he desperately tried to find an escape

from homelessness. Ideological commitment or its opposite, namely a desire to free oneself from it, led to the alienation and voluntary exile of many other twentieth-century artists and intellectuals, including James Joyce, Ezra Pound, and Samuel Beckett.

We wish to distinguish this transcendental sense of estrangement and homelessness from the concrete social and political forms of twentieth-century exile and mass dislocation. Pre-modern exile concerned individuals or small groups of people. Starting with the Renaissance, however, masses of people came to be expelled, and the term “refugee” was introduced to designate groups of people who sought to escape persecution by asking for asylum in another country. Such were the French Huguenots, the French Acadians expelled by the British from Nova Scotia, and, later, the refugees (or émigrés) fleeing the French Revolution (Zolberg 5–11). In East-Central Europe, the dominant form of nineteenth-century displacement became political (rather than religious) exile; witness the exiles of the Polish uprisings in 1830 and 1863 and those who fled after the defeat of the 1848–49 Hungarian war of independence.

In the twentieth century, the conditions of European exile have changed radically, and not only because of its massive numbers. As Aristide Zolberg writes, one of the hallmarks became the “the reinstatement of *prohibition against exit*, such as were common in the age of absolutism but now implemented by states with a much greater ability to control movement across their borders” (16; italics JN). Those who were able to escape found themselves in a new situation, because, as Hannah Arendt (and more recently Giorgio Agamben) has argued, nation states now governed human rights. Those who did not have a nationality reverted to a state of nature.

Expulsion in the traditional sense became relatively rare in the twentieth century, though it was occasionally exercised in the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic, and at times also by virtually all East-Central European communist regimes. The methods varied from country to country. Some dissidents, for instance the Hungarian Squat Theater, were simply ejected; others, like the Czechs Jiří Gruša and Pavel Kohout, were denied reentry after a trip abroad; the Hungarian György Konrád was offered, but refused, the possibility to leave. The Romanians Paul Goma, Dumitru Țepe-neag, and Dorin Tudoran were allowed to exit after a protracted fight for a permit, whereas the Poles Leszek Kolakowski, Zygmunt Bauman, Jan Kott, and others were forced abroad by means of job deprivation, publication prohibition, and various sorts of harassments.

Still, the mentioned cases were exceptions. Twentieth-century European dictatorships preferred to keep their critics, dissidents, and undesirable

elements at home rather than abroad, for at home they could be silenced, locked up in jails and forced labor camps, or simply murdered; abroad they could rally politicians and public opinion against the dictatorial regime. Our following definition reflects then the key historical fact that within the spatial and temporal coordinates of our study exiles were usually not ejected; they *fled by their own volition* in order to escape totalitarianism, minority suppression, and racial persecution:

In twentieth-century East-Central Europe exile usually meant a self-motivated or, occasionally, forced departure from the home country or habitual place of residence, because of a threat to the person's freedom or dignified survival, such as an imminent arrest, sentence, forced labor, or even extermination. The departure was for an unforeseeable time irreversible.

The criteria of irreversibility and "immediate threat to a person's freedom or dignified survival" restrict our definition but include the major groups: the leftists who fled after the fall of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in 1919 for fear of a White Terror; the Jews, Czechs, and Poles who fled the imminent Nazi threat in 1938–39; participants of the Hungarian 1956 revolution who had to flee after its defeat; and most of those that left Czechoslovakia after the suppression of the Prague Spring in 1968.

To this core group of exiles we may add those to whom our central criteria of "immediate threat" and "no return" apply only partially: the émigrés and the expatriates. The latter retain their original nation-state rights and are spared an indefinite, possibly final, sundering from their native society, whereas émigrés "may share in the solitude and estrangement of exile, but they do not suffer under its rigid proscriptions" (Said, "Reflections" 166). As Leszek Kołakowski put it:

More often than not, modern exiles have been expatriates, rather than exiles in the strict sense; usually they were not physically deported from their countries or banished by law; they escaped from political persecution, prison, death, or simply censorship. The distinction is important insofar as it has had a psychological effect. Many voluntary exiles from tyrannical regimes cannot rid themselves of a feeling of discomfort. [...] A certain ambiguity is therefore unavoidable, and it is impossible to draw up any hard-and-fast rules to distinguish justifiable from unjustifiable self-exile. (188)

Since it remains unclear in this passage by what criteria a self-exile may be "unjustifiable," it would perhaps be better to speak of a departure that is not primarily motivated by political pressure. Still, our distinction generally agrees with that of Kołakowski, if we insert between exiles and expatriates the émigrés. Like him, we emphasize that earlier exiles were ejected whereas modern ones usually enter a *self*-exile. Like him, we ask when political suppression becomes so unbearable that self-exile remains the only self-defense, and we

believe, like him, that no hard-and-fast rules can be established for this, partly because we usually have only the evidence given by the exiled person, which is subjectively experienced and may change with time. We are usually unable to determine, just how threatening the home conditions were for the person who left. For all these reasons, it is preferable to separate exiles and émigrés by an imaginary gray band rather than a sharp line.

The socio-political conditions at the time of departure and the original intentions of the departing person are not the only factors that determine the status of a person. Émigrés or expatriates may suddenly turn into genuine exiles by making a provocative statement or engaging in a political act that turn them into an enemy of the regime at home. Eugène Ionesco, for instance, departed as an expatriate but became an exile that could no longer return to communist Romania when his play *Le Rhinocéros* came to be understood as an allegory of suppressive states like Romania.

Émigrés may be dissatisfied with the cultural and political situation at home, but, in our view, they become exiles only if they are under imminent threat. If they leave legally and do not burn the bridges behind themselves, they are, strictly speaking, no exiles. Take, for instance, the Romanian Jewish writer Benjamin Fundoianu, who, having visited Paris in 1923, definitely left his country in 1935. His reasons included the growing anti-Semitism in Romania, but also his wish to write in a major language and to contribute to world literature. In this sense, he was strictly speaking no exile, though he became one when measures were taken against the Jews in Romania. Unfortunately, he was denounced in his presumed safe haven, and perished in the Holocaust. The eminent Serbian writer Miloš Crnjanski (see Guido Snel's article on him below) quit the Yugoslav diplomatic service when his country was invaded by the Germans, and he stayed in London even after the war in a semi-legal fashion. He finally returned to Yugoslavia as a celebrated writer in the 1960s. Thus, Crnjanski shifted his status: he did not flee but became an exile due to the Nazi occupation of his country; after the war, he was an émigré rather than an exile, perhaps even an expatriate. Milan Kundera is also difficult to classify. Unlike the Hungarian exiles of 1956, he did not flee his country immediately after the suppression of the 1968 Prague Spring but tried to make the best of it. His life and freedom were apparently not immediately endangered, though he was kicked out of the Communist Party in 1970 (after an earlier ejection and readmission). When he finally concluded in 1975 that "normalized" Czechoslovakia was unlivable, he left and did burn the bridges behind himself by publishing regime-hostile texts abroad.

Expatriates are easier to distinguish from exiles and émigrés because they leave without being existentially endangered; in principle, they can return

any time they want to. More often than not – as in the case of James Joyce and Samuel Beckett departing from Ireland, or Gertrud Stein, Ernest Hemingway, and other American artists settling in Paris during the interwar years – their unforced departure is motivated by a general sense of alienation from the home culture. That Joyce often stylized himself as an exile, and that exile was both a theme of his fiction and an attribute of his literary alter-egos are important for understanding the writer and his art, but classifying him as a genuine (rather than metaphoric) exile would water down the existential weight of the term as we use it. Similarly, East-Central European writers, artists, actors, and directors went to Paris and Berlin in the 1920s because they were attracted to the intensity of artistic and intellectual life there. They were not, strictly speaking, exiles; one of the exceptions was Bruno Jasiński, who quit Poland in 1925 due to harassments at home, and lived a destitute life in Paris until he was ejected because of his 1929 novel *Je brûle Paris* (I Burn Paris).

The terms exile, émigré, and expatriate designate individuals or small groups; they carry a certain elitist connotation, though not in terms of material wealth. Such individual fortunes should be considered against the background of historical mass movements. During the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, masses of people fled religious persecution all over Europe, and in East-Central Europe, massive dislocations were caused by the Ottoman wars. As late as 1690, tens of thousands of Serbs left with the Patriarch Čarnojević III their still beleaguered homes and resettled in various parts of Hungary.

At least three designations refer to masses of displaced individuals in modern East-Central Europe: *diasporic people*, *migrants*, and *forcefully repatriated people*. The Jews (outside of Israel), the Roma, the Armenians, and other diasporic people were stateless ethnic groups throughout much of their history. They have been admitted to various modern states, but always tenuously and with restrictions. Some members of these diasporic communities acquired ambiguous multiple identities, while others have refused dispersion and either assimilated or displayed their marginality and otherness consciously and conspicuously. *Migrants* refer in our context to those masses whom deprivation drove to migrate from Europe to North America in the nineteenth and early twentieth century (migrant workers came in large numbers to Western Europe in the post-World-War II decades, but not to the region we are concerned with). While there were relatively few first-generation writers and artists among these economic immigrants of the New World, their ethnic-social organizations became of considerable importance to writers who fled there later.

Exiles and émigrés become refugees if they ask for asylum abroad. Article 1 of the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (as amended by the 1967 Protocol) defines a refugee as follows:

[A person who] owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it. (www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/o_c_ref.htm)

Focusing on a refugee's past status in the home country (or habitual residence), the convention defines what a refugee status in a host nation state is. This highly important question of legality will play a relatively small role in our volume.

Having sharply distinguished between exiles and émigrés, we admitted subsequently that in concrete cases the choice of label is not always easy to make. To this "experiential" fuzziness we have to add in conclusion a linguistic/discursive one. In Polish, and to a lesser extent in Hungarian and other languages of the region, the terms "emigrants," "emigration," and their variants have often been used to cover also what we define in this volume as "exile": our rational-transnational distinction occasionally clashes with historical discourse. In specific contributions to our volume it would have been pedantic as well as a-historical to insist on using "exile" instead of "emigration." We allowed for inconsistency in order to accommodate national and historical variety.

2. Exile and Writing

We spoke of exiles, émigrés, and expatriates as if all of them had been writers, though these constitute only a vanishingly small fraction of all those that leave their home. We did so, because, next to judicial records (which are scarce and often completely lacking), writers give the most thorough and extensive accounts of exile. As Dubravka Ugrešić ironically remarks, "writers are those rare migrants who leave their footprints," though they are statistically the most insignificant and unreliable witnesses (127). Millions survived or died in exile silently; writers have offered us not only stories of their lives but also literary works like Dante's *Divine Comedy* that transcend the immediate events, personal feelings, and their articulations.

Indeed, some of the most distinguished pre-nineteenth-century European exiles were writers. Next to the famous cases of Ovid, Cicero, Seneca, Dante,

Petrarch, and Machiavelli there were many exiled writers that became key figures within a national tradition. Perhaps the most distinguished eighteenth-century Hungarian literary work was written by Kelemen Mikes, who followed his political leader, Ferenc Rákóczy, into an exile that led him into Poland, France, and finally Turkey. At Terkirdag/Rodostó he wrote between 1717 and 1758 some 207 letters to a fictional aunt, which constitute his *Törökországí levelek* (Letters from Turkey), a poignant literary masterwork that could be published only posthumously, in 1794.

Torn out of their home environment and frequently separated from their family and friends, exiles settle in alien social and linguistic worlds that often restrict them to solitary confinement. This is particularly true of East-Central European writers (as well as actors), because the communities they settle in do not speak their language. Dante settled in another Italian culture, British emigrants usually went to other English-speaking parts of the world, East German writers could settle in West Germany; but East-Central European exiles – apart from ethnic German writers who lived in East-Central Europe (see Thomas Cooper's article below on Herta Müller) – had to settle in foreign linguistic environments, in which, at best, they could occasionally find a minority subculture of their language. Although we intend to go beyond individual writers and their texts, for practical reasons we are unable to offer a systematic and comprehensive treatment of these exile and emigrant subcultures, which also include other artists, scholars, free-lance intellectuals, as well as various professional people and politicians. In Chapter II we do offer, however, case studies on literary exile cultures abroad.

Businessmen, doctors, lawyers, engineers, and most academic people can continue to exercise their professions in exile, for these depend less on language. Painters and musicians can also get along with a rudimentary mastery of the host language. Writers, however, are not engineers ("of the soul," as Stalin thought) but verbal artists who often have to make traumatic and existential decisions in exile concerning their *métier*. If they continue to write in their mother tongue, their readers will usually be restricted to the exile and émigré community of their language, for their works can reach neither the native readers they left behind nor the readers of their host country (as was the case with Sándor Márai, Witold Gombrowicz, and most other exile writers). If they adopt the language of their host country, their work becomes available to a larger, often global, reading public, but the switch often becomes the source of a life-long sense of inadequacy and inferiority, as in the case of Emil Cioran, Agota Kristof, and others. A number of writers – among them Milan Kundera, Andrei Codrescu, Jerzy Pietrkiewicz, Ota Philip, Libuša Moníková, and Jiří Gruša – switched with relative ease to a new language, and a few exile

writers from East-Central Europe could turn the exposure to several languages even into a source of artistic creativity.

Having said all this, it remains difficult to demarcate exactly literature from other types of writing, and to differentiate between professional and occasional writers. Studies of writing in exile must go beyond imaginative literature and include autobiographies, correspondence, and other personal writings that are often produced by journalists, philosophers, essayists, historians, and other professionals. We have tried to keep our demarcations flexible.

3. The Home Cultures

In contrast to essays and critical reflections, scholarly studies of exile have traditionally focused on a single country and a single linguistic community. This is justified inasmuch as exile and emigration are induced by national political and social conditions, but the results, which utilize a limited database, do not allow for generalizations. In the absence of a comparative international framework, such studies may not even reveal the full significance of the national phenomenon, for understanding a specific form of national exile may require, as in the case of a native language, knowledge of analogous and alternative possibilities. Hence our choice to study exile on a regional level.

The transnational region we have chosen for our study includes the present states of Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Croatia, and Serbia. Including other countries would have raised both serious practical difficulties and additional conceptual problems. The Russian Revolution of 1917 to the East of our region, and Hitler's Germany to the West of it, forced masses of people into exile (usually termed *émigrés* in the Russian case), but the scale and the problems of these displacements fundamentally differed from the phenomenon we are studying here. The exiles from the Baltic countries and from the southern Balkan countries involved smaller groups, but their patterns were significantly different: in the Baltic countries: the threat and the actual Nazi occupation produced a massive Soviet forced removal eastward, but only a negligible exodus over the borders of the Soviet Union, whereas the reoccupation by the Soviet Union produced a small but significant exodus, mostly to Sweden, where only a handful of exiles fled from our region. In the Balkans, history also ran differently. There were no significant exile groups from Albania and the southern states of ex-Yugoslavia. Bulgaria represents somewhat of an exception, but we excluded it in order to keep geographic coherence.

There are no fully satisfactory ways of labeling our region. Calling it Central Europe would have necessitated the inclusion of Austria and Germany,

whereas the Cold-War term “Eastern Europe” is too broad and now outdated. We have therefore adopted and modified for our purposes the term that has been used in Marcel Cornis-Pope’s and John Neubauer’s four-volume *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe*.

What, then, were the social, political, and historical conditions in these countries that gave rise to the exile of writers in the twentieth century? To take a step backward, we first note that none of the countries now occupying the region was fully independent in the nineteenth century. In the process of a national (re)awakening, each of them went through a struggle against one or several hegemonic powers that forced many patriotic writers into exile. The suppressors were in the first instance the powers to the East and West (Russia, Prussia, and Austria), but we ought to add that nations struggling for independence usually also suppressed their minority populations. This was the case with Hungary, especially once it became the junior partner of the Dual Monarchy.

The situation radically changed, and to certain extent reversed itself, when in the wake of World War I the Dual Monarchy collapsed and Hungary lost two-thirds of its pre-war territory whereas a number of nation states – Poland, Czechoslovakia, Greater Romania, and the Kingdom of Serbia, Croatia, and Slovenia – (re)emerged. The new national constellation and the redrawing of borders led to an unprecedented European phenomenon: millions of refugees, as well as persons who were expelled or exchanged in order to create homogenous national populations:

In 1918 huge masses of refugees appeared in Europe, victims of the new-style nation-states – especially those consolidating their precarious existence in the postwar world. It was estimated in 1926 that there were no less than 9.5 million European refugees, including two million Poles to be repatriated [...] 250,000 Hungarians, and one million Germans expelled from various parts of Europe (Marrus 51–52, based on Bryas 56).

World War II created an even greater humanitarian crisis: at the end of the war, millions of liberated concentration-camp inmates, released prisoners of war, refugees, and displaced persons from the Eastern parts of Europe were roaming around or lingering in DP camps. While the Western Allies managed to repatriate more than five of the seven million displaced persons by September 1945 (often, however, forcing them to go back to the Soviet Union: see Marrus 313–17), the situation worsened in the Eastern part of Europe, because another redrawing of borders led to the expulsion or voluntary departure of those that became unwanted in their home. Article XIII of the Potsdam agreement sanctioned, for instance, the “transfer” of Germans from Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary to Germany, a country that had just lost a significant part of its Eastern territory (now stretching only to the Oder-

Neisse line) to Poland. It is estimated that Hungary, one of the more liberal countries in this respect, expelled some 135 000 Germans.

Many of the homes vacated by the expelled Germans came to be occupied in these countries by refugees that the Soviet Union had displaced by incorporating into the Ukrainian Soviet Republic Poland's Eastern Borderlands, Czechoslovakia's Carpatho-Ruthenia and Romania's Bessarabia and Bukovina. Czechoslovakia forcefully "exchanged" also some of its Hungarians; Romania did not eject its Transylvania Saxons, Banat Swabians, and Hungarian Székelys (though many Romanian Germans were taken into Soviet and Romanian camps for many years), but its minorities dramatically dwindled in the following decades by voluntary or involuntary exits. Such massive and painful intra-regional removals gradually homogenized formerly multicultural areas by moving people from minority habitats to ethnically and/or linguistically "home" countries.

We shall bypass these mass displacements in this volume, for they represent intra- rather than inter-regional forms of exile and emigration, and they involved relatively few mature writers. To be sure, many writers were displaced as young adults or as children of migrating families. The parents of Eva Hoffman moved in 1945 (the year she was born) from the Ukrainian L'viv (formerly the Polish Lwów) to Cracow (Hoffman 8); Aleksander Rymkiewicz and many others moved in 1945 to Poland, when Wilno became Vilnius, capital of the Lithuanian Soviet Republic; Włodzimierz Odojewski, born in Poznań but raised in the Polish/Ukrainian borderland, also moved to Poland; Paul Celan, Norman Manea, and other Romanians moved from the now Ukraine Bukovina to Romanian cities; Romanian and Hungarian writers moved back and forth according to the fortunes of Northern Transylvania, which went from Romania to Hungary (as the consequence of a Hitler-supported decision in Vienna) in 1940 and was returned to Romania after the war. The Romanian poet Lucian Blaga, who held a special university chair in Cluj, fled when the Hungarian troops marched in; he returned to Cluj in 1945 but was deprived of his chair by the communists in 1948. We shall bypass also those Romanian German writers (most prominent among them Heinrich Zillich), who voluntarily went "home" to Nazi Germany in the 1930s, but Thomas Cooper will discuss below Herta Müller, a prominent Romanian Swabian writer who was allowed to leave the Banat in the 1980s and experienced a complicated "homecoming" in Germany. The Hungarians still represent a significant minority in Transylvania and the Banat, but writers continued to transfer to Hungary both during the interwar years (e.g. Lajos Áprily and Sándor Makkai) and after 1945 (e.g. Miklós Bánffy and Áron Tamási).

Each East-Central European communist regime forced its own pattern of exile and emigration. Yugoslavia, expelled in 1948 from the Stalin's international Cominform, subsequently became a receiver rather than exporter of exiles (Vladimir Dedijer, a follower of Milovan Đilas, was an exception). Many exiles left the other East-Central European countries in the late 1940s to escape the communist takeover and consolidation of power, but this stream dwindled by 1950, and even the death of Stalin (1953) did not ease immediately the border control. The two windows of opportunity during the 1950–70 period –, after the defeat of 1956 Hungarian uprising and after the suppression of the 1968 Prague Spring – involved a host of prominent writers and intellectuals. Poland had a different history. A steady stream of Jews left after the government lifted the ban on Jewish emigration in 1958, and the exodus peaked again during the anti-Semitic wave in the Party (1968), as well as the declaration of martial law in the early 1980s. The rhythm of exodus was different again in Romania. Relatively few people left during the Thaw of the 1960s, but the numbers increased in the 1970s and 80s, when Ceaușescu's regime became increasingly dictatorial. Though Ceaușescu made departure extremely difficult for native Romanians, he “generously” allowed Jews and Germans to emigrate by exacting substantial “ransoms” from Germany and Israel.

We shall fill in this outline with a history of individual writers and intellectuals in the following section. Suffice to conclude here that the exile and emigration policies of the East-European satellite nations was by no means uniform, and, furthermore, that until the later 1970s and 80s the dissident writers and intellectuals of the various countries had little contact with each other. As Csaba Kiss remarks, East-Central European writers traditionally knew little about each other because they looked to Paris from Warsaw and Prague, Belgrade and Bucharest rather than to the neighboring capitals (126). Exactly this common attraction to the Western cultural centers (in case of the communists of the 1930s to Moscow) encourages us to treat exile on a regional basis. Those who remained at home dreamed of a world beyond the region's western borders, while those who departed shared a romantic *Heimweh* coupled with a disdain for the *Heimat*. National differences determined only partly which of these feelings dominated. Those who were literally forced to flee from their homeland tended to suffer more from pain and nostalgia than the émigrés and expatriates who departed usually by their own volition. Sándor Márai, who was for all practical purposes forced out of Hungary, remained affectionately attached to it all his life, while the Polish Witold Gombrowicz and the Romanian Emil Cioran, who were not coerced to leave, had adopted sharply critical and ironic views of their country even before they had

left it. Witness Cioran's *Schimbarea la față a României* (The Transfiguration of Romania), which he published in 1938, based on views he had held already in Romania.

Having an audience in the native language is an existential need for most writers. Émigrés and expatriates from East-Central Europe could, as a rule, hold on to their home audience until they became publicly critical of the political regime. Those who fled, instantaneously lost their opportunity to publish at home and were forced to consider alternatives: they could try publishing for a native reading public abroad, or they had to learn to write for a larger public in a new language. Smuggling books into the homeland was all but impossible during World War II; in the later years of the communist regimes, from the 1960s onward, it became possible in some countries (notably Poland, partly in Czechoslovakia), though it remained an unstable and unreliable source of income. Samizdat publications of exiled authors also surfaced in these decades, but they were of artistic and political rather than financial value.

Those who survived exile and lived to see 1945 or 1989 could consider reestablishing their personal and professional ties with the homeland, but, as our articles in Chapter V show, this turned out to be in most cases immensely more complicated than it had been anticipated. Here we wish to touch merely on the clashes between returning exiles and those that claimed to have lived in "inner emigration" during totalitarian regimes. A brief reflection on the origin of the term may help us identify some of its complexity.

The term came into use in the 1930s, by both those who fled Hitler and those who remained at home. In those years, Klaus Mann, Paul Tillich, Thomas Mann, and other exiles acknowledged the existence of an internal resistance to Hitler and felt in solidarity with it (Grimm 40–41). This changed during the war and its aftermath. To Thomas Mann's great chagrin, several German writers who had stayed at home started to glorify inner emigration. As Frank Thiess wrote with a swipe at the exiles: inner emigration consisted of a community of intellectuals that remained loyal to Germany by not abandoning it and not watching it from a comfortable dress box abroad, but shared its misfortune with all sincerity (Mann, *Die Entstehung* 124; see also 119 and 168). Gottfried Benn, a leading poet, even made the outrageous claim that becoming a Wehrmacht officer was an "aristocratic form of emigration" (3: 942 and 8: 1960). As a result, Thomas Mann angrily came to deny that "inner emigration" had ever existed.

The Frank Thiess/Thomas Mann controversy continued in the following decades, when German writers and literary historians came to argue about the relative values of exilic and "home" literature. Conservatives tended to over-

value the literature written in Germany under Hitler, while exiles and critics from the left came to regard claims to “inner emigration” as empty excuses. At a University of Wisconsin conference on exile and inner emigration Reinhold Grimm gave an excellent historical account of how “inner emigration” emerged as a concept, but in his subsequent examination of opposition to Hitler Grimm confounded inner emigration with dissidence, and once more obscured its meaning (see Snell 10–11).

What implications does this first, specifically German, use of “inner emigration” have for its use by others elsewhere? Though it was coined to designate a phenomenon in Nazi Germany, we must allow for other meanings in other contexts, especially since it is not always clear whether the new use of the term was a “nomadic” variant of the German one or a new coinage, whose originator was unaware of the first German meaning. Comparative studies such as ours should remind us, however, that this usually positively connoted term had a decidedly negative meaning for German writers, critics, and scholars returning from exile. Just as many Frenchmen claimed after the war to have participated in the resistance movement, many German writers who stayed at home constructed a self-image via “inner emigration” that prettified their often less than admirable attitude under the Nazi regime.

We should also keep in mind a terminological rather than historical aspect of “inner emigration”: Grimm’s historically useful discussion does not carve out a conceptual space for it. Dissidence and internal emigration partially overlap, but they are surely not synonymous. Did, for instance, the Polish poet Stanisław Barańczak automatically become, as he claimed, an inner emigrant rather than a dissident when he was silenced (Kliems, “Dissens” 209)? Facing censorship, dissidents try to assume an oppositional public voice and activity, whereas those in internal exile tend to withdraw from politics and even from the world. They are silenced, or they voluntarily fall silent, and their writing goes into the drawer of their desk, not to a (legal, samizdat, or foreign) publisher. Yet writers and scholars continue to confound dissidence and “inner emigration.” Ferenc Fejtő, for instance, calls Milovan Đilas’s prohibition to publish and frequent jailing a “belső [internal] migráció” (536), though Đilas did publish his writings abroad, and he was an active dissident rather than a silent voice, even if the authorities tried to silence him. Even more complicated is the case of the Hungarian writer Imre Kertész that Susan Suleiman analyzes in our volume. Kertész had difficulty publishing during the postwar decades, and he felt isolated from the Hungarian literary establishment. Hence he claims that during the decades of Russian occupation he had been in a “de facto in inner emigration” (“Das eigene Land” 111). He did not completely fall silent, nor was he completely ignored, but for a long time he did not

receive the recognition he should have. Still, as Suleiman rightly argues, he was no dissident, and part of his isolation resulted precisely from his reluctance to join dissidents like György Konrád or István Eörsi.

In other contexts, “internal exile” has been used to refer to people who were banished to a remote part of the same country (Siberia, Kazakhstan, or, as in Adrian Marino’s case, to Romania’s Baragan region). More recently, it has also been applied to people who fled from one member state of the former Yugoslav Federation to the other.

4. The Dialectics of Exile and Homecoming

Dividing history into centuries is a convenient way to chop up time, but actual historical events seldom fit into prefixed calendar units. Is it justified then to single out twentieth-century exile, as we do in our volume? For practical purposes, twentieth-century exile actually begins only after World War I, and we shall therefore pass over in silence all but a fifth of it, limiting thus our treatment to what is sometimes called the “short” century. We do believe that the exilic experiences of the following eighty years (1920–2000) were radically different from those of earlier centuries, in terms of both scale and violence. The suffering of exiles in the nineteenth century pales in comparison to the pain of those that barely escaped the Holocaust and communist persecution.

Could we not, however, distinguish within the twentieth century itself radically different exilic experiences? More than one answer is possible. We have chosen the twentieth century as our basic unit because we believe that, for all their differences, the Nazis and the communists have produced interrelated exilic forms and experiences. The two ought to be seen in light of each other, not because they were identical or even similar, but because understanding one necessitates the context of the other. The otherwise excellent encyclopedic study *Grundbegriffe und Autoren ostmitteleuropäischer Exilliteraturen 1945–1989* (Basic Concepts and Authors of the East-Central European Exile Literatures, 1945–1989) by Eva Behring and her associates misses the opportunity of such a mutual illumination by focusing exclusively on the postwar exiles that fled from the communist regimes. Yet, those fleeing Stalin’s totalitarianism often had to settle in communities with exile and émigré social networks that were built by both those that had fled the Nazis and those that had supported them. The shared bitter experience of exile could not erase the difference in the worldviews and ideologies of these two groups. To put it perhaps all too sharply, those who fled the Nazis were mostly Jews and/or people with left-

wing political convictions, whereas most of those that fled after the war were either militant anti-communists, or reform communists who fled Hungary after 1956 or Czechoslovakia after 1968, deeply disillusioned by the betrayal of their ideals in political practice.

Precisely the differences between the conditions of exiles fleeing the Nazi and the communist regimes warrant their joint study. The relationship between the first (Nazi) and the second (communist) waves of exile does not simply follow the arrow of time, revealing how the later phenomenon had been conditioned by the former. On a more theoretical level, in meta-reflections that attempt to systematize thinking about exile, we must draw on both experiences, as well as on the more recent European and global cases of exile, displaced persons, refugees, and asylum seekers. Modern theorizing on exile began with the work of Hannah Arendt, Theodor Adorno and other exiles fleeing the Nazis. Some contemporary authors, for instance the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben, take Arendt's ideas as their point of departure; others, for instance the Palestine-American Edward Said and authors interested in post-colonialism, choose to start with reflections on forced displacements outside Europe. Given our subject, the social and historical dimensions of the (East-Central) European experience and its theoretical implications, the approach of Arendt and the other pre-war exiles is of special importance to us. Yet we must reconsider their Nazi/Jewish based reflections, in light of the exilic experiences brought about by Communism, and the new technological modes of communication. In short, if fleeing the Nazis was a historical antecedent of exile from the communist regimes, the latter, in turn, should lead to a retrospective rethinking of what Arendt, Adorno, and other Nazi exiles wrote. Studies of concrete exile phenomena may follow the arrow of historical time, but theoretical reflections should point in the opposite direction today.

The Nineteenth-Century Exile Traditions

General opinion holds that exiles and émigrés have traditionally gravitated towards Paris. Indeed, this was the city where many nineteenth-century East-Central European exiles, émigrés, and expatriates settled, but their composition fluctuated and was never evenly distributed among the various nations. Note, for instance, that East-Central European exiles fleeing Russian repression flooded Paris in the nineteenth century, whereas after 1919 the city became inundated by émigré Russians fleeing the Bolsheviks. In what follows, we wish to show that Paris was a second, and sometimes even primary, home

for Polish and Romanian writers, but this does not hold for Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, and South-Slavic writers.

After Poland's second partitioning in 1795, Paris became the Polish political and cultural capital, and the city kept this role during the first half of the nineteenth century. Poland and France, both Catholic countries, had maintained close political and cultural ties for centuries. These ties became particularly close under Napoleon, whom most Poles supported in the hope that he would free the country from Russian oppression. As Czesław Miłosz writes, the most important single phenomenon of Polish Romanticism was, perhaps, "the Napoleonic legend, releasing as it did new forces of feeling and imagination" (*History* 207). Indeed, common anti-Russian sentiments fuelled French-Polish ties throughout the nineteenth century. In 1831, after the collapse of the November Insurrection against Russian domination, several thousand Polish officers, soldiers, and intellectuals immigrated to France. In 1843, Prince Adam Czartoryski set up the conservative "Monarchist Society of May 3" in the Parisian Hotel Lambert, which came to function as an informal government in exile. For several decades, Paris, rather than Warsaw or Cracow, was the center of Polish culture, and the national romantic tradition that emerged here was so powerful that Polish writers felt compelled to follow, oppose, or, as in the case of Witold Gombrowicz, to ridicule it ever since. Miłosz recalls in "Tak zreszta spełniła" that reading at the lyceum the grand prophetic texts of the Polish romantic exiles he came to believe (we should say prophetically) that he could achieve poetic greatness only if he too went into exile (*Poezje* 3: 79).

However, the relationship of the major Polish romantic writers to Paris was not always simple. Adam Mickiewicz, the most important of them, was invited in 1840 to assume the first chair of Slavic language and literature at the Collège de France, but his initially very popular lectures came to an unforeseen early end in 1844, partly because the poet came under the influence of the Polish mystic Andrzej Towiański, but mainly because his distrust of the Church and the admiration he expressed for Napoleon in his later lectures embarrassed the French authorities. Juliusz Słowacki fled to France after the 1830–31 insurrection, but he was prevented next year from reentering because the French authorities considered his first collection of poems too patriotic. Nevertheless, he managed to live in Paris until his death in 1849. Cyprian Kamil Norwid, another leading Polish romantic poet, was expelled from Prussia in 1846 and lived much of his nomadic exile (1849–52 and 1854–83) in Paris, though mostly in poor health and in depravation. Zygmunt Krasiński, finally, also lived much of his emigrant life in Paris, against the wishes of his father, a pro-Russian general.

Polish literature was also present in nineteenth-century Paris through cultural institutions, two of which still function. The *Société littéraire polonaise* (after 1854 *Société historique et littéraire polonaise*), was founded in 1832 by Prince Adam Czartoryski, who also became its first President. Founded to combat Poland's Russification and Germanization, the *Société* counted among its members not only such Polish cultural emblems as Chopin, Mickiewicz, and Józef Bem, but also distinguished French writers and historians like George Sand, Jules Michelet, Prosper Mérimée, and Alfred de Vigny. The *Société* initiated the *Bibliothèque Polonaise* with a call by Mickiewicz. Established in 1838, it grew in the following decades through major donations of books, manuscripts, art objects, and a variety of archival materials. In 1893, it became a subsidiary of the Cracow (later Polish) Academy of the Sciences and Letters. In the last decades of the nineteenth century there were actually more than sixty active Parisian-Polish associations, clubs, and societies, among them *Le Cercle Polonaise Artistique-Littéraire*, an association of Polish artists in Paris. The primary aim of these organizations was to translate Polish literature into French, to stage theater performances in Polish, and to study the Polish language.

Paris was also a Mecca of Romanian exiles, facilitated by the linguistic ties between Romanian and French. Although the Romanians had neither the critical mass nor the means to establish Parisian literary institutions that could compare with those of the Poles, they played a crucial role in the cultural and political awakening of their people. Most of the liberal Romanian "Westernizers" – including the important political leaders and writers C. A. Rosetti, Ion C. Brătianu, Vasile Alecsandri, Alecu Russo, Mihail Kogălniceanu, Ion Ghica, and Ion Heliade Rădulescu – fled to Paris after the defeat of the 1848 revolutions in the Romanian Principalities. Most of them contributed to Romanian literature (especially to the epistolary genre) in the French language. Heliade Rădulescu, whose exile in Paris lasted nine years, underwent a significant evolution from his earlier revolutionary animus to a more traditionalist position. In *Mémoires sur l'histoire de la régénération roumaine* (Memories of the History of the Romanian Regeneration; 1851), he concluded that the Romanian revolution had failed because it neglected the continuity of "national traditions," though Moldova and Walachia were still separated at the time and did not always view themselves as belonging to a single nation. The original French version of Alecu Russo's prose poem *Cântarea României* (Song of Romania; 1855) described a mythic rather than a real homeland.

Twentieth-century exiles from Poland and Romania were thus able follow the trajectories and footsteps of their nineteenth-century predecessors, whom they regarded as writers that conceptualized and truly represented their national culture. This was not, however, the case with the Czechs, for

only two major Czech writers went into exile during the nineteenth century: Karel Havlíček Borovský and Josef Václav Frič. Havlíček, the first great Czech journalist, was twice tried for sedition and finally deported in December 1851 to the South-Tyrolean town of Brixen. There he wrote his *Tyrolské elegie* (Tyrolean Elegies) and two long satirical poems against Russian and Austrian absolutism, which circulated in manuscript form until they were published posthumously, in 1861 and 1870 respectively. Frič, a leader of the radical students in 1848–49, was imprisoned in the years 1851–54, arrested again in 1858, and then released the following year on the condition that he leave the country. He lived in London, Paris, and Berlin before he could return to Prague in 1880. Havlíček and Frič did not become symbols of an exiled Czech national culture as the romantic poets did for the Poles. Twentieth-century Czechs (except perhaps Kundera) tended to look at exile rather in terms of Viktor Dyk's oft-quoted adage from 1921: not the homeland but those leaving it will perish ("Fenêtres"; qtd. in Škvorecký's *Moscow Blues* 215).

Only few Slovak, Hungarian, Croat, and Serb writers went into exile in the nineteenth-century, and those who did were usually drawn to the German/Austrian, and, less frequently, to the English cultural orbit. They attended German universities and often published with German publishers. Miklós Jósika, for instance, a Hungarian-Transylvanian writer of historical novels, fled to Brussels to save his life after 1848–49; later he moved on to Germany rather than Paris because his wife and his publishers were German.

Hungarian writers continued to pay secondary attention to Paris in the first decades of the twentieth century. To be sure, the greatest Hungarian modernist poet, Endre Ady, found a second home in Paris prior to World War I, and Lajos Kassák, the most important figure of the avant-garde, "pilgrimaged" there on foot in 1909 – an event he commemorated in 1922 with his long, and perhaps best, poem "A ló meghal, a madarak kirepülnek" (The Horse Dies the Birds Fly Away). However, when World War I broke out, the patriotic Béla Balázs symptomatically declared in the *Nyugat*: "Paris was our first great casualty. [...] We no longer like Paris" (Aug. 16/Sept. 1, 1914: 200). When Kassák had to flee from Hungary in 1919, he settled in Vienna, not Paris (see Éva Forgács's essay in this volume).

Masses of poor people left East-Central Europe around the turn of the twentieth century to seek a better life overseas, but hardly any fled for political reasons. Those writers who left, temporarily or permanently, became expatriates rather than exiles, and they settled in Europe rather than overseas. Joseph Conrad, the most famous one of those who left permanently, traversed the world but settled in England. Some key figures of early East-Central European Modernism went abroad as temporary expatriates but returned later. Stanisław

Przybyszewski started to write in Berlin, but became the leading figure of Polish Modernism only once he returned to Cracow in 1898. The Hungarian Ady went seven times to Paris between 1904 and 1911 because of the lure of the city and of a married woman he called Léda. Perhaps only the Latvian Aspazia and Jānis Rainis were genuine East-European exiles during the prewar period: they fled to Switzerland after the failure of the 1905 Russian revolution.

Exodus from Hungary in 1919

During and after World War I, masses of people were forcibly displaced, but, as mentioned, this involved only few writers. The first major twentieth-century exodus of East-Central European writers was not part of a larger mass movement of refugees. It consisted of artists and intellectuals of liberal, socialist, and communist persuasion, who feared, justifiably, the worst when right-wing extremists assumed power in Hungary and the country lost a substantial part of its population to the surrounding countries. The bloodletting in the country's cultural life possibly surpassed the brain drain that followed the suppression of the 1956 revolution.

A few words on the background of this first exile wave may be useful. The Hungarian anti-war and social protest started to gain momentum in 1916–17, as it became gradually evident that the central powers were losing the war. The March 1, 1917 issue of the leading journal, *Nyugat*, was confiscated because of Mihály Babits's powerful anti-war poem. Oszkár Jászi's journal *Huszadik század* became the organ of the young anti-war sociologists and political scientists who envisioned a Danubian Federation, whereas Lajos Kassák's *Tett* and its successor *Ma* rallied the avant-garde writers and artists, who had revolutionary-utopian visions of a creative new humankind (see Éva Forgács's article below). The Sunday Circle started in the winter of 1915. Dreamed up by Béla Balázs and led by György Lukács, it involved brilliant young intellectuals, such as the sociologist Karl Mannheim, the art historian Arnold Hauser, the philosopher Béla Fogarasi, the poet Anna Lesznai, the psychologist Julia Láng, the art historian Frederick Antal, as well as Emma Ritoók, Edith Hajós, and Anna Hamvassy. Leaning at that point towards a leftist philosophical idealism, the members became more radical in 1918–19 and assumed leading roles in the culture of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic. The Galileo Circle, finally, was a radical but non-violent student organization at the university, with some members engaging in illegal action. The leaders included Jászi and the Polányi brothers Károly (its first President) and Mihály, both of whom became later highly respected Western intellectuals.

The collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy led in October 1918 to a bloodless bourgeois revolution and a republican government under the leadership of Count Mihály Károlyi. The Hungarian Communist Party was founded on November 24, and its ranks quickly swelled with intellectuals and returning soldiers. In the December 1918 issue of *Szabadgondolat*, the journal of the Galileo Circle edited by Károly Polányi, Lukács still pondered Bolshevism's "moral question," but later that month he joined the Communist Party (Congdon, *Exile* 29–30). He was not entirely welcome. As József Lengyel remembers, a major conflict developed in the editorial offices of the communist paper *Vörös Újság* when Lukács and the "spiritual" group behind him offered their services. The group around Ottó Korvin, including Lengyel and József Révai, distrusted the idealism of the Lukács people, and could not understand why Béla Kun, the leader of the Party who had just returned from Russia, had accepted Lukács's "help" (*Visegrádi utca* 101). Indeed, the Lukács circle was preoccupied with the Dostoyevskian question whether violence and killing could sometimes be justified, and several members, among them Ervin Sinkó, could not condone brutality, not even as a sacrifice for a future humane society. But Lukács, once he turned away from Dostoyevsky, steadfastly held on to a new anti-idealism.

In March 1919, Károlyi could no longer resist the internal and external pressures and offered his power to the communists, who established a proletarian dictatorship under Béla Kun. Many writers and intellectuals supported the new regime, though most of them became gradually disillusioned by its violence and ineffectuality. Lukács, to be sure, became a highly effective Commissar of Education and Culture who appointed the best talents to the leading cultural institutions (Congdon, *Exile* 36–37). Jászi and his circle opposed all forms of dictatorship, whereas Kassák, a radical individualist, rejected the dominance of the Party and its politicians (see Éva Forgács's article below).

A word has to be said here of the unjustly neglected writer Ervin Sinkó, whose life and work will crop up repeatedly in our account. Born in Apatin, now in the Serbian Vojvodina, Sinkó started to publish during the war in the social-democratic newspaper *Népszava*, as well as in Kassák's *A Tett* and *Ma*. He quit the *Ma* circle, together with József Révai, Aladár Komját, and others, to become a founding member of the Hungarian Communist Party. In May 1919, he succeeded as the military commander of the town Kecskemét in getting a mild sentence (ideological retraining) for the participants of a suppressed counter-revolutionary uprising. For this, he was sharply criticized later by Otto Korvin and his terrorist group called "Lenin Boys."

Though a fervent revolutionary, Sinkó abhorred violence. József Lengyel remembers him as "the most interesting person" of the Soviet headquarters,

“a very young boy who sported an enormous black beard and black shirt. He talked inordinately much but it was really interesting” (*Vísegrádi utca* 174). After Kecskemét, Sinkó made the so called Soviet house in Budapest his home, and he became the center of a debate, which had, according to Lengyel, “no little influence on the politics of the Hungarian dictatorship” (175). The debate concerned Dostoevsky’s Grand Inquisitor in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Sinkó disliked him and took the side of Christ, whereas Lukács and his group sided with the Grand Inquisitor. Sinkó managed to win over some in the Soviet House. The “moralists” honored in him the repentant sinner, while Korvin called him an impostor siding with the counter-revolution (Lengyel 177). Sadly, the counter-revolutionary officers, whose life Sinkó saved in Kecskemét, perpetrated one of the worst bloodbaths during the White Terror in Orgovány. Korvin was arrested in Hungary and executed after a brief trial before the end of the year. Balázs dedicated a poem to his memory, but Sinkó reaffirmed in 1922 his continued opposition to Korvin’s ideology: “It is my belief that the inhumanity now expressed by the raging White Terror will not be eradicated from the hearts by a raging red terror taking its place” (“Az út” 66).

Arthur Koestler, at the time only fourteen, remembers the Commune with surprising warmth and sympathy, though his father was owner of a small soap factory: “During those hundred days of spring it looked indeed as if the globe were to be lifted from its axis [...] Even at school strange and exciting events were taking place. New teachers appeared who spoke to us in a new voice, and treated us as if we were adults, with an earnest, friendly seriousness.” Those were days of a “hopeful and exuberant mood.” The family fled when the Commune was defeated and Romanian troops took over Budapest (*Arrows* 62, 64, 68–69). Gyula Háy, just five years older than Koestler, had no role in the Commune, but the family thought it wise to send him to Dresden to study. Years later, Háy and Koestler met in Switzerland and held a joint wedding.

Many exiles of 1919 were young writers and intellectuals, usually Jewish, who saw no possibilities to develop their talents in postwar and post-revolutionary Hungary. Some of them went to Germany, many of them became expatriates rather than exiles. The young Sándor Márai, neither a Jew nor a communist (though he did publish two articles in the *Vörös Újság*), went into emigration from his hometown Kassa (just becoming the Czechoslovak Košice) to Leipzig, Weimar, and Frankfurt. As he recounts in his fictional autobiography *Egy polgár vallomásai* (Confessions of a Citizen; 1934), he stayed a few years in Berlin before moving on to Paris in 1923, and finally returning to Hungary in 1928. He could not anticipate that he would be forced into genuine exile twenty years after these expatriate years.

Fleeing the Nazis: 1938–39

A few Romanian and Polish writers left their countries in the 1920s and 30s. The Romanians, among them Benjamin Fondane, Claude Sernet, Ilarie Voronca, and Emil Cioran, all migrated to Paris and were cultural rather than genuine political exiles, though for Jewish writers like Fondane the increasingly anti-Semitic climate in Romania was a deterrent to return. In contrast, the Polish writers Bruno Jasiński, Witold Wandurski, and Ryszard Stanczyk were communists; they gravitated towards the Soviet Union and perished there prematurely in the purges. The great waves of exiles were set off by the German invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1938 and of Poland on September 1, 1939, followed by the Soviet attack on Poland on September 17.

The Czech and Slovak writers fled westward, with exception of the cultural historian Zdeněk Nejedlý, who went to Moscow. František Langer, Pavel Tigrid, Jiří Mucha, Viktor Fischl, Egon Hostovský, Theo Florin, and Vladimír Clementis (a communist, who protested against the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact) all fled to England or the US, some of them after a brief stay in Paris.

The trajectory of Polish exiles fleeing westward was considerably more circuitous, for the direct route was cut off. They had to undertake dangerous and difficult journeys, usually via Romania or Hungary. The *Skamander* poets Julian Tuwim, Antoni Słonimski, Kazimierz Wierzyński, and Jan Lechoń, as well as their friend and editor Mieczysław Grydzewski, fled via Romania. They went on to France, and were soon forced to flee further: Słonimski and Grydzewski landed in London, whereas Tuwim and Lechoń were shipped from Portugal to Rio de Janeiro and went on to New York after a peaceful year in Rio. Their paths parted after the war: Tuwim returned to Poland in 1946; Słonimski, after some hesitation, in 1951, just when Miłosz bolted from his diplomatic post in Paris. The returning poet attacked the fresh exile in an open letter with “Stalinist rhetoric” (Shore 291–93), but in the years to come, Słonimski regained his sarcastic wit, directing it increasingly against the communist regime. Lechoń stayed in New York but became isolated and finally committed suicide in 1956; Grydzewski stayed in London and became editor of the important exile journal *Wiadomości Literackie*; Wierzyński worked for Radio Free Europe and published first in the *Wiadomości*, and later more at *Kultura*’s Instytut Literacki. Other exiles fleeing via Romania included Melchior Wańkowicz, who went via Tel Aviv to Italy, and young Jerzy Pietrkiewicz, who went via France to England.

A number of Polish writers fled to Hungary. Jerzy Stempowski went on from there via Yugoslavia and Italy to Bern, Zygmunt Haupt and Józef Łobodowski to France. Haupt managed to get to England, but Łobodowski was

arrested on the way in Spain. He was released in 1943 and remained there until the end of his life. Those who decided to stay in Hungary included Stanisław Vincenz, who went to Switzerland after the war, as well as Adam Bahdaj, Tadeusz Fangrat, Lew Kaltenberg, and Andrzej Stawar, all of whom returned to Poland after surviving the war in Budapest. Kazimiera Iłakowiczówna survived in Kolozsvár/Cluj, where she wrote her moving poem “Pogrom in Kolozsvár” on the deportation of Jews (Maciejewska 275–76). Finally, Czesław Straszewicz and Witold Gombrowicz were on the maiden voyage of a cruise ship when the war broke out. The latter stayed in Buenos Aires until 1963, whereas Straszewicz returned to France.

Many communist and leftist Polish writers, including former futurists, tried to escape the invading German troops by fleeing southeastward to Lwów (the Austro-Hungarian Lemberg), which became the Ukrainian-Soviet L’viv as soon as the Soviet troops invaded Poland from the east. As Aleksander Wat remarks, this loveliest Polish city lost its beauty and was terrorized by November-December: “the Soviets had barely arrived, and all at once everything was covered in mud (of course it was fall), dirty, gray, shabby. People began cringing and slinking down the streets. Right away people started wearing ragged clothes; obviously they were afraid to be seen in their better clothes” (104).

Tragic stories of Polish communists who vanished in the Soviet Union reminded the newcomers that Soviet-occupied Lwów was unsafe, even if you were a Polish communist or leftist. Wanda Wasilewska fared best. To be sure, her husband was “accidentally” murdered (probably by the NKVD), but she later married the Ukrainian writer Oleksandr Korneichuk, became a Soviet citizen, a member of the Supreme Soviet, a high-ranking officer, and Stalin’s favorite. She received three times the Stalin Prize in literature, and returned to Poland only for visits. Jerzy Putrament, and Jerzy Borejsza also found a place in the Soviet system; they returned to Poland with the Soviet-Polish Army in 1944 to become cultural functionaries of the communist regime. Julian Strykowski, Adolf Rudnicki, Adam Ważyk, and others accommodated themselves to the Soviet system, supported the communist Polish regime after the war, but eventually rebelled against it. Strykowski returned his Party membership book in 1956; Ważyk did the same in 1957, two years after lashing out at the system in his “*Poemat dla dorosłych*” (A Poem for Adults).

Others did considerably worse. As Lwów and its surrounding area became incorporated into the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, the Polish writers who fled to a still Polish city came under pressure to approve publicly the annexation and accept Soviet citizenship (see Shore 158–60, Piotrowski 77–79, and Wat 97–123). Among those who briefly stayed in Lwów were the former futurists and avant-gardists Aleksander Wat, Anatol Stern, Władysław Bro-

niewski, and Tadeusz Peiper, all of whom turned into communists or communist sympathizers in the course of the 1920s. Wat founded and edited the important Marxist *Miesięcznik Literacki* (Literary Monthly; 1929–31) and was imprisoned for it, but by the time he got to Lwów he no longer sympathized with Communism, and the Soviet authorities regarded him with skepticism. He was welcomed in the new Writers' Union and the Editorial Board of new Polish-Soviet newspaper *Czerwony Sztandar* (Red Banner), but for a short time only: Stern, Wat, Peiper, Broniewski, Teodor Parnicki, and others were arrested on January 23, 1940 by means of a grotesque provocation at a dinner party that was also attended by Boris Pasternak (Wat 118–23, Shore 165–69). In conversations with Czesław Miłosz shortly before his death, posthumously turned into the book *Moi wiek* (partial English translation in *My Century*), Wat movingly recalled his “Odyssey” through thirteen Soviet prisons and his banishment to Alma Ata. Stern was freed after three months, but Broniewski, a great poetic talent and one not to cave in during the interrogations, was kept in jail until August 1941. He was then exiled for five years to Kazakhstan, but upon the outbreak of the German/Soviet war he was allowed to enlist in General Anders's Polish army. As a communist, he felt uncomfortable in Anders's decidedly anti-communist army, and the commander dispatched him to the Polish Information Center in Jerusalem. A gentile and an atheist, Broniewski wrote there poetry, gave lectures, and cultivated contacts with Jews from Poland – and remained a convinced communist, in spite of his Soviet jail experiences. Early 1946 he returned to “liberated” Poland. Leo Lipski, who also fled to Lwów and reached Palestine by means of Anders's army, stayed in Jerusalem and continued to write novels in the Polish language.

Several other Polish writers who fled to Lwów and got into Soviet jails or camps were also released in 1941 to join Anders's army. Parnicki got out of an eight-year jail sentence; Marian Czuchnowski, a former Cracow avant-garde poet, and Gustaw Herling-Grudziński were in gulag camps and released 1941 and 1942 respectively. Herling came to fight with Anders's 2nd Corps in Italy and gave an account of his gulag experiences in *Inny świat* (1953; trans as *A World Apart*, 1986), while Czuchnowski reached London with Anders's army via the Middle East.

Three major writers stayed in Lwów, even after the German troops took over the city on July 4, 1941: the ageing Tadeusz Boy-Żeleński, the former avant-garde poet Julian Przyboś, and Halina Górska. Boy-Żeleński, who became head of the French Department at the Sovietized university, was immediately shot by the Germans; Górska was killed by them in 1942, whereas Przyboś was “only” arrested, and survived.

German troops occupied Hungary only in 1944, but the Horthy government had enacted laws that curtailed the rights of Jews already in May 1938, April 1939, and August 1941. In light of these laws, and the imminent war, many Hungarian writers of Jewish descent left the country in 1938–39. They included György Faludy, Endre Havas (the model of Arthur Koestler's protagonist in *Arrival and Departure*: Koestler, *Stranger* 31), Ferenc Fejtő, Pál Ignotus, Bertalan Hatvany, Tibor Tardos, Ferenc Molnár, and Andor Németh. With the exception of Molnár, all of these writers were of socialist or communist persuasion, and this was usually as decisive an impulse for departure as their Jewishness. Ignotus, for instance, had founded in 1936 the leftist literary journal *Szép Szó* with the financial help of Bertalan Hatvany, the editorial contributions of Fejtő, and the participation of the great poet Attila József, who committed suicide in 1937. Fejtő fled the country to avoid arrest for one of his publications; the composer Béla Bartók, a prominent contributor to *Szép Szó*, departed in protest against the Jewish laws, the government's general policy, and the imminent war.

Serbian Miloš Crnjanski, Jovan Dučić, and Rastko Petrović quit the Yugoslav diplomatic service and stayed privately in London and the US. Mircea Eliade, whom the New York Time once called "exile from eternity," remained a Romanian diplomat in Lisbon (1942–44) and adopted a positive attitude towards Salazar's fascist regime. Only after opting for exile in 1946, did Eliade return to the idea that aspirations of the spirit, embodied in the figure of the enlightened intellectual, rise above history. He became involved in the anti-communist Romanian emigration in Paris, launching the journal *Luceafărul* and formally breaking with the Romanian regime a few years later.

We have to mention here a group that may well be the strangest of all exile formations in our study: the Romanian Iron Guard (founded 1930), the paramilitary political arm of Corneliu Zelea Codreanu's Legion of the Archangel Michael (1927). The fascist, anti-Semitic, and pro-Nazi Legionnaires were both perpetrators and victims of bloody massacres and assassinations in fighting against centrists, leftists, as well as other right-wing formations. They came to power in 1940 in alliance with General Ion Antonescu, but after an unsuccessful coup and pogroms in 1941 Antonescu suppressed them with German consent. Several hundred Legionnaires fled then to Germany, where they were arrested and interned 1942–44 in a special section of the Buchenwald concentration camp (see Weber 107, and Ronnett's apologist, pro-Legionnaire book). Weber, relying on data in Constantin Papanace's pro-Legionnaire *Martiri Legionari, evocari* (Legionnaire Martyrs Remembered) showed that these fascists were mostly students and young professionals. This provides a background for the surprisingly large number of writers and intellectuals that our overview had to

associate with the Iron-Guard, whether they were actual members of it or not. Mircea Eliade and Emil Cioran sympathized with the Iron Guard in the 1930s. We know (see our passage on Madrid as a site of exile) that Horia Stamatu was in Buchenwald, and that Vintilă Horia was also in Nazi camps after his arrest in Vienna in 1944, due to Romania's switch to the Allies.

Escaping and Homecoming in 1944–45

The Yalta conference of the Allied Powers in January 1945 formally divided Europe into Eastern and Western power zones, and the Potsdam Conference of July–August the same year confirmed the new international borders. Though full-fledged Soviet-style regimes were established in East-Central Europe only a few years later, we may regard Yalta as the date that split “émigré” cultures from “domestic” ones (see Marta Wyka). Of the several hundred-thousand East-Central Europeans that found themselves in Western Europe at the end of the war – among them some two-hundred-thousand members of the Polish army attached to the London government in exile, and former inmates of German concentration camps – a high percentage refused to return to the Soviet-ruled countries. They stayed in Western Europe or went overseas, mainly to the USA and Canada, but also to South America and Australia. Gustaw Herling-Grudziński, co-founder of the Paris *Instytut Literacki* and the journal *Kultura*, stayed in Italy, Tadeusz Nowakowski, who had been in German concentration camps and then, for two years, in DP camps, spent several years in Italy, England, and the US before settling in Munich as contributor to Radio Free Europe. Marian Pankowski, also a concentration-camp survivor, settled in Brussels as Professor of Slavic Studies at the Free University.

The exilic wheel of fortune took an astonishing turn in 1944–45. While many returned home from Moscow, London, New York, and elsewhere, Nazi sympathizers, supporters of Nazi puppet governments, staunch anti-communists and anti-Semites now fled westward with the retreating Nazis to escape the advancing Soviet troops. The refugees from the East, including those from the Baltic countries and the Ukraine, did not foresee that they would have to spend tough years in DP camps before settling in a country that was willing to admit them.

Escapes

Of the handful of Nazi collaborators among the Polish, Czech, and Serbian writers, we should mention the Pole Ferdynand Goettel, President of the Polish PEN Club and of the Polish Writers' Union in the interwar years, who

fled to London, and the Serbian Vladimir Velmar-Janković. The latter served as assistant to the Serbian Minister of Culture and Religion in the Nazi puppet government, fled 1944 to Rome and, two years later, to Barcelona, where he started to write under the penname of V.J. Wukmir. His works have become available in Serbia after the collapse of Yugoslavia, but efforts by his daughter, the Serbian writer Svetlana Velmar-Janković, to get him officially rehabilitated, ran into opposition.

The situation was quite different in Slovakia and Croatia, two Catholic countries in which the Nazis installed Jozef Tiso and Ante Pavelić's Ustaše movement. These puppet governments enjoyed a certain popular support because they liberated the two countries from federations (Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia) in which they were the junior partners. Unexplainably, the analogous situations did not produce similar effects on writers. Apparently, no major Croatian writer supported the Ustaše and none fled subsequently to the West, whereas a number of Catholic Slovak writers supported Tiso, hoping that his regime would lead to a genuinely independent state. Most of these Catholic Slovak writers – among them Rudolf Dilong, Mikuláš Šprinc, Stanislav Mečiar, Ján Okál', and Jozef Cíger-Hronský – fled to Italy, and from there, with the help of the Vatican, to Buenos Aires and North America. Andrej Žarnov and Milo Urban were extradited by the Allies. The latter received only a reprimand at home, and lived in Croatia for several decades before returning to Czechoslovakia in 1974.

As members of the Romanian Orthodox Church, the Romanian Legionnaires and their sympathizers could not count on Vatican help to escape. Most of them stayed in Europe, but quite a few of them, for instance, Alexander Ronnett, managed to immigrate to the Midwest in the US. Vintilă Horia, who was cultural attaché in Rome and Vienna during the war, spent several years in Italy (1944–48) and Argentina (1948–53) before settling in Madrid. Traian Popescu, who served in the Romanian Embassy of Slovakia during the war, escaped to Austria and from there, in 1947, to Madrid. He started there the pro-Legionnaire journal *Carpatii* with Aron Cotruș. Pamfil Șeicaru, editor of the anti-Semitic *Cuvântul* (The Word) and supporter of Romania's Jewish Laws, was condemned to death in absentia by a Romanian court on June 4, 1945. He lived in Madrid some thirty years before moving to Dachau, Germany. Horia Stamatu, a Legionnaire inmate of Buchenwald, went to study in Freiburg/i. Breisgau, where he established in 1949 a Romanian exile and cultural center. Director of the Center became later Paul Miron, Professor of Romanian at the university and editor of the *Jahrbuch Dacoromania*, a nationally tinged journal, as indicated by its title. Stamatu himself spent a decade in Madrid (1951–61) before returning to Freiburg.

The right-wing Hungarian writers settled mostly in Germany, Argentina, Madrid, the US, and Canada. József Nyíró fled to Germany, and, in 1952, to Madrid; his *A zöld csillag* appeared in 1950, the same year he founded the Hungarian publishing house Kossuth Könyvkiadó in Cleveland. Albert Wass (see John Neubauer's article on him in this volume) went to the US in 1951, after several years in a DP camp and a stay in Hamburg. He later claimed that his admission was delayed for several years by "a woman called Rosenberg" in the State Department.

Josef Mackiewicz was the most important Polish writer fleeing with the retreating German troops (on Mackiewicz, see Bolecki, who also wrote the present account on him). He had fought in the so-called Polish-Bolshevik war of 1919–20 as a volunteer soldier against Red Army troops, for he regarded this as a struggle for democracy, freedom, and the independence of his homeland, and a resistance against Bolshevik ideology. Mackiewicz embraced anti-Communism as a moral and philosophical world-view in the many articles he wrote in the 1920s and 30s about the USRR as a totalitarian state.

During the Soviet occupation of Vilnius (June 1940 – June 1941) Mackiewicz became a woodcutter and a carter in forests, for he refused to agitate against Western civilization and the Second Polish Republic. When the Germans took over Vilnius, they asked Mackiewicz to become the editor-in-chief of a German-supported Polish newspaper. Mackiewicz refused, but he published in it during the following months five articles (including two chapters of the novel he was writing) under his own name, about Soviet lawlessness, deportations, murders, and other atrocities.

In 1942, Mackiewicz spread his two book-length manuscripts among Polish readers in the Vilnius region. The first one concerned the Polish government's responsibility for the military catastrophe in September 1939, which led to accusations that he opposed and libeled it. The second manuscript was a novel about the Sovietization of the Vilnius region. Both manuscripts mentioned anti-Semitic Polish attitudes, which led to rumbles that he cast aspersions on his people.

In April 1943, the Germans asked Mackiewicz to observe in the Katyń forest the opening of the graves of Polish soldiers killed by the Soviet NKVD in April 1940. Mackiewicz asked the authorities of the Polish Underground State (AK) for permission to participate in the inspection; the Head of the Polish Resistance in Vilnius consented, and gave him permission to be interviewed upon returning from Katyń. Mackiewicz wrote a special report for the Authorities of the Polish Army in Warsaw. The interview with him, titled "Widziałem na własne oczy" (I Saw it with my Own Eyes), was published in June 1943 in *Goniec Codzienny*, a German-controlled Polish newspaper in Vil-

nus. This was the only way Mackiewicz could publicize in the Polish community of the Vilnius region that he was sure that the Soviet NKVD had committed the massacre. Unofficial accusations now emerged that Mackiewicz collaborated with the Germans, and he was probably sentenced to death upon the instigation of Soviet agents (though this is not documented in writing), but the Polish authorities, which knew him as a patriotic and anti-Bolshevik writer, refused to carry out the sentence.

When the Red Army re-entered Eastern Poland in 1944, Mackiewicz knew that the communist authorities would execute him as a witness of the Katyń graves and a well-known anti-communist writer. He escaped to Italy in January 1945, where he cooperated as a journalist with the Polish Army. He published the collected documents about the massacre in *The Katyn Wood Murders* (German ed. 1949) and he gave testimony about it to a special commission of the US Congress.

Mackiewicz also wrote on the extermination of Jews in the Vilnius region, claiming that the leaders of the Polish Army made many political mistakes during the last phase of World War II, for instance by downplaying the danger of Soviet ideology and the Soviet occupation of Poland, and by not informing the population about the Soviet deportation of Poles to concentration camps and the extermination of Polish soldiers and other citizens. While Polish émigré propaganda claimed that Poland had shared with the Allies a victory in World War II, Mackiewicz held that the war had been the worst catastrophe in Polish history.

In response to these views, Mackiewicz opponents started to attack him as a German collaborator. They claimed, incorrectly, that he had been the editor-in-chief of the German newspaper during the war, as well as a critic of the Polish Catholic Church and of the Vatican's policy concerning the USSR and the communist system. Another wave of accusations started when Mackiewicz asserted in *Sieg der Provokation* (The Victory of Provocation; 1964) that the Germans treated Polish citizens better than the Jews. Characteristically, some émigré officials agreed with the Polish communists, because they considered Mackiewicz's anti-Communism as evidence of his collaboration with the Germans.

Czesław Miłosz, Gustaw Herling-Grudziński, Aleksander Wat, Jerzy Giedroyc, and other outstanding Polish writers highly admired Mackiewicz's novels, and even his critics acknowledged that they were unique and eminent. Mackiewicz categorically rejected nationalist ideologies, which, in his view, destroyed the solidarity among the people of Eastern Europe and enabled the Bolsheviks and Nazis to conquer them. Mackiewicz promulgated the idea of homelands, of historical regions shared by different nations; multicultural East-Central European homelands were to override borders between states.

Homecoming

While the mentioned fascists and anti-communists fled in 1945, those communists who fled to Moscow before and during the war and survived the Stalinist purges could now repatriate. Next to communist politicians, who returned home with Stalin's assignments, a number of communist writers came home as well: apart from the Czech Zdeněk Nejedlý and a number of Polish writers, they were Germans, who settled in what became the German Democratic Republic, and many Hungarians, including Béla Balázs, Andor Gábor, Gyula Háy, Béla Illés, György Lukács, and József Révai. John Mácza stayed in Moscow as a teacher of aesthetics and art history, József Lengyel was released from captivity only in 1955, and the artist Béla Uitz continued to work in the Soviet Union until 1975. No significant Romanian, Croatian, or Serb writers had lived in Moscow during the war.

Lukács claimed that 1945 was a "homecoming in the true sense" for him (*Record* 166). Was it, really? Did he forget his youthful insight that the condition of humanity in the modern world was "transcendental homelessness"? True, Lukács and Révai came to play important cultural and political roles after 1945. Révai became Minister of Culture (*nép művelés*) in the communist regime, a member of the innermost triumvirate that ruled with an iron fist during the Stalinist years. Lukács wielded less though still considerable power in silencing non-communist writers and forcing some, like Sándor Márai, into Western exile (see Szegedy-Maszák 123–25, and, as a counter-voice, Galin Tihanov's article below). However, his star quickly faded. By 1949, Révai and his associates started to castigate publicly their erstwhile friend and fellow exile for ideological deviations and for preferring bourgeois writers like Thomas Mann to Soviet writers. Lukács lost political clout, and, once more, he had to confess in public that he had made "mistakes." As to Balázs, he became an international celebrity but was deliberately ignored at home until his death in 1949. The Balázs manuscripts in the Hungarian National Library (Box 3) contain an exchange of letters from 1948, in which Révai sharply criticized Balázs's and Zoltán Kodály's *Czinka Panna baladája* (Panna Czinka's Ballad) as "mistaken in its content, politically harmful, and therefore also an artistically failed piece."

Révai remained the potentate of culture in the Stalinist years (1949–53), but was forced into the background during the reform years that led to the revolution of 1956. As an opponent of the revolution, he fled for a second time to the Soviet Union in October; he returned in March 1957, but his name was so tainted that the Kádár regime had no use for him. The 1956 uprising brought Lukács (reluctantly) back to power as Minister of Culture; after a brief exile in Romania he was tolerated, but officially ignored. Háy towed the

line for several years after his return as Director of the Society for Soviet-Hungarian Friendship, but he gradually turned into a reform communist and a follower of Imre Nagy. His satirical essay on the communist bureaucrats, “Why I don’t like Comrade Kucsera,” became an important ferment in the debates leading to up to the revolution. After its suppression, he was given a six-year sentence, but released in 1960. In 1965, he went once more into exile – this time, however, in western direction, which allowed him to write and publish his memoirs.

Writers who had fled to the West and returned to their home country after the war were received with suspicion, and many of them were arrested once the communists consolidated their power. In greatest danger were those who had some political or military role in the West during the war, for instance in the Czech or Polish exile governments and armies. The Polish authorities arrested many returnees, though Julian Tuwim, returning from New York in 1946, Roman Brandstaetter, returning from Israel in 1948, and Antoni Słominski, returning from London in 1951, were well received and left unharmed. In 1945, Pavel Tigrid and Viktor Fischl returned from London, as did Ferdinand Peroutka from a concentration camp. Jiří Mucha followed in 1947. All of them were initially well received, but the 1948 communist takeover forced Tigrid, Fischl, Peroutka and others to escape once more. Tigrid received a journalist assignment abroad at the right moment and remained in Paris, Peroutka went to London, whereas Fischl immigrated to Israel and became a diplomat under the assumed name of Avigdor Dagan, although he continued to write in Czech. Mucha, however, sat in jail between 1948 and 1953. Even more tragic was the fate of the Slovak communists Theo Florin and Vladimír Clementis, who also returned from London in 1945 in order to enter Czechoslovak diplomatic service. Florin became the personal secretary of Clementis when the latter was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1948, but both were arrested in 1950 on trumped-up charges. Clementis was executed in 1952, whereas Florin was jailed and then released in 1953, after Stalin’s death.

A number of writers living abroad accepted diplomatic appointments in the postwar years, but resigned when it became their task sell the Party line in the West. Milada Součková became the Czechoslovak cultural attaché in New York in 1945, and resigned in 1948; her compatriot Egon Hostovský entered diplomatic service in Norway in 1947 and resigned in 1949. Count Mihály Károlyi, the leader of the 1918 “pink” revolutionary government, returned to Hungary in 1946 and was appointed that year Ambassador to Paris. He engaged there Endre Havas, a writer of communist convictions who had been his personal secretary in London since 1942, Ferenc Fejtő, who survived the

war hiding in France, and the writer and folklorist Zoltán Szabó. Cardinal Mindszenty's trial in Budapest in 1949 and the subsequent trial and execution of the veteran communist László Rajk led, however, to the resignation of Károlyi, Fejtő, and Szabó; the latter two asked for asylum in France. György Schöpflin, the Hungarian Ambassador to Sweden, resigned in 1950 and moved to London.

Those former exiles who returned to Hungary after a diplomatic service abroad fared badly. To be sure, Károlyi remained a *persona grata* in Hungary, but Havas, who sent secret reports on his superiors to Hungary, obeyed a recall in 1950, was arrested the same year, and tortured to death in 1953. The dying, by now legendary, Ignotus was flown back by the Hungarian government in 1948. When he died in August 1949, his son, Pál Ignotus, cultural attaché of the postwar Hungarian government in London, flew home for his funeral, was prevented from leaving again, and arrested in 1949. In the notorious torture prison at Andrásy út 60 (today a museum serving questionable anti-communist propaganda), he kept a jail diary (*Börtönnaplóm*), in which he flagellated himself with aphorisms like the following: "Kellett neki London helyett Pest? / Megtanulta: aki mer az vesz" ("Did he want Pest rather than London? / He learned: he who dares loses"; September 5, 1949); "Pedig ha ma nézhetnék a / Tükörbe, [...] Ennyit szólnék [...] / Mindössze – Ökör te" (If I could look into the mirror today I'd only say: you blithering idiot; September 26, 1949). He was released and rehabilitated in March 1956, participated in the intellectual ferment leading up to the revolution, and departed for London when the Russians suppressed it – this time for good.

The Romanians who quit diplomatic service included Ștefan Băciuț and Alexandru Ciorănescu. The former left in 1949 the post of Press Secretary at the Romanian Embassy in Bern, went to Rio de Janeiro and the US mainland before settling in Honolulu. The latter defected from diplomatic service in France and went in 1948 to teach at the University La Laguna in Tenerife. The last major writer to defect from diplomatic service was Czesław Miłosz, who quit in 1951 his post of Cultural Attaché at the Polish Embassy in Paris.

Pál Ignotus was not the only Hungarian to return from Western exile after the war: György Pálóczi-Horváth, György Faludy, Tibor Tardos, Lajos Hatvany, Andor Németh and others not in service made the same mistake. Except for Andor Németh and the internationally famous Hatvany, all of them were jailed during the next years. Pálóczi-Horváth, for instance, returned in 1949 and was condemned twice (1950 and 1951) to fifteen years of prison. He was released after Stalin's death in 1954.

Racing against the Dropping Iron Curtain: 1947–50

A few Hungarian exiles managed to cross the border before it closed down in 1948. Lajos Zilahy (1947), Sándor Márai (1948), and Miksa Fenyő (1948), a former editor of *Nyugat*, succeeded, but Győző Határ was caught in 1950 and condemned for two-and-a-half years in prison. Among the Romanians who escaped were Miron Butariu (1947 to France), Constantin Virgil Gheorghiu (1948 to Paris), and Gherasim Luca, who was arrested at the border the first round but succeeded in his second attempt in 1952. He went via Israel to Paris, where acquired later a remarkable reputation (see the Paris section below).

The Czech escapees included Ivan Blatný, who came to England in a visiting delegation of Czechoslovak writers. He asked for and received asylum, but became schizophrenic by 1954 and destroyed many of his poems. The distinguished poet and translator Jan Čep adventurously crossed the border to Bavaria and moved on to Paris. In the years 1951–55 he was again in Munich, working for Radio Free Europe, but returned in the end to Paris. The Slovak Imrich Kružliak was imprisoned for a year before he was able to flee to Austria in 1949.

The Romanian Virgil Ierunca and his future wife Monica Lovinescu left home with a fellowship and refused to return in 1948, as did the Hungarian László Cs. Szabó the same year. After a stay in Italy he moved in 1951 to London.

1956

The suppression of the Hungarian revolution forced many politically active writers into exile. For reform-communists like Tamás Aczél and Tibor Méray, supporters of Imre Nagy, staying at home would have surely meant years of jail, possibly execution. Indeed, Tibor Déry, Zoltán Zelk, Gyula Háy, István Eörsi, Tibor Tardos, Dezső Keresztúry, and István Bibó were jailed for several years; Gyula Obersovszky and József Gáli were condemned to death and pardoned only as a result of international protest. György Faludy, György Pálóczi-Horváth, and Pál Ignótus went for a second time into exile. Győző Határ could now exit without getting arrested. With the exception of Méray, all these new Hungarian exile writers settled in England and the US rather than in Paris. Ágota Kristof, a young poet, went to French Switzerland. She continued to publish Hungarian poems in exile journals for a number of years, but once she sufficiently mastered French she embarked on the trilogy that was to make her famous: *Le grand cahier* (The Notebook; 1986), *La preuve* (The Proof; 1988), and *Le troisième mensonge* (The Third Lie; 1991).

Relatively few writers left East-Central Europe between 1958 and 1968. The Czech poet Jiřina Fuchsová went to the US and launched in 1975 the Czech poetry publishing company Framar in Los Angeles. The Polish Marek Hłasko went legally to Paris in 1958, then asked for asylum in West Germany but went, briefly, to Israel. More important was the case of his compatriot Andrzej Stawar, a Marxist who survived the war in Hungary, became Gomulka's adviser in 1956, but left Poland dying in 1961. He managed to finish before his death a text that the Polish exile journal *Kultura* published in October that year, and *Time* magazine called "the most devastating indictment of the Communist system since Milovan Djilas' *The New Class*" (October 27, 1961), because it showed that Stalinist "Caesarism" still ruled in the Soviet Union. The Polish regime flew Stawar's ashes back to Warsaw with pomp and circumstance, but erased all traces of his memory once the publication appeared and was smuggled back into Poland. Sławomir Mrożek, the great satirical author of absurdist plays, left Poland legally in 1963, lived in Italy, and moved to Paris in 1968. He became an exile when he denounced the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia in *Le Monde*, but his *Emigranci* (1974) confronts with biting satire an intellectual and a worker, two squabbling members of the exile community. When Jaruzelski proclaimed martial law in 1981, Mrożek forbade publication and performance of his works in Poland. In 1989 he moved to a ranch in Mexico, where he started to write his diary; he moved back to Cracow in 1997. As our timeline in the Appendix shows, Petru Dumitriu, Andrei Codrescu, and Ion Ioanid were among the few Romanian defectors during the Thaw of the 1960s. Dumitriu left in 1960 for Germany but then moved to Paris and started to write in French. Codrescu left in 1965, and went via Italy to the US, where he quickly established himself in the counter-culture (see our section on the US as exile host country below). The dissident writer Ion Ioanid, who was in and out of jail between 1953 and 1969, escaped in 1969 during a trip to Switzerland and subsequently worked for Radio Free Europe in Munich. His *Închisoarea noastră cea de toate zilele* (Our Everyday Jail; 1991–96) is one of the most impressive revelations of prison life behind the Iron Curtain.

Some Polish writers trusting Gomulka's reform Communism moved back to Poland, Jerzy Sito, a controversial translator of Shakespeare, returned in 1959; Melchior Wańkowicz, who was unhappy in the US, returned home in 1962 but was arrested there in 1964 with other protesters and given a three-year jail sentence.

1968 and Beyond

Two rather unconnected major events took place in 1968 that set off new waves of exile: the Prague Spring and an anti-Semitic campaign within the Polish Party. Josef Škvorecký, who was in Berkeley during Czechoslovakia's invasion, returned but left again on January 31, 1969, only a few days after Jan Palach immolated himself in Prague. After several shorter appointments, he became professor of English literature at the University of Toronto, and launched with his wife Zdena Salivarová, in 1972, the Sixty-Eight Publishers (see the section on Toronto below). Antonín Brousek, who also left after the military invasion, settled in Germany but kept publishing Czech poetry with the Sixty-Eight Publishers. Ota Filip received in 1969 an eighteen-months sentence in Prague. After his release, he did physical labor for a living and wrote for samizdat as well as German publishing outlets. When the authorities finally expelled him, he settled in Munich and adopted German as his primary language of writing. Milan Kundera, who first advocated staying at home, was finally unable to bear the situation and left the country for France in 1975 (see Vladimír Papoušek's article on him below). Kundera, perhaps the most important Parisian East-Central European author in the final decades of the century, started to write in French in 1993.

Two distinguished writers of the next Czech generation, Jiří Gruša and Libuše Moníková, followed Ota Filip, not only by settling in Germany but also by adopting German as their main language of writing (Kliems *Stummiland*). In contrast to the exiles of the 1940s and 50s, there has, indeed, been, a marked tendency among the later Czech exiles and émigrés to adopt the language of the host country: Kohout, Gruša and Moníková started to write in German, Linhartová and Kundera in French, and Jan Novák in English.

Gruša, co-founder and editor in Prague of the journal *Tvář* (Face), started as a lyrical poet in the early 1960s and became engaged in a series of confrontations with the authorities once he switched to prose. His first novel was labeled pornographic; the underground circulation of his next novel *Dotazník* (The Questionnaire; ms 1975) brought him instantaneous success abroad but led at home to his brief arrest in 1978 and a prohibition to publish. *Dotazník* is a fictional curriculum vitae, written in answer to a bureaucratic communist questionnaire for job seekers, but it is also a response to the dogma that novels must satisfy the criteria of Socialist Realism. Gruša's narrator repeatedly comments on the questionnaire and directly addresses the "Comrade" who demands its completion. Gruša's protagonist goes beyond Laurence Sterne's Tristram Shandy by telling not only how he had been conceived but also what he observed from his mother's womb. He freely drifts back and forth over

centuries of family and general history in a racy and erotic style that often slides into sheer fantasy. Gruša, a signatory of Charta 77, was allowed to exit from the country in 1980 when he was invited to the US, but was subsequently prevented from reentering Czechoslovakia and deprived of his citizenship. He settled in Germany and came to write even German poetry. After 1989, he became Czechoslovakia's Ambassador to Germany and Austria, Minister of Education in Czechoslovakia, and President of the International Pen Club.

Libuše Moníková left Czechoslovakia legally in 1971, by marrying a German. After studying and teaching comparative literature, she started in Czech but completed in German her first story, *Eine Schädigung* (A Damage; 1981). Her most important novel, *Die Fassade* (The Façade), came out in 1987 and won that year the prestigious German Alfred-Döblin Award. It is about four artists who are fancifully restoring the Renaissance palace of Litomyšl, the birthplace of the composer Bedřich Smetana and the site where Magdalena Dobromila Rettigová, author of the first cookbook in Czech, had died. In the lengthy sixth chapter of the first part, Moníková reconsiders the Czech national awakening by putting her artist-restorers on stage to play some of its leading figures: next to Smetana and Rettigová, we see the scientist Jan Evangelista Purkyně, who went to high school there, and the historian Alois Jirásek (Kliems, *Stummland* 104–108). The play's historical commentary mirrors the playful and irreverent redecoration of the palace façade. Indeed, Moníková's voluminous picaresque novel brims with humorous episodes and countless learned puns and allusions. She calls the fictional castle actually Friedland (Frýdlant)-Litomyšl to fuse the Czech tradition with the German one (Kafka visited the castle in Friedland). The first part of the novel is titled *Böhmische Dörfer* (Bohemian Villages), not just to indicate the place of the action but because the German phrase also refers to things completely incomprehensible and alien (=“it is Chinese to me”). The second part, titled “Potemkin Villages,” refers to the fake villages that Potemkin is said to have built to deceive Empress Catherine. In the novel, it covers the hilarious adventures of the Czech artists in Siberia: en route to an assignment in Japan, they get stuck in native communities and in a Kafkaesque Soviet bureaucracy overseeing a friendly scientific institution. The Soviet scientists are portrayed with sympathetic irony, but this, together with political allusions in the first part, made the novel unpublishable in communist Czechoslovakia, though Moníková was allowed to return for visits. She died prematurely in 1998.

The Polish Jews who were ejected from their academic jobs in the 1960s included Zygmunt Bauman and Jan Kott. Leszek Kolakowski, who took a “revisionist” and humanist approach to Marxism in the late 1950s and the 60s, was forced to leave because he had been expelled from the Party and deprived

of his university chair. Kazimierz Brandys, Janusz Głowacki, Stanisław Barańczak, and other Polish writers left when General Jaruzelski declared martial law in 1981. Adam Zagajewski left a year later, after he had received an official prohibition to publish because of his involvement in dissident activities.

Romania's Thaw in the 1960s, overrated in the West because of Ceaușescu's relative independence from Moscow (for instance, by refusing to participate in the joint invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968), came to an abrupt end after Ceaușescu visited North Korea, Vietnam, and Mao's Chinese cultural revolution. In the so-called Theses of (July) 1971 he reasserted strict Party control, for instance by reestablishing an index of books and writers. As a result, the trickle of Romanian exiles swelled in the 1970s, with some prominent dissident writers, though the government did everything to throttle the exodus. The playwright and poet Gheorghe Astaloș left in 1971 for Paris, where he became known for both his plays and his volumes of poetry – in French. Dumitru Țepeneag, a founder in the mid-60s of a surrealist group called "Aesthetic Onirism" that had to disband in the wake of the 1971 Theses, became a bold critic of Ceaușescu's regime at home and even on Radio Free Europe (see Camelia Crăciun's article below on Monica Lovinescu). Finally, his citizenship was revoked during a trip abroad in 1975, and he had to ask for asylum in France. Virgil Tănase, another leader of the Oniric group and the director of the National Theater of Iași, published in 1976 his first novel at Flammarion in Paris. The regime offered a passport for him and his wife, and they took the opportunity. Paul Goma settled in Paris in 1977, after serious confrontations with the government (see Marcel Cornis-Pope's article below). Petru Popescu escaped in 1977 to Los Angeles, where he became a successful novelist and screenplay writer.

The Romanian exodus continued in the 1980s. The first major figure was Ion Caraion, who asked in 1981 for asylum in Lausanne, after decades of persecution at home. His first book of poetry was banned; he was charged in 1950 with trying to publish abroad, and was subsequently stripped of his civil rights, deprived of his property, and given a life sentence of hard labor on the Danube-Black Sea canal. Released in 1955, Caraion was rearrested in 1958, sent to work in copper mines, and was freed in 1964 under a general amnesty. He lived only five years in the West, isolated and mistrusted, before he died. Dorin Tudoran went on a hunger strike in April 1985 when his application for emigration was rejected; he stopped forty-two days later, when he was granted a passport, partly due to protests from human-rights groups abroad (see Camelia Crăciun's article below on Monica Lovinescu). Nina Cassian and Norman Manea, two Romanian Jewish writers, went to New York in 1985 and 1986 respectively.

Romanian exiles in the West were still in reach of Ceaușescu and his secret police. Monica Lovinescu was beaten in Paris by two agents on November 18, 1977, whereas Tănase and Goma were ordered to be murdered in 1982. The attempt misfired when the Securitate officer charged with the task, Matei Pavel Haiducu, revealed the matter to his French colleagues. The resultant simulated kidnapping was worthy of a spy comedy, but but a good excuse for French President François Mitterrand to cancel his planned trip to Bucharest. Whether Ceaușescu wanted to have the Hungarian Transylvanian writer Albert Wass also be murdered in the US, as the writer claimed, remains unclear.

All Romanian writers suffered under Ceaușescu's stricter ideological policies, but writers from the German and Hungarian minorities became additionally victims of his increasing nationalism. The *Aktionsgruppe Banat* of young German (Swabian) writers was officially banned in 1975, but Rolf Bossert, Johann Lippet, Herta Müller, William Totok, Richard Wagner, and others were allowed to leave Romania in the 1980s as undesirable minority dissidents. Müller (see Thomas Cooper's article on her below) and Wagner, who became highly successful writers in Germany, obsessively continued to return to the world of their dying ethnic community, for which they had no sympathy, and to the terrors of totalitarianism (see Wagner "Selbstdarstellung"). German society, their home as well as their place of exile, remained problematic for them, because their worldviews sharply differed from those dominant in the German refugee organizations. Bossert committed suicide in 1986.

Last but not least, we have to mention here the very special case of the Serbian writer Danilo Kiš, who moved in 1979 to Paris, mainly because of a campaign and a court case against him in Yugoslavia on charges of plagiarism. Since he left by his own volition, under pressure but not vitally threatened, and since he could return, he was not formally an exile, though it has been claimed, with some justification, that his departure initiated the waves of exile from ex-Yugoslavia a decade later.

Homecoming and New Forms of Exile after 1989

The conditions of exile radically changed when the East-Central European countries became finally free of communist regimes and Soviet domination. With the exception of ex-Yugoslavia, the region is sending today expatriates rather than exiles into the world. All countries have started the difficult and often painful task of readmitting their surviving exiles and of reintegrating into their national literary canons the work of all who left. Jiří Mucha, Jiří Gruša, and Pavel Tigrid temporarily or permanently returned to Prague and

accepted government and diplomatic posts; Adam Zagajewski, Sławomir Mrożek, Czesław Miłosz, and others cautiously and slowly returned to Poland, while others started to shuttle between a Western abode and a new one at home. For the Hungarian Sándor Márai, who committed suicide in 1989, the changeover came too late but the international success of his works that started in the 1990s was nothing short of sensational. Yet the return of the “prodigal sons” has often been painful, especially when movements to rehabilitate anti-communist writers who held fascist, right wing, or anti-Semitic views (e.g., Albert Wass, József Nyírő, Vintilă Horia), came to clash with democratic, socialist, or reform-communist worldviews.

Such reintegration problems were often related to the revival of nationalism and chauvinism that actually dismantled two federal states, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. The particularly violent civil wars in former Yugoslavia have sent many new dissidents into the world, for instance, Dubravka Ugrešić to Amsterdam, Slavenka Drakulić to Sweden (by marriage), Semezdin Mehmedinović from Sarajevo to the US, and David Albahari to Canada. Predrag Matvejević, who chose, as he says, a “midway between asylum and exile,” now teaches at Rome’s “La Sapienza” University. Many “internal” exiles and émigrés were forced from one member state of the former federation to another, now independent one.

Chauvinism, lack of a broad and receptive reading public, and anti-Semitism are prompting, once more, many writers to leave their home. Some settle in other East-European countries, others emigrate to the West or split their lives between home and abroad. Participation in two worlds has been made possible by new modes of communication. New forms of displacement and Diaspora often allow writers a marginal oppositional role at home. The very division between “domestic” and “diasporic” literature has changed its character, and whether “exile” is still a relevant term under the new conditions is open to question.

5. Sites of Exile Culture

Ejecting Greek citizens by ostracism was probably the earliest European form of banishment, but a history of exile in Europe could arguably start with the Roman practice, for Roman laws provided the model for judicial proceedings that led to banishment in the Middle Ages and even beyond. In republican Rome, the Senate voted about sending people into exile, but in the Roman Empire autocratic Emperors or their secret arms decided on such matter.

Unlike Ovid, twentieth-century East-Central European exiles seldom settled in cultures they regarded as barbarian. As a rule, they were received by countries more developed and richer than their homeland, and, consequently, it is not always clear whether political, artistic, or economic factors were paramount in a person's departure. Motivations for leaving are not, however, the main subject of the following section. Instead, we shall ask why writers went to one cultural center rather than the other, and how they acclimatized to it once they were there. Many writers moved, like nomads, from one center to another, out of restlessness or because of job opportunities. Surveying the most important sites of exile, we shall look not only at individual fortunes, but also at the exile associations and institutions. We shall ask, what contacts, if any, the exile groups from different nations had among each other, and we shall give attention to the host culture's social and intellectual climate, its degree of hospitality, and its attitude towards the exiles. What traditional elective affinities or enmities existed between the home and the host countries? How did these define the trajectories of writers in exile? How restrictive was the political, cultural, literary situation of their host country? What, if any, impact did the exiles have on the cultural and educational institutions of their host country? What was the general reaction to the exiles? Did the host countries exploit the exiles for their own political agendas? Did the exile writers from Warsaw, Prague, Belgrade, and Budapest interact among each other once they arrived in Paris, London, or New York?

Most of these questions have no general answer, and need to be discussed in terms of concrete historical, geographical, and political situations. Still, we note that exiles (as well as *émigrés* and expatriates) were seldom received with open arms by the host countries, in spite of much humanitarian rhetoric. Although led by Karl Renner's social-democratic government, Austria was highly embarrassed by the Hungarians who fled there in 1919. Western European countries and the US were disturbingly reluctant to admit those who fled Hitler in the 1930s, and they were hardly more generous when it came to settling Holocaust survivors after World War II or admitting exiles fleeing the communist regimes during the Cold War. The great exception was in 1956–57, when in a wave of enthusiasm (propelled by a sense of guilt for not having helped politically and militarily) most countries opened their doors to the Hungarian refugees and helped many writers to start a new career. On a smaller scale, special measures were also taken after the suppression of the 1968 Prague Spring.

Exiled writers had to overcome not only bureaucratic hurdles, but also political and cultural ones, which were often even more difficult to surmount. Leaving aside the obvious problems of general cultural adjustment, and those

directly related to writing, exiled writers from East-Central Europe often found themselves out of tune with the political attitudes of the Western intelligentsia and the larger public. Refugees of Hitler in the later thirties had trouble conveying their sense of impending disaster to their new neighbors, especially overseas, whereas those who fled the communist regimes often felt uncomfortable in the company of those French or Italian communists and their fellow-travelers who dominated the cultural scene. Last but not least, exiled writers and intellectuals were courted and often pressured by the CIA and other Western agencies to become informants. A number of writers, journals, and associations were supported by the CIA, often without their knowing since this was channelled via the Congress for Cultural Freedom, a front organization for it (see Frances Stonor Saunders). Radio Free Europe, which provided a source of income for untold number of writers, was financed almost exclusively with CIA money between 1949 and 1971 (see Borbándi).

A final word about our choice of cultural centers. For historical reasons we were inclined to start with the three imperial centers of the previous centuries: Istanbul, Vienna, and Moscow. This, however, proved to be impractical, for they carried different weights and functions in the twentieth century. We shall start with Istanbul, which used to be an important, although seldom justly recognized, center of exiles. Vienna's key moment as an exilic center was in the years 1919–1922, when it served as a conduit for Hungarians fleeing right-wing terror. Moscow, in turn, became a highly problematic center for communist exiles who fled Hitler.

Istanbul

Recurrent invasions by the Huns, the Mongols, the Tatars, the Magyars, and other nomadic tribes had destabilized East-Central Europe in the deeper past, but the most recent and lasting mark on the region was left by the Ottoman Empire, which ruled much of it, directly or indirectly, between the thirteenth and the nineteenth century. The Ottoman wars and occupations led to vast population displacements towards the north, i.e., present-day Hungary and even Slovakia, and towards the west, the Habsburg territories. However, refugees often found Habsburg Austria, for religious as well as political reasons, no more desirable than the Ottoman Empire. The Hungarian and Transylvanian princes, who frequently shifted their alliances between Vienna and Istanbul, fled almost as frequently southward as westward. The greatest Transylvanian prince, Gábor Bethlen, fled twice to Istanbul in the seventeenth century; Ferenc Rákóczi and his followers found an eighteenth-cen-

tury refuge in Tekirda, near Istanbul; refugees of the 1848–49 Hungarian revolution found safe haven in Istanbul. Lajos Kossuth, Ferenc Pulszky, the Polish military commander Henryk Dembiński, and others moved subsequently to London and Paris, but Józef Bem, the Polish hero and military leader of the revolution, stayed in Istanbul and died there after converting to the Muslim religion. Polonezköy (or Adampol), in the Beykoz district of Istanbul, was established in 1842 by Prince Adam Czartoryski with the hope that it would eventually become, next to Paris, a second center of exiled Poles. He commissioned the Polish-Ukrainian writer Michał Czajkowski (Mykhailo Chaikovsky, or Sadyk Pasha), an exile of the 1830–31 Polish insurrection, to carry out a plan that never fully materialized but helped the Hungarian and Polish exiles of the 1848–49 revolution to settle in Turkey.

We may add, though this falls beyond the limits set for this book, that several leading writers of the Bulgarian and Albanian national awakening lived and published in Istanbul, and it was in that city, and in Ankara, that German Jewish academic refugees (among them Erich Auerbach and Leo Spitzer) found employment during World War II. The Hungarian writer George (György) Tábori was journalist in Istanbul for a year during the war.

Vienna

The second imperial metropolis, Vienna, played a different role in exile politics. In the nineteenth century, it was a magnet for writers, musicians, journalists, and scholars, some of whom were exiles. The great Serbian linguist and folklorist Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, for instance, fled in 1813 from the Serbian-Turkish wars to Vienna, and remained there for most of his life. Austria, eager to get the support of the Croats, Slovaks, Serbs, and Romanians in fighting the 1848 Hungarian revolutionaries, also offered a haven to those who had to flee the Hungarian insurgents. The leading Slovak poet Jan Kollár, who lived all his professional life in Pest as a Lutheran minister but supported the Slovak cause in 1848–49, fled from revolutionary Pest to Vienna and was given a professorship for his anti-Hungarian stance. However, he died already in 1851.

In the last decades of the nineteenth century and the prewar years of the twentieth, there was a considerable influx to Vienna from the eastern provinces and from various parts of Russia. The first group included ethnic Germans from cities like Lemberg and Chernowitz, and regions like the Banat. Since they simply moved from the margins of the Empire to its metropolitan center, they should not be regarded as genuine exiles. The second category,

mainly Jews fleeing the pogroms in the Ukraine and Russia, were genuine exiles coming into rather than out of East-Central Europe. David Vogel, for instance, came from Satanov (Podolia) to Vienna, and wrote there in Hebrew *Married Life* (first published in 1929–30, in Tel Aviv), which many regard as Vienna's first great city novel.

Austria ceased to be an imperial power in 1918, but Vienna became for the rest of the century, often rather reluctantly, a major center and transit station for exiles from East-Central Europe. The first wave of exiles that inundated the city in 1919 consisted, as we noted already, of Hungarian writers and intellectuals who fled because they foresaw the atrocities and pogroms of a coming White Terror.

These Hungarian exiles adhered to conflicting groups and factions. Béla Kun and the other communist political leaders arrived in a special train enjoying diplomatic immunity. The Austrian social-democratic government arrested them, but it resisted the demand by Hungary's new government to extradite them. The communist leaders were allowed to depart for Russia, whereas the social democrats were permitted to settle in Austria. Most of the writers, artists, and intellectuals crossed illegally and continued to live without proper papers. Many of them, for instance Ervin Sinkó, lived in the flimsy barracks of Grinzing, which used to serve as a temporary hospital during the war and were now inhabited "by political refugees, Zionists, struggling artists, university students, indigents, rebellious predecessors of the 'beat generation,' self-appointed saints, philosophers, and messiahs – a weird medley of rootless humanity" (Zsuffa 123). Others did better. Béla Balázs moved with his wife into the Union Hotel and from there to Schloss Waisnig in nearby Reichenach to avoid being seen and identified. The filmmaker Sándor (Alexander) Korda moved into a luxurious hotel to impress those he was to deal with.

Lukács and Korvin were ordered by Kun to stay in Hungary to rebuild the Party. Korvin was soon caught and executed, and Lukács retrospectively thought that Kun just wanted to get rid of him. Lukács himself was smuggled out in September, disguised as a chauffeur of a foreign officer, with the help of his wealthy father and Karl Mannheim. Balázs found Lukács in Vienna "a most heartrending sight – deadly pale, with sunken face, nervous and dejected." He carried a gun for fear he might get kidnapped, for he was accused in Budapest of instigating murder on nine counts (Balázs, *Napló* 2: 358–59). He was briefly detained in Vienna, but then released and kept under surveillance. Fearing his extradition, his supporters published an appeal in the November 12, 1919 issue of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, which was signed, among others, by Richard Dehmel, Paul Ernst, Bruno Frank, Alfred Kerr, as well as by Thomas and Heinrich Mann.

Balázs jumped on a boat with his wife Anna Hamvassy late November, after the police found his diary in his abandoned home. He traveled with his brother's passport, and with a fake moustache, eyelashes, and sideburns. Still shaken, he noted in his diary: "I had the hideous face of a Jewish-broker, with a monocle on my nose. Sad, isn't it, that one can mask me like this? Perhaps somewhat of an unmasking? If not of myself, of the species" (*Napló* 2: 347; see also Éva Forgács's article below). The shadowing of Lukács frightened Balázs so much that he avoided him, and this contributed to their gradual alienation from each other. Indeed, Balázs now wanted to avoid politics altogether. Communism, he wrote in his diary, was his religion, not his politics. From now on, he wanted to be only an artist – though he had pangs of guilt for avoiding his conspiratorial friends in need. The Communist Party rejected his membership, but he continued to pay his dues (*Napló* 2: 354 f).

For Balázs, exile meant a crisis of his revolutionary and Hungarian identity. He embraced the war in 1914 with unusual patriotic fervor, suggesting in a *Nyugat* article that the war was "holy" and each war's ditch of blood served the evolution of humanity ("Párizs-e vagy Weimar?" 200). He became an internationalist and an activist during the Hungarian Soviet Republic, whereas in Vienna he started to experience a deep tension between his Hungarian and Jewish ties, and sensing that he may become a wandering Jew he desperately tried to construct for himself a composite identity:

I am not Hungarian, and instincts of race have no voice in me. However, I accompanied them along the path of metempsychosis, and I attached myself to them wholeheartedly; I assumed their language and clothes, I made mine and loved their cause (not that of the Hungarian lords but of Hungarianness, that mystical and indefinable something that glows in Ady's songs and the kuruc tunes). I joined and loved Hungarian culture, concluded with it a pact of comradeship, and I would have become just as good a soldier as Bem, Damjanich, or Guyon of the [1848] revolution. They threw me out now, and this hurts. [...] However, this perhaps completes my fate: out here, I can love that Hungarianness more clearly, undisturbed, and in my own way. ... My "home" cannot be located on a map. And if that is the case, so be it. ...

Conclusion: I am not an exile. [...] I am not interested in their national-political life (Nonsense! Not true, either. How it hurt when I read "Bratislava" over the port of Pozsony, and how glad I was when the Viennese paper wrote that this is not yet final.) I do not look for their company: I am a wanderer, and a lonely, non-national foreigner (for the Jew is not nationless either); but Hungarian strings are strung over the lyre of my heart, and I relate in Hungarian songs what hurts. (*Napló* 2: 361)

Balázs adhered to this slightly maudlin self-image and self-pity to the very end of his life, though he often tried to overcome his isolation, at times, for instance under Stalin, at a price. As he wrote in his last, perhaps most beautiful autobiographical text: "That I was excluded from one community without be-

longing to another, that in my early childhood I was an outsider for every denomination and every community as an isolated lonely individual – this determined my conduct and my fate throughout my entire life” (*Álmodó ifjúság* 86).

While Balázs continued to write Hungarian essays, fairy tales, and some uneven poetry, he succeeded faster and better than most other Hungarian exiles in getting integrated into German culture, thanks to his social grace and his excellent mastery of German. His early play, *Halálos fiatalság* (Deadly Youth; 1917) was panned in *Nyugat*, rejected by the Hungarian National Theater, and earlier also by some Viennese theaters, but was now staged on the *Neue Wiener Bühne* by Balázs himself under the title *Tödliche Jugend* (February 1920). It showed a group of young people threatened by nihilism, centering on a young pianist who cannot decide between her career and her love for a composer and finally commits suicide. The play had popular and a limited critical success, but Balázs realized that the young Viennese literati looked down upon its trashy sensationalism: “at home, the old officials hated me but the young generation was on my side. Am I to experience this here the other way round?” (*Napló* 2: 389) Still, Balázs enjoyed the good money he earned with his Viennese projects, which also included a book he wrote with the Danish writer Karin Michaelis and a regular column of film criticism he started late 1922 for the daily *Der Tag* (The Day). The reviews helped him to develop his book *Der sichtbare Mensch* (The Visible Man; 1924), a pioneering theoretical approach to silent films that established his international reputation and allowed him to move in 1926 to Berlin, the center of interwar German film culture. The very title indicates that Balázs treasured film as a medium that was able to reveal thoughts and feelings by means of faces, movements, and, above all, gestures. Images, he thought, disclosed the invisible better than words in literature. For this reason, Balázs highly valued close-ups, and he assigned a central role to the camera operator. Though Balázs used Eisenstein’s *Potemkin* in a Berlin lecture to illustrate this, Eisenstein himself took issue with his view, arguing that montage and cutting were more important. Several aspects of Balázs’s film aesthetics did not satisfy communist ideologues, who believed that material reality and class struggle determined psychology, and regarded the attention to close-ups and cameraman with suspicion, for they foregrounded subjective (at times deliberately distorted) visions of things, people, and events. For the same reason they were suspicious of Balázs’s interest in dreams and visions. Though he repeatedly rejected the capitalist film industry and affirmed his belief in a coming new society, his deviations from the dogmatic Party line got him into trouble, time and again.