Chronotopos
A Journal of Translation History

Spencer Hawkins

The English of Exile.
The Cultural and Linguistic Self-Translations of German-speaking Philosophers During and After World War II

1&2/2020
DOI: 10.25365/cts-2020-2-1-3

Herausgegeben am / Éditée au / Edited at the: Zentrum für Translationswissenschaft der Universität Wien

ISSN: 2617-3441

Abstract

Much research has been devoted to the fates and careers of the Germanophone philosophers who were forced into exile from continental Europe during the rise of fascism. Yet little has been made of the confrontation of these thinkers with the militant monolingualism that has presided in the United States since the beginning of the Great War. This paper will discuss philosophers' engagement with English when forced migration landed them in the United States or other Anglophone countries with large and growing university systems. While many German and Austrian writers living in the United States continued to write in German, the majority strove to master English-language publishing and to adopt the Anglophone research paradigm. The history of these scholars' linguistic reeducation, I conclude, cannot be understood separately from the rise of English to its current position of prominence as the language of intellectual discourse globally.

Keywords: self-translation, Germanophone philosophers in exile, twentieth-century Anglophone philosophy, English as a lingua franca (ELF), German-American identity, WWII, intellectual history

Zum Zitieren des Artikels / Pour citer l'article / To cite the article:
Hawkins, Spencer (2020): The English of Exile. The Cultural and Linguistic Self-Translations of German-speaking Philosophers During and After World War II, *Chronotopos* 2 (1&2), 32-49. DOI: 10.25365/cts-2020-2-1-3

Spencer Hawkins

The English of Exile.
The Cultural and Linguistic Self-Translations of German-speaking Philosophers During and After World War II

Abstract

Much research has been devoted to the fates and careers of the Germanophone philosophers who were forced into exile from continental Europe during the rise of fascism. Yet little has been made of the confrontation of these thinkers with the militant monolingualism that has presided in the United States since the beginning of the Great War. This paper will discuss philosophers' engagement with English when forced migration landed them in the United States or other Anglophone countries with large and growing university systems. While many German and Austrian writers living in the United States continued to write in German, the majority strove to master English-language publishing and to adopt the Anglophone research paradigm. The history of these scholars' linguistic reeducation, I conclude, cannot be understood separately from the rise of English to its current position of prominence as the language of intellectual discourse globally.

Keywords: self-translation, Germanophone philosophers in exile, twentieth-century Anglophone philosophy, English as a lingua franca (ELF), German-American identity, WWII, intellectual history

Funding source: Österreichischer Austauschdienst

Introduction

The exile of a generation of German-speaking professional thinkers from Nazi-occupied Europe has been a popular research topic for several decades. Historical research has given special attention to those philosophers who were established enough to continue writing in their native languages while living in the United States. Ehrhard Bahr's *Weimar on the Pacific* (BAHR 2007) and Thomas Wheatland's *The Frankfurt School in Exile* (WHEATLAND 2009) rightly portray their protagonists as an exception to the general tendency of German-Americans arriving after World War I to assimilate quickly. These works emphasize these authors' dependence on translators: the former describes Brecht's collaboration with Charles Laughton on a translation of *Galileo*, which Brecht found awkward because "one translator knew no Ger-

man and the other scarcely any English" (BAHR 2008: 118). The latter book discusses cases like Max Horkheimer's anxiety about his own "inability to master the English language style of thinking and writing" and the crucial role of translators in "converting the Horkheimer Circle's dense Germanic prose into comprehensible English" (WHEATLAND 2009: 142). But what about the German-language authors who fully adopted English as their own means of expression? In the following, I bring together existing documents in several domains and disciplines – political science, cultural anthropology, and philosophy of science – to show that German-language philosophers have not only thrived in English, but that they have perhaps also unwittingly played the role of the foreign import that lends a local system legitimacy. It would be too speculative to assert that the cumulative willingness of prominent foreign scholars to reinvent themselves linguistically helped propel English to its postwar position as *the* global language of intellectual discourse. And yet, this history of linguistic assimilation leaves the strong impression that Anglophone academic culture required foreign converts in order to achieve its current global dominance. The following section shows that English began surpassing German as the lingua franca in the sciences long before the more visible spread of English through the postwar globalization of American consumer culture (see AMMON 2015: 575-578). Paradigmatically, by the 1930s, the academic world was already demanding a level of English fluency from new learners that has since become standard for academic publishing across the globe in various fields (see GORDIN 2015: 163-179; BECKER 1980: 357; FERNBERGER 1917; 1926; 1936; 1946; 1956).

The near eradication of German identity in the United States

A bit of social historical background explains the urgency with which most German-speaking philosophers took up English in exile. In a kind of Babel narrative in reverse, an increasingly monolingual American culture emerged simultaneously with the military campaign to support Great Britain in World War I. Up until the end of the nineteenth century, the German education system was a model to the United States at all levels: kindergartens, trade schools, classically oriented high schools, and above all the world-renowned German, Austrian, and Swiss research universities. The world saw these institutions as granting Germany a competitive edge over otherwise more industrialized nations, including those with more expansive empires (see GEITZ et al. 1995: 23, 71, 86). Leaders around the world believed that leading in the development of new communication, chemical, and industrial technologies would empower a nation's technocratic elite in new and unforeseen ways. The United States in particular adopted practices from German-language research institutions; the practice of granting doctorates, for example, only began in the United States after American scholars began returning from University of Berlin with these highly qualifying degrees.

By 1906, however, the ambition to reduce foreign influence and to develop English into a world language was already evident. This year Andrew Carnegie sponsored the

Simplified Spelling Board, whose express goal was to modify English to enhance its global reach. As the *New York Times* reported:

> *"Mr. Carnegie has long been convinced that English might be the world language of the future, and thus one of the influences leading to universal peace; and he believes that the chief obstacle to its universal adoption is to be found in its contradictory and difficult spelling"* (THE NEW YORK TIMES 1906).

In the same year, President Theodore Roosevelt even demanded that Simplified English be used in official government communications.

From this period onward, German-speaking migrant academics unquestioningly adopted English as their working language and thereby infused academic English with more or less subtle borrowings from German. Before that, when such labors were not as patently necessary, they were not taken as consistently. For many, the adoption of English occurred under duress: German writers fleeing National Socialism had to deal with American suspicions against German society, politics, language, and culture. These suspicions had their origins in social tensions that had emerged during WWI. And these tensions only mounted when the horrors of the concentration camps became known and came to represent the antipode of tolerant, liberal America in the popular imagination.

German ancestry remains the most prevalent ethnic origin in the United States, and, considering that most immigrants from the Austro-Hungarian Empire would have been German-speakers, the German-speaking immigrant community in the United States had a strong linguistic basis for cohesion. Around the time of the Civil War, Germans were some of the most prominent abolitionists and the German language was one of the first modern languages to be taught in public schools in cities with large immigrant communities like St. Louis. Behind the effort to bring German to schools were German-American intellectuals and American admirers of the German education system. In the case of St. Louis, it was none other than W.T. Harris – a translator of Hegel – who promoted German in his capacity as superintendent of the public school system (HAMLIN 1998: 116).

"German-American" would thus become the first so-called "hyphenated" identity, regraded in popular and political discourse as second to full-blooded (white Anglo-)American identity, a basis for patriotism legitimated by the Great Rapprochement between the United States and the United Kingdom in the 1890s, which marked the end of the tensions resulting from the Revolutionary War. Once suspicions against German-Americans arose in the late nineteenth century, they never relented until this group responded by assimilating to the point of near invisibility. President Woodrow Wilson openly voiced suspicion against "hyphenated Americans" (by which he especially meant German-Americans) even after WWI was over. In his 1919 "Final Address in Support of the League of Nations", Wilson was as suspicious of hybrid identity as ever: "Any man who carries a hyphen about with him carries a dagger that he is ready to plunge into the vitals of this Republic whenever he gets ready."

The suspicions were not entirely unfounded: the intellectual class in the United States, for instance, was surprisingly forgiving of the German Empire's occupation of Belgium. Major German-American intellectuals mirrored the enthusiasm of the 93 authors of the September 1914 *Aufruf an die Kulturwelt*, a defense of Germany's military actions and a demand to the end the academic boycotts. The *Aufruf* was signed by illustrious artists, writers, and researchers within Germany, including the likes of Fritz Haber, Ernst Haeckel, and Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. The Scramble for Africa was only a few decades back at this point, and Britain had already long expanded its plantation extraction practices into poorer nations across the globe from Ireland outward. But no Western European powers would support Germany's military incursions into another rich European trading partner nation. Rather than being removed after the war, the academic boycott of the German language intensified in 1919 when German and Austrian researchers were banned from international conferences until 1926 (see REINBOTHE 2013).

The 93 signers came off as the cultural ambassadors of an imperial threat to the balance of power that America had a strong interest in maintaining. But at the same time the petition had its titular effect as an *Aufruf*, a call to arms, that was heard loud and clear by the German-American community. WWI thus sparked a sincere crisis of loyalty for prominent German-American intellectuals, such as George Sylvester Viereck, editor of *The Fatherland*, a periodical representing perspectives of US citizens and residents of German ancestry. Viereck criticized Woodrow Wilson for his support of England in WWI prior to the US entry into the conflict. Viereck called Wilson "the Most Hyphenated American" since Wilson had British ancestry and thus his support for Britain in an intra-European conflict could be interpreted as motivated by his own ethnic identity (Viereck cit. in KELLER 1979: 148). Viereck warned that "before long, a large passenger ship like the Lusitania, carrying implements of murder to Great Britain, will meet a similar fate" to the Gulflight, a US tanker carrying fuel to France, that had been torpedoed by a German submarine earlier in 1914 (VIERECK cit. in KELLER 1979: 149). The accuracy of this predication cannot have helped his career.

After the Lusitania was in fact sunk by German aggressors, Viereck toned down his treasonous rhetoric, yet still faced severe public rebuke as part of the violent backlash against German-Americans. He was expelled from the Poetry Society of America, and, out of shame, he quit writing poetry altogether. In the words of historian Phyllis Keller, he lost "faith in his own immediate responses to the world" (KELLER 1979: 159). The distrust of multiple identities shook intellectuals like Viereck to the core. He quit publishing for *The Fatherland* in the grim period around the Sedition Act of 1918, the most severe censorship law in US history, which specifically outlawed speech that questioned the American war effort in Europe, and was used as a pretense for vigilante acts of violence against German-Americans. His historical irrelevance as a thinker was later cemented by his fervent sympathies with National Socialism.

Another spokesperson for German-American community whose response to the German invasion of Belgium gleaned opprobrium was Hugo Münsterberg, a psy-

chologist at Harvard recruited in 1892 by none other than William James. Before 1916, Münsterberg had been as vocal a proponent of German national interests as Viereck. Before the extreme hostility to patriotically hybrid German-Americans, Münsterberg had regularly contributed to *The Fatherland* and spoken freely in favor of German-American identity when it was still safe to do so.[1] As late as Aug. 11, 1915, he praised the journal for "courageous work" in "the turmoil of this hysteric year." He further wrote an article for the *New York Times* entitled "Allies of the Future," which argued that "the three Teutonic master nations," Germany, the UK, and the USA, would form a new strategic alliance to become world leaders – a prediction that may not have been far off, but which would put him on the wrong side of history while Germany was embroiled in war.

Like Viereck, Münsterberg faced vicious public rebuke in 1916, and an ensuing identity crisis. One of Münsterberg's most vociferous detractors was none other than Edwin B. Holt, the translator of Münsterberg's work of cultural criticism, *Die Amerikaner*. Holt had gossiped about Münsterberg's loyalties to others at Harvard and was evasive when the latter confronted him about it. Holt had also written his own monograph entitled *The Freudian Wish* (1916), which Münsterberg used against him by making counteraccusations against Holt among their mutual colleagues using psychoanalytic language: he claimed that Holt was projecting a maternal role onto him. Münsterberg himself had identified Americans with femininity and Germans with masculinity in his own popular writings on American culture (MÜNSTERBERG / HOLT 2006: 1910). Münsterberg's accusation could thus be psychoanalyzed within his own framework: Münsterberg felt his hostile junior colleague underappreciated his Germanic masculinity.

Prominent American philosophers worsened the anti-German environment with stereotyping screeds. Before WWI, philosopher John Dewey and economist Thorstein Veblen admired the German model, since they were both prominent advocates of academic freedom against the encroachment of capital and administrative bureaucracy at a time when the American university system was rapidly expanding at the beginning of the turn of the century (VEYSEY 1970: 346–47). Just a decade later, however, they began polemically besmirching the German traditions of thought that had inspired the ideal of academic freedom. In 1915, when the United States had just entered World War I, these two leading American thinkers penned book-length treatises, in which they indicted German philosophy as irrelevant to modern society. In *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution*, Veblen writes that German philosophy "finds no application in the scheme of thought within which the modern science and technology live and move" (VEBLEN 1915: 227). In *German Philosophy and Politics*, Dewey calls German universities "state-controlled institutions" designed for "the preparation of future state officials" as opposed to independent thinkers (DEWEY 2008: 145). Considering their positions in the German-influenced liberal education

[1] Incidentally, Hannah Arendt also wrote for a German-language Jewish newspaper, *Aufbau*, during her early years in the US shortly before she began writing solely in English (HELLER, A. C. 2015: 77).

discourse, expressing anti-German sentiments put their patriotism brightly on display.

Such doubts about Prussian supremacy in education also had precedents before WWI. In 1899 even William James, the cosmopolitan philosopher of pluralism, voiced a familiar accusation against German universities, namely, that they are too focused on teaching research skills that are not practically useful. While German-trained students could "grind out in the requisite number of months some little pepper-corn of new truth worthy of being added to the store of extant human information on that subject," British students, by contrast, learned something personally transformative: to become "gentlemen" (JAMES 1916: 16). Reading these barbs from the present, in light of the Anglo-American orientation of contemporary philosophy departments, might give the misleading impression that American thinkers always found German Idealism naïve. That may have been what inspired Münsterberg to become a spokesman for German-American identity, defending German intellectual character in *American Problems* (1910) with counterattacks on Americans' pathetic susceptible "nervousness."

WWI not only changed the perception of German people within the United States, but also of the German language. In 1919 the Supreme Court Case Meyer v. Nebraska ruled laws like the following from Nebraska unconstitutional: "1. No person, individually or as a teacher, shall, in any private, denominational, parochial or public school, teach any subject to any person in any language other than English." But by the time such laws were repealed, the damage had been done: American education and research have been fiercely monolingual ever since. Against this background, forced migration in the United States must also be understood as forced conversion to the still current English-dominated research paradigm. The "translation" of German-American identity into different linguistic and imagological forms (from model minority to stigmatized minority to invisible one) is characterized by the "conspicuous inconspicuousness" that Lavinia Heller describes as the effect of the translation-critical gaze on the movement between source and target texts (HELLER, L. 2013: 97). In this theoretical and historical context, we can begin to imagine the possibility that the English-language output of particular German-speaking thinkers may have assisted academic English in reaching its current global preeminence.

The Encounter with English

Historiography has somewhat downplayed the linguistic dilemma that exiled European writers have faced. The pressure to conform to the dominant system ruled out writing in their own language. The dominance of English seems almost too familiar to remark on when not re-examined in the above outlined history of the decline of German in the United States, and it first becomes interesting for research if historians do not prescribe to a positivistic view of language, which minimizes the importance of language in the development of writers' style of thinking. Some of the most famous Los Angeles-based exiles – such as Bertolt Brecht, Theodor Adorno, and Max Horkheimer – saw to it that their work was translated, promoted, and performed in Eng-

lish, while producing their new work in German. Yet it is important to consider other writers – equally famous in their fields – who went further in adapting to an English-speaking setting. Ernst Cassirer in his *Myth of the State* (1946), Hannah Arendt in her *Denktagebuch* (1950-1973), and Karl Popper in his autobiography *Unended Quest* (1976) directly address the political crisis in Europe – a directness not possible in Europe even during the first decades after the war. These three authors also had developed an astonishing degree of fluency in English for that time – adding to their critical distance from the problems (fascism, anti-Semitism, the trauma of war) that were afflicting Europe and that comprised the painful impetus for their exile.

To adapt to the American education system, Ernst Cassirer performed an exemplary act of self-translation. In close dialogue with Charles W. Hendel, his friend and colleague at Yale, Cassirer wrote *An Essay on Man* (1944), his first monograph in English. The book's foreword introduces it as a rethinking of *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen*. Rather than finding a translator for his earlier work, he rethought his former insights so that Anglophone readers would be more receptive to them. Cassirer's arguments against translating his earlier work summarize the differences between German and American intellectual culture: the original work was outdated, too long, and on "a difficult and abstract subject" (vii). Cassirer knew how seriously disciplinary boundaries were taken in the United States and apologizes for his interdisciplinary "book concerned with psychological, ontological, epistemological questions and containing chapters on Myth and Religion, Language and Art, on Science and History." And yet it was precisely through such cultural translations – works that mediated between American and German understandings of scholarship – that global English was able to absorb and continue developing the German ideal of *Bildung* within the context of the American university.

The example of Cassirer's *Essay on Man* shows how translation, for new contexts, can include forms of localization. Since his earliest anthropological work in Hamburg, Cassirer had been interested in defining the use of symbols as a specifically human faculty. His negative examples of how animal communication is not symbolic were based on zoological research he had encountered pre-exile: monkey's screams only refer to present objects; the bee's dance refers to the (absent) location of distant pollen but is incapable of spontaneous inventions of signs or of syntax. But he selected a new positive example of human language that would be familiar to his American readership: even without the exposure to the normal cues for relating sign to concept (i.e., spoken or written language), when the blind and deaf Helen Keller went beyond learning touch-based signs for the names to objects and understood the creative principle that animates symbolization:

> *[She] had to understand that* everything had a name *– that the symbolic function is not restricted to particular cases but is a principle of* universal *applicability, which encompasses the whole field of human thought. In the case of Helen Keller, the discovery came as a sudden shock. […] A new horizon is opened up, and henceforth the child will roam at will in this new wider and freer area. […] The case of Helen Keller […] shows us that a human being in the construction of his human world is not dependent on the quality of his sense material.* (CASSIRER 1972: 34-35)

Cassirer localizes his theory of the symbolic function by pitting it against "sensationalism," an epistemological theory linked to the Anglo-American behaviorist psychology of the time, using an example familiar in American culture. *The Essay on Man* is thus a rapprochement between philosophical traditions that is only possible through translation – in this case, cultural rather than interlingual translation.

Like Cassirer, Hannah Arendt too joined in the long German tradition of analyzing language as a key starting point in the investigation of what it means to live a human life. Her coerced turn to English as a working language therefore could not fail to inspire the development of her philosophical work. She not only performed a major cultural translation throughout her English-language oeuvre; she also took on major interlingual self-translation projects. Ambivalence about German *and* English is a central node of Hannah Arendt's thinking that Sigrid Weigel has taken up in several essays. Weigel sees Arendt's work as a peculiar kind of "self-translation," that is, a Freudian "translation without original" both in the sense that writing in English involved a moment of inward self-transposition, but also in the sense that Freud saw in the manifestation of unconscious processes through dreams, jokes, and slips (WEIGEL 2018: 34).[2] Weigel's analysis explains how rarely Arendt explicitly discusses English despite her shift to it as her working language during her lifelong exile in the United States.

The case of Arendt is especially interesting since she crossed the linguistic divide twice: first learning to write and publish books in English, beginning with the massive *Origins of Totalitarianism*, and later overseeing the translation of her English works back into German, reworking them as she goes, most famously expanding the references to Greek language for the humanistically educated German readership in *Vita Activa*, her German version of *The Human Condition*. In her famous 1964 interview with Günter Gaus on German television, Arendt emphasizes how vastly superior her German is to her English. She even expresses a degree of contempt for fellow immigrants who completely forgot their native languages. She says that when these forgetful ones speak English, "one cliche chases another because the productivity that one has in one's own language has been cut off when they forgot that language" (ARENDT 1964, my translation). What Arendt calls "productivity" (*Produktivität*) sounds like what is often thematized as "creativity" in translation studies, and a German-sounding creativity is certainly on display in Arendt's English in matters as simple as her diction, including words like calling a satellite an "earth-born object" and calling science-fiction "non-respectable literature" (ARENDT 1958: 1, 2).

Arendt's interlingual life is by far the best researched among the three scholars discussed in this article. Because of her originality, charisma, and ability to write for a non-academic audience, the memory of her transatlantic life extends beyond the ivo-

[2] Arendt's self-transposition is not identical to the borrowing of poetic forms that Gauti Kristmannsson calls "translation without original," but Arendt too could be read as having made the wager Kristmannsson describes: to sacrifice a degree of the prestige of originality in order to accrue the higher cultural capital linked to foreign writing conventions (KRISTMANNSSON 2012: 114).

ry tower deep into the popular imagination.[3] Her careful curation of her work in both English and German also served to secure her international legacy. Sigrid Weigel accounts for Arendt's linguistic double movement as follows: she integrated more and more into the Anglophone publishing world while constantly returning to the use of German as a way of gathering and honing her thoughts. Since she was writing down similar ideas about the concept of *persona* in German during the 1950s in her *Denktagebuch* as the ones she would publish in *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Her posthumously published intellectual diary (*Denktagebuch*) was an especially valuable secret space for thinking in German, "a German *Parerga* to the work of a German-speaking English-writing author" (WEIGEL 2012: 59). Her generative use of self-translation is Weigel's explanation for Arendt's thriving in exile – where so many German Jews were paralyzed by the task of adapting to a new culture, language, and society.

In the April 1970 entry of Arendt's *Denktagebuch*, she writes overtly "On the difficulties I have with my English readers." There she challenges the assumption that a "thesaurus-philosophy" is possible wherein "words 'express' ideas that I supposedly have prior to having the words" (ARENDT 2002: 1 770f). In the same passage, she expresses her doubt "that we would have any 'ideas' without language."[4] The militant monolingualism of the United States since 1915 would indeed have provided an environment where intellectuals widely shared the notion that ideas beyond language existed. During Arendt's lifetime, exiled thinkers of the Vienna Circle, like Rudolph Carnap and Otto Neurath, contributed to the ascendance of the liberal-technocratic belief that language can pose no impediment to the best of ideas.

As with Cassirer and Arendt, Karl Popper began lecturing and writing in English immediately after leaving continental Europe. He migrated to the English-speaking world in 1935 in flight from the anti-Semitic violence sanctioned under Austrofascism in Vienna – thus much earlier than Arendt (1941) though not as early as Cassirer (1933). Yet Popper may have anticipated his destiny to write in English more than these other two philosophers did; Popper's mentors, professors, and colleagues in the Vienna Circle were political Anglophiles in a time when the German language was becoming associated with the fascist and pan-Germanist movements sweeping central Europe.

While he left for England in 1935 and 1936 in search of academic positions on the strength of his first and only major German-language work, *Die Logik der Foschung* (1934), it took until March 1937 for him to receive an acceptable offer, and it was in Christchurch, New Zealand, which he experienced as oppressively remote, but only in 1945 did he manage to receive an offer to teach philosophy of science at the London School of Economics (a position he secured with help from another English-

[3] Popular representations of Arendt have appeared in multiple languages at a steady rate following her death in 1975, including at least one novel (CLÉMENT 1999), theater play (FODOR 2004), graphic novel (KRIMSTEIN 2018), and biopic (TROTTA 2012).

[4] This is one of the most central passages for Sigrid Weigel's interpretation of Arendt as an adherent of linguistic determinism. Cf. WEIGEL 2018: 34; 2009: 104; 2014: 76.

publishing Austrian exile, his mentor Friedrich von Hayek). While his prior experience with English was not extensive, it became Popper's working language as soon as he arrived in New Zealand (POPPER 1976: 111). He describes the shift to English as a major event in his life as a researcher. In that first position, he began his first work of political philosophy, *The Poverty of Historicism*, which would also be his first major publication in English:

> *My main trouble was to write in acceptable English. I had written a few things before, but they were linguistically very bad. My German style in Logik der Forschung had been reasonably light – for German readers; but I discovered that English* standards *of writing were utterly different, and far higher than German standards. For example, no German reader minds polysyllables. In English, one has to learn to be repelled by them. But if one is still fighting to avoid the simplest mistakes, such higher aims are far more distant, however much one may approve of them.*
>
> *The Poverty of Historicism is, I think, one of my stodgiest pieces of writing.* (my emphasis, 113-114)

Popper continued to work with German in a small capacity in 1937: he edited the German translation of his own autobiography, as the copyright page of the German edition asserts. The German version of his autobiography adds the phrase: "und an die Klarheit seines Stils" to characterize the stylistic expectations that make English prose challenging. How do we evaluate the clarity of the two sentences? Would the standards already have been obvious to readers of English? Was it so clear just by virtue of being an English sentence that it was not necessary to specify which "standards" were meant? The German word, *Anforderungen* that translates "standards" would be a perfect example of the translator having assumed, as Popper had also surmised, the German reader's tolerance for polysyllabic words that Popper argues.
Finally, the addition of the adjective *englisch* in the last line of the German translation shows a strong interpretive choice. He calls *The Poverty of Historicism* "der schwerfälligste unter meinen *englischen* Schriften" (my emphasis, POPPER / GRIESE 2004: 161). The implication is that his German texts were of course cumbersome (*schwerfällig*) and lacked the accessibility that enhanced his influence as a philosopher. Although he did not espouse the merits of English with the same zeal as his Vienna Circle colleagues, Popper would also quit writing in German once his exile began. At the same time, the autobiography exhibits an attachment to language, specifically the Austrian language. Austrian dialect makes a prominent appearance in the very opening passage of his autobiography. The occasion for the dialect is to give a sense of the "local color" in the story of his exile. When the young Karl serves as an apprentice to "an old master cabinetmaker in Vienna," he includes his statements about cabinetmaking in dialect:

> *Once he told me that he had worked for many years on various models of a perpetual motion machine, adding musingly: "They say you can't make it; but once it's been made they'll talk different!" ("Da sag'n s' dass ma' so was net mach'n*

> *kann; aber wann amal eina ein's gemacht hat, dann wer'n s' schon anders red'n!") A favourite practice of his was to ask me a historical question and to answer it himself when it turned out that I did not know the answer (although I, his pupil, was a University student – a fact of which he was very proud). "And do you know", he would ask, "who invented topboots? You don't? It was Wallenstein, the Duke of Friedland, during the Thirty Years War." After one or two even more difficult questions, posed by himself and triumphantly answered by himself, my master would say with modest pride: "There, you can ask me whatever you like: I know everything." ("Da können S' mi' frag'n was Sie woll'n: ich weiss alles.")* (POPPER 1976: 7)

In the German edition, Popper does not deem translation into standard German necessary, but the quotation about Wallenstein – originally rendered in standard English – could not be left in standard German, that had to be assimilated into the dialect of the other quotations: "Und wissen S'", fragte er mich, "wer die Schaftstiefel erfunden hat? Nein? Dös wissen S' net? Das war der Wallenstein, der Herzog von Friedland, im Dreißigjährigen Krieg!" (POPPER / GRIESE 2004: 1). The German version thus shows that he has retained his sensitivity to regional differences in the German language even though he had long quit publishing new work in German by the time of writing. The dominance of the proudly Germanophone Adorno within contemporary research has overshadowed the impact of geographic displacement on these other philosophers' output.[5] It is time for a reversal of the privileging of space over text in the discussion of translation. As Federico Italiano writes, past work on migrant and multilingual writers (like Sherry Simon's *Cities in Translation* or Scott Spector's *Prague Territories*) begin with geography whereas a new approach would begin with publication histories to understand the "negotiation of cultural differences between construction of worlds and spatial imaginations" (ITALIANO 2016: 4). While previous work has highlighted the importance of these thinkers' social networks, there is not yet adequate research on these philosophers' encounter with the English language and on the English language's corresponding accommodation of German speculative theory. In neglecting this forceful encounter between languages, research has overlooked the way in which these refugees' English-language publications constituted an early canon of academic English, composed by foreigners, a clear precursor to today's use of English as a lingua franca in academic publishing.

The opposite omission occurs, perhaps by necessity, in histories of the rise of global English. Seminal recent works like James McElvenny's *Language and Meaning in the Age of Modernism* (MCELVENNY 2017) and Michael Gordin's *Scientific Babel* (GORDIN 2015) make it clear that scientists, philosophers, and linguists had been trying to establish a kind of new Latin for the scientific community since the Enlightenment. As Gordin describes, conferences were especially important to scientific collabora-

[5] Adorno did argue that German prose style would benefit from more foreign linguistic influence. Hence his advocacy for German prose stylists to follow the lead of Proust's translators and embrace Latinate loan words as a means of curtailing tendencies to mimic some philosophers' and theologians' Germanic "jargon of authenticity" (See ADORNO 1974).

tion in the early twentieth century, and it was thought that adopting a universal language would accelerate this collaboration. In McElvenny's account, "technocrats" observing the rise of fascism after WWI also hoped that a universal language would promote peace, and both Charles Ogden and the members of the Vienna Circle saw the political stability of Britain as one part of the case for English. As efforts to persuade the scientific community to adapt an artificial language were failing one by one (Esperanto, Ido, and Volapük – to name the most ambitious three), English was gaining traction.

The various responses of philosophers such as Cassirer, Arendt, and Popper to the Anglophone context functions like a complex ropework, fastening the English language to its fate of global dominance and making the preference for English as a world language all but unquestionable. As British linguist Charles Kay Ogden explicitly campaigned for "Basic English" as a world language, he saw the commonality between his thinking and the work of Rudolph Carnap and Otto Neurath, exiled Vienna Circle philosophers interested in developing a universal language. Neurath was already famous for the universal pictographic language that he developed in Vienna before he fled prior to the *Anschluss* during the violent rise of Austrofascism. Ogden's project was unusual for combining the universal hopes of previous world language proposals with an undeniable British nationalism (although, as Gordin discusses, this was also the case in Friedrich Ostwald's *Weltdeutsch*). "While other language constructors agonized over the most inclusive 'international' forms for their languages, Ogden saw all that was needed in English," in McElvenny's apt phrase (McElvenny 2017: 155). However, Ogden succeeded in his efforts to persuade members of the Vienna Circle to join him in promoting Basic English to the extent that Otto Neurath wrote extensively in that language.

Implications for the Rise of Global English

Global English may primarily be a result of capital accumulation from British colonialism prior to WWI, American occupations after WWII, and the resulting economic dominance for those nations. For a brief moment, however, spreading global English was also an explicit project supported first by US President Theodor Roosevelt and then by British Prime Minister Winston Churchill. The spread of English could only have succeeded on the scale that it did with the help of converts to the English-language publishing world, who expressed their ideas passionately in the ascendant lingua franca – even though the pursuit of survival thrust them into the role of mediator between academic cultures.

The grandfather of the international English movement is the linguist Charles Ogden, whose BASIC English captured the imagination of Vienna Circle adherents who felt a liberal, internationalist English-language movement was a necessary counterforce to the imperialist, nationalist pan-Germanism that was gaining traction in Austria and Germany. There was no need for such an explicit program, however, after the fall of National Socialism, and thus a movement of possible world (linguistic) historical importance fell into obscurity. The explicit promotion of English as a lingua

franca by British and American politicians was already on the wane by the end of WWII since "the current of technocratic benevolent control […] strongest in the interwar years" was no longer trusted so blindly after it was evident that the era's core engine of science and tech innovation – military technology – was capable of rendering harm on unprecedented scales (McElvenny 2017: 158). During the Cold War, for example, American military investment was primarily concerned with surveillance over communist countries. Developing and marketing the internet was the crowning success of the government-sponsored ARPANET military project, but internet technology firms, like Apple, IBM, and Hewlett-Packard, successfully hid their ties to military research by promoting the internet as a consumer good that served all Americans, not just supporters of Cold War politics - a network for hippie and square alike (Levine 2018: 13-34, 101-138). The desire to control the scientific discourse suited a moment when the Anglo-American alliance worshipped technocratic power, a time when prominent British writers like H.G. Wells openly admired the Nazis' technological supremacy (McElvenny 2017: 104).

The three philosophers discussed above have not only contributed nuanced defenses of liberal democracy to American political discourse, but Arendt and Popper have also infused English-language philosophy with new vocabulary. Popper's term "falsifiability" has become a foundational concept in the philosophy of science and the popular understanding of scientific method. Arendt developed an English language vocabulary in *The Human Condition* that has gained wide acceptance in critical theory. Her terms "labor," "work," and "action," "natality" and "the banality of evil" enjoy the status of memes in Anglophone academic discourse. Their influence resembles that of the English-language Heideggerian terminology ("Being-in-the-World," "Tool-Being," "Readiness-to-Hand," etc.) which influenced Anglophone discourses through English translation and through translated post-Heideggerian French philosophy. But the difference is that Arendt and Cassirer wrote about these concepts in English, thus importing their German-language *Bildung* whose intellectual communities in Europe collapsed for political reasons.

The next phase of work on this topic will involve examining private correspondence in order to understand the motivations that led influential German-language thinkers to adopt English as their research language. Various motivations propelled exiled Europeans not to write in their native tongues, most obviously the sheer cumbersomeness of having to find a translator to render the work into English, if they did not draft their work in English themselves. It is easier (and usually cheaper) to find a good proofreader than a good translator – a fact known today to non-native-English-speaking scholars around the world. Among the practical and ideological motivations that drew these writers to academic English were: conviction of the linguistic elegance of English (Carnap), successful integration in the English-speaking intellectual community (Cassirer), faith that a single world language would facilitate international science (Neurath), fear of having to return to fascist-dominated central Europe if one failed to acclimate to the English-language norms (Popper), and the persuasion that Americans understood the problems of political deliberation better than Ger-

mans – even if they made poorer philosophers (Arendt).[6] While all of these luminaries' work, especially Arendt's, have received warm and copious reception in the United States, the lack of a "systematic, comparative study" of Arendt's self-translations is an omission that Sigrid Weigel has recently noted (WEIGEL 2014: 85f.). That research vacuum looms even larger for less famous self-translating philosophers in exile.

Two of the most prominent exiled Vienna Circle members, Neurath and Carnap, had ideological motivations for preferring English that derived from older arguments for international languages. Johann Martin Schleyer, the German Catholic priest who invented the constructed language Volapük, based it on English because it was "the easiest and most widespread of all the civilised languages," and Ludwik Lejzer Zamenhof, inventor of Esperanto, also wanted to create a language that mimicked "the simplicity of English grammar" (Quoted in MCELVENNY 2013: 77). British writers like Charles Ogden and H.G. Wells saw a linguistic and cultural capital worth sharing in English, and they found support in their Prime Minister; Winston Churchill saw English as "an invaluable amenity" worth spreading more widely globally after the Allied victory, as he stated in a wartime speech at Harvard (CHURCHILL 1943). Intellectual historian James McElvenny, however, does not credit the wishes of any of the "technocrats" behind the mid-century international English movement with a decisive part in the rise of English as *the* international language. Rather, he calls the predominance of English in the sciences "a status it has won not through the careful plans of any scholar, but through the sheer weight of British and then, especially in the decades following the Second World War, American economic, military, and cultural hegemony. […] As the simple victory of might over mind, it is probably fair to say that it is not precisely what Ogden and his supporters envisaged" (MCELVENNY 2013: 81).

While the international English movement provided a powerful face for global English, it may indeed have had no significant influence on its rise. The fascist threat to the lives of continental European scholars, however, was a strong push factor that enhanced English's "victory of might over mind" by infusing it with a powerful dose of German *Bildung*. These German scholars' conversion to English-language discourse was hardly an expression of personal preference, but – perhaps lending credence to William James' notion that German students could do nothing but perform research – exile could not extinguish their research ambitions even though they faced the obstacle of mastering the language on offer in their displacement. While the translation economy still largely flows out of English into other languages, it may not have come to this point if such a large number of exiled scholars had not been so successful in taking on English when forced to do so in order to continue their careers in the United States and Great Britain. It is worth noting in conclusion that the authors in question fled out of urgent necessity, but that Britain and the United States were in a position to capitalize on the decline of Europe into fascism by importing top talent from abroad – which amounted to a continuation of the promotion of English as language of science by other means (rendering unnecessary an explicit plan, like Og-

[6] On these topics, see, for instance: (QUINE & CARNAP 1991; BELKE 1987; WEIGEL 2014).

den's international promotion of BASIC English). While the expansion of the American university system over the course of the twentieth century played no small role in enhancing the significance of English for academic discourses, it was rendered legitimate by safety that many foreign scholars found in the English-speaking world, and by the work that they managed to publish in English – in some cases to great renown. New forces have cemented the need to publish in English in an academic system that it is globally linked in terms of funding, evaluation, student mobility, and the flow of knowledge (see BENNETT 2014; CURRY & LILLIS 2017). Twenty-first-century philosophers around the world continue to adopt English as their language of publication, and their practice had an unwitting and often reluctant trial run among Europe's exiled philosophers.

References

Primary Sources

ADORNO, Theodor (1974): „Wörter aus der Fremde". In: *Gesammelte Schriften II*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 216-232.

ARENDT, Hannah (1958): *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

ARENDT, Hannah (1964): Günter Gaus im Gespräch mit Hannah Arendt. *Zur Person*. Sendung vom 28.10.1964.
https://www.rbb-online.de/zurperson/interview_archiv/arendt_hannah.html (15.12.2020)

ARENDT, Hannah (1967): *Vita activa oder Vom tätigen Leben*. München: Piper.

ARENDT, Hannah (2002): *Denktagebuch*. München: Piper.

CASSIRER, Ernst (1923-29): *Die Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* Berlin: Bruno Cassirer Verlag.

CASSIRER, Ernst (1961): *The Myth of the State*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

CASSIRER, Ernst (1972): *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

CHURCHILL, Winston (1943): "The Gift of a Common Tongue" The International Churchill Society. https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1941-1945-war-leader/the-price-of-greatness-is-responsibility/ (21.11.2020)

DEWEY, John (2008): *The Middle Works of John Dewey, 1899-1924: Essays and Miscellany in the 1915 Period and German Philosophy and Politics and Schools of To-Morrow*. Carbondale: SIU Press.

JAMES, William (1916): *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

MÜNSTERBERG, Hugo (1910): *American Problems from the Point of View of a Psychologist*. Moffat, Yard.

MÜNSTERBERG, Hugo / HOLT, Edwin B. (transl.) (2006): *The Americans*. [New York: Cosimo Classics.]

POPPER, Karl (1976): *Unended Quest: An Intellectual Autobiography*. Revised ed. La Salle: Open Court.

POPPER, Karl & GRIESE, Friedrich (2004): *Ausgangspunkte: Meine intellektuelle Entwicklung*. München/Zürich: Piper Taschenbuch.

QUINE, W. V. & CARNAP, Rudolf (1991): *Dear Carnap, Dear Van: The Quine-Carnap Correspondence and Related Work: Edited and with an Introduction by Richard Creath*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

THE NEW YORK TIMES (1906): "Carnegie Assaults the Spelling Book; To Pay the Cost of Reforming English Orthography." March 12, 1906, sec. Archives.

VEBLEN, Thorstein (1915): *Imperial Germany*. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Secondary Sources

AMMON, Ulrich (2015): *Die Stellung der deutschen Sprache in der Welt*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

BAHR, Ehrhard (2008): *Weimar on the Pacific*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

BECKER, Joachim H. (1980): „Englischsprachige Publikationen deutscher Psychologen. Trends, Inhalte, Herkunft, internationale Aufnahme", *Psychologische Beiträge* (22) 356-371.

BELKE, Ingrid (1987): „Karl R. Popper Im Exil in Neuseeland von 1937 Bis 1945." In: STADLER, F. (ed.): *Vertriebene Vernunft II. Emigration und Exil österreichischer Wissenschaft 1930–1940*. Münster: LIT, 140-55.

BENNETT, Karen (2014): *The Semiperiphery of Academic Writing*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

CLÉMENT, Catherine (1999): *Martin et Hannah*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

CURRY, Mary Jane & LILLIS, Theresa (2017): "Problematizing English as the Privileged Language of Global Academic Publishing." In: CURRY, M. J. & LILLIS, T. (eds.): *Global Academic Publishing: Policies, Perspectives and Pedagogies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1–20.

FERNBERGER, Samuel W. (1917): On the number of articles of psychological interest published in the different languages. *American Journal of Psychology* 28: 141-150.

FERNBERGER, Samuel W. (1926): On the number of articles of psychological interest published in the different languages: 1916-1925. *American Journal of Psychology* 37: 578-580.

FERNBERGER, Samuel W. (1936): On the number of articles of psychological interest published in the different languages: *American Journal of Psychology* 48: 680-684.

FERNBERGER, Samuel W. (1946): On the number of articles of psychological interest published in the different languages: 1936-1945. *American Journal of Psychology* 59: 284-290.

FERNBERGER, Samuel W. (1956): On the number of articles of psychological interest published in the different languages: 1946-1955. *American Journal of Psychology* 63: 304-309.

FODOR, Kate (2004): *Hannah and Martin*. New York: Dramatists Play Service Inc.

GEITZ, Henry; HEIDEKING, Jürgen & HERBST, Jürgen (1995): *German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GORDIN, Michael (2015): *Scientific Babel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

HAMLIN, Cyrus (1998): "Transplanting German Idealism to American Culture." In: MUELLER-VOLLMER, K. (ed.): *Translating Literatures – Translating Cultures: New Vistas and Approaches in Literary Studies*. Berlin: Schmidt, 107-124.

HELLER, Anne Conover (2015): *Hannah Arendt: A Life in Dark Times*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

HELLER, Lavinia (2013): *Translationswissenschaftliche Begriffsbildung und das Problem der performativen Unauffälligkeit von Translation*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.

ITALIANO, Federico (2016): *Translation and Geography*. Abingdon/New York: Routledge.

KELLER, Phyllis (1979): *States of Belonging: German-American Intellectuals and the First World War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

KRIMSTEIN, Ken (2018): *The Three Escapes of Hannah Arendt: A Tyranny of Truth*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

KRISTMANNSSON, Gauti (2012): „Wie man ohne Original übersetzt: Die Rolle der Translation in der Kulturgeschichte", *Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (38), 108-119.

LEVINE, Yasha. (2018): *Surveillance Valley*. New York: PublicAffairs.

MCELVENNY, James (2013): "Meaning in the Age of Modernism: C. K. Ogden and His Contemporaries." Dissertation, Sydney: University of Sydney.

MCELVENNY, James (2017): *Language and Meaning in the Age of Modernism: C.K. Ogden and His Contemporaries*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

REINBOTE, Roswitha (2013): „Der Boykott gegen die deutschen Wissenschaftler und die deutsche Sprache nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg", *DMW – Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* 138 (51/52): 2685-2690.

SIMON, Sherry (2011): *Cities in Translation: Intersections of Language and Memory*. Abingdon; New York: Routledge.

TROTTA, Margarethe von (2013): *Hannah Arendt*. Heimatfilm, Amour Fou Luxembourg, MACT Productions.

VEYSEY, Laurence R (1970): *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

WEIGEL, Sigrid (2009): "Poetics as a Presupposition of Philosophy: Hannah Arendt's Denktagebuch," *Telos* 2009 (146): 97-110.

WEIGEL, Sigrid (2014): „Per-Sonare, Poetische Differenz und Selbstübersetzung. Der Sound von Hannah Arendts Denken und Schreiben." In: BAER, U. & ESHEL, A. (eds.): *Hannah Arendt Zwischen Den Disziplinen*. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 63–90.

WEIGEL, Sigrid (2018): "Self-Translation and Its Discontents." In: COSTA, M. T. & HÖNES, H. C. (eds): *Migrating Histories of Art: Self-Translations of a Discipline.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 21-36.

WHEATLAND, Thomas (2009): *The Frankfurt School in Exile*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.