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Abstract—This paper attempts to demonstrate that many historians have resisted the censorship of historical thought, either inside or outside tyrannical regimes, throughout the twentieth century. Those who actively struggled against persecution were either directly threatened and resisted the threat, or less personally involved but fighting for the cause of history, academic freedom and human rights. A third group, frequently in the background, consisted of all the outsiders who attempted to maintain solidarity with their persecuted colleagues. In addition, historians, in a unique professional reflex, are able to supplement contemporary resistance with retroactive resistance. They possess the power to reopen cases and challenge the rulers' amnesia and falsification of history.

The first group of historians were those directly affected by repression. Historians in prison taught history to their fellow inmates or were able to do some historical research. Outside prison, some historians engaged in clandestine activities such as publishing their work in the samizdat circuit, teaching at flying universities, or illegally gaining access to closed archives. Others defied likely censorship by refuting the cherished historical myths that supported the powers that be, or by uttering the unmentionable with historical metaphors. A minority adopted methods of open resistance. Some bravely refused to take loyalty oaths, and were dismissed. A stubborn few reoriented their work towards the eras and topics under embargo.

Historians of the second group were those living under repression without being as cruelly affected by it as their more unfortunate colleagues, and transforming their outrage in what I call insider solidarity. Some organised petitions and letters of protest. Others actively supported their colleagues fallen into disgrace at great personal risk or resigned in protest against their dismissal. As deans and rectors, some challenged violations of university autonomy. A wider circle of resistance was constituted by the struggle historians waged as peace and human rights activists, again at the risk of dismissal and prosecution. Once countries toppled their dictators and set in a process of transition towards democracy, new tasks fitted the historians' commitment: they took part in the work of official or unofficial truth commissions. Nowadays, truth commissions are so successful that the underlying principle, the right to know the truth about past abuses, and hence the right to history, is increasingly recognised in international law.

Historians living in countries and times without threats to their freedom or life formed the third group. They
tried to apply the difficult principle of universality of human rights to the core right of the historical profession: freedom of information and expression. This principle meant that, wherever a colleague’s freedom was threatened, one’s own was too, and, conversely, that historians enjoying freedom had an obligation to use it for those who did not possess it. In short, the principle was translated into international solidarity. This solidarity took on many different shapes at the national level. Several historians wrote or taught on the controversial aspects, the blank spots and the falsified history of tyrannical countries, or on academic freedom, either in general or in response to concrete threats. Petition and letter writing campaigns were launched against the detention of colleagues. Also, the tragic fate of historians in exile was sometimes alleviated by the welcome prepared for them in the host countries. At the international level, the interventions of the International Committee of Historical Sciences are briefly discussed in the paper. The initiative of the Network of Concerned Historians is outlined.

From this overview, it may be concluded that the first social responsibility of historians is to defend their human rights, and particularly the freedom of information and expression central to their profession. Without these freedoms, historians cannot discharge their first professional obligation—the pursuit of historical truth—nor their other social responsibilities towards past, present and future society. When we look back at the twentieth century as historians and as human beings, the record of examples of commitment and integrity coming from dozens of countries on all continents inspires hope and pride: despite the vulnerability of the historical profession, there is a stubborn tradition of freedom among historians to be aware of, to care for, and to strengthen.
INTRODUCTION: CONTEMPORARY AND RETROACTIVE RESISTANCE

Simon Dubnov (1860–1941) was a great Jewish historian and a double exile from the Soviet Union (1922) and Nazi Germany (1933). In the weeks before his death in December 1941, while he was living in the ghetto of Riga, Latvia, his library was seized and he was obliged to hide his manuscripts. Cut off from his daily work, he began chronicling life in the ghetto. His notebooks were smuggled out to some friends in the city. During one of the roundups in the ghetto, a Gestapo officer (a former student of Dubnov, some assert) murdered him. Later, his daughter heard the rumour that Dubnov repeatedly exclaimed in the minutes before his death: "People, do not forget. Speak of this, people; record it all." These last words, an appeal to memory and responsibility, passed from mouth to mouth. Simon Dubnov could undoubtedly have said them, but whether he really uttered them in the dark and tragic moments just before his death will remain uncertain forever.

This risk of untraceability, and hence of oblivion, is even greater for the words and deeds of lesser-known historians writing and teaching in similar repressive conditions. As early as 1963, Czech historian Jan Kren (1930–) had launched an appeal for more autonomy in historiography. Dismissed during the 'normalisation', he became active in the samizdat circuit. In the mid–1980s, he received a visit from a clever history student who had researched a subject that Kren had worked on before his persecution. He did not know any of Kren's works written on the topic in the 1960s and had heard about him only vaguely. "I thought you were dead", the student confessed. The courage to confront tyrannical power frequently passes unnoticed. Although for this reason it is not possible to give precise statistics, the following examples, based on data from more than 130 countries, demonstrate that there must be many who have resisted persecution and censorship either inside or outside tyrannical regimes. Those who actively struggled against persecution found themselves in one of two groups: either they were directly threatened and resisted the threat, or they were less personally involved but fought for the cause of history, academic freedom and human rights. A third group, frequently in the background, consisted of all the outsiders who attempted to maintain solidarity with their persecuted colleagues.

In addition, historians, in a unique professional reflex, are able to supplement contemporary resistance with retroactive resistance. Today, few historians believe that they are judges before the tribunal of history charged with the vengeance of peoples, as René de Chateaubriand did in the early nineteenth century; they nevertheless possess the power to reopen cases and challenge rulers' amnesia and falsification of history. It is never too late for the historical truth, because truth is able to transcend its particular roots and context. Even when sources of information are disappearing, research on past crimes may always begin. It is a task with many risks. Without the passion of the survivors, historians may "normalise" the cruel abuses of the past by inserting them into the stream of history. They may omit crucial findings for fear of breathing new divisive fever into the collective memory. It is, however, the historians' professional obligation to see that the dead do not die twice; for it is the first human right of deceased persons to be treated with dignity. Even Simon Dubnov was able to take posthumous revenge:
the Nazis believed to have destroyed the entire run of his autobiography’s third volume. One surviving copy, however, rediscovered in 1956, served as the basis for a new edition the following year.⁸
Some historians who for various reasons were jailed, displayed moral and intellectual courage of the Dubnov type. They began teaching history while in prison or in prison-like circumstances. While living in German internment camps in 1916, the Belgian historian Henri Pirenne (1862–1935) lectured on history several days a week to a camp audience of more than two hundred. Even the German soldiers who were supposed to monitor what he said became so interested that they joined the prisoners in asking questions after the lectures. French historian Claude Cahen (1909–1991) gave informal lectures on history to his companions while he was imprisoned in a German camp in 1940–45. Historian and co-founder of the *Annales* Marc Bloch (1886–1944), executed by the Gestapo near Lyons in June 1944, taught French history to one of the young inmates while incarcerated and tortured in the months before his death. Poet and historian Nina Gagen-Torn (1900–1986) taught Russian literature and history to a group of ill Ukrainian girls in a Soviet camp during 1947–53. Polish historian Władysław Bartoszewski (1922–) delivered some seventy hours of lectures during his five-month internment after the declaration of martial law in Poland in December 1981. The Sudanese school teacher Suleiman Mohamed Soail, detained in 1985 because of his research on the 1885 Mahdist Revolution, taught history to his fellow prisoners. Indonesian author Pramoedya Ananta Toer (1925–) was imprisoned at Buru island in 1973, and was not allowed to write. In the evenings he told his fellow inmates stories about the incipient nationalist movement in early-twentieth-century Indonesia entirely from memory. When he was finally allowed to write in 1975, the other inmates gave him paper and he transformed the stories into a set of four historical novels while they did his duties. When the quartet was published after his release in 1979, each of the volumes was banned. This official censorship was inspired partially by fear that analogies would be drawn between the historical abuses of power and those occurring at the time.

In prison, the present is grim, the future inconceivable; only the past gives some comfort. The large amounts of time suddenly available provided some prisoners with the chance to develop an intimate relationship with history, at least when detention conditions allowed for a minimal level of activity beyond survival. Between 1921 and 1945, Jawaharlal Nehru (1889–1964), India's future premier, was held in British jails for nine years. There, he read and wrote as an autodidactic historian about Indian and world history. Between October 1930 and August 1933 he sent almost two hundred letters on world history from different prisons to his daughter, Indira Gandhi. Their publication in 1934, *Glimpses of World History*, made Nehru the first non-western world historian of modern times. Another of his historical works, *The Discovery of India* (1946), was written between August 1942 and June 1945, when he remained under rigorous confinement. Like Nehru, some historians had the opportunity to write letters, such as Adam Michnik (1946–) in Poland; some of his letters were actually essays. Others kept notebooks, as Antonio Gramsci (1891–1937) did in Italy. Still others were able to conduct some historical research, as was Adolfo Gilly (1928–) in Mexico. Often, prisoners had to draw on the powers of memory. French historian Fernand Braudel (1902–1985) is said to have written from memory...
large portions of his work about the Mediterranean while interned in German camps in 1940–45.\textsuperscript{20} Thai historian Jit Phumisak (1930–1966) wrote many songs and essays while imprisoned for his Marxist views in 1957–64; most were smuggled out and published under various pen-names.\textsuperscript{21} In China, Gu Jiegang (1893–1980), a historian famous for his critical discussions of Chinese antiquity and described as "the first problem-centered historian to emerge from the more than two-thousand-year tradition of discipline-centered historiography in China",\textsuperscript{22} was branded a "reactionary academic authority" during the Cultural Revolution. His research was suppressed and he had to clean the desks and floors of the History Department of the Chinese Academy of Sciences. His library of 70,000 volumes was sealed. In spite of Red Guard inspections, he continued his research, relying mainly on his well-trained memory. He used a fountain pen and primary school copy books, which he placed on his children's desks when the Red Guards paid him a visit.\textsuperscript{23} African National Congress leader Govan Mbeki (1910– ), father of South Africa's current President, established a programme of political education and wrote two syllabi during his twenty-three-year prison term at Robben Island (1964–87). The first was a detailed history of the African National Congress, the second a materialist history of the development of human society. Both were based on material taken from newspapers and texts that he received as part of correspondence courses.\textsuperscript{24}

Outside prison, possibilities for resistance were naturally somewhat greater. For purposes of presentation, they are divided here in two categories (clandestine activities and open resistance) although, in reality, between them is a large zone of legal but dangerous activity. In the decades before 1990, numerous historians in the USSR,\textsuperscript{25} Poland, Czechoslovakia, and, to a lesser degree, other Central and Eastern European countries, preferred fighting censorship by publishing their manuscripts in small underground circles. An example is the \textsl{Politicheskii dnevnik} (Political Diary), a monthly magazine circulated secretly in the USSR by historian Roy Medvedev (1925–) among a small group of people between October 1964 and March 1971. One of its pieces was a 1965 letter on the duty to search for the historical truth, written by a group of prominent historians to the newspaper \textsl{Izvestiia}, which had refused to publish it.\textsuperscript{26} Many historians also taught the forbidden historical subjects at "flying universities", series of educational self-help lectures given at private homes. In Poland, similar clandestine classes had existed under tsarist and German occupation.\textsuperscript{27} In Czechoslovakia, plenty of manuscripts from the \textsl{samizdat} circuit were written while their authors were still in office before the 1968 Warsaw Pact invasion. The "normalisation" following the invasion led to the dismissal of hundreds of historians. The \textsl{samizdat} current gained strength there after the establishment of the human rights movement \textsl{Charta 77}. Large unofficial debates were held, like that in 1984 on \textsl{"The Right to History"}, which re-evaluated several episodes and persons in Czechoslovak history.\textsuperscript{28} In Slovakia, Jozef Jablonicky (1933–) had been constantly harassed for more than fifteen years, because he systematically revised the official truths on the 1944 Slovak National Uprising in his \textsl{samizdat} writings. The police repeatedly confiscated his manuscripts and documents, but each time he would stubbornly begin his research again.\textsuperscript{29} Elsewhere, in
Iran, hundreds of titles known as cap-e safid (with blank covers), including many previously banned books on the political history of Persia, were published between late 1977 and the final collapse of the monarchy in February 1979.30

Some historians illegally forced their way into archives, those suppliers of raw materials for historical research under perpetual danger of destruction or closure for political reasons. In some instances they were rescued from oblivion. Since 1976 at the age of twelve, Dmitry Yurasov (1964–) had been compiling a file of victims of the Stalinist repression from archival and published sources. Barely eighteen, while studying at the Moscow Historical Archives Institute in the evenings, he began working in several archives. He worked sixteen months at the Central State Archives in 1981–82 and twenty-two months in 1985–86 at the Supreme Court and Military Collegium archives, meanwhile secretly recording and smuggling out information. In late 1986 his activities were discovered and he was dismissed. The following year, he was summoned for questioning by the Committee of State Security (KGB) after his first public appearance, a speech about his work at a Moscow Writers' Union meeting. After an article in the underground magazine Glasnost, in which he denounced the burning of archives, he was again interrogated by the KGB. In September 1987, 150 notebooks and 15,000 to 20,000 index cards from a total of hundreds of thousands were confiscated from his apartment. Although frequently harassed, he began lecturing on Stalinism across the country after a television appearance in the autumn of 1988, acting as a liaison officer for Memorial, the "historical-enlightenment" and human rights society. In 1991 he accepted a position at the Communist Party archives. Since 1992, microfilmed copies of Memorial's archives have been deposited at the International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, and at Columbia University, New York, for security reasons.31 Another almost unbelievable case of retrieval took place in Brazil. From 1979 to 1985, a team of thirty-five lawyers working with the Catholic Church secretly photocopied and microfilmed the complete records of the Supreme Military Court and stored duplicates of them outside Brazil. These records contained the proceedings of all political cases tried in military courts in the 1964–79 dictatorship years. The copying and analysis of the materials was done in complete secrecy as an amnesty law approved in 1979 deterred investigation. In addition, if caught, the lawyers could be subject to reprisals and the archives in danger of destruction. The team maintained its anonymity even after the shocking and best-selling publication in 1985 of their analysis, Brasil: Nunca Mais (Brazil: Never Again).32

Others adopted legal means that, however, were dangerous and therefore implied much courage. Some historians vigorously preserved the highest scholarly standards in the face of likely censorship and, in so doing, strove to maintain their professional integrity. We think, in the first place, of that peculiar brand of destroyers of cherished historical conceptions: historians who doubted the authenticity of ancient myths and legends that supported the powers that be and endured much hostility and worse for it, such as Gu Jiegang, already mentioned, in China, and Tsuda Sokichi (1873–1961) in Japan before World War II, or Aleksandr Zimin (1920–1980) in the USSR after the war.33 In the second place, some defied censorship indirectly through the skilful use of Aesopian language and historical metaphors. In
In the 1920s and 1930s, Victor Ehrenberg (1891–1976), a historian at the German University of Prague, warned against the rise of the Nazis. He did so by lecturing about anti-Semitism, militarism, war and dictatorship in ancient Greece.\(^{34}\) In Iran, historian and sociologist Ali Shariati (1933–1977), the ideologue of the Iranian Revolution, criticised the Shah in his tremendously influential Tehran lectures in the 1970s. He compared the Shah to the Pharaoh or to Umayyad caliph Yazid. It took the secret police Savak six months to realise what was going on.\(^{35}\) Under martial law in Poland (1981–83), no discussion of current political affairs was possible. However, substitute historical polemics did occur. The 1861 introduction of martial law in the Polish Kingdom was discussed, as were the repercussions of the Targowica Confederation of 1792–93 when, ominously, Polish traitors had called in the Russian army.\(^{36}\) Nowhere did Aesopian writing reach such heights as in China, where for centuries it had been a frequently used technique. The most notorious case is perhaps that of Ming historian Wu Han (1909–1969). As early as the 1940s, when Jiang Jieshi (Chiang Kai-shek) and the Guomindang suppressed open discussion of contemporary problems, Wu made use of historical allegories in his short satirical essays as a form of indirect criticism. He and others would resume these satirical essays in the early 1960s, under Communist rule. In 1961 Wu also wrote a play, *Hai Rui Dismissed from Office*, in which the upright Ming official Hai Rui defends the peasants against bureaucratic arbitrariness, and is, as a result, dismissed. At the time of its appearance, the play created no great stir. Chairman Mao Zedong urged that Hai Rui's criticism be emulated. Later, Mao became convinced—erroneously, many believe today—that Wu's Hai Rui was in fact a historical symbol for Peng Dehuai, the Minister of Defence whom he had dismissed in July 1959 for his criticism of the Great Leap Forward policies. Thus, the play was read as an indirect criticism of Mao and Wu Han was attacked for having written it. In November 1965 he became the first victim of the Cultural Revolution; he died in 1969 as a result of prolonged ill-treatment and refusal of medical attention. Sadly, it was this experience that made his reputation immortal.\(^{37}\)

Acts of open resistance were of two kinds. Some did not bend for political intervention in their work and were dismissed. Others reoriented their work towards the eras and topics under embargo. Both phenomena occurred also under democratic regimes, especially during their less democratic episodes, or because their culture of secrecy hampered historical research. With regard to political intervention, Edward Shils reminded us that the most common sanction against academics was dismissal.\(^{38}\) Therefore, refusing to take a loyalty oath was a real act of courage and resistance. In Italy, historians Gaetano De Sanctis (1870–1957), Giorgio Levi Della Vida (1886–1967), Ernesto Buonaiuti (1881–1946) and art historian Lionello Venturi (1885–1961) were among the twelve professors of a total of 1,225 university lecturers who refused to take the Fascist Oath in November 1931.\(^{39}\) They were consequently dismissed.

In August 1950, the heyday of McCarthyism in the United States, historians John Caughey (1902–), Ludwig Edelstein (1902–1965), Ernst Kantorowicz (1895–1963), Charles Mowat and psychohistorian Erik Erikson (1902–1994) refused, on grounds of conscience, to sign the text of an anti-Communist loyalty oath circulated at the University of California, Berkeley. They, too, lost their jobs.\(^{40}\)
Many historians reoriented their attitude when the profession came under fire. They did take the oath, or withdrew into safer areas of research. A few, however, gradually shifted their attention and research towards the eras and topics under embargo. Historian Ienaga Saburo (1913–) sued the Japanese state in three different cases in order to protest the Ministry of Education's censorship of his history textbooks. The cases, begun in 1965, lasted more than thirty years and were partially won in 1997. Through the years, Ienaga had also begun writing about history textbook censorship. From the beginning, he received wide and organised support from many researchers and educators and from the Japan Teachers' Union. In 1992, an appeal for fairness in the textbook cases had been signed by five hundred Japanese historians. In March 2001 Ienaga was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. In Czechoslovakia, historians Vilem Precan (1933–) and Milan Otahal (1928–) compiled an illegal Black Book about the first week of the August 1968 Warsaw Pact occupation. In the autumn of 1968, they distributed 2,900 copies of the book before it was withdrawn. Both were dismissed and indicted on charges of subversion. Precan became the historian who documented in detail the persecution of his profession, risking police reprisal and punishment. In 1975 he wrote an open letter to the participants of the Fourteenth International Congress of Historical Sciences in San Francisco, a lashing complaint against "normalisation". The day after the Congress, he was interrogated by the police. As an exile in West Germany since 1976, he established an archive of samizdat manuscripts. In 1985 British historian and civil servant Clive Ponting (1946–), acquitted of charges that he had disclosed Falklands/Malvinas War documents without authorisation, immediately began to study the notorious culture of official secrecy in Great Britain. He published the results in such books as *The Right To Know* and *Secrecy in Britain*. In all the cases summarily depicted here, historians served the historical truth in one way or another, and took pride in it.
Edward Shils believed that the prevailing attitude towards academic freedom among university teachers was indifference. This is only partially true, there being examples from repressive and non-repressive countries that contradict this opinion. The most obvious signs of insider solidarity were the petition and the letter of protest. In India, Japan, Colombia and the United States, the authors of secondary-school history textbooks threatened with censorship were defended by petitions from academics, teachers and students. In 1982 thirty Polish historians protested to President Henryk Jablonski, also a historian, against the detention of medievalist and 1997–2000 Minister of Foreign Affairs Bronislaw Geremek (1932–) who had gone on hunger strike in prison for fifteen days. In 1987 thirty-six professors, including historians, signed an open letter calling for an end to political interference in their work and citing the Geremek case. In Romania, prominent intellectuals protested the massive demolition of historical monuments in the 1980s. Historian Andrei Pippidi (1948–) sent a letter to several Romanian journals in which he denounced the demolition of the house of Nicolae Iorga (1871–1940), one of Romania’s most famous historians and former Prime Minister, killed by the Iron Guard in 1940.

Stronger actions involving personal risks were not always avoided. Italian historian Federico Chabod (1901–1960), future president of the International Committee of Historical Sciences, actively supported his colleagues who fell out of grace after the Fascist race laws of November 1938. Elsewhere, historians resigned in protest against the treatment of their colleagues. Such was the case in the United States with Arthur Lovejoy (1873–1962), who in 1900 left Stanford University over a famous academic freedom case in which an economist was dismissed. Fifteen years later, he became co-founder and first secretary of the American Association of University Professors. Charles Beard (1874–1948) resigned from Columbia University in 1917, in protest against the failure to re-appoint one faculty member and the dismissal of two others who opposed United States intervention in World War I. Sergio Buarque de Holanda (1902–1982) resigned his chair in São Paulo, Brazil, in 1969 to protest the military government's mass dismissal of staff. Jan Vansina (1929–), the doyen of oral history, resigned in 1971 in Zaire (now Congo) to protest the disappearance of three of his licence students when Lovanium University, Kinshasa, was closed.

As deans and rectors, some historians defied violations of the autonomy of the university. When Johan Huizinga (1872–1945) was rector of Leiden University, the Netherlands, in 1933, he informed the visiting Nazi historian Johann von Leers that he was persona non grata at the university because he had written an anti-Semitic pamphlet. The Syrian Constantine Zurayq (1909–) resigned in 1952 after the military had invaded the campus in Damascus. In 1962 Marcello Caetano—Portugal's future Premier—resigned as Lisbon University's rector following a clash between students opposing the regime and the political police, and in protest against the latter's invasion of the campus. The Argentinian Enrique Barba (1909–1988), alone and unarmed, expelled Onganía's police along with their dogs from the campus of the Universidad Nacional of La Plata in the late 1960s. In Warsaw medievalist Henryk
Samsonowicz (1930–), elected rector of Warsaw University, was dismissed in 1982 because he disagreed with the "verification" of university staff (a screening process requiring "political conversations" and the signing of "loyalty declarations"). One last case not fitting the category of deans and rectors, but similar, deserves mention. Etched into the Hungarian collective memory is an act of jurist and historian Istvan Bibo (1911–1979), a Minister of State in 1956. When Soviet troops encircled the parliament building on 4 November 1956, he was the only one to remain at his post, writing a famous appeal for passive resistance. Bibo was sentenced to life imprisonment, but amnestied in 1963.

A wider circle of resistance is constituted by the struggle historians were engaged in as peace and human rights activists. Ludwig Quidde (1858–1941) gained worldwide recognition when awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. Quidde was a German historian, excluded from the profession in 1894 after publishing a highly successful book on Caligula with satirical allusions to Kaiser Wilhelm II. After the boycott, he became a leader of the international peace movement, which earned him the prize in 1927. He spent two spells in prison, one for lèse majesté in 1896, and one for his revelations on the Schwarze Reichswehr in 1924. In 1933 he went into exile in Geneva, where he died in 1941.

There is a rich record of cases of historians involved in human rights work at the risk of dismissal and prosecution. In 1904–05, Belgian historian Henri Grégoire (1881–1964) was the secretary of an official commission of inquiry into King Leopold II's misgovernment of the Congo Free State (1885–1908). As the commission's critical report was not well received by the King, Grégoire was obliged, according to some sources, to leave Belgium and returned only in 1909. He was active in the anti-German resistance during World War I; during World War II, already a Byzantinist of international fame, he helped gather French and Belgian refugee scholars into the New School for Social Research in New York. German historian and archivist Veit Valentin (1885–1947) was a pacifist and active defender of the democratic constitutional state during the Weimar Republic, and headed the history department of the German League for Human Rights. He was dismissed twice, in 1917 and 1933, the year he went into exile. After the war, he returned to Germany to help prepare the Nuremberg trials. In 1960 Pierre Vidal-Naquet (1930–), then a lecturer in ancient history at the University of Caen, France, was suspended. He had signed the "Declaration on the Right of Insubordination in the War in Algeria", a manifesto issued during a campaign against torture in the North African colony. In 1963 he published a work about the colonial torturers and in later years incessantly opposed Holocaust deniers. Soviet historian Pyotr Yakir (1923–1982) spent seventeen years of his youth in prisons and camps. He defended many colleagues, including Aleksandr Nekrich (1920–1993), whose book June 22, 1941 was beleaguered, and Andrei Amalrik (1938–1980), author of the essay Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984. Yakir was a leading member of the Action Group for the Defence of Civil Rights in the USSR, founded in 1969. Between June 1972 and September 1974 he was in prison, where, broken, he cooperated with the KGB and named names. Ostracised by dissident circles upon his release, he died...
isolated in 1982.\textsuperscript{66} Between 1975 and 1987, historian and literary specialist Sergei Grigoryants (1947–) spent nine years in Soviet jails because he had published \textit{samizdat} human rights bulletins.\textsuperscript{67} The original charter of the Czechoslovak human rights organisation \textit{Charta 77} was signed by forty historians—one sixth of all signatories.\textsuperscript{68} In Chile historian Pablo Arturo Fuenzalida Zegers, harassed for months as a member of the Human Rights Commission, was arrested on 10 December 1981 (Human Rights Day) and tortured for five days.\textsuperscript{69} Afghan historian Hasan Kakar (1932–), head of the History Department at Kabul University, was imprisoned for five years in 1982 for his membership in a campus group that suggested peaceful solutions to the armed conflict with the USSR and protested the arbitrary arrest of a number of teachers and students.\textsuperscript{70} In 1986–87 Cuban historian Ariel Hidalgo Guillén (?1945–), serving a prison term for "enemy propaganda" because he had criticised the regime in a manuscript, became the vice-president of a human rights organisation while in jail and began hunger strikes to ameliorate prison conditions.\textsuperscript{71} In May 1989 South African social anthropologist and historian David Webster (1945–1989) was fatally shot in Johannesburg because (among other things) as a member of the Detainees' Parents Support Committee, he was engaged in research into death squads.\textsuperscript{72} In May 1992 Bosnian historian Fadila Memisevic (?1940–) and others founded a research center in Zenica to document war crimes in Bosnia. Unable to return from Geneva after presenting a list of 1,350 perpetrators to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in 1993, she continued her work in Göttingen, Germany, and provided the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia with much valuable information.\textsuperscript{73} In June 1994 Brazilian historian Hermógenes Da Silva Almeida Filho was shot dead in Rio de Janeiro, apparently in retaliation for his investigation into massacres of street children.\textsuperscript{74} In 1996 Croatian historian Ivo Banac (1947–), a member of the Croatian Helsinki Committee, was labeled an "internal enmy" by President Franjo Tudjman (also a historian) because he had pleaded for the repatriation of Croatian Serbs.\textsuperscript{75}

Once in exile, historians sometimes became human rights activists. In 1966–67 Yugoslav historian Vladimir Dedijer (1914–1990), who had fallen into disgrace in the 1950s and moved to the United States, served as president of sessions of the Russell International War Crimes Tribunal, a commitment he continued after his return to Yugoslavia.\textsuperscript{76} The Algerian \textit{Front de Libération Nationale} leader Mohammed Harbi (1933–) spent eight years in prison and under house arrest for criticising Boumédiène's 1965 coup, then escaped to France, became a historian in Paris, and was involved in human rights campaigns for the Islamic world.\textsuperscript{77}

In countries that toppled their dictators and began a process of transition towards democracy, opportunities for commitment gradually increased. There and then, newly installed official truth commissions were writing, as it were, a first draft of the dictatorship's history. These commissions acted as archive-producers and protohistorians. Logically, some historians participated in them, such as Gonzalo Vial Correa, a former Minister of Education under Augusto Pinochet in Chile,\textsuperscript{78} or Joan Kakwenziri, a historian from Makerere University in Uganda. Bernd Faulenbach (1943–), Hermann
Weber (1922–) and several other historians served as experts or eye witnesses in two German truth commissions. Some experts and researchers for the El Salvador commission had received a historical training.

Historians also participated in civic groups, investigating past abuses. In the late 1930s, French historian Lucien Febvre (1878–1956), co-founder of the *Annales* and an active anti-Fascist, was the president of a commission of enquiry into the April 1937 destruction of Guérnica, Spain. ⁷⁹ In the USSR, Yuri Afanasiev (1934–) and Medvedev were among the sixteen founders of *Memorial* in 1987. Others, such as Yurasov and Arseni Roginsky (†1947–), where collaborators from the start. ⁸⁰ In the final days of the Ceausescu regime in Romania, on 25 December 1989, four Romanian historians wrote a declaration which, signed by thirteen historians, was given to the press (access to the television was refused). It condemned the historical lies of the former regime and proposed the outline of a new programme for Romanian historiography. ⁸¹ It could not be ascertained whether historians took part in initiatives such as *Recuperación de la Memoria Histórica* (Recuperation of the Historical Memory) in Guatemala, or *Direitos Humanos e Memória Popular* (Human Rights and Popular Memory) in Brazil, but at the University of Malawi a *History Project* was started to collect testimonies about the Banda era (1964–94) for use by a future truth commission. ⁸² Also worth mentioning in the context of *Vergangenheitsbewältigung* is the fact that in 1991, the doyen of Afrikaner historiography, Floors van Jaarsveld (1922–1995), publicly apologised for the distorted way in which he had for four decades depicted South African history. ⁸³ Today, official and unofficial truth commissions are so successful that the underlying principle, the right to know the truth about past abuses (and hence the right to history) is increasingly recognised in international law. This principle of obligatory investigation of abuses *even after a change of regime* was rapidly taken up by human rights observers. In 1995 United Nations Special Rapporteur on States of Emergency Leandro Despouy called the principle "the right to truth" and "a rule of customary international law", and made a plea to recognise it as non-derogable. ⁸⁴
III SOLIDARITY ON THE PART OF OUTSIDERS

Many historians living in countries and times without threats to their freedom or lives tried to apply the difficult principle of universality of human rights to the core right of the historical profession: freedom of information and expression. This principle meant that wherever a colleague's freedom was threatened, one's own was as well, and conversely, that historians enjoying freedom had an obligation to use it on behalf of those who did not possess it. In short, the universality principle was translated into international solidarity. At the national level, this solidarity assumed many shapes. First, several historians wrote or taught about the controversial aspects, blank spots and falsified histories of tyrannical countries. Second, they wrote or taught about academic freedom, either in general or in response to concrete threats. Third, petition and letter writing campaigns were launched against the detention of their colleagues. In the case of Belgian historians Henri Pirenne and Paul Frédéricq, arrested for resisting the reopening of Ghent University by the German authorities as a Flemish university in 1916, even President Woodrow Wilson (himself a historian) twice requested the Kaiser to release them. Other campaigns, too numerous to describe here, included those in favour of Luis Vitale (1927–) in Chile, Ernest Wamba-dia-Wamba (1942–) in Zaire (Congo), Amalrik, Yakir, and Roginsky in the USSR, and Mushirul Hasan in India. Fourth, the tragic fate of historians in exile was sometimes alleviated by the welcome their colleagues prepared for them. Historians in Mexico and other Latin American countries helped their colleagues who had fled Spain during or after the Civil War (1936–39). Many of the refugee historians from Nazi Germany were given assistance in the United States, the United Kingdom and elsewhere. To name just one of plenty examples, archivist Ernst Posner (1892–1980) was able to escape Nazi Germany in 1939 with the help of such American historians as Eugene Anderson, Waldo Leland, Merle Curti and Solon Buck. He went on to become the dean of American archivists.

At the international level of action, official and unofficial initiatives should be distinguished. The International Committee of Historical Sciences (CISH), founded in 1926, has always been keenly aware of both the crucial importance and the problematic character of the freedom of historians in many parts of the world, but was not always able or willing to campaign for individual cases. The discussions about this aspect of the committee's work were unavoidably heightened time and again when the doyen of historians in a particular country—often a CISH member—or other prominent historians became the target of persecution, or when the entire profession in a particular country came under fire. In such cases, CISH was presented with a dilemma: it had to either speak out in order to help the historians under attack or remain silent in order to avoid conflict with the official delegation of the new, abusive regime that usually tried to downplay the situation. At stake were the neutrality, international character and very existence of CISH on the one hand and the fate of individual persecuted historians on the other. Despite the lack of official collective intervention in individual cases, several CISH bureau
members made individual *ex officio* efforts on behalf of their endangered colleagues, such as Austrian Alfons Dopsch (1868–1953) in 1935 and Hungarian Domokos Kosary (1913–) in 1958. Kosary, a professor of history at the University of Budapest, had been dismissed as director of the Academy of Sciences History Institute in 1949 and sent to work as a librarian at the Agrarian Sciences University in Godollo. He participated in the 1956 Revolution, and in 1958 was arrested and sentenced to four or five years' imprisonment because he had compiled a documentation about the Revolution and deposited it at the university library. He was released in 1960 and later entirely rehabilitated; then-CISH president Chabod and secretary-general Michel François (1906–) had intervened on his behalf. Another telling case was the attempt by some delegations to boycott the International Congress of Historical Sciences in Moscow in 1970 because of the pogrom of historians unchained by the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia.

In October 1995 a small international *Network of Concerned Historians* (NCH) was established in the wake of the Eighteenth International Congress of Historical Sciences, to provide a bridge between historians and the human rights movement. NCH participated in the urgent actions for historians issued by six recognised international human rights organisations. In 1996 it campaigned for two Albanese historians, Elvira Shapplo and Vladimir Qiriaqi, who had published a photograph of former Communist ruler Enver Hoxha in a guide book, and for former history student Wang Dan (?1969–) in China, a leader of the 1989 Tiananmen Square protests; in 1998 for Rwandese college director Philomène Mukabarali (?1942–), who apparently possessed leaflets expressing support for the (pre–1959) monarchy of Rwanda, for Burmese authors Ko Aung Tun (1967–) and U Myo Htun, imprisoned for writing a history of the Burmese student movement, for Palestinian history student Wael Ali Farraj (?1972–), detained on the assumption that he supported an Islamist group, and for Mexicans Andres Aubry, a historian and anthropologist, and Angélica Inda, an archivist, intimidated and harassed for their assistance in the peace talks between the government and the Zapatistas; in 1999 for Ethiopians Moti Biyya (?1957–), Garuma Bekele (?1960–), and Tesfaye Deressa (?1959–), three writers strongly interested in the Oromo past, detained for their peaceful activism on behalf of the Oromo minority, for Guatemalan Bishop Juan Gerardi (?1923–1998), assassinated days after he had presented the report of the *Project Recuperation of the Historical Memory* about human rights violations committed during the 1960–96 civil war, and for Palestinian history professor Abdulsittar Qassem (?1949–), who had signed a petition criticising the government; in 2000 for Chinese historian and librarian Song Yongyi (1949–), arrested for his research on the Cultural Revolution. In addition, NCH annually forwarded to its members historical news as reported by the six human rights organisations.
CONCLUSION: A TRADITION TO STRENGTHEN

Although human rights organisations emphasise that campaigns waged by colleagues of the victims of human rights violations are most effective, it should never be forgotten that many outside the historical profession have made efforts on behalf of the persecuted historians, since they applied the principle of universality not just to their colleagues but to all human beings. Moreover, novelists, playwrights, journalists, storytellers, and singers often took care of the historical truth, keeping it alive when the collective memory was in danger because the silenced and silent historians were not able to refute the heralded truths of official historical propaganda. Even in the darkest hours of tyranny, the distorted past was challenged by versions whispered at home or written down by those who replaced the silenced historians. At times, these alternative versions were equally distorting, but they were alternative, and through them the flame of plurality continued to burn.

In this tribute to courageous historians from vastly different countries on all continents, the basic principles of the historian's ethic become visible. A precondition for the work of historians is that they defend their human rights, particularly the freedom of information and expression central to their profession. Without these freedoms, historians cannot discharge their first professional obligation—the pursuit of historical truth—nor their social obligation towards past, present and future society. When we look back at the twentieth century as historians and as human beings, the record of examples of commitment and integrity inspires hope and pride: despite the vulnerability of the historical profession, there is a stubborn tradition of freedom among historians to be aware of, to care for, and to strengthen.
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