

THE DIASPORA EFFECT:
CULTURAL HYBRIDISATION IN ITALIAN JEWISH PHILOSOPHER
RENATO TREVES AND SPANISH REPUBLICAN ESSAYIST
FRANCISCO AYALA IN ARGENTINA (1938-1944)

GIULIA QUAGGIO *

ABSTRACT

Following Peter Burke's suggestions about the history of diasporas and their intricate interplay with knowledge and Michele Espagne's theorisation about "cultural transfer", this article aims to delve into the channels, personal contacts and distinctive carriers through which the European cultural resistance during the Second World War transited and transplanted its ideas from the homeland to the host-land. Notably, the article explores the transcultural lives and intellectual hybridisation between the Italian Jewish exile Treves and the Spanish Republican *émigré* Ayala within the polarised context of Argentina before Juan Domingo Perón's rule (1946-1955) through enquiry into the contents and cross-border scope of the essay *A Double Political Experience* (1944). After considering the experience of European intellectual exiles in Argentina and the complex creation process of this essay, the article examines three major points: the debate between the two European exiles about freedom, antifascism and the interpretation of the origins of fascism; their idea of nation and cosmopolitanism; and finally their conversion to the discipline of sociology as the more effective intellectual tool to be deployed for the democratic reconciliation and liberal reshaping of post-war Europe. I will argue that for both scholars the exile experience represented a turning point in the assessment and processing of their knowledge on the post-war order. On the threshold of the Cold War era, it globalised and hybridised their intellectual approach to a 'third Europe', neither liberal nor socialist but 'liberal socialist'. The article also helps to provide a more nuanced interpretation of European intellectual resistance during the Second World War and takes into account the often-overlooked agency of American intellectual actors in its narrative and shaping.

Keywords: Transnational Anti-Fascism, Intellectual Exile, Cosmopolitanism, Post-War Europe, Liberal Socialism, Argentina.

* Universidad Complutense Madrid. Address for correspondence: giulquag@ucm.es.

In February 1988, the Spanish sociologist, essayist and future Cervantes Prize winner Francisco Ayala reminded his readers of *El País*, the most widely read newspaper during the local transition to democracy: “[...] in these days I have received the text of a paper [...] by Professor Renato Treves on Italian and Spanish anti-fascism in Argentine exile. Memories of a debate” and he promptly added “the debate to which he refers developed in Buenos Aires, when we had both just arrived in Argentina from our respective exiles. [...] It was a friendly debate [...] and although these were all vital issues, it only developed on a strictly intellectual level” (Ayala 1988). Similarly, the Italian philosopher and sociologist of law, Renato Treves, only a few weeks earlier, had explained the roots of this intense cultural dialectic between European refugees in Latin America during a conference at the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy at the University of Naples (Treves 1990: 85-95).

Treves, of Jewish descent, opted to leave Italy in 1938 after the first racist measures were made official by Mussolini’s regime which, at the time, was dangerously close to aligning itself with Nazi Germany’s politics (Zimmerman 2005). Emigration from Italy, a decision made by around 6,000 Italian Jews (Capristo 2013), appeared to many as a concrete necessity in the face of the dispossession of civil rights and the desire to resume their careers or to find employment that would allow them to survive materially (De Felice 1961, Capristo 2002, Toscano 2019). On the one hand, Treves, because of his racial origins, was excluded from a tenured position at the University of Urbino in 1938 (Nitsch 2015). On the other hand, Ayala, who had actively supported the legitimacy of the Second Republic as the Secretary of the Spanish Embassy in Prague during the Civil War, and lost his father and younger brother in the fratricidal conflict, was forced to flee with his wife and little daughter to Latin America in 1939 (Rodríguez Cela 1998, García Montero 2009). In his case, like 5,000 other Spanish scholars, the ultimate goal was to save himself and his loved ones from the violent nationalist retaliation (Abellán 1976, Caudet 2005, Pagni 2011).

The debate between the two exiles originated with an invitation to Treves by a multifaceted intellectual network of Italian liberal-socialist anti-fascists in New York and Boston headed by the young Jewish architect Bruno Zevi and his wife Tullia Calabi (Bello 2019). They wanted Treves to explore the distinctive intellectual grievances about liberal democracy before the Spanish Civil War and the cultural orientation of Republican refugees in the Americas through the fresh perspective of Ayala’s essay *The Problem of Liberalism* (Ayala 1941, Cerezo Galán 2006: 17-57). This transnational intellectual exchange on civil liberty, democracy, socialism, weakness and strength of liberalism and its connections with youth and antifascism was finally published in 1944 as a brief co-authored essay *Una doble experiencia*

política: España e Italia (A Double Political Experience: Spain and Italy) by the Centre for Social Studies of the College of Mexico, a cultural institution created in Mexico City to provide employment for Republican intellectuals forced to flee Francoist Spain (Valerio Pie 2015, Lida 2019).¹

As outlined by these brief editorial notes, the intellectual dialectic between Ayala and Treves represents a good empirical micro case study of the encounter/clash of antifascist ideas among different European cultural migrations during the world wars in territories across the Atlantic Ocean. Following Peter Burke's suggestions about the history of diasporas and their imbricate interplay with knowledge, this article aims to delve into the channels, personal contacts and distinctive carriers through which the European cultural resistance during the Second World War transited and transplanted its ideas from the homeland to the host-land. This displaced knowledge triggered a tangled dissemination, mediation and hybridisation of insights, disciplines and political cultures (Burke 2017). In addition, the article draws on the scholarship of Michele Espagne, Michel Werner and Matthias Middell on 'cultural transfer'. It aims to examine cultural formation from a perspective other than the seeking of national demarcation within the field of comparative history and it investigates the varying forms of reduction, reinterpretation and interconnection of foreign cultural elements (Espagne and Werner 1988, Middell 2016). Without undermining the traumatic effects of the harsh experience of exile, the article focuses on the positive cultural consequences of expatriation, that is to say, the 'silver lining of the dark cloud' or 'the blessing of adversity', as defined by the anthropologist Anton Blok (Blok 2017). Indeed, European cultural migration played a major role in the movement, transfer and creation of new democratic knowledge on the threshold of the Cold War and in the defining of a 'transatlantic anti-fascism', namely, a political and cultural thinking in contrast to fascism, which, although originating in Europe, was in turn strongly modified and affected by the same rhetoric in the Americas and simultaneously brought about cultural changes in both regions (García 2016, Seidman 2018).

Because of its numerical breadth and strong cultural impact on Western sciences, the most commonly studied case has undoubtedly been the 'great exodus' of the Jewish scholars who fled Hitler's Third Reich in the 1930s. They were mostly Jews – intellectuals and academics from Central Europe – who were forced to leave, en masse, from Germany, Austria, Poland and Czechoslovakia (Krohn 1993, Ash and Sollner 1996, Palmier 2006, Lamberti

¹ I will refer to the pages of the last edition of *A Double Political Experience*, Treves and Ayala's essay (1944), edited by Quaggio in 2017, throughout the entire article.

2006) as a consequence of Nazi ethnic politics. Nevertheless, it is now of considerable interest to focus on groups of European exiles who remain on the margins of studies about the interconnection between diasporas and knowledge, as is the case of Jewish migration from Fascist Italy. This culturally displaced group often overlapped with the dynamics of anti-fascist political exiles (*fuoriuscitismo*) (Camurri 2009, Capristo 2010). Treves was not a *fuoriuscito* for his anti-fascist militancy and Ayala was not a pure intellectual as a result of his political engagement with the Spanish Republic.

As historian Burke suggests, leaving the ‘illustrious immigrants’ aside for once and taking into consideration the outcomes of promising second rank scholars, such as young Ayala and Treves in the 1940s, appears to be highly advantageous with a view to understanding to what extent exile represented a form of “unsentimental education”, which triggered “new insights and de-provincialized many European scholars” (Burke 2017). Last but not least, the analysis of the micro case of Ayala and Treves could enrich both a recent strand of studies that delves into the empirical value of systematic cross-comparison between different social groups and institutions of academic refugee scholars in the 1930s and 1940s (Goddeeris 2007, Faber 2009, Acle-Kreysing 2016, Pries 2017), and pioneer investigations on exile and antifascism at a transnational level (Bechelloni 2001 and 2009, Groppo 2002, Deschamps 2007).

Notably, this article explores the transcultural lives and intellectual cross-fertilisation between the Italian Jewish exile Treves and the Spanish Republican *émigré* Ayala within the polarised social, political and cultural context of Argentina before Juan Domingo Perón’s rule (1946-1955), through enquiry into the contents and cross-border scope of the essay *A Double Political Experience*. After considering the experience of European intellectual exiles in Argentina and the complex creation process of this essay, the article examines three major points: the debate between the two European exiles about freedom, antifascism and the interpretation of the origins of fascism; their idea of nation and cosmopolitanism; and finally their conversion to the discipline of sociology as the more effective intellectual tool to be deployed for the democratic reconciliation and liberal reshaping of post-war Europe. Through these points, I will argue that for both scholars the exile experience represented a turning point in the assessment and processing of their knowledge on the post-war order. On the threshold of the Cold War era, it globalised and hybridised their intellectual approach to a ‘third Europe’, neither liberal nor socialist but ‘liberal socialist’. The article also helps to provide a more nuanced interpretation of European intellectual resistance during the Second World War and takes into account the often-overlooked agency of American intellectual actors in its narrative and shaping (Wilkinson 1981).

1. GLOBAL LIVES IN A BIPOLAR ARGENTINA

The intellectual friendship between Ayala and Treves was no accident. According to sociologist Bourdieu, among the social conditions that foster the international circulation of ideas, some kind of mutual spiritual empathy between scholars crossing borders is required (Bourdieu 2002). Although Ayala and Treves came from different geographical and cultural areas in Southern Europe, they displayed certain similarities of mind even before they met. Firstly, they belonged to the same European generation that was forced to react to the eruption of the masses in the public arena, to the moral crisis of the First World War, the subsequent rise of fascism or authoritarian regimes and seizure of power by Hitler. Ayala was born in Granada in 1906 and Treves in 1907 in Turin. When they arrived in Argentina, between 1938 and 1939, they were young academics in their late thirties who, with obstinacy, aspired to continue their professional careers and, consequently, exhibited a similar and pragmatic interest in the search for new academic opportunities. They were part of the same multifaceted cohort of European scholars who had come to terms with the social, political and economic changes of the so-called crisis of modernity and the interrelated distrust in the effectiveness of parliamentary democracy (Boggs 1993, Mazower 1998). Madrid and Turin, the cities, in which they were educated, had experienced lacerating social and cultural transformations: uncontrolled urban development, conflicting dynamics of religious secularisation, progressive configuration of the middle and intellectual classes, tensions between emerging groups that clashed with the persistence of strong conservative and patronage interests alongside a heated ideologisation of the masses (Juliá 1994, Tranfaglia 1998). Notably, like many Jewish scholars who fled to the United States from the Weimar Republic's universities, both intellectuals had already expressed, before their exile, the urgency to nurture a sociological approach with a view to understanding the conflicting phenomena of modernity and expanding mass culture. At the same time they both conducted their academic analysis with the civic engagement of highlighting the strengths of social democracy and liberalism in defeat throughout Europe.

Secondly, Ayala and Treves were educated in two countries, Spain and Italy, where parliamentary liberalism had a similar history of precariousness, uncertainty and corruption (Sapelli 1995). Nonetheless, they faced different traumatic and radical cultural experiences: on the one hand, after a period of progressive extension of democratic freedom, a violent civil war which dramatically interrupted the development of Spanish liberal democracy in the aftermath of the Primo de Rivera's military dictatorship; on the

other, after the shock of the First World War, in which Spain did not take part, an educational development within the Fascist regime with the consequent lack of freedom, increased censorship and a progressive approach to Hitler's racist policies. Furthermore, Ayala and Treves were both young scholars who, before their exiles, had moved within the influential field of legal science that, during the interwar period, treated the most modern doctrines of public law and its links with current politics and changing society. Namely, Ayala had been a pupil of jurist and sociologist Adolfo Posada, who brought him closer to the principles of Krause's thought, that is to say, a harmonious and tolerant vision of society, at the turn of idealism and materialism (Ureña and Lázaro 1999) and a progressive Hispano-Americanism that rejected the usual paternalistic and colonial Spanish schemes in South-America and discerned in it the opportunity to regenerate Spain (Escudero 1996). Ayala also trained in close contact with the philosopher José Ortega y Gasset and in so doing achieved a profound trust in the value of civil liberties and in the intellectual's ethical obligation, as a sort of special community guide, to publicly disseminate his rational achievements against an alleged spiritual dehumanisation and moral pauperisation caused by mass culture (Ribes Leiva 2007: 101-122). Most importantly, Ayala admired the humanist socialism of Fernando de los Ríos, professor of political law, who strongly criticised the capitalist system for its anti-human implications, but simultaneously rejected Marxist materialism because, in his opinion, it generated an excessively mechanistic and economist vision of life (De los Ríos 1926). These two points, that is to say, the strenuous defence of the principle of formal freedom in the face of a perceived dehumanised mass society and the search for social and humanist corrections to the supposed moral barbarity, caused by both liberal capitalism and Marxist materialism, are consistent with the cultural milieu of both young scholars before their exile. More generally, this cultural milieu was in line with several multifaceted contemporary revisionist and anti-Marxist tendencies of European socialist thought, that could be partially detected for instance in Henri De Man, Gaetano Salvemini, Rodolfo Mondolfo, who was also forced to exile in Argentina, and Franz Oppenheimer, and especially in British ethical socialists like George Douglas, Howard Cole and Richard Henry Tawney (Degl'Innocenti 1999, Bastow and Martin 2003: 72-92). Thus, these same cultural affinities were implemented and cross-fertilised by domestic socialist and liberal circles in the host-land.

For his part, Treves was educated within the lively cultural dynamics of Turin during the interwar period (D'Orsi 2000). He studied with the philosopher Gioele Solari who led him to merge positivist socialism with idealism, and with economist Luigi Einaudi who trained him on the absolute inviolability of the private sphere (Atienza and Ruiz Manero 1990). Despite

its progressive fascistisation, the cultural climate of Turin academia in the 1920s and 1930s mostly expressed a common devotion both to the liberal philosopher Benedetto Croce, editor, in 1925, of the Manifesto of the Anti-Fascist Intellectuals in response to the Manifesto of the Fascist Intellectuals by Giovanni Gentile (Schnapp, Sears and Stampino 2000: 304-307) and Piero Gobetti, a radical-liberal and non-dogmatic intellectual inspired both by critical Marxist Antonio Gramsci and the idea of freedom as a collective good (Martin 2008). In addition to the philosopher Norberto Bobbio, Treves' closest friends at the University of Turin were Mario Andreis and Aldo Garosci, the young local promoters of the antifascist resistance movement Justice and Freedom – *Giustizia e Libertà* (GL) founded by non-Marxist socialist Carlo Rosselli (Bagnoli 1996, Calabrò 2009). Notably, Treves met historian Nello Rosselli, Carlo's brother, at the end of 1928, during the writing of his thesis on the utopian socialist Henri de Saint-Simon. In doing so, he approached Carlo Rosselli's proposal of liberal and reformist socialism: in Carlo's opinion, it was necessary to separate the ethical-political perspective of liberalism from the economic one. Consequently, liberalism was not to be rejected as a whole: it had to be updated and regenerated in a revolutionary way, embracing disadvantaged social classes that should now become the main trigger of a non-violent path to deepening civil and social liberties (Urbinati 2017). Furthermore, as had happened to many other young European anti-fascist intellectuals, when his friend Garosci left for Spain in 1936 as a volunteer for the Republican front of the Civil War, Treves' romantic admiration for the resilience of the Second Spanish Republic to Nationalists was ignited (Hobsbawm 2007).

Both Ayala and Treves completed their studies in the cultural turmoil of the Weimar Republic between 1929 and 1932: Ayala studied with legal scholar Herman Heller in Berlin and Treves in Cologne with teacher of constitutional law Hans Kelsen who put his theories into practice in the Republican Austrian Constitution enacted in 1920 (Ingenschay 2009, Treves 1990:181-195). In other words, the two young professors witnessed firsthand the dramatic legal disintegration of Weimar Germany's parliamentary and liberal democracy and, at the same time, took advantage of the civic example of two legal scholars who, although from different positions, had tried to implement democratic freedom through the example of reformist socialism (Caldwell and Scheurman 2003). When Ayala and Treves arrived in Argentina before the Second World War, they encountered a country as politically and culturally polarised as Europe: they implemented their initial liberal-socialist commitment within a highly biased Argentinean environment in their essay *A Double Political Experience*.

Despite strict migration policies and growing local conservative nationalism, Buenos Aires remained a favourite destination for European refu-

gees (Schwarzstein 2001). Since 1930 Argentina had been living through a period of social unrest: among intellectuals, liberal doctrine still enjoyed consensus albeit not restricted by rigid ideological definitions, but anti-democratic and authoritarian nationalist currents were spreading rapidly (Nállim 2012). The European cultural and social divisions, exacerbated by the Spanish Civil War, influenced local intellectual quarrels; moreover, intellectual dissatisfaction was nurtured by the fact that Argentina, shortly before the outbreak of the Second World War, had been governed for almost ten years by conservative governments for which electoral fraud was a common instrument on their agenda. Nevertheless, European fascism seduced neither the governments of General Augustín Justo (1932-1938) nor those of Roberto M. Ortiz (1938-1942), later replaced by Ramón Castillo (1942-1943) (Fiorucci 2006). As the number of sympathisers for Italian Fascism or Francoist puritanical Catholic authoritarianism increased steadily, similarly the Argentinean nationalist movement was penetrating all those parts of society in search of an alleged internal enemy that could easily be considered as the major cause of the unrestrained economic and opaque social changes Argentina was experiencing. Some historians detect in this domestic nationalism a special form of 'creole fascism' that drew different Argentinean social components by means of a powerful Catholic ideological apparatus (Finchelstein 2010, Pasetti 2019).

According to Bourdieu (2002) and theorists on travelling ideas (Said 2000), local intellectual interest in foreign authors contributes to creating alliances and strengthening threatened ideas. Moreover, foreign authors are often exploited with the aim of belittling domestic authors. Following such methodological suggestions, it is possible to interpret the concern that the liberal Argentinean intellectual elites displayed towards Ayala and Treves and more generally towards scholars fleeing from Nazi-Fascist Europe as a means to making their domestic position against conservatism and authoritarian nationalism more influential. At the time, American intellectuals of all sorts were eager to learn first-hand what was happening in a burning Europe along the lines of a long-time relationship of Argentine culture with the European world of ideas. This entangled connection dates back from the late eighteenth century, increased with liberalism in the nineteenth century and internationalised in the interwar period. Local events began to be read through the biased lens of European political events and the heated ideological clash between fascism and anti-fascism (Bisso 2016: 133-151). The Second World War warmed the hearts even more: Argentina's neutrality in the conflict appeared to many liberal intellectuals as tacit support for Nazism and proof of how much fascism was already a domestic problem. As a result, Argentine liberal intellectuals – and with such a broad concept it is possible to include a flexible cultural identity from socialists to several

communists – generated an effective network of solidarity to protect European scholar *émigrés*.

The arrival in Argentina of Ayala and Treves was facilitated by such domestic anxieties about an alleged local fascism and the desire to disseminate European ideas about freedom, liberalism and parliamentary democracy as a sort of cultural counter-offensive against local nationalism. Treves rapidly obtained a position at the peripheral University of Tucumán (UNT) thanks to the mediation of Argentine reformist philosopher Carlos Cossío (Losano 1998). In fact, the Argentinean reformist intellectuals, who since 1918 had nurtured a progressive student movement that wanted to extend academic education to all American social classes, became the genuine protagonists of the solidarity towards European refugees (Buchbinder 2005). Between the 1930s and 1940s, UNT, whose rector Julio Prebisch had formerly participated in the university reform movement, experienced a decade of effective cultural globalisation, especially in social and humanistic sciences: not only accommodating clever young scholars from Buenos Aires to work there (i.e. Risieri e Silvio Frondizi), but also 14 European exiles, among them Italian Jewish exiles (i.e. Benvenuto and Alessandro Terracini) and several Republican exiles, such as Lorenzo Luzuriaga, former pedagogue of the *Institución Libre de Enseñanza* (The Free Institution of Education), a private educational institution designed to foster liberties in learning (Naessen and Santillán 1999: 9-21; Vanella 2008). Ayala and Treves also found solidarity in the salon of Victoria Ocampo's *Sur* journal founded in 1931 under the auspices of Ortega y Gasset (King 1989). The aim of the journal was to open up Argentine culture to the rest of the world and to all those intellectuals who did not want to choose between socialist revolution and materialistic capitalism but hoped for a return to a humanist and enlightened cosmopolitan culture.

As a result, Ayala and Treves with their co-authored essay became intellectual mediators and activators of cultural mobility (Greenblatt 2009), at a time when Buenos Aires turned into the main centre for the edition and publishing of Spanish texts and the Spanish translation of major European works. Notably, the Losada publishing house welcomed Ayala as the director of the sociology series, while Treves released his first book in Argentina *Sociology and Social Philosophy* (1941) with this same publisher. At the same time Ayala was a consultant for the publishing house Americalee, belonging to the anarchist brothers Landolfi; Treves also wrote about Crocean liberalism and collaborated with these same publishers in the dissemination and translation of Carlo Rosselli's writings and liberal socialism in Argentina (Gómez Ros 2011: 249-261).

2. NEW YORK, MEXICO CITY AND BUENOS AIRES: ANTIFASCISM AND POST-WAR ORDER

Like other refugee scholars, Ayala and Treves took part in the struggle for intellectual hegemony in Argentina during the wartime and their co-authored essay is tangible proof of that conflicting cultural environment. Notably, the assessment of civil liberties threatened by fascism – the main topic of *A Double Political Experience* – also became a crucial local matter in the interwar period, especially after the 1943 military coup, when the latent fascist threat was then perceived as real. This shared anxiety about a deeply threatened political freedom is well highlighted in the introduction to their co-authored essay: “Consecutive confrontations of their respective points of view pushed both writers towards a common approach to the problem of political freedom in the present conditions. They agreed that these conditions linked the destinies of all Latin countries, while conferring them a specific cultural mission in the future world” (Ayala and Treves 2017: 163).

Many intellectuals concerned about the challenge to local social freedom ended up joining the anti-fascist associations that had meanwhile spread in Argentina (Pasolini 2010). During the Second World War the anti-fascist discourse turned into a concern of internal politics in Argentina and not, as in the previous decade, only a peripheral framework exclusively linked to the Italian immigrant community. Antifascism was now broadly interpreted as a strategic tool whereby intellectuals could strengthen a progressive political bloc against the paralysis of Argentinean conservatism and afterwards the advance of the domestic nationalist movement. Treves and Ayala’s co-authored essay fits perfectly into the domestic anti-fascist cultural climate. Mainstream antifascism in Argentina was predominantly liberal-socialist and did not hesitate to condemn restrictions of freedom at the hands of both fascist and communist regimes. This circumstance explains the continuous friction with the communist side within Argentine antifascism. The 1941 entry of the United States into the Second World War further complicated the domestic anti-fascist discourse and the quarrel for cultural hegemony due to American diplomatic and cultural pressure for Argentina to enter the war.

Although neither Ayala nor Treves sided with any political party, they joined several local anti-fascist cultural organisations. In the Argentine anti-fascist movement there were comparatively few ‘fighters’ and many ‘speakers’ against an alleged global fascism (Bisso 2016: 133). For instance, both collaborated with the CLES (Colegio Libre de Estudios Superiores – Free College of Higher Studies), a private academic establishment for the outreach of liberal and democratic culture, founded in Buenos Aires in 1930.

CLES sought to become a sort of ‘army of culture’, that is to say a space of higher education sheltered from any counter-reformist reaction and capable of triggering a democratic and up-to-date debate on different Argentine social matters (Neiburg 1998: 143). Moreover, Ayala collaborated between 1940 and 1943 with the weekly journal *Argentina Libre* (Free Argentina), connected with *Acción Argentina* (Argentine Action), the most widely recognised organisation in the pro-Allied Argentine movement led mainly by liberal-socialist notables (Bisso 2009). Treves, for his part, wrote several articles in the magazine *Italia Libre* (Free Italia) (Nitsch 2018). Like *Argentina Libre*, the journal *Italia Libre* displayed a striving hostility towards Argentine neutralist politics in the global conflict and, despite the numerous declarations of ideological independence, an overt anticommunism (de Luján Leiva 1983: 573-574). Moreover, with the passing of time, *Italia Libre* took an editorial line increasingly similar to the Mazzini Society, a democratic-republican anti-fascist association that several Italian exiles in New York and Boston – i.e. socialist historian Gaetano Salvemini, professor of political philosophy Max Ascoli and young Italian émigré scholars from the antifascist resistance movement GL such as Bruno Zevi – founded with the aim of creating a pressure group for the Italian democratic cause against fascism in the U.S. and the Italian immigrant community in the Americas. (La Gumina, Cavaioi, Primeggia, Varacalli 2000: 362-363).

Ayala detected the genesis of their co-authored essay *A Double Political Experience* within this international network of intellectual solidarity of anti-fascist and social-liberal groups, which, through the journal *Quaderni Italiani* (Italian Notebooks), asked Treves to delve into his idea about the distinctive crisis of liberalism and freedom in Spain (Ayala and Treves 2017: 163). *Quaderni Italiani* was a journal of Italian émigrés and four issues were published between 1942 and 1944 in the U.S. by Zevi and Calabi. Its intention was to become heir to *Quaderni di Giustizia e Libertà* (Notebooks of Justice and Liberty) and to trigger an international debate on the different meanings of liberal socialism, as defined by Rosselli (Dulio 2008). Ayala stressed that circles close to Max Ascoli asked both exiles in Argentina for a comparative reflection on the differences between Spain and Italy regarding the relationship between the fall of liberalism and the local rise of fascist tendencies. Notably, Ascoli, with whom Ayala continued to collaborate during his long American exile, occupied a pivotal cultural position between U.S. government cliques and liberal and socialist intellectual anti-fascists on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean (Grippa 2009, Camurri 2012). Moreover, the Jewish Freemason Ascoli, who was about ten years older than Ayala and Treves, had written extensively about the crisis of Italian liberalism and Crocean freedom, leaving Italy soon after the fascist march on Rome. His opportunity to flee Italy came in the form of a Rockefeller

Foundation grant. Afterwards, the economist Alvin Johnson introduced him to the New School for Social Research in New York, which soon became known as ‘the university of exile’, as it welcomed a large number of intellectuals fleeing Nazi-Fascist Europe (Friedlander 2019). In record time, he became Dean of the New School and forged a close friendship with Nelson Rockefeller and Adolf A. Berle, member of the Brain Trust of the Roosevelt administration. The U.S. government, in fact, feared that in the unstable South American countries military actors close to the Axis powers could suddenly produce political coups. Moreover, the U.S. interest in the anti-fascist movement as a strategic tool for the Allies in the war against Nazi-Fascists was steadily growing (Varsori 1991). For all these reasons, Nelson Rockefeller invited his friend Ascoli, between 1940 and 1941, to form part of the Office of Inter-American Affairs (OIAA), a government agency dedicated to studying and coordinating specific policies for the fragile Latin American economies and preventing the penetration of the interests of Nazi Germany and its allies into the commercial and cultural spheres (Cramer and Prutsch 2012). In 1943, Ascoli was appointed Associate Director of Cultural Relations of the OIAA and during the war he dealt with cultural relations between North and South America through the Bureau of Latin American Research. Notably, this agency elaborated dossiers on the social and cultural situation where European exiles had landed and financed public activities, such as, in particular, the Congress of Italian anti-fascists in Montevideo in 1942 (Buchanan 2014: 137). Finally, Ascoli was very close to Italian emigrant industrialist Torcuato Di Tella, who financed most of the activities of the Argentine social-liberal intellectual anti-fascism and sponsored, from Buenos Aires, the Antifascist Concentration in Paris (Di Tella 1993).

The topic of the essay *A Double Political Experience* reflects this tangled transnational social-liberal and pro-Allied network that, as historian Seidman explained, contributed to the enhancement of a transatlantic antifascism. This was a strain of antifascism based on a robust anti-communist narrative, which embraced Atlantic liberalism with the aim of the restoration of Enlightenment-era liberalism, democracy and individual freedom in the post-war period. As in the case of German antifascist refugee scholars during the last year of the global conflict, the essay by Ayala and Treves mainly focused on ‘what should be done with post-war Southern Europe’ with the aim of influencing public opinion and U.S. government planning (Lamberti 2007). In reality, as Treves states, the essay’s scope was even broader: “[Spanish and Italian antifascists] look far beyond the war crisis to tomorrow Europe, and know that until a new idea capable of solving the problems posed by fascism has been outlined, there will be no definitive victory” (Ayala and Treves 2017: 165).

Ayala and Treves developed their argument in four sections, starting with the comparison of Spanish and Italian political events in the interwar period and the causes of the rise of fascism and its continuation into Spain. The essay is a sort of back and forth dialogue, where: 1) Treves criticises the scepticism of Spanish Republican intellectuals towards liberalism because of the strong influence of German idealistic culture after the First World War in the Iberian country, seen as the main cause of fascism gaining traction in Spain. In his opinion, German cultural influence generated a strong rejection of both economic and political liberalism within an intellectual environment not yet fully developed and independent from foreign cultural currents (Ayala and Treves 2017: 165-173). 2) Ayala rebuts this accusation by explaining how Spain's major cultural problem was the diplomatic isolation of the country after the Spanish-American war in 1898 and the international disinterest in its peripheral condition (Ayala and Treves 2017: 174-186). 3) Treves detects a similar political condition in both Mediterranean countries in their post-war urgency to build a new civil cohabitation, which would have been possible only by finding a more powerful and attractive idea than fascism. According to Treves, this idea was already embedded in the cultural orientations of young Italians, who were born under fascism but never lost their faith in liberalism and democracy and were trying to generate a "silent revolution" and democratic change within Italian society. This "revolution", however, was not inspired by anti-capitalist communist ideals, but by an "underground" cultural transformation of Southern European societies, which, according to this perspective, should rediscover the value of freedom and individual liberties according to the ideas of Gobetti and Rosselli (Ayala and Treves 2017: 187-211). 4) Ayala concludes the essay with the need to strengthen the cultural ties between both countries and in broader cultural terms also with Latin American countries. Indeed, according to him, the "Latin peoples" would face a common political future of submission and dependence upon several superpowers after the war. As a result, recognising as early as 1944 how post-war peace would be defined by the USA, USSR and British Empire, Ayala advocates for a "new mission" for the Latin people (Ayala and Treves 2017: 212). This mission should be based on the continuation of the struggle to culturally eradicate fascism. In his opinion, the last could be better carried out in these countries thanks to the alleged spiritual aptitude of Latinity, which was not dominated by the principles of utilitarianism of the Protestant countries (Ayala and Treves 2017: 212-218).

These reflections on freedom, anti-fascism, fascism and Latinity could not be disseminated in Argentina during this period. In fact, after the coup in 1943, some army officers, one of whom was Juan Domingo Perón, took power and launched censoring measures against liberal intellectuality in

support of an intransigent Catholicism. For instance, Ayala himself was forced to leave his teaching position at the University of Litoral during the summer of 1943 (Escobar 2011). As a result, the network of solidarity that allowed the essay to see the light of day became even denser. *A Double Political Experience* was not published in Argentina but in Mexico, where the anti-fascist rhetoric was not only a matter for civil society but became an integral part of the government political strategy (Acle-Kreysing 2014). Notably, under the presidency of Manuel Avila Camacho, the official anti-fascist language shifted from a revolutionary rhetoric to a more moderate one in support of liberal democracy. The solution to the dissemination of the debate between Ayala and Treves came from Mexico City and more specifically from the sociologist José Medina Echavarría, also a Spanish Republican exile and Alfonso Posada's disciple (Morales 2014: 30-32). Echavarría agreed that Hispanic and Latin cultures had to acquire new relevance in the restoration of a global democratic post-war order according to several Latin American theorisations that linked modernity and regeneration to Latinity during the previous decades (Coletta 2018). On the basis of these premises, Echavarría invited both European refugee scholars to publish their shared reflections in *Jornadas* (Days), the journal of the Centre of Social Studies of the College of Mexico (Moya López 2013).

3. INTERNATIONAL NETWORKING AND INSTITUTIONALISATION OF SOCIOLOGY IN THE AMERICAS

The increasing development of legal philosophy studies with a sociological orientation during the interwar period further contributed not only to shaping the intellectual relationship between both European exiles in their co-authored essay but also to framing multifarious cultural connections in the Americas (González Bollo 1999). As a result, the debate between Ayala and Treves on the correlation between freedom, democracy and the pivotal role of new generations educated within fascist regimes was encouraged both by liberal transnational anti-fascist networks and the growing internationalisation of empirical sociology in Argentina during the Second World War. In the region, sociological studies flourished from the beginning of the global conflict to the Cold War zenith (Pereira 2005). Moreover, as with the case of increasing domestic attention to anti-fascist rhetoric, the actions of several U.S. foundations, such as the Ford and Rockefeller foundations, boosted Argentine interest in social sciences (Parmar 2012, Salvatore 2016). After 1920, these U.S. philanthropic donors tried to export and fund social scientific research with an empirical focus and promote technical cooperation with the aim of halting the cultural

influence of German idealism in South America and therefore increasing security and backing on its southern flank. Argentina was one of the recipients of such cultural cooperation. Notably, during their exile, both Ayala and Treves were hired as university lecturers of sociology and collaborated in the translation and dissemination of several sociological works in Latin America. For instance, Ayala not only worked at the Losada publishing house as reviewer of the sociology collection but also translated into Spanish several German sociologists such as Karl Mannheim, Georg Simmel and Hans Freyer, as well as works by Americans such as Ernest Manheim (Ribes Leiva 2007). Both took part in the activities of the Institute of Sociology in Buenos Aires, which was founded in 1940 by the liberal historian Ricardo Levene with the aim of creating a far-reaching pan-American connection of sociologists (Morales Martín 2013). A point, which is especially significant for this argument: the Italian anti-fascist exile Gino Germani also initiated his academic career at the Institute of Sociology in Buenos Aires (Germani 2004 and 2015). It was at that time that he began his first empirical research on the leisure time of the Argentine middle classes and the integration of the masses into totalitarian regimes, carrying out his very first sociological attempts to explain Peronism in Argentina (Blanco 2006). The main goal of Germani and his network of American sociologists focused on promoting a sociological discipline based on the strength of rationality and empirical data in contrast to the romantic idealism and German critical pessimism and catastrophism of previous decades that, in their opinion, contributed to discrediting liberalism and merit of democracy. On the contrary, according to all these scholars, sociology represented 'the science of the crisis', that is to say, an effective scientific tool that might provide rational and data-driven answers to the current global crisis of peaceful coexistence and multifactorial societal transformations. As Germani and Treves himself pointed out, the scientific model to follow was no longer the one indicated by 'irrational philosophical currents' at the start of the century, but English or U.S. pragmatic studies, such as the empirical model of the Chicago school's sociological thought. Furthermore, as the same essay *A Double Political Experience* outlines, it was necessary to apply sociological studies to understanding and factually solving political conflicts in progress. At the time, Argentinean socialist politicians also shared the same interest in scientific sociology. They connected the empirical sociological discipline to their drive for reformist action and societal modernisation. Notably, Argentine socialist scholars defended the idea of applying empirical research as a tool for local social planning: the university should interact with government politics to stimulate a planned modernisation and economic development. This made it possible for academic institutions to assist in the making of the foundations of a harmoni-

ous democracy able to embrace all social classes and avoid past tensions and cultural turmoil (Graciano 2003). It is no coincidence that Argentine socialist senator Alfredo Palacios took an interest in Ayala's work, while socialist MP Mario Bravo forged a cordial friendship with him. Furthermore, it was Mario Bravo himself who introduced several Italian anti-fascists in Argentina to Treves.

Treves and Ayala's main intellectual reference was a German sociologist of Jewish origin, Karl Mannheim, who, as a result of Nazi racial policies, had moved to the United Kingdom. According to Mannheim, in fact, in the post-war period social science was supposed to carry out a mission of planning and improvement of daily quality of life, contributing to the formation of a citizen capable of regenerating the national consciousness towards liberties and democracy (Mannheim 1950, Kettler and Loader 2002). The essay *A Double Political Experience* embodies several proposals of a sociological network of scholars who were interpreting fascism as a crucial phenomenon of modernity to be defeated on the basis of this awareness. The debate between Ayala and Treves could be inserted within connections of *émigré* sociologists and political scientists who, as in the case of Emili Lederer's reflections at New School in New York and in *The State of the Masses* (Lederer 1940), considered fascism not only to be the result of the anxieties of decadent conservative bourgeoisie but above all as a direct consequence of the disruptive social and economic transformations experienced by the middle classes in the interwar period and political systems which rested on amorphous masses (Salvati 2002: 154-176). According to these intellectuals, understanding societal transformations and, therefore, the different facets of the 'fear of freedom', which had taken hold of the souls of many citizens, became an effective instrument to restore a democratic post-war world and avoid the possibility of new forms of fascism in the future. In this regard, Treves himself pointed out in their co-authored essay: "These young people, who were born after First World War and were educated in fascist schools, say that they are familiar with fascism and believe that the leaders of democratic powers [...] now interpret fascism too superficially and are too optimistic in believing in the possibility of rebuilding Europe only through industrial enhancement, primary education and technical progress [...] This premise leads them to reject [...] any illusion of achieving a lasting peace, without first incurring a profound social revolution, and pushes them to work with commitment to make concrete a radically new attitude of life" (Ayala and Treves 2017: 204).

4. COSMOPOLITANISM, MACRO-NATIONALISM AND IDEAS FOR A NEW GLOBAL ORDER

As this long Treves quote substantiates, both European *émigré* scholars interpreted fascism as a modern political system. According to them, it could easily acquire new semblance and should never be underestimated in the post-war period. As stated in their co-authored essay: “Fascism is, in a bad way, more modern and up-to-date than the traditional democratic state is in a good way: Fascism is the degenerate and corrupt son, but it still belongs to a younger generation than the bourgeois honest father” (Ayala and Treves 2017: 204).

They understand it as the direct landing place for the contradictions of the rise of modern mass society and not so much as a consequence of bourgeois conservatism or as a ‘local moral disease’ (De Bernardi 2001). For all these reasons, in their opinion, similar to the view of the Pan-American cultural network of which they were part, it was urgent to find not only a domestic but a global solution to the post-war possibility that fascism could reappear in other forms and in other places. They were convinced that it was resurfacing in pre-Peronist Argentina through the abundant local dissemination of nationalist ideas. As a result, thoughts on nation, nationhood and nationalism, as in the case of many other refugee academics (García Sebastiani and Núñez Seixas 2020) and as a pivotal component of fascist ideology, also played an important role in the Treves and Ayala debate. In addition to the stimuli of domestic socio-liberal anti-fascism and empirical sociology, they became receivers of cosmopolitan and anti-nationalist ideas mostly because of their condition of exiles at the crossroads of different cultures and geographical spaces (Lachenicht and Heinsohn 2009). Furthermore, elements of the cosmopolitan tradition, for example thinking on a global scale and in universal terms, became an integral part of many different political cultures during wartime (Gusejnova 2018: 217-242). According to both Ayala and Treves, the intellectual was now entrusted with overcoming borders, not defining frontiers through ideas of national sovereignty that had revealed their ineffectiveness with the outbreak of a global war. World wars acted as a sort of catalyst for a new intellectual interest in both non-European territories and European integration. Furthermore, European anti-fascism itself, and the GL movement in particular, placed particular emphasis on the international dimension of the fight against fascism and the urgency to reformulate a different idea of nation after the war (Spät 2016, Bresciani 2017).

Notably, Treves in the essay *A Double Political Experience* re-actualised Giuseppe Mazzini’s ideas on nation, people’s solidarity and the alleged virtues of Italian unification (*Risorgimento*) connecting it with eighteenth century

Argentine liberalism (Isabella 2009). In his opinion, following the model of Mazzini's Italian unification project in the nineteenth century, in the aftermath of the Second World War, it was similarly necessary to develop a federal Europe or supranational organisation in which each nationality would carry out its own "mission", that is to say, it would perform a specific function in relation to its social and cultural characteristics (Chabod 1961). According to Treves, through their experience accumulated during the fascist regime, Italian people could help to eradicate "the fascist virus" on a global scale (Ayala and Treves 2017: 209). As a result, the idea of nation and nationhood could only be recovered in the post-war period as a superior and unselfish mission within wider international bodies. Treves' point of view was as much national, since he dwelt particularly on the "Italian people's mission", as it was supranational. In fact, by reversing Carlo Rosselli's well-known statement "today in Spain, tomorrow in Italy" on collectively eradicating Fascism during the Spanish Civil War, thanks to its broad anti-fascist experience, the time had come for Italians to suggest a democratic transformative path to Spanish Republicans and more generally to the rest of the people who were similarly victims of undemocratic regimes.

The national perspective is less incisive in Ayala. Unlike Treves, Ayala never moved towards a concrete political standpoint, nor did he evoke political ideologies as sources for the post-war period. Stressing the global and interdependent dimension that, in his opinion, had acquired the question of freedom, he supported the need to recover a shared debate between "Latin peoples", such as Spaniards and Italians, that is to say, between all those nations that in the post-war new global order would inevitably represent powerless countries (Ayala and Treves 2017: 212-218). According to Ayala, an effective debate on post-war liberties could only come from the making of a Latin Union, a sort of international cultural organisation that would include not only Latin Europeans but also South American peoples. Ayala adopted several cues of pan-nationalist movements that, since the beginning of the twentieth century, had placed nationalism on a scale larger than ever on both side of the Atlantic, as was the case of pan-Latinism (Giladi 2018, Snyder 1984). The supporters of such variants of macro-nationalism deplored the decline of 'Latin' civilisation vis-à-vis Anglo-Saxon or German powers. The foundation of a Latin Union could have served as a spiritual resistance to the envisaged increase in Anglo-Saxon cultural hegemony in the post-war period. Nevertheless, Ayala's argument is not at all similar to the fascist or right-wing groups who also aspired towards a Latin Union because they wished to build a new 'Roman empire' or associated this term with racial and eugenics aspects (Rohrleitner 2017, Gori 2020). Ayala, like Medina Echavarría and other liberal Argentine intellectuals of the time, strove towards an interpretation of Latinity as a 'universal civilisation' at

the dawn of the Cold War era. According to progressive pan-Latinism, 'Latinity' was identified with 'human dignity', 'freedom', and 'tolerance' (Giladi 2018: 97). In their view, Latin peoples represented the best spiritual (and not material) counterbalance to a life that should not be governed exclusively by the utilitarianism and excessive dynamism of Western bourgeois capitalism as already condemned by social liberalism. Ayala concluded by hoping that the post-war order would provide an outlet for "these spiritual reserves of Latin peoples that are capable of asserting a conception of life closer to new circumstances. Without renouncing the level of technical civilization achieved, they can help stopping an excessively activist spirit whose extreme expression was totalitarian dynamism and they can help in organising human relations for a life full of spiritual meaning" (Ayala and Treves 2017: 217).

CONCLUSION: HYBRIDITY AND EXILE AS LIVING BETWEEN CULTURES

The findings of this article suggest to what extent the intellectual encounter between two academic antifascist exiles fleeing Nazi-Fascist Europe triggered a new imbricated global network of cultural solidarity and significant cross-fertilisation in their thinking and knowledge beyond Europe and across the Atlantic Ocean. Ayala and Treves represented two intellectual personalities who experienced the cultural traditions of different countries and the need of exiles for networks of solidarity. Their special condition 'between worlds' and global lives (Löhr 2013) made a distinctive contribution to the dissemination of post-war antifascist social liberalism and third way thinking both in the Americas and in Europe during and after the Second World War. Notably, their co-authored essay *A Double Political Experience* represents tangible evidence of such cultural hybridism within possible solutions after the desired fall of fascism and the advocated cultural independence of powerless countries from a perceived extreme material pragmatism of the Allies at the end of the Second World War. In the form of a dialogue between two European scholars that even before their exile proposed solutions for the regeneration of liberalism from a social standpoint, it provides proof of the acquisition and enhancement of sociological insights into the causes of the loss of freedom. Despite their lack of or almost no participation in the Argentinean political arena, Treves and Ayala's interpretation of fascism and post-war order embedded transnational academic networks with a distinctive perception of domestic and international political and social problems.

Such global academic networks of *émigré* scholars between the Americas and Europe deserve more analysis by historians who aspire to understand

culture after the Second World War and domestic hegemonic or powerless interpretations of fascism, anti-fascism and new forms of liberalism (Kershaw 2015: 513-526). According to Max Ascoli himself, only from outside Europe could a new effective perspective on fascist phenomena be developed (Grippa 2009: 126-147). The diaspora experience modified or rather accentuated some of the existing features of Treves and Ayala's thoughts on the pivotal social role of the intellectual in a period of global ideological radicalisation. Both intellectuals increased their interest in empirical sociology and the application of pragmatic tools in intellectual analysis and political education during their Argentine exile. In their view, social science had to abandon past idealisms and promote a practical rationality: empirical sociology was the appropriate scientific tool to solve post-war crisis, highlighting the multifaceted contradictions of modernity and at the same time optimistically promoting societal modernisation.

The analysis of the intertwining of those academic networks triggered by European diaspora could contribute to further research on the evolution and cultural impact of post-war sociological disciplines and their empirical relevance in relation to a Western post-war global system guided by the idea of government social planning and blurring material utilitarianism prior to the World War (Huber 2017). It is interesting to note how Treves, once he had reintegrated into the post-fascist Italian Academy in 1947, became the pioneer of the sociology of law in Italy, bringing brand new sociological ideas to its traditional legal scholarship (Tanzi 1988) and later helping and training young anti-Francoist academics within Spain (Quaggio 2017: 148-153). On the contrary, given the longevity of Franco's regime, Ayala was forced to continue his exile, although he was obliged to leave Peronist Argentina for Puerto Rico and the United States. Nevertheless, Ayala kept up his sociological line of research on modern society and through academic journals, such as *Realidad* (Reality), continued to enhance his commitment as an interpreter of the moral crisis after the Second World War.

Notably, the outcomes presented in this article suggest that in the micro-case of Ayala and Treves the effect of their exile and American connections was particularly evident in their political antifascist concerns. During their Argentine exile, from their sociological approach they prominently turned to a new transatlantic antifascist rhetoric through the crucial impact of several American-based sociologists like Gino Germani. Their antifascism fed on their previous first-hand struggle against fascism and on the cultural experience of exile itself, reaching some degree of influence in Europe and the Americas. Furthermore, during their exile they accentuated their cosmopolitan and macro-nationalist perspective even if paradoxically they simultaneously emphasised, as had happened with many other *émigré* scholars, their interest in the homeland and a transnational Latinity as a

democratic tool of reconciliation and mitigation of Anglo-Saxon cultural and value hegemony.

The experience of exile increased their non-dogmatic predisposition to welcome and merge different political cultures, in their case socialism and liberalism. Treves and Ayala's intellectual proposal, although originating from a longstanding European social democratic tradition, was altered by American cultural and intellectual contaminations. Their proposal restored the moral value of freedom and the principles of cultural and political liberalism, but in an inclusive and critical manner, that is, by embracing the growing middle classes and lower social classes and by theorising the need for their participation in the economic and ethical benefits of modernity. In other words, at the dawn of the Cold War, Ayala and Treves promoted a 'third way', between socialism and democratic liberalism, which was not successful in the European continent at a political level until much later, during the collapse of the Soviet system, the end of the bipolar system and the democratisation of Spain at the end of the twentieth century (Bonoli and Powell 2002). This is evident from the fact that the dialogue between the two exiles recovered at the very end of the 1980s, as was argued at the beginning of this article. Ultimately, this article proposes itself as an invitation to historians to interpret the global cultural resistance during the Second World War and the European political cultures and knowledge emerging from the ashes of this global conflict through the networks and innovative experiences of cultural contamination that European *émigré* scholars triggered across the Atlantic Ocean. It is necessary not to overshadow the role of American intellectuals but to take into consideration that during the global war the cultural circuit was inverted and the perceived 'periphery' at times became the centre.

REFERENCES

- ABELLÁN J.L. 1976, *El exilio español de 1939*, tomo 4, Madrid: Taurus.
- ACLE-KREYSING A. 2017, "Exiliados europeos y cultura antifascista en Ciudad de México y Buenos Aires (1936-1945)", in R. Villares Paz and X.M. Núñez Seixas (eds.), *Os exilio ibéricos, unha ollada comparada*, Santiago de Compostela: Consello da Cultura Gallega: 171-192.
- ASH M. and SÖLLNER A. 1996, *Forced Migration and Scientific Change*, Washington DC, German Historical Institute: Cambridge University Press.
- ATIENZA M. and MANERO RUIZ J. 1990, "Entrevista a Renato Treves", *Doxa*, 8: 321-332.
- AYALA F. 1988, "Evocación de un viejo debate", *El País*, 25th February.
- AYALA F. 1941, *El problema del liberalismo*, Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- AYALA F. and TREVES R. 2017, *Una doble experiencia política: España e Italia*, Granada: Universidad de Granada (First Edition Mexico: Colegio de Mexico 1944).

- BAGNOLI P. 1996, *Rosselli, Gobetti e la rivoluzione democratica. Uomini e idee tra liberalismo e socialismo*, Firenze: La Nuova Italia.
- BASTOW S. and MARTIN J. 2003, *Third Way Discourse: European Ideologies in the Twentieth Century*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- BECHELLONI A. 2001 (ed.), *Carlo e Nello Rosselli e l'antifascismo europeo*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- BECHELLONI A. 2009, "Esilio e antifascismo", *Parolechiave*, 41: 141-157.
- BELLO F. (ed.) 2019, *Bruno Zevi intellettuale di confine. L'esilio e la guerra fredda culturale italiana 1938-1950*, Roma: Viella.
- BISSO A. 2016, "The Argentine Antifascist Movement and the Building of a Tempting Domestic Appeal, 1922-1946", in H. García, M. Yusta, X. Tabet and C. Climaco, *Rethinking Antifascism: History, Memory and Politics, 1922 to the Present*, New York: Berghahn Books: 133-151.
- BISSO A. 2009, *Argentina Libre y Antinazi*, San José: Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica.
- BISSO A. 2007, *El antifascismo argentino*, Buenos Aires: Buenos Libros.
- BLANCO A. 2006, *Razón y Modernidad*, Buenos Aires: Siglo XXI.
- BLOK A. 2017, *Radical Innovators: The Blessings of Adversity in Science and the Arts, 1500-2000*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- BOGGS C. 1993, *Intellectuals and the Crisis of Modernity*, Albany NY: State University of New York Press.
- BONOLI G. and POWELL M. 2002, "Third Ways in Europe?", *Social Policy and Society*, 1 (1): 59-66.
- BOURDIEU P. 2002, "Les conditions sociales de la circulation internationale des idées", *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 145: 3-8.
- BRESCIANI M. 2017, *Quale antifascismo? Storia di Giustizia e Libertà*, Roma: Carocci.
- BUCHANAN A. 2014, *American Grand Strategy in the Mediterranean during World War II*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BUCHBINDER P. 2005, *Historia de las universidades argentinas*, Buenos Aires: Sudamericana.
- BURKE P. 2017, *Exiles and Expatriates in the History of Knowledge, 1500-2000*, Waltham: Brandeis University Press.
- CALABRÒ C. 2009, *Liberalismo, democrazia, socialismo. L'itinerario di Carlo Rosselli*, Firenze: Firenze University Press.
- CALDWELL C.P. and SCHEUERMAN W.E. (eds.) 2000, *From Liberal Democracy to Fascism: Legal and Political Thought in the Weimar Republic*, Boston and Leiden: Humanities Press.
- CAMURRI R. 2012, *Max Ascoli. Antifascista, intellettuale, giornalista*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- CAMURRI R. 2009, "Idee in movimento. L'esilio degli intellettuali italiani negli Stati Uniti (1930-1945)", *Memoria e Ricerca*, 31: 43-62.
- CAPRISTO A. 2013, "Italian Intellectuals and the Exclusion of Their Jewish Colleagues from Universities and Academies", *Telos: A Quarterly Journal of Radical Thought*, 164: 63-95.
- CAPRISTO A. 2010, "Fare fagotto: l'emigrazione intellettuale ebraica dall'Italia fascista dopo il 1938", *Rassegna mensile di Israel*, Unione delle Comunità Ebraiche Italiane, 77 (3): 177-200.
- CAPRISTO A. 2002, *L'espulsione degli ebrei dalle accademie italiane*, Torino: Zamorani.
- CAUDET F. 2005, *El exilio republicano de 1939*, Madrid: Cátedra.
- CEREZO GALÁN P. 2006, "Prólogo", in F. Ayala, *Ensayos políticos y sociológicos*, Barcelona: Galaxia Gutenberg: 17-57.

- CHABOD F. 1961, *Storia dell'Idea di Europa*, Milano: Laterza.
- COLETTA M. 2018, *Decadent Modernity: Civilization and 'Latinidad' in Spanish America, 1880-1920*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- CRAMER G. and PRUTSCH U. (eds.) 2012, *¡Americas Unidas! Nelson A. Rockefeller's Office of Inter American Affairs (1940-1946)*, Madrid: Iberoamericana, Vervuert.
- DE BERNARDI A. 2001, *Una dittatura moderna: il fascismo come problema storico*, Milano: Mondadori.
- DE FELICE R. 1961, *Storia degli ebrei italiani sotto il fascismo*, Torino: Einaudi.
- DEGL'INNOCENTI M. 1999, "Socialismo liberale e socialismo europeo", in M. Degl'Innocenti (ed.), *Carlo Rosselli e il socialismo liberale*, Manduria-Roma-Bari: Manduria: 65-108.
- DE LOS RÍOS F. 1926, *El sentido humanista del socialismo*, Madrid: Editorial Javier Morata.
- DE LUJÁN LEIVA M. 1983, "Il movimento antifascista italiano in Argentina (1922-1945)", in B. Bezza (ed.), *Gli italiani fuori dall'Italia*, Milano: Franco Angeli: 573-574.
- DI TELLA T.S. and GAGGERO H. 1993, *Torcuato di Tella: industria y algunas cosas más*, Buenos Aires: Asociación Dante Alighieri.
- DESCHAMPS B., DREYFUS M., BLANC-CHALÉARD M.C., BECHELLONI A. and VIAL É. (eds.) 2007, *Les petites Italies dans le monde*, Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- D'ORSI A. 2000, *La cultura a Torino tra le due guerre*, Torino: Einaudi.
- DULIO R. 2008, *Introduzione a Bruno Zevi*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- ESCOBAR L.A. 2011, *Francisco Ayala y la Universidad Nacional del Litoral: la construcción de una tradición sociológica*, Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- ESCUDERO M.A. 1996, "Hispanist Democratic Thought versus Hispanist Thought of the Franco Era: A Comparative Analysis", in M. Pérez de Mendiola (ed.), *Bridging the Atlantic: Toward a Reassessment of Iberian and Latin American Cultural Tie*, New York: State University of New York Press: 160-186.
- ESPAGNE M. and WERNER M. 1988, *Transferts. Les relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand (XVIII^e-XIX^e siècles)*, Paris: Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- FABER S. 2009, "L'esilio degli intellettuali spagnoli e tedeschi in Messico: due esperienze a confronto", *Memoria e Ricerca*, 31: 63-80.
- FINCHELSTEIN F. 2010, *Transatlantic Fascism. Ideology, violence and the Sacred in Argentina and Italy, 1919-1945*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- FIORUCCI F. 2006, "El antiperonismo intelectual: de la guerra ideológica a la guerra espiritual", in M. García Sebastiani (ed.), *Fascismo y antifascismo, peronismo y antiperonismo, conflictos políticos e ideológico en la Argentina, 1930-1955*, Madrid: Iberoamericana Vervuert: 161-193.
- FRIEDLANDER J. 2019, *A Light in Dark Times: The New School for Social Research and Its University in Exile*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- GARCÍA H. 2016, "Transnational History: A New Paradigm for Anti-Fascist Studies?", *Contemporary European History*, 25 (4): 563-572.
- GARCÍA MONTERO L. 2009, *Francisco Ayala: el escritor en su siglo*, Granada: Publicaciones de Diputación Provincial de Granada.
- GARCÍA SEBASTIANI M. and NÚÑEZ SEIXAS X.M. (eds.) 2020, *Hacer patria lejos de casa. Nacionalismo español, migración y exilio en Europa y América (1870-2010)*, Zaragoza: Prensa Universitaria de Zaragoza.

- GERMANI A. 2015, *La sociologia in esilio. Gino Germani, l'America Latina e le scienze sociali*, Torino: Donzelli.
- GERMANI A. 2004, *Gino Germani: del antifascismo a la sociología*, Buenos Aires: Taurus.
- GILADI A. 2018, "From Macro-Nationalism to Anti-Imperialism: Pan-Latinism in France in the Late Twentieth Century", *History: The Journal of the Historical Association*, 354: 82-99.
- GODDEERIS I. 2007, "The Temptation of Legitimacy: Exile Politics from a Comparative Perspective", *Contemporary European History*, 16 (3): 395-405.
- GÓMEZ ROS M. 2011, "Francisco Ayala, editor", in L. García Montero and M. Gutiérrez (eds.), *De este mundo y los otros. Estudios sobre Francisco Ayala*, Madrid: Visor Libros: 249-261.
- GONZÁLEZ BOLLO H. 1999, *El nacimiento de la sociología empírica en la Argentina*, Buenos Aires: Dunken.
- GORI A. 2020, "The Association de la Presse Latine. Efforts and Failure of a Right-Wing Transnational Pan-Latinist Project", in V. Galimi and A. Gori (eds.), *Intellectuals in the Latin Space During the Era of Fascism. Crossing Borders*, London and New York: Routledge: 109-131.
- GRACIANO O. 2003, "Intelectuales, ciencia y política en la Argentina neoconservadora. La experiencia de los universitarios socialistas", *Estudios Interdisciplinarios de América Latina y el Caribe*, 14 (2): 51-70.
- GREENBLATT S. (ed.) 2009, *Cultural Mobility. A Manifesto*, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- GRIPPA D. 2009, *Un antifascista tra Italia e Stati Uniti: democrazia e identità nazionale nel pensiero di Max Ascoli (1898-1947)*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- GROPPA B. 2002, "Los exilios europeos en el siglo XX", in P. Yankelevich (ed.), *México, país refugio: los exilios europeos en el siglo XX*, Mexico: Plaza y Valdés: 19-34.
- GUSEJNOVA D. (ed.) 2018, *Cosmopolitanism in Conflict: Imperial Encounters from the Seven Years' War to the Cold War*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- HOBBSAWM E. 2007, "Intellectuals and the Spanish Civil War". Available at: <https://www.orwellfoundation.com/the-orwell-foundation/orwell/library/eric-hobsbawm-intellectuals-and-the-spanish-civil-war/> (accessed June 24, 2020).
- HUBER V. 2017, "Introduction: Global Histories of Social Planning", *Journal of Contemporary History*, 52 (1): 3-15.
- INGENSCHAY D. 2009, "El Berlín de Ayala", *Cuadernos de Filología Alemana*, 1: 203-216.
- LACHENICHT S. and HEINSOHN K. (eds.) 2009, *Diaspora Identities. Exile, Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism in Past and Present*, Frankfurt-New York: Campus Verlag.
- JULIÁ S., RINGROSE D. and SEGURA C. 1994, *Madrid. Historia de una capital*, Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- KERSHAW I. 2015, *All'inferno e ritorno. Europa 1914-1949*, Bari-Roma: Laterza.
- KETTLER D. and LOADER C. 2002, *Karl Mannheim's Sociology as Political Education*, New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- KING J. 1989, *Sur. Estudio de la revista literaria argentina y de su papel en el desarrollo de una cultura 1931-1970*, Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- KROHN C.D. 1993, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research*, Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- LA GUMINA J., CAVAIOLI F., PRIMEGGIA S. and VARACALLI J. 2000, *The Italian American Experience: An Encyclopedia*, New York: Garland.

- LAMBERTI M. 2007, "German Antifascist Refugees in America and the Public Debate on 'What Should Be Done with Germany after Hitler', 1941-1945", *Central European History*, 40 (2): 279-305.
- LAMBERTI M. 2006, "The Reception of Refugee Scholars from Nazi Germany in America: Philanthropy and Social Change in Higher Education", *Jewish Social Studies*, 12 (3): 157-192.
- LEDERER E. 1940, *State of the Masses: The Threat of the Classless Society*, New York: Norton and company.
- LIDA C.E. 2019, "The Institutional Reception of Spanish Émigré Intellectuals in Mexico: The Pioneering Role of La Casa de España, 1938-1940", in L. Pries and P. Yankelevich (eds.), *European and Latin American Social Scientists as Refugees, Émigrés and Return-Migrants*, Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 205-219.
- LÖHR I. 2013, "Lives Beyond Borders, or: How to Trace Global Biographies 1880-1950", *Comparative*, 23 (6): 6-20.
- LOSANO M.G. 1998, *Renato Treves, sociologo tra il Vecchio e il Nuovo Mondo*, Milano: Unicopli.
- MANNHEIM K. 1950, *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MARTIN J. 2008, *Piero Gobetti and the Politics of Liberal Revolution*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MIDDELL M. 2016, "Kulturtransfer, histoire croisée, cultural encounters", *Docupedia Zeitgeschichte*. Available at: <https://docupedia.de/zg/Kulturtransfer> (accessed: June 23, 2020).
- MAZOWER M. 1998, *Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century*, London: Penguin Press.
- MORALES J.J. 2014, "Un corredor de ideas entre México y Argentina. El intercambio científico e intelectual entre los sociólogos del exilio español", *Iberoamericana*, 53: 29-48.
- MORALES MARTÍN J.J. 2013, "Entrecruzamientos en el Instituto de Sociología de la Universidad de Buenos Aires (1955-1965) y sus derivaciones: movilidad académica y Latin American Studies", Draft of Primeras Jornadas de Sociología, Mendoza: Universidad Nacional de Cuyo. Available at: https://repositoriosdigitales.mincyt.gov.ar/vufind/Record/BDUNCU_41236a391d7b02377b802ca2e1a6b05a (accessed: March 14, 2020).
- MOYA LÓPEZ L.A. 2013, *José Medina Echavarría y la sociología como ciencia social (1939-1980)*, Mexico: El Colegio de México.
- NÁLLIM J. 2012, *Transformation and Crisis of Liberalism in Argentina, 1930-1955*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- NEIBURG F.G. 1998, *Los intelectuales y la invención del peronismo: estudios de antropología social y cultural*, Buenos Aires: Alianza Editorial.
- NITSCH C. 2018, "T. Santorevere (Renato Treves) e Italia Libre. Note per una ricerca sull'antifascismo degli esuli italiani in Argentina", *Sociologia del Diritto*, 2: 187-207.
- NITSCH C. 2015, *Renato Treves esule in Argentina. Sociologia, filosofia sociale, storia*, Torino: Accademia delle Scienze di Torino.
- PAGNI A. 2011, *El exilio republicano español en México y Argentina. Historia cultural, instituciones literarias, medios*, Madrid: Iberoamericana Vervuert.
- PALMIER J.M. 2006, *Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration in Europe and America*, London: Verso.
- PARMAR I. 2012, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power*, New York: Columbia University Press.

- PASETTI M. 2019, "From Rome to Latin America: The Transatlantic Influence of Fascist Corporatism", in A. Costa Pinto and F. Finchelstein (eds.), *Authoritarianism and Corporatism in Europe and Latin America. Crossing Borders*, London-New York: Routledge: 143-158.
- PASOLINI R. 2010, "The Antifascist Climate and the Italian Intellectual Exile in the Interwar Argentina", *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 15 (5): 693-714.
- PEREIRA D. 2005, *International Networks and the Institutionalisation of Sociology in Argentina (1940-1963)*, Ph.D. diss. Brighton: University of Sussex.
- PRIES L. 2017, "Scientists as Forced Migrant and Refugees: What Can We Learn from the 1930s and 2010s?", *Social Research*, 84 (4): 857-872.
- QUAGGIO G. 2017, "En la tierra del medio. El antifascismo transnacional de *Una doble experiencia política: España e Italia*", in F. Ayala, R. Treves, *Una doble experiencia política: España e Italia*, Granada: Universidad de Granada: 19-160.
- RIBES LEIVA A. 2007, *Paisajes del siglo XX. Sociología y literatura en Francisco Ayala*, Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva.
- RODRÍGUEZ CELA J. 1998, "El exilio de Francisco Ayala en Buenos Aires (1939-1950): una trayectoria intelectual", in M. Aznar Soler (ed.), *El exilio literario español de 1939*, vol. 1, Barcelona: Gexel: 123-132.
- ROHRLEITNER M. 2017, "Pan-Latinidad", *Oxford Bibliographies*. Available at: <https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780199913701/obo-9780199913701-0064.xml> (accessed: March 14, 2020).
- SAID E. 2000, "Invention, Memory and Place", *Critical Inquiry*, 26 (2): 175-192.
- SALVATI M. 2004, "Antifascismo e totalitarismo nelle scienze sociali tra le due guerre", *Contemporanea*, 4: 623-650.
- SALVATORE R.D. 2016, *Disciplinary Conquest: U.S. Scholars in South America, 1900-1945*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- SAPPELLI G. 1995, *Southern Europe Since 1945: Tradition and Modernity in Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece and Turkey*, London: Longman.
- SCHNAPP J.T., SEARS O.E. and STAMPINO M.G. 2000, *A Primer of Italian Fascism*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- SCHWARZSTEIN D. 2001, *Entre Franco y Perón: memoria e identidad del exilio republicano español en Argentina*, Barcelona: Crítica.
- SEIDMAN M. 2018, *Transatlantic Antifascisms: From the Spanish Civil War to the End of World War II*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- SNYDER L. 1984, *Macro-Nationalism. A History of Pan-Movements*, Westport: Greenwood.
- SPÄT J. 2016, "The Unifying Element? European Socialism and Anti-Fascism, 1939-1945", *Contemporary European History*, 25 (4): 687-706.
- TANZI A. 1988, *Renato Treves: dalla filosofia alla sociologia del diritto*, Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane.
- TOSCANO M. 2019, *Ebrei e ebraismo nell'Italia del Novecento*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- TRANFAGLIA N. 1998, *Storia di Torino. Dalla Grande Guerra alla Liberazione (1915-1945)*, Torino: Einaudi.
- TREVES R. 1990, *Sociologia e socialismo. Ricordi e incontri*, Milano: Franco Angeli.
- URBINATI N. 2017, *Liberal Socialism*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- UREÑA E.M., and LÁZARO P. (eds.) 1999, *La actualidad del krausismo en su contexto europeo*, Madrid: Fundación Duque de Soria.

- VALERIO PIE A. (ed.) 2015, *Los empeños de una casa. Actores y redes en los inicios de El Colegio de México 1940-1950*, Mexico: El Colegio de México.
- VANELLA L. 2008, *El exilio europeo en la Universidad Nacional de Tucumán en las décadas de 1930 y 1940*, Argentina: Universidad de Córdoba.
- VARSORI A. 1991, "Gli Stati Uniti paese di rifugio e l'emigrazione politica tra le due guerre", in *L'émigration politique en Europe aux XIX^e et XX^e siècles. Actes de colloque de Rome (3-5 mars 1988)*, Roma: École Française de Rome: 171-187.
- WILKINSON J.D. 1981, *The Intellectual Resistance in Europe*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- ZIMMERMAN J.D. (ed.) 2005, *Jews in Italy under Fascist and Nazi Rule*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.