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ADDENDA

My debt of gratitude is furthermore extended to Prof. Bernhard Giesen, Prof. Jeffrey C. Alexander, Prof. Joshua W. Arthurs, Dr. Ulf R. Hansson, Dr. Allan Klynne, Cecilia Klynne MA, SIR board chairman Carin Fischer, Prof. Örjan Wikander, Prof. Hans Bjur, Dr. Paavo Roos, librarian Åsa Rausing-Roos, Fredrik Tobin MA, Dr. Ida Östenberg, Dr. Lena Landgren, to other colleagues in Lund and elsewhere and to my fellow grant holders, other colleagues and acquaintances at the SIR.

This list is probably incomplete and any omissions are unintentional. Future additions may be made to the bibliography. The following additions could be made to the list of abbreviations:

FAO Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
IAA International Association of Academies
ICIC International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation
ICSU International Council of Scientific Unions (the International Council for Science)
IRC International Research Council
KB Kungliga Biblioteket (the Royal Library/the National Library of Sweden, Stockholm)
UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
Unione Unione degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma

ERRATA AND CLARIFICATIONS

p. 6 ‘debt’, not ‘dept’
p. 20 ‘German Jewish’, not ‘Jewish and German’
p. 67 The Accademia della Crusca originated in Florence, not in Rome
p. 152 ‘Mason Hammond’, not ‘Mason Holland’
p. 154 ‘Republic’, not ‘Republic’
p. 185 ‘Actual archaeological work by foreign scholars was […]’
p. 194 ‘[…] the Unione (established in 1946)’
p. 202 ‘Such ‘cultural nationalism’ […]’
p. 208 ‘Gianicolo’, not ‘Gianocolo’
p. 226 ‘embassy’, not ‘embasy’
p. 239 ‘absurd’, not ‘abusrd’
p. 249 ‘KNIR’, rather than ‘Dutch institute’
p. 251 ‘however’, not ‘hwoever’
p. 295 ‘colonial’ with quotation marks
p. 327 ‘In the context of the BSR, Boëthius referred to Great Britain as […]’, not ‘Boëthius for example spoke of the BSR and Great Britain as […]’
p. 335 ‘see section 3.2’, not ‘section 3.2’
p. 406 ‘que s’adresse […]’, not ‘qu s’adresse’
p. 538 ‘a move’, not ‘move’
p. 542 Repetition of the phrase ‘nineteenth and twentieth-century’
p. 543 ‘North America’, not ‘the North America’

Other errors and omissions remain to be found.

Respectfully submitted,

Frederick Whitling, November 2010
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA.VV.</td>
<td>Autori vari/Various authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAR</td>
<td>American Academy in Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Allied Commission for Civil Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>Archivio Centrale dello Stato, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIAC</td>
<td>Associazione Internazionale di Archeologia Classica, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>Athenische Mittellungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Archives Nationales, Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCSA</td>
<td>American School of Classical Studies at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASMAE</td>
<td>Archivio Storico del Ministero degli Affari Esteri, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Bundesarchiv, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSR</td>
<td>British School at Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSA</td>
<td>British School at Athens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAI</td>
<td>Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAIA</td>
<td>Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Athen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAIR</td>
<td>Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Abteilung Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHI</td>
<td>Deutsches Historisches Institut, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>Dagens Nyheter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>École française d'Athènes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFR</td>
<td>École française de Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUB</td>
<td>Gothenburg University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRCE</td>
<td>Istituto Nazionale per le Relazioni Culturali con l'Estero, Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>Istituto Svizzero di Roma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNIR</td>
<td>Koninklijk Nederlands Instituut Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUB</td>
<td>Lund University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFAA</td>
<td>Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives (the Allied subcommission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>National Archives, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIAC</td>
<td>Pontificia Istituto di Archeologia Christiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Riksarkivet (the National Archives, Stockholm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Römische Mittellungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>The Swedish Cyprus Expedition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Svenska Institutet, Stockholm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>Svenska Institutet i Athen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIR</td>
<td>Svenska Institutet i Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SvD</td>
<td>Svenska Dagbladet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>Utrikesdepartementet (the Swedish foreign office)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Life is worth living, says art, the beautiful temptress; life is worth knowing, says science. (Friedrich Nietzsche, ‘Homer and Classical Philology’)

In the aftermath of the fall of the Fascist regime and the German occupation of the city 1943-1944, the community of scholars based at the so-called foreign academies in Rome with a shared interest in classical antiquity, were discussing the need for closer institutionalised collaboration with their Italian colleagues in order to legitimise their continued presence in the ruins of the old system; of the dead-end consequence of the intense nation-building processes of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The fall of the Fascist regime also entailed the fall of regime policies; one of which was the exclusion of foreign archaeological undertakings in Italy from the early 1870s until the end of the Second World War. The foreign academies in Rome had to adapt to this new opportunity with its inherent competitive elements; the need for communication and collaboration was arguably greater than ever. This required diplomatic efforts on the part of the directors and boards of the foreign academies in balancing the challenges of the new situation; one that would otherwise risk becoming dominated by national competition. It was felt that the time had come for the foreign academies in Rome to truly collaborate.

Collaborate regarding what, exactly? The issue at hand was to ensure that the four so-called ‘German libraries’ – transported to German territory by the Nazi regime in early 1944 – would be returned to Rome as
soon as possible, as these libraries were perceived to be of fundamental importance for continued scholarly activities at the foreign academies in Rome. The two related international organisations that emerged out of this discussion – the Associazione Internazionale di Archeologia Classica (AIAC) in 1945, and the Unione of Institutes in 1946 – reflected a structure that stemmed from balancing compromises between national interests and varying levels of representation of national policies at the foreign academies in Rome.

The pragmatic issue of the return of the four German libraries was not quite sufficient, however, the new rhetoric of post-war collaboration also sprung from the disastrous experience of the war and a satiated nationalist disillusionment, as well as nostalgia and desire for a renaissance of ‘lost’ values and scholarly milieux. The two organisations (AIAC and the Unione) were set up in a spirit of humanism, with direct references to the return of the alleged ‘international’ spirit of the establishment of the Franco-Prussian, Anglo-Italian Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica (ICA) in 1829 – the ‘mother institution’, from which the national foreign academies evolved after the unification of Italy and Germany in the early 1870s. The nature of and motives behind this spirit of humanism will be tried in this study.

This study does not intend to explicitly criticise the academic study of ancient history, classical archaeology or classical philology (the discipline of classics). On the contrary, it attempts to contribute to the historicising process of the study of antiquity and the classical tradition through an appeal for self-reflective understanding.
Analogies can be made between this transnational character of the scholarly community in post-war Rome and the organisation of the European Union or the United Nations – super-structures that rely on transparency enabling fruitful compromise, good faith and the incorporation of a multitude of corporate cultures in order to function successfully. This study will illuminate these issues through an investigation of the milieu of international collaboration and what will be referred to here as academic diplomacy in post-war Rome, a context that deserves more attention than it has traditionally received outside Roman scholarly circles.

The study analyses national and international perspectives of scholarly interaction at the foreign academies in Rome, and discusses the notion of accessible ‘common roots’ through claims to and the study of ancient culture. The potential for a deeper understanding of the development of Western culture over the past centuries increases through contextualisation of the nature and structures of the study of classical antiquity as a legacy of multiple legacies. This study aims at contributing to such contextualisation and enlightenment.²

This PhD dissertation is entitled ‘The Western Way. Academic Diplomacy: Foreign Academies and the Swedish Institute in Rome, 1935–1953’. The notion of the ‘Western Way’ takes its inspiration from the main protagonist Erik Sjöqvist’s home address in Princeton (40, the Western Way, Princeton, N.J.) while professor there (in the 1950s and 1960s), and carries at least

two embedded meanings relevant to this study. The notion of the ‘Western Way’ simultaneously alludes to Western supremacy manifested through the narrative of the classical tradition, as well as to a specific context-dependent tradition of academic diplomacy. The title attempts to capture the multifaceted dimensions of changes that took place in cultural self-perception as a result of the collapsed paradigm of national identification with classical heritage after the Second World War.
1 FOREIGN ACADEMIES AND ACADEMIC DIPLOMACY

Se vogliamo che tutto rimanga com’è, bisogna che tutto cambi.
(Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa, ‘Il Gattopardo’)

1.1 PURPOSE, METHOD AND MAIN QUESTIONS

The focus of this investigation lies on the dynamic of national interests versus international collaboration among the so-called foreign academies in Rome during the immediate post-war period in Italy. This is a study of individual, local and national representation and mentalities, as well as of national scholarly institutions. The study covers the period 1935-1953, and concerns scholarly interaction at five foreign academies in Rome – the Swedish Institute in Rome (SIR), the British School at Rome (BSR), the American Academy in Rome (AAR), the École française de Rome (EFR) and the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom (DAIR) – all representing national academic structures and scholarly paradigms in relation to the study of antiquity and perceptions of common classical heritage and tradition.

The investigation attempts to illuminate and contextualise the foreign academies in Rome, and has been inspired by the conspicuous general lack of assessment of the foreign academies beyond national ‘hagiographical’ histories, and by a need for self-reflective evaluation of the academies in historical context. This is a new and largely unexplored interdisciplinary field of study, which can be simultaneously understood as transnational history, cultural diplomacy, intellectual biography and cultural history. This study addresses several historiographical gaps: it attempts to bridge
the disciplines of classics and (modern Italian) history; it discusses the intellectual legacy of the classical tradition during the twentieth century; it furthermore discusses Swedish perspectives of cultural neutrality, as well as dynamics of institutions and organisations dedicated to principles of international collaboration.

The study furthermore analyses the employment of what is referred to here as academic diplomacy (through individual and institutional agency) in terms of degrees of individual representation of directors of the foreign academies in Rome during the period in question. This study introduces the concept of academic diplomacy as a way of illustrating a diverging range of diplomatic lobbying demarches by foreign and domestic scholars in Rome in the immediate post-war period.³

The topics investigated in this study are arguably of importance for a more nuanced and dynamic understanding of the scholarly world of classical archaeology. The work is structured around the theme of research libraries as spoils of war, and reconstructs the series of events that led to the salvation of the four German scholarly libraries in Rome and Florence during and after the Second World War.

The interaction of various foreign academies in Rome before, during and after the war are integrated with that central theme. This interaction and collaboration in turn relates to the not wholly successful efforts of locally formed international organisations (AIAC and the Unione) to integrate the activities of the academies in Rome. The unifying threads of

³ The concept was introduced by the author in Frederick Whitling, "The Unione in 1946: Reflections on Academic Diplomacy and International Collaboration," Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma. Annuario 50 (2008).
the investigation can be found in the activities of the Swedish Institute in Rome (SIR), the only foreign academy operative during the war, therefore providing the historical link from 1935 to 1953.

This is a study of incentives and motives, of individualism and idealism, of national compromise in the name of common interests. The study focuses on applications and consequences of Swedish neutrality at the SIR; and on Erik Sjöqvist (1903-1975), its director 1940-1948. The SIR and its director Erik Sjöqvist provided the sole institutional continuity during this period, vital to the survival of scholarly resources and maintaining a sense of scholarly community. The investigation discusses the role of individuals in relation to structures, and the flexibility of institutions or degrees of collaboration and institutional mobility.

The main chronological focus of the study lies on the immediate post-war period (1944-1948), capturing the transition from the crumbling of Fascist Italy, the end of the Second World War and the foundation of the Italian republic. The study however encompasses the period 1935-1953, ending with the restitution of the German scholarly institutions in Italy to German control in 1953. The starting point is the transformation of the paradigm of classical archaeology in Italy that took place after the Second World War, following the ‘opening’ of Italy for foreign excavations (a strictly domestic Italian archaeological general policy had been operational since the 1870s as part of the Italian nation-building project); as well as the restructuring of the dynamic of foreign research institutions in Rome during and directly following the end of the war.
One aspect of this that would require further investigation, not covered by this study, is the role of Jewish and German refugees to the USA in the dynamics of the American Academy in Rome as well as to the scholarly community in Rome in more general terms, through American academic networks and contacts with scholars such as Charles Rufus Morey (cf. chapters 4 and 6).

This study takes an interest in the desire in 1945 to return to the international mindset of the 1829 *Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica* (ICA), after an extensive period of rivaling national paradigms. It will be argued that the post-war years can potentially illustrate both the roots and the implications of such international (institutional) collaboration, manifested through the establishment of the two organisations AIAC and the Unione in Rome in 1945-1946.

The study can furthermore be defined in 'negative' terms of what it does not set out to do: it is not an intellectual biography of Erik Sjöqvist, nor is it an institutional history of each respective institution – this has to some extent been carried out elsewhere. The study furthermore does not aspire

---

to cover comprehensively the histories of the two international organisations in question here (AIAC – the International Association of Classical Archaeology – and the Unione of institutes (foreign as well as domestic). These aspects have been covered in greater detail in locally contained histories (cf. the historiography in section 1.9).5

Neither is it an investigation into the nature of the issue of the return of the four so-called German libraries to Rome after the Second World War. The study does however discuss the ‘why’ and the ‘how’ of the return of these libraries in the light of academic diplomacy and international collaboration between representatives of the foreign academies in Rome.

The study deals with a wide variety of source material, and intertwines reports, memoranda and correspondence in Swedish, English, Italian,


French and German. Passages and quotations are translated by the author (into English) when it is considered relevant and useful to do so; the system of quotations in this study is thus based on ongoing selections and assessments by the author. The original text is quoted in the main text and in footnotes when it is judged to be relevant.

It is suggested here that individual agency and institutional traditions illustrate degrees of scholarly collaboration through power relations in overlapping networks, such as those of the directors of the foreign academies in Rome, of the Vatican, UNESCO and the American network of transatlantic scholars. How are narratives of institutional ‘memory’ shaped, as individuals interpret events, situations and institutions differently? What are the implications of combining a cultural and a political perspective?

The study sets out with the purpose of deconstructing and diversifying the narrative of post-war international collaboration in scholarly circles in Rome, making a case for the pan-European nation-building phase (approximately 1870-1945) as an anomaly in the local historical context of the city of Rome.

The study investigates national characteristics of the foreign academies themselves as well as of their directors. It is however not conceived comparatively, but rather as an entangled (transnational) analysis of the network of scholars of classical archaeology and their national institutional representations in post-war Rome. In terms of method this is achieved through combining and meshing archival material from different institutional and national contexts. This is done in order to avoid purely
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national narratives, addressing the foreign academies from universal perspectives of common legacies.

1.2 ACADEMIC DIPLOMACY

Every generation, it seems, claims to write a ‘new’ international history, although as often as not there is more rhetoric than substance in the boast. The irreducible core of diplomatic history remains the relationship among nation states expressed through interchange between governments and foreign ministries.⁶

This study is concerned with the interrelationships and degrees of academic diplomacy of individual directors of foreign academies in mid- to late career in post-war Rome, characterized as a blend of elements of political and cultural diplomacy, carried out by scholars (foreign academy directors) in semi-diplomatic functions.

The study investigates the corporate culture, climate and context of the network of foreign scholars in Rome in the immediate post-war period. Such a culture is arguably the result of actions, achievements and aspirations as well as the manner in which issues are resolved and received in specific contexts; for this study one based on scholarship, tradition and degrees of cultural diplomacy.

The conceptualisation of academic diplomacy has sprung from the challenge of expressing the activities and multiple functions of the directors of foreign academies in Rome, above all in the immediate post-

war period. The phenomenon permeates the ends as well as the means of diplomacy, and might be alternatively referred to as ‘diplomacy of academics’. It will be suggested that academic diplomacy has been expressed differently at for example the ‘neutral’ SIR (through its director Erik Sjöqvist), at the EFR (Albert Grenier) and the AAR (Charles Rufus Morey), which is illustrated throughout this study. The dynamic of the institution itself and its governance, it is suggested, dictates the framework of possibilities within specific national academic traditions.

It might be possible to alternatively conceptualise for example the notion of ‘scholarly diplomacy’; ‘academic diplomacy’ is arguably a more potentially useful concept for the present purposes. Similar nuances in diplomacy have in other contexts been addressed as for example ‘cultural diplomacy’, ‘science diplomacy’ and ‘archaeological diplomacy’. Would the directors of the foreign academies in question here have labeled themselves as scholars rather than as diplomats?

This study should in this sense not be understood as a diplomatic history, as academic diplomacy incorporates elements of both cultural and political diplomacy. It is not yet an established concept, but is suggested here as a useful tool for discussing the ‘political’, quasi-diplomatic positions for scholars representing institutions. To the extent that the concept does exist, it has come to represent a diverse field, ranging from educational exchange to master studies in combining an academic, historicising approach to diplomatic practice.  

The focus on the notion of academic diplomacy allows for a focus on the directors of the foreign academies as individuals as well as scholars, as the ‘revolving door’ between institutional and personal motives, moving between different types of agencies. Academic diplomacy can thus be understood as a descriptive concept. Determining the role of individuals in relation to institutions in the development of networks and research strategies is problematic.

The ambiguous ‘semi-diplomatic’ status of the Swedish Institute in Rome (it does not benefit from extra-territorial rights, for example) provides one reason for the focus on the SIR in this study, and emphasises the potential influence of individual directors. It thus offers a strong case for their individual importance in entertaining networks and

---

interests (their own as well as those of the institutions they represent) through academic diplomacy.

The network of directors or foreign (and domestic) academies in Rome can be conceptualised as an ‘aristocracy’ (following the original definition of the term) of some of the foremost (classical) scholars from each specific national context; this is also reflected in the structure of the two post-war organisations discussed here (AIAC and the Unione). This study is therefore played out in local, national, international as well as postcolonial ‘pan-Mediterranean’ dynamics, and is connected with the issue of alleged scholarly irreproachability.  

The close-knit circles of individual directors, with individual (biographical) levels, provide a tool for discussing commonalities in terms of formation, training and common research interests (one aspect of which being linguistic versatility in producing and digesting the published cumulative, ‘transnational’ results of classical scholarship), by way of addressing varying scales of analysis.

Conceptualising academic diplomacy requires further investigation and a developed and nuanced understanding of how and to what extent

---

the foreign academies served a ‘diplomatic’ function in relation to Italy, the host country, in the period in question (1935-1953); as well as of the dynamic of the role of science in relation to politics. This study can hopefully contribute to that understanding. This dynamic by necessity includes communication with domestic Italian authorities and scholarly institutions. The diplomatic effort at the foreign academies in Rome is also directed at (funding) authorities in the home country (in the Swedish case avoiding being ‘reduced’ to the status of a cultural institute, for example).

1.3 THE FOREIGN ACADEMIES IN ROME AND THE POST-WAR PARADIGMATIC SHIFT

The ‘foreign academy’ is defined by relationships between boards and trustees of the home countries in relation to the respective institutions and their directors, as well as by the Italian context and international network in which these institutions operate. ‘Academies’ is used here as a generic term, referring to the (foreign) scholarly educational institutions in Rome; the term thus includes ‘academies’ – such as the American Academy in Rome (AAR), ‘institutes’ – such as the Swedish Institute in Rome (SIR), as well as ‘schools’ – such as the British School at Rome (BSR). The use of the term ‘academies’ is in accordance with for example the American Academy’s (AAR) ‘collective’ use of the term for the foreign scholarly institutions in Rome.¹⁰

¹⁰ The term was also used by the BSR; in planning the formal opening of the new wing of the BSR in 1938, reference was made to the necessity of ‘bringing our action in this into line with the other Academies’. C.A. Ralegh Radford to Evelyn Whitling, Frederick (2010), The Western Way: Academic Diplomacy. Foreign academies and the Swedish Institute in Rome, 1935-1953 European University Institute DOI: 10.2870/64251
The foreign academies in Rome can from several perspectives be said to function as extensions of national scholarly paradigms; its fellows and students constituting a self-fashioning ‘elite’. It is suggested here that that dynamic has been and still remains more prominent and important than collaborative efforts among the academies themselves in the local context.

The foreign academies share similar conservative structures, in part inherent to the topics with which they are concerned: classical archaeology, classical philology and art history. As outposts removed from the institutional context of their home countries, such conservatism is to a certain extent to be expected.\(^\text{11}\) Analogous to how a piece of written work can be described by what it is not, the foreign academies in Rome might also be defined ‘negatively’: they are not generally speaking cultural institutions or outspoken promoters of national cultures (as opposed to for example the Centre Culturel Suédois (CCS) in Paris); the foreign academies in Rome in fact embrace a shared (international) heritage structure of classical archaeology and the classical tradition by way of empirical research springing from diverging national scholarly paradigms and perspectives.

---


\(^{11}\) In the context of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome (the DAIR), it is for example possible to speak of a conservative enclave on the one hand during the 1930s and early 1940s (represented by for example director Armin von Gerkan), and a more radical (Nazi) approach on the other (above all represented by ‘second director’ Siegfried Fuchs). This division was clearly visible in the issue regarding whether or not to keep the German libraries in Italy in 1943-1944 (cf. chapter 4). Cf. Thomas Fröhlich, "Das Deutsche Archäologische Institut in Rom in der Kriegs- und Nachkriegszeit bis zur Wiederöffnung 1953," in *Deutsche Forschungs- und Kulturinstitute in Rom in der Nachkriegzeit*, ed. Michael Matheus (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2007).
1944-1948, the main period of interest in this study, was not a period characterised by large-scale excavation projects in Italy (due to the recovery after the Second World War as well as to the gradual ‘opening’ of Italy for foreign excavations after the fall of Fascism during this period). The following decade (after 1950) was on the contrary one of intense excavation (made possible through national funding in each specific context) after the ‘collaborative turn’ of the mid-1940s. Indeed, without the collaboration manifested in the organisation and establishment of the two Rome-based organisations AIAC and the Unione, the widespread perception of the cultural relevance of the classical tradition and the fate of classical archaeology in Italy would arguably have been at the mercy of individual national contexts.

The Second World War brought an end to the most intense phase of (Western) European nation-building to date, opening up new possibilities for the establishment of (regional) networks and organisations focusing on common interests, as well as for an ameliorated potential for diplomatic international ties. In the context of the foreign academies in Rome this can was partly manifested through different kinds of intra-institutional (personal) networks (cf. chapters 4-6).

The alleged post-war shift towards official mutual recognition and international collaboration (a break with the past, but at the same time relying on the past) does however require further contextualisation. The notion of a paradigmatic shift towards international collaboration within

---

12 Examples of early foreign excavations in Italy are the EFR excavations at Bolsena in Etruria (initiated in 1946) and Megara Hyblaea on Sicily (initiated in 1949), as well as the AAR excavations at Cosa (the first campaign of which took place in 1948-1954). See map of excavation sites in the Mediterranean (fig. 19, chapter 3).
the context of the foreign academies in Rome after the Second World War will be tried in this study by means of an analysis of the direction and aims of the desirable post-war ‘spirit of international collaboration’. This is the picture this study sets out to paint. How was the continued study of ancient (imperial) Rome, so closely associated with the Fascist regime and its conceptualisations of *romanità*, justified and maintained in the local Roman context by the foreign academies after the Second World War?

**1.4 The Swedish Institute in Rome and Swedish Neutrality**

The strategies, implications and driving forces behind the paradigmatic shift towards international collaboration (cf. section 1.3) constitute the object of this investigation, mainly through a study of the Swedish Institute in Rome (SIR, established in 1925-1926), located in the Valle Giulia adjacent to Villa Borghese in Rome. This is not a ‘case study’ in the sense of the widespread use of that concept; the focus on the SIR provides a way of focusing on one of the agents in this study, contrasting the director of the SIR with those of the four traditionally most influential foreign academies, the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom (DAIR,

---


established in 1871), L’École française de Rome (EFR, 1873), the American Academy in Rome (AAR, 1894), and the British School at Rome (BSR, 1901).

The study furthermore discusses Swedish neutrality. The SIR was the only foreign academy in Rome to remain operational throughout the Second World War. To what extent did this circumstance influence the dynamic of collaboration after the war (partly through the gestation of the two international organisations AIAC and the Unione)? The main focus of the interest in the SIR lies on the role of Erik Sjöqvist, its director 1940-1948.

As was stated earlier, this is not an intellectual biography of Sjöqvist, however, nor is it an attempt to comprehensively cover his legacy as a scholar; a legacy that is understudied, as is the history of the SIR in more general terms. Sjöqvist seldom commented on his years as director of the

---

15 It remains unclear to what extent for example the neighbouring Dutch Institute was really closed during the war – although its activities ceased, its director (Hoogewerff) remained in Rome, meeting regularly with Sjöqvist at the SIR. Hoogewerff contributed to the early structure of the Unione together with Sjöqvist et al. (cf. chapter 6). Interview with Dutch Institute in Rome (KNIR) historian Hans De Valk, March 26, 2009. Cf. Cools and de Valk, *Institutum Neerlandicum MCMIV-MMIV. Honderd jaar Nederlands Instituut te Rome*. The other foreign academy in Rome representing a neutral state, The Swiss Institute (ISR), was not established until 1948.

16 Sjöqvist proceeded to become visiting full professor at Princeton University, USA, from August 1, 1948 to July 31, 1949. He was hired as a full professor at Princeton, beginning in September 1951, serving there until his retirement on June 30, 1969.

17 For an appraisal of Sjöqvist as director of the SIR (1940-1948), see Carl Nylander’s historical overview of the SIR in commemoration of its 75th anniversary in Magnusson, ed., *Humanist vid Medelhavet*. See also Barbro Santillo Frizell, "1903-2003. Due centenari all’Istituto Svedese: Erik Sjöqvist e Gösta Säflund," *Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma Annuario* 45, 2003-2004 (2003). and Ingrid Edlund-Berry, "Erik Sjöqvist: Archeologo svedese e ricercatore internazionale alla Princeton University," *Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma Annuario* 45, 2003-2004 (2003). The archival material at The Department of Art and Archaeology as well as at the Mudd Library at Princeton University (Faculty files, correspondence and photographs), only used to a limited extent in this
SIR, not from a lack of eventful circumstances, but seemingly from a habit of not emphasising his own agency. This study hopes to illuminate and contextualise that agency, as well as Sjöqvist’s parallel legacy as a scholar-diplomat, telling a story Sjöqvist never told himself.

Sjöqvist participated in the first course in classical archaeology given by the SIR in 1926 (cf. section 2.2). This is significant for several reasons: (1) it cemented Sjöqvist’s close relations with Axel Boëthius, director of the SIR 1926-1935, thereafter secretary of the board during Sjöqvist’s directorship; (2) Sjöqvist would have been well acquainted with what awaited him as director in 1940, in terms of the structure and pedagogical aims of the archaeological course, a prominent part of the SIR profile; (3) the experience and factual knowledge gained from the archaeological course influenced the then 23-year old Sjöqvist to become what might be defined as a stereotypical (conservative) classical archaeologist-‘colonial’ explorer. From a Swedish perspective this era peaked with the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (SCE) 1927-1931, led by Einar Gjerstad, director of the SIR 1935-1940 (thereafter member of the SIR board). Erik Sjöqvist formed part of the four-man expedition, together with Gjerstad, archaeologist Alfred Westholm and architect John Lindros.18

---

The role of director Sjöqvist and the SIR in the collective pursuits of foreign schools in Rome after the Second World War is of specific interest to this study. How was Sjöqvist’s role interpreted by his colleagues in Rome and by the board of the SIR in Stockholm? As director of the SIR 1940-1948, Sjöqvist could provide a safe haven for the early life of the two organisations AIAC and the Unione, partly thanks to the recently established new facilities of the SIR in Valle Giulia (in 1940), which were in part enabled by the concession of state funding of the SIR in 1938.19

The SIR therefore offers the possibility for unique insights into limited (censored) communications with the home country, the restraints on the scholarly community in Rome during the war, as well as the dynamic and pragmatic function of the directorship of a foreign academy in Rome during the 1940s.20

---

19 Medelhavsmuseet visits Bucharest (Stockholm: Medelhavsmuseet, 2005), Marie-Louise Winbladh, "The Swedish Cyprus Expedition 1927-1931," in The Swedish Cyprus Expedition on Tour. Medelhavsmuseet visits Bucharest (Stockholm: Medelhavsmuseet, 2005), Marie-Louise Winbladh, ed., An Archaeological Adventure in Cyprus. The Swedish Cyprus Expedition 1927-1931. A story told with contemporary photographs and comments (Stockholm: 1997). Archival resources at Medelhavsmuseet, Stockholm (correspondence, field diaries and photographs) relating to the SCE have not been taken into account in this work, but offer a rich potential for further study. For Einar Gjerstad’s scholarly and archaeological legacy, cf. for example correspondence in Samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden; as well as the Einar Gjerstad research papers, the Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, Special Collections.

One of the richest sources for insights into the continuity of operations at the SIR (other than correspondence at the SIR and at RA, Stockholm) during the war is the collection of Sjöqvist’s personal almanacs (ranging from 1935 well into the 1950s – the series is not complete, but does cover the war years and Sjöqvist’s directorship). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI: 3. Other enlightening material on the war years at the SIR contains Margareta Winbergh’s correspondence (preserved at the SIR) with her sister in Sweden, the testimony
No successful attempts at institutionalised international collaboration between the foreign scholarly institutions in Rome were made after the First World War, which make such collaboratory attempts after the Second all the more noteworthy. International collaboration in the immediate post-war period can be studied in terms of inclusion and exclusion and a certain degree of rivalry between the foreign academies themselves. The professionalisation of the discipline of classical archaeology had initially sprung from a German context (in the 1760s – cf. chapters 2 and 3); the end of the Second World War presented an opportunity for Italian and Allied institutions to take control of the German scholarly assets in Rome, manifested in institutions and above all library resources, or the ‘hardware’ of classical scholarship.

The discussion concerning the German scholarly assets in Rome after the war was in part balanced by Erik Sjöqvist and the ‘neutral' Swedish position. Swedish classical archaeologists had historically been more closely affiliated with the German scholarly tradition of professionalisation in relation to ancient history and classical archaeology, rather than with for example the French or British scholarly traditions. This was partly due to cultural and geographic proximity.

---

of Prof. Sture Linnér (in an interview conducted in Stockholm in April 2009, one year before Linner's death), as well as the memories of librarian John Rohnström, in the form of an unpublished manuscript preserved at the Royal library, Stockholm. KB, Stockholm, Acc. 1997/37; and those of Prof. Per-Gustaf Hamberg (private collection, courtesy of Mrs. Ulla Hamberg). Linnér was grant holder at the SIR 1941-1942, and continued to spend part of 1942-1943 at the institute; Rohnström and Hamberg were both grant holders at the SIR in 1943-1944.
This study analyses the role of the SIR in the transnational microcosm of foreign academies in Rome, and in practice allows for a discussion of its activities as well as its ‘neutral’ status in the context of what is traditionally perceived as the four most influential such foreign academies (the BSR, AAR, EFR and DAIR, not necessarily in that order). Five institutions have been selected for study here; fewer or more could have been chosen. The ambition is to combine and entangle (rather than compare) a wide variety of source material, focusing on a narrowly defined chronological period.

My background as a native Swedish (and English) speaker allows me to access institutional archival material of the SIR not previously used, ranging beyond the material used by Swedish scholar Erland Billig.²¹ There is an element of self-criticism in my work, as I am myself a ‘product’ of the Swedish paradigm of the study of ancient history and classical archaeology. I had the privilege of taking part in the 2004 SIR archaeological course, from which this study has in part evolved.

1.5 Rome: Roman Spatiality and Temporality

Cos’altro è infatti la storia intera se non una celebrazione di Roma? (Petrarca)²²

The ‘Roman space’, perceptions of Rome, as well as what ‘Rome’ can signify and symbolise based on the polarity of ‘universal identity’, represented by the classical tradition as well as by the Vatican, and a cosmopolitan identity through archaeology and cultural anthropology, offers a multitude of avenues for further study. This study hopes to illuminate certain links of that chain. In the post-Enlightenment European nationalist tradition, ‘culture’ framed as archaeological epistemology often tends to become a normative concept, connected with the development of paradigms explaining ‘that which they have themselves created’.²³

From this perspective, it is necessary to conceptualise the South European ‘Mediterranean’ as a perceived coherent whole, as a stage for expressions of cultural unity and common heritage, largely invented by North European scholars in search of common roots in a longue durée-perspective.²⁴ This agenda was indeed on one level such a common pursuit; on a more pragmatic and dominant level it was however characterised by

²⁴ This can also in a sense be seen as a European extension of the domestic Italian problem of ‘la problema del mezzogiorno’ or the ‘questione meridionale’ – Northern perspectives on Southern Italy (the geographical territory corresponding to that of the Bourbon ‘Kingdom of the Two Sicilies’ (1816-1860); as Northwestern Europe ‘dealing with’ Southern and Souttheastern Europe.
national scholarship, national funding and connections with national scholarly structures. A clandestine narrative and intellectual legacy of cultural and scholarly superiority furthermore formed part of the basis on which the foreign academies were constructed, with ample evidence of mistrust of domestic (Italian) scholarship, expressed in terms of national prestige (see also chapter 5).

Rome is at the same time the focal point of the Ancient world as well as of Christianity, the capital of Italy and a city without national identity – in the sense of Rome representing symbols through the physical remains of Ancient Roman material culture, the link to perceived common values and a common (European) past. If Rome did not exist, it would have to be invented. The allure of ancient Rome lies in part in that ‘Rome’ simultaneously refers to a city and an empire, thus representing distance and proximity, universality and locality. ‘Rome’ in this sense has served as a foundation narrative for neohumanist and neoclassical western European identity, particularly as the narrative includes the dramatic ‘reconquering’ of classical antiquity after the Middle Ages through the Renaissance. The city of Rome has thus fulfilled a complex function for the foreign academies themselves, as the centre of a long tradition of foreign scholarly presence from the age of the Renaissance humanists, via the Grand Tour, the Enlightenment and Romanticism. Modernism is however conspicuously absent from the milieu of the foreign academies in Rome.
Rome harbours multiple legacies and projections; the city is in that sense the ideal ‘projection surface’. Its historical palimpsest oscillates between the ancient legacy and the *Roma Sancta* of the Catholic church:

For Leo [St. Leo I (‘the Great’), Pope 440–461], the coming of Peter to the centre of empire had been a providential act, designed so that from Rome the Gospel might be spread all over the world. Christian Rome, refounded on Peter and Paul as ancient Rome had been founded on Romulus and Remus, was the heart of the Church. Leo acted on these convictions, harnessing his immense talents to strengthening papal authority throughout the West. [...] Rome, for Leo, was indeed the *caput orbis*, the head of the world. But it was Christian Rome which was the eternal city, not the thousand-year old wonder that he saw dissolving around him. The empire had been born so that Christianity might triumph. The spiritual Rome, built on the blood of the Apostles and alive in Peter’s heir and spokesman, could not be ruined. [...] In Leo’s vision of the papacy as the head of an *imperium* which was not of this world, the Church had found an ideal which would carry it through the collapse of the classical world, and into the future.25

The notion of time, as discussed by François Hartog, forms part of a constructive tool for discussing tradition and heritage. Hartog discusses the concept of authenticity, as well as *historia magistra* – the relationships with the past grounded in Ancient Rome and the enlightenment, acknowledging a pluralism of ‘regimes of historicity’. Hartog rightly emphasises that heritage (or ‘memory’) is constructed around the relationship between society and time.26

---

The origins of the foreign academies in Rome lie in an embedded discourse of late nineteenth century national rivalry and the spirit of ‘peaceful conquering’ (in the words of Swedish philologist Johan Bergman, from his essay on Sweden and antiquity from 1906), characterised by an undercurrent of tension in terms of national research paradigms imbued with competitive elements and prestige.27

Shared conceptual frameworks and common aims with transnational bearings are trapped in national bodies while at the same time crossing national boundaries. The institutionalisation of the foreign academies in Rome can, as mentioned in the preface, be traced back to the ‘Institute for archaeological correspondence’ (Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica, or ICA), established in Rome in 1829. The main exception is that of the Académie de France, located in Villa Medici, established in 1666 as the first ‘foreign academy’ in Rome – cf. chapter 2). The ICA and the foreign academies in Rome attempted to channel the ‘eternal verities’, in a description from 1934, and ‘that great stream of creative influence, that springing from Greece and the Orient centuries before the Christian Era and drawn to Rome of the Empire as into a great reservoir has fertilized all the subsequent art of Europe and later of America’.28

Expression of admiration for these ‘eternal verities’ were certainly not confined to the 1930s and the peak of Fascism; Italy has however often


been given the benefit of the doubt as the European repository par excellence of art, architecture and classical (humanist) scholarship; sometimes referred to in terms of a ‘moral influence’. Before the Italian elections in 1948, architect Bruno Zevi wrote to AAR president James Kellum Smith that Italy had ‘a permanent value which cannot be easily defeated: humanism’.

This study analyses the activities of the foreign academies in Rome during and after the Second World War, and, apart from the academies themselves, therefore takes domestic Italian and Vatican perspectives into account, as well as those of local administrative bodies and of archaeological traditions. Transnational interrelations between the foreign academies in Rome are documented here in terms of the degree of representation of the diverging and converging national traditions and research paradigms that they represent, in the longue durée-perspective of the influence of classical archaeology on European nation-building processes.

‘Rome’ is thus in every sense a ‘city of the mind’ (such as fifth century BC Athens, or Renaissance Florence). ‘Rome’ is simultaneously a city and a concept of Empire; a stage, with a coexisting multitude of contemporary as well as retrospective projections. Rome, the ancient past, and classical tradition(s) are constantly reinvented. This performative dimension

---

29 See for example ‘Roma centro di coltura europea’, II Messaggero, February 25, 1928 (Diego Angeli): ‘Nessuna altra città di questo mondo, io credo, può godere di questo duplice privilegio onde irraggiare fra i vari popoli della terra la sua influenza morale’.

30 Bruno Zevi to AAR president J.K. Smith, April 9, 1948. AAR, reel 5758.
constitutes an important element of the ‘collaborative turn’ among the foreign academies in Rome in the immediate post-war period.

In 1919, British scholar Percy Gardner accentuated the legacy of ancient Rome and Greece as a ‘guiding star for all time’ in the dystopic aftermath of the First World War: ‘At present, it is to be feared, a day of trial for classical education is dawning. Modern subjects and the study of physical science are pressing hard for a greater share in education. It is time to call in the reserves, to bring all our knowledge of antiquity, from whatever quarter derived, to bear on our teaching; to give life to ancient history by bringing its fruits before the eyes as well as the minds of the young, to exhibit ancient art as a growth parallel to that of classical literature, and equally with it a guiding star for all time’. Gardner’s battle cry conclusion still rings true today to some extent; similar rhetoric was also voiced in the following post-war period after 1945, as this study illustrates.

This study places the classical tradition and classical reception in the context of memory and history studies, sympathising with the direction advocated by Jan-Werner Müller and Thomas Berger, which involves identifying the social carriers of memory, ‘engaged in a constant process not just of remembering, but also of reshaping [as] memory is not a vessel of truth or a mirror of interests, but a process of constructing meaning’.

There is a constant danger of succumbing to unhelpful generalisations of national stereotypes in such processes of interpretation and ‘constructing meaning’; the analytical concerns involved are connected with representation and scale. In discussing individual directors of foreign

---

31 Jan-Werner Müller, in Müller, Memory and Power in post-war Europe: Studies in the presence of the past, 27 & 29-30.
academies for example, the levels of representation involved need to be
determined; taking self-perception into account in relation to institutions,
tradition, national culture and ‘pan-European values’.

Manifestations of so-called ‘collective memory’ often employ a
problematic rhetoric summarised by Alon Confino as ‘who wants to
remember what, and why?’,

32 essentially with the aim of stabilising power
relations and neutralising insecurities. ‘Memory’ is often confused and
mistaken for ‘myth’. ‘Collective memory’ should arguably rather be framed
as collective mythology or common myth.

The memory boom or ‘memory wave’ of the last twenty years has been
fuelled by important contributions by scholars such as Paul Ricoeur,
Pierre Nora, Jan and Aleida Assmann, Alon Confino, Jay Winter, Wolf
Kantsteiner, Stefan Goebel and Norman M. Klein, to name but a few.
Contemporary debates regarding the role of memory in historical
discourse are to some extent the result of the failure of historical writing
to assert itself in a postmodern academic climate by facing the challenge
of combining the cult of the fragment with ‘hegemonic’ historical
narrative. Subjective memories (in the plural) indeed constitute a
complementary source material category for historians; from this does not
however follow a division between memory and history as two opposed
categories.33

Memory and history terminology rests on a crude binary opposition
between ‘authentic’ memory and ‘ideological’ history (in defense of

‘memory’). While the writing of history entails a political aspect as well as having to take authorship and subjectivity into account, and can hardly be labeled ‘authentic’; ‘memory’ can certainly be ideological. In the Italian case, Claudio Pavone advocates ‘re-establishing a relationship between history and memory that is simultaneously philologically correct, historiographically broad and morally aimed at removing stereotypes that falsify the image Italians have of themselves’.34

A bridge between modern history and the legacy of classical reception would be desirable in general terms for self-reflective and critical perspectives on classical archaeology the classical tradition, and specifically for the Roman framework of this study in local terms. This could be achieved through the use of a refined conceptualisation and appreciation of the potential of memory and history studies in discussing the position of the classical legacy within a broader European framework. The terminological confusion of the ongoing memory and history debate can be viewed as a rich complexity – as an asset rather than a problem; taking an entangled view of tradition as a legacy of multiple legacies.35

I.6 SCIENCE AND POLITICS

The end of the Second World War witnessed a desire to protect the world of scholarship from the field of politics, manifested in the creation of AIAC and the Unione in Rome. The role of academic diplomacy (incorporating elements of both cultural and political diplomacy) is not specific to this context. It is however discussed in this study in the Italian context of domestic scholarship and the potential cultural neutrality offered by the Vatican, for example (particularly through its role during the liberation of Rome and the process of the restitution of the four German libraries after the war – cf. section 4.8). The dynamic of the interrelation of the fields of science and politics requires further contextualisation and analysis of how ‘national’ ideas become international, and vice versa. The present work hopes to offer some contributions to this discussion.

In contrast to the common narrative of science and scholarship being protected from the realm of politics in the spirit of post-war international

collaboration, this study suggests that science cannot be protected from politics and is therefore obliged to operate within its sphere of influence. Acknowledging this could help to shed light on funding structures and the potential of scholarly collaboration. A ‘structural’, or Foucauldian approach to defining ‘science’ would be to speak of the ‘disciplinarisation’ of knowledges, and its ‘polymorphous singularity’, which leads to the ‘constraint’ of ‘science’ as ‘an integral part of our society’. A recurring underlying problem in this regard is that of developing an understanding of how politics affect scholarly work, and how this in turn is used for political aims.

1.7 SCALES OF ANALYSIS, METHOD AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This work should be understood more as a transnational entangled discursive analysis of epistemological contexts than as an outright comparison of similarities and differences between national paradigms. The context in question is the changing role and evaluation of classical archaeology after the Second World War and the maintenance of the study of antiquity and the classical tradition, through national and international perspectives.

The investigation searches for an identifiable sense of direction and trajectory, and sets out to evaluate a ‘corporate culture’ of shared terminology and common idioms. Expectations need to be clarified in

terms of what one expects to see (cf. Reinhart Koselleck’s notion of Erwartungshorizont). The attempt here is to write ‘polyphonically’, which entails (at least) three levels of analysis: (1) the individual level, (2) the transnational level of scholarship and academic diplomacy, as well as (3) the national level. The issue of agency coupled with that of discreet actions is essential here – individuals act within structures and frameworks in constant flux; these structures are in a sense ‘distilled’ into, or channelled through, the individuals themselves.

Individuals are links in a chain, the fabric from which transnational history is weaved; they simultaneously represent a variety of contexts and interests, they not least represent themselves (through individual agency as well as through personal motives and agendas). This study employs a broadly defined notion of discourse analysis, emphasising what it makes possible, not what it limits. Ideology is viewed here as a way of thinking and analysing why and how people are doing things, allowing for parallel, simultaneous multiple ideologies; viewing networks in terms of a nexus of interaction.

For these purposes levels of representation are of interest, on a scale progressing from the protection of individual interests via nationalised institutions (or in the name of those institutions), to more or less official ‘national policies’ (reflected in government and board decisions). The scales of analysis employed here focus on motives and degrees of self-interest, and the role of the individual in issues of representation of institutions and organisations in matters of collaboration, such as the example of the establishment of the two Rome-based international
organisations AIAC and the Unione in 1945-1946. The degree of autonomy in operation is therefore relevant to this discussion. Discourse informs practice, and vice versa; this opens up the possibility for a ‘negative space’ (with categories of analysis that are not relevant). What does taking such negative spaces into account allow for?

Analytical categories are constructions and have no automatic intrinsic meaning; they are referential and unstable. It is therefore necessary to tackle the categories themselves, and to attempt to push the boundaries in liminal areas. This illustrates the necessity of illuminating the genealogy of categories and concepts, for example in relation to that of the classical tradition, as well as to an awareness of the consequences of the use of specific concepts in analysis.

Educational structures maintain power through a series of inclusion and exclusion (after Foucault), which again highlights the importance of distinguishing between ‘institutional’ and individual scales of analysis. The points of convergence between scales of analysis are potentially fruitful – it is suggested here that it is in the boundaries between categories that slippages occur (for example between institutional and individual levels of analysis).

---

The methodological approach applied in this study is placed ‘between structure and agency’ as a recent Berghahn volume adequately has it.\(^{38}\) In attempting to recreate or discuss the context of foreign academies in Rome in relation to academic diplomacy and the political context in which they operate, questions of changing scales of analysis as well as of moving from the ‘micro-scale’ (individuals and their interrelations) to the ‘macro-scale’ (political structures and institutional \textit{longue durée} observations) can become actualised and relevant.\(^{39}\) The narrowing of the analytical scale serves the purpose of addressing the agents behind the structures and their interrelations. The challenge is to legitimate general ‘structural’ conclusions from ‘micro-cases’, as well as to avoid succumbing to the ‘biographical trap’.

1.8 SOURCES

The use of source material originating from the foreign academies themselves is based on a selection, although the ambition has been from the outset to cover as much ground as possible regarding the institutional archival material. The analysis aims to transcend the internal logic of the individual institutions by untangling as well as entangling source material from different (national) contexts. The conceptualisation of academic


diplomacy allows for a focus on the directors of the foreign academies as both individuals and scholars, moving between different types of agencies and modes of representation.

This work attempts to draw from as many archival resources as possible; its main focus however lies on Swedish sources not previously used in this context. Other resources will be investigated in future work (such as the DAI archives, Berlin, and the US National Archives at College Park, Maryland); the approach has been to attempt to exhaust the institutional archives of the five foreign academies in question, filling in the gaps with official records in the national archives of each specific context. For further discussions of SIR archival material, see section 2.2; for the BSR and AAR see section 2.3, for the EFR and DAIR see section 2.4.

The role of SIR director Erik Sjöqvist is illustrated through archival material at the SIR as well as at the Swedish National Archives (RA), Stockholm. Sjöqvist was actually to some extent responsible for the organisation of this material himself, through a donation of ‘all of the correspondence I have [had] with members of the [SIR] board and other Swedish and foreign circles that have been close to the institute’ during Sjöqvist’s directorship of the SIR.\textsuperscript{40} Sjöqvist himself felt that the early

\textsuperscript{40} See Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, March 1, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5: ‘I känslan av stark avsaknad av ett brevarkiv, som avspeglar Institutets utvecklingshistoria under de gångna åren och som för svensk lärdomshistoria överhuvud torde äga sitt värde, men samtidigt i klart medvetande om de ofta ömtåliga spörsmål, som uppstå vid uppläggandet av ett dylikt, skulle jag vilja föreslå Styrelsen att vid min avgång från förståndarkapet såsom gåva mottaga hela den brevväxling som jag under dessa år upprätthållit med Styrelsens ledamöter och andra svenska och utländska kretser, som stått Institutet nära under denna tid. [...] Om Styrelsen mottager Gavin, skulle jag föreslå att den förvarades förseglad under så lång tid, som Styrelsen själv behagade bestämma och på plats, som Styrelsen finner för gott besluta’.
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development of the SIR might be of some value for Swedish intellectual history.

Sjöqvist’s central position in the network of foreign (and domestic) scholars in Rome during and after the war has produced a rich collection of source material, most of which has not been previously studied (with certain exceptions used by Erland and Ragnhild Billig for their unpublished (incomplete) history of the SIR, 1925-1948 – see below). One example of a particularly illuminating source can be found in appendix 1 of this study (‘Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5).

To a considerable extent, formulations and hints in the institutional source material in question here indirectly express what is not explicitly stated, common discourse and understanding being read between the lines. The interpretation is furthermore complicated by inherent problems relating to the self-commemoration of institutional sources, as they often tend to inadvertently emphasise national frameworks and traditions. At the same time, personal correspondence takes place in a ‘microscopical’ biographical dimension, which adds to the methodological problématique inherent in attempting to recreate networks through incomplete series of correspondence.

This project deals with diverging types of source material (annual reports, ‘official’ correspondence, newspaper articles, routine
administrative documents and private letters). The interest here lies in identifying expressed claims to legitimacy and references to the role of the respective institutions, although such direct references are rare. The temptation to write internal ‘family histories’ of the respective foreign academies is imminent. The different kinds of source material before and after the war for the institutional contexts investigated here furthermore needs to be taken into account. The SIR provides an exception to this rule in terms of the continuity of produced material during the war, which is one of the main reasons for the focus of attention of this study.

Contemporary sources (from the period 1935-1953) are used here to as large an extent as possible; earlier and later material is used solely for contextual illumination of the issues in question. The bulk of the source material for this project consists of correspondence and the (mainly unpublished) annual reports and administrative material of the respective institutions from the period in question. This institutional material is made up of correspondence to, from and between the directors of the academies, as well as of administrative material in the archives of the respective institutions.

The main part of the archival material preserved at the SIR is unpublished and not systematically categorised. Approximately fifty percent of the total amount of preserved documents in the archive have been organised in document boxes by the Swedish National Archives 
Riksarkivet (RA). A substantial part of the SIR-related archival material has been transferred to RA in Stockholm. Relevant reference categories of archival material at RA are above all series ‘I’, ‘III’ (III A, B and F:i) and
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'VI'. Duplicates and copies of individual documents, as well as unique material, can furthermore be found in the collections of letters pertaining to Einar Gjerstad and Martin P. Nilsson at Lund University Library, Sweden. Axel Boëthius’ collection of letters in Gothenburg University Library, Sweden, is only taken into account to a marginal extent in this study.

The institutional archival material is divided between the academies in Rome and the national archives of the countries that they represent; for the SIR also for example in Lund University Library, Sweden (LUB, the Einar Gjerstad'and and Martin P. Nilsson collections); Gothenburg University Library (GUB, Axel Boëthius’ correspondence), as well as in the Princeton University Archives (Erik Sjöqvist’s post-SIR correspondence) – see the bibliography (chapter 8) for a more detailed source material commentary.

Another important category of evidence is that of unpublished sources other than correspondence and other archival documentation. This category includes above all two important documents: (i) Erland and Ragnhild Billig’s manuscript – an unfinished history of the SIR 1925-1948, written by Erland Billig, active at the SIR during the Second World War. The manuscript was never completed before Billig and his wife Ragnhild passed away (Erland Billig died in 1990); it thus remains incomplete and unpublished.41 Based on the narrative of the Billigs’ manuscript, it is

41 In his narrative of the history of the SIR (in celebration of its 75th anniversary in 2001), former director Carl Nylander frequently referred to Billig’s unpublished manuscript. Nylander is the only scholar to date to have used this manuscript as source material (other than Erland Billig himself). Nylander’s bibliography furthermore provides a useful overview of SIR-related publications.
reasonable to assume that Erland Billig (its principal author; the manuscript was co-authored by his wife Ragnhild Billig) neither saw nor used Sjöqvist’s useful correspondence in the Riksarkivet (RA) files III: A:1-5 (see the bibliography, chapter 8). One indication of this is that Billig’s manuscript refers to the uncertain whereabouts of the receipts for the DAIR material deposited at the SIR (1943-1944); these receipts can be found in RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III: A: 5. Billig also discussed the location of correspondence pertaining to the Veii-excavation permit application (1942), which is also preserved in RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III: A: 5. The correspondence in RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III: A was organised by Erik Sjöqvist himself, in files bearing his handwriting (with correspondents in alphabetical order).

The second document in this category is (2) the book of minutes of the first Unione meetings (held on a more or less monthly or bimonthly basis from February 6, 1946 to June 27, 1958), which are gathered in one unpublished volume, preserved in the archives of the Unione. The minutes have been made available to me, the Unione archives themselves however remain unorganised and have not been accessible for this study. This has in part been remedied by Unione-related material in the EFR archives and the AIAC archives (Palazzo Venezia, Rome).

Archival material in the Archivio Centrale dello Stato (ACS), Rome, as well as in the Archivio Storico del Ministero degli Affari Esteri (Archivio Storico Diplomatico, ASMAE), is used in order to illuminate Italian perspectives on foreign scholarly presence in Rome. Archaeological issues

Magnusson, ed., Humanist vid Medelhavet, 383-384. It is the ambition of the author of this study to edit the Billigs’ manuscript for publication.
and relations with the foreign academies in Rome were placed under the
government body of the Ministry of Public Instruction (Ministero di
Pubblica Istruzione), the archival material of which is conserved at the
ACS.42

This study focuses on material that is relevant for the
conceptualisation of academic diplomacy and for the illumination of
degrees of post-war collaboration at the foreign academies in Rome.
Other categories could be utilised for purely institutional histories.
Potential source material from the Vatican archives, from the US National
Archives (College Park, Washington, D.C.), or from the UNESCO
archives in Paris will not be taken into account within the framework of
this study. The Vatican perspective will be commented on mainly through
the use of archival material emanating from the foreign academy archives,
as well as through an interview with Antonio Nogara, the son of
Bartolomeo Nogara, director of the Vatican Museums 1920-1954.

42 The ACS preserves the records produced by most Italian government
ministries; for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, see Cassels, ed., Italian Foreign
evaluation of Italian archives, see Isabella Massabò Ricci, "Gli archivi italiani tra
XVII e XXI secolo," in La Cultura Italiana, ed. Carlo Ossola (Torino: UTET,
2009). See also Cornelia Regin, Tesori di carta. Guida agli archivi e alle collezioni degli
istituti membri dell’Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia
dell’Arte in Roma (Rome: Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia,
Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma, 1998).
This study comprises the diplomatic aspect of the foreign academies in Rome in their communication and relations with domestic Italian institutions and authorities. It thus navigates in the sometimes dire straits between archaeology, internal historiography, diplomacy and biography. The challenge lies partly in establishing this field of research in relation to those of Italian studies and modern (post-war) Italian history on the one hand, as well as classical reception studies and the *longue durée*-perspective of the influence of classical tradition and classical archaeology on nation-building processes (in the sense of a ‘Western canon’ of a repertoire of symbols) on the other.

The present work operates in and between several academic fields and therefore has to take a broad range of historiographies into account. At the same time the production relevant to this topic is so far limited, which makes the literature survey discussed here representative in general terms. This is not yet a very extensive field of research. The *Fragmenta*-volume entitled *Archaeology and National Identity in Italy and Europe 1800-1950*, a (Brethols) publication of a conference in 2007 at the Dutch Institute in Rome, was one of the first efforts to come to terms with the intellectual legacy of classical archaeology, and contains several relevant articles (by Stephen Dyson, Horst Blanck, Philippe Foro and Sara Rey, Domenico Palombi, Christian Jansen and Thomas Fröhlich).

One exception to the general lack of relevant literature, and in many ways an important step, is Angela Windholz *Et in Academia Ego. Ausländische Akademien in Rom Zwischen Künstlerischer Standortbestimmung Und Nationaler Repräsentation* (Regensburg, 2008). Windholz’ work
discusses the birth of ‘national academies’ in Rome, covering the period 1750-1914. Windholz engagingly elaborates on themes such as ‘academy nationalism’ and ‘academic imperialism’. She focuses on ‘academies’ in the tradition of the Académie de France (Villa Medici); that is to say institutions with a profile of hosting creative artists from their respective national contexts. The term ‘academies’ is used in a more generic sense in the present work, encompassing ‘academies’ (in the sense discussed by Windholz), ‘schools’ (combining practising creative arts with scholarly endeavours, cf. the BSR – this profile can however be shared with ‘academies’, such as the AAR) and (research) ‘institutes’ (such as the SIR). Interest in the nature, traditions and histories of the foreign academies in Rome has increased considerably since the present work was initiated in 2006. The recent Accademie svelate-publication produced by the Regione Lazio and the Provincia di Roma (2010) is one expression of this (in particular the contribution by Emilio Del Gesso entitled ‘La cultura internazionale a Roma’), another is the conference on the intellectual legacy of the foreign academies organised by the Unione, planned for 2012. This study can to some extent be perceived to be based on a ‘concordance’ of earlier research (by scholars such as Erland Billig, Paolo Vian and Arnold Esch) as a point of departure; at the same time it entails

an attempt to widen the discourse in several directions, linking a variety of fields of research (reflected in the bibliography), transgressing national paradigms and interpreting multiple snapshots of events and phenomena.

The years immediately following the Second World War are often associated with Italy’s relations with the United States – mainly through the Marshall Plan, or the European Recovery Program, which began in 1947 and ran until 1952, with the United States allocating $13 billion to the restructuring of Western Europe after the Second World War. Italian post-war inter-European connections and diplomatic relations did not really come into play until 1947-1948, when Italy could again act as a political unit with the advent of the Italian constitution, enacted on December 22, 1947 (it came into force on January 1, 1948); and the Paris Peace Treaties, signed on February 10, 1947, according to which Italy abandoned claims to its former colonies, as well as entailing the restitution of territory to Greece, France, Yugoslavia, Albania and other countries. The Treaty of Peace with Italy followed on the Paris Peace Conference (from July 29 to October 15, 1946).  

In a 1948 memorandum regarding an ‘administrative program to strengthen the UN’, by the ‘United Nations Citizenship League’ to Italian foreign minister Carlo Sforza, it was stated that Italy, of course, is not a really a defeated nation. Nevertheless, it labors under a harsh peace treaty. And it has not been admitted to UN membership. Here is Italy’s opportunity. [...] Count Sforza, the Italian Foreign Minister, has recently offered a very constructive suggestion. Count Sforza has proposed the formation of a federal union of European states, and has said that Italy is willing to set an example by giving up some of her sovereignty. Perhaps Count Sforza’s generous and statesmanlike offer will be accepted in the near future. Perhaps the acceptance will be delayed for some time. In the first case, the new European Union should, of course, adopt the Plan. In this way the European Union will not stand alone but will be making its powerful contribution to international law for everybody under the newly streamlined UN. In the second case that is, if Count Sforza’s offer is not accepted in the near future – then the next best thing is for Italy alone to furnish an example by adopting the Plan. Even though sovereignty will be retained, sovereignty will be used in a manner which will be a thousand times more cooperative than any manner in which sovereignty has ever been used before. Moreover, this cooperative use of sovereignty under the Plan will be a training school for gradually giving up sovereignty on a regional basis – in a European Union and in other unions. In any case, Italy can be the pioneer. [...] The UN is going on from there. Rivalry between nations can be put on a constructive basis – in the forum of the UN for international
approval – instead of on the lawless, destructive basis which has, until now, disgraced the pages of history. A chain reaction of constructive causal relationships will be touched off.46

In the words of historian Christopher Duggan, ‘the principles embodied in the [Italian] constitution […] as in so many other moments of Italian history […] underlined the gap between the mass of the population and the elites and thereby the limits of the latter’s moral authority in the country. Nor was the cause of the anti-fascist leadership assisted by the British and Americans, who, in drawing up the peace treaty in 1945–6, refused to recognize that Italy’s contribution to the defeat of Germany had been significant, and certainly not enough to atone for the sins of fascism’.47

Italian history is not traditionally very strong on conceptualisation (‘Italian Empire’, ‘Italian Colonialism’) and is hence faced with a

47 Duggan continues: ‘Benedetto Croce and a number of other prominent Italian intellectuals had been endeavouring since 1943 to argue that the interwar years had been no more than a mysterious parenthesis in the country’s history, an aberration from the true path of liberalism and peace laid down during the Risorgimento. […] Even more telling of the gulf between the ‘values of the resistance’ and the reality of the post-war Republic was the failure to rid the state of former fascists. A number of decrees were issued in 1944 calling for the bureaucracy to be purged, but they were not implemented with any rigour. This was partly because of the practical difficulties of trying to prove who had been ‘fascist’ (or at least sincerely ‘fascist’) in a regime where party membership had been compulsory for all civil servants, but more fundamentally because the Christian Democrats, and behind them the British and Americans, had no wish to see the administrative machinery decimated and replenished with communists and socialists’. Christopher Duggan, The Force of Destiny. A History of Italy since 1796 (London: Allen Lane/Penguin Books, 2007), 541–544. Cf. Daniel Pick, Rome or Death: The Obsessions of General Garibaldi (London: Jonathan Cape, 2005) and Silvana Patriarca, Italian vices: nation and character from the Risorgimento to the Republic (Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
Existing scholarly work in modern Italian and diplomatic history has often treated the transitional period after the fall of Fascism and the end of the Second World War as something directed to the future, anticipating future events, often in the context of the Cold War. Treating the transitional post-war years as a period steeped in tradition, in many ways building on the past as well as pointing to a future, can be considered a recent development contemporary with this study.

The present work combines intellectual history with the reception of antiquity and classical tradition studies, a field of research which has recently expanded dynamically; this expansion can be represented by two recent (Blackwell) anthologies: *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*, edited by Craig W. Kallendorf (Malden, MA & Oxford, 2007), and *A Companion to Classical Receptions*, edited by Lorna Hardwick and

---


Christopher Stray (Malden, MA & Oxford, 2008); as well as the series Oxford Studies in Classical Receptions: Classical Presences, edited by Lorna Hardwick and James I. Porter. Salvatore Settis’ The Future of the ‘Classical’ (Cambridge & Malden, MA, 2006) offers wide-ranging and profound discussions regarding the notion of the ‘Classical’ and the legacy of the classical tradition.\textsuperscript{50}


Ilaria Dagnini Brey’s study of the Allied subcommission for the protection of monuments and archives in Italy (cf. section 4.3), is useful in terms of tracing the work of the subcommission in Italy and events leading up to the establishment of AIAC and the Unione in 1945-1946.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{50} Other Italian contributions to this dynamic field include a wide range of publications, for example Gabriele Borghini, Paola Callegari, and Leila Nista, eds., Roma: Il riuso dell’antico. Fotografie tra XIX e XX secolo (Bologna: Bononia University Press, 2004), Maria Bugli, Franco Miracco, and Claudia Terenzi, eds., Roma: continuità dell’antico. I Fori Imperiali nel progetto della città (Milano: Electa, 1981), Andreina d’Agliano and Luca Melegati, eds., Ricordi dell’Antico. Sculture, porcellane e arredi all’epoca del Grand Tour (Milano: Silvana Editoriale, 2008).

\textsuperscript{51} Ilaria Dagnini Brey, The Venus Fixers: The Untold Story Of The Allied Soldiers Who Saved Italy’s Art During World War II (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 2009).

2 How the West Was One. Contextualising the Foreign Academies in Rome

2.1 The Foreign Academies in Rome

This chapter discusses the foreign academies in Rome in historical context. The focus here lies on the Swedish Institute in Rome (SIR), although the chapter also analyses the context and profile of four of the most influential foreign academies in Rome: the BSR, the EFR, the AAR and the DAIR. This study at the same time discusses the SIR, BSR, EFR and AAR in relation to the DAIR and the role and perceptions of German scholarship (Altertumswissenschaft as well as the history of art).

Foreign scholars and artists had traditionally seldom truly felt like ‘foreigners’ in Rome; this can be attributed to the outcome of a combination of foreign scholars being made to feel welcome as well as the ‘projection’ of a common heritage onto the universal stage of Rome, in part based on the centuries-long tradition of religious as well as antiquarian pilgrimage to Rome – a contributing aspect of the ambience in which the foreign academies were established.52


Athens had often been perceived as a meeting-point and a place for organisation and discussion of archaeological results from the Greek cultural sphere of ancient Greece; Rome was perceived as ‘Rome’ as a complex, distilled symbol of not only Italian cultural legacy, but of the whole Mediterranean world as the focal point of the ancient Roman Empire.

What is then a foreign academy, institute or ‘school’? These concepts defy comprehensive description, in part as they spring from diverging national contexts, but should be approached in the light of changing conceptions, understandings and appreciations of the importance and cultural relevance of the classical tradition (the ‘antiquarian’ context), as well as in relation to national prestige and competitive outposts of national scholarship in a ‘colonial’ context. The notion of a ‘school’ implies subscription to a certain ‘dogma’ or tradition. Tradition can from this perspective be perceived as a way of inculcating Western values.

The main earlier local precursor to the nineteenth-century foreign academies in Rome is the Académie de France, established as a French centre for the arts in Rome by Louis XIV in 1666, the year after the death of artist Nicolas Poussin, who spent most of his working life in the city.53 This early ‘foreign academy’ should (apart from the allure of Rome and its

'eternal verities') be seen in the light of a tradition of domestic academies in Italy, initiated by the ‘Accademia Platonica’ (attempting to ‘revive’ Plato’s ancient academy in Athens), established by Marsilio Ficino in Florence in 1459. This sparked an ‘academy fashion’ in Italian cities, each aspiring to the ideal of a universal academy. The seventeenth century witnessed an increasing specialisation of Italian academies, further enhanced by Enlightenment ideas and ideals.

In Papal Rome, the most important domestic academies were the Accademia della Crusca (established 1582-1583, specialising in the publication of a Vocabolario of the Italian language), the Accademia di San Luca (1593, dating back to 1478, dedicated to the arts), the Accademia dei Lincei (1603, the oldest ‘scientific academy’ in the world, remodeled as the ‘Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei’ following the unification of Italy in 1870, covering both arts and sciences as the national academy of Italy), and the Accademia Reale, established in Rome by Queen Christina of Sweden in 1674, that developed after her death into the Accademia dell’Arcadia (1690, specialising in poetry). During the Fascist period Mussolini’s ambition was to unify all Italian academies into the ‘Accademia d’Italia’ (established 1926). The Accademia dei Lincei was thus temporarily merged with the Accademia d’Italia from 1939 until 1944.

---

57 See for example the entry ‘Roman academies’ in the 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Catholic_Encyclopedia_(1913)/Roman_Academies (visited June 29, 2010).
The foreign academies in Rome date back to the Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica (ICA), a small-scale private international organisation established in 1829, which in turn harked back to the (German) Hyperborei association in Rome (dating to 1823) and previous antiquarian contexts such as the (British) Society of Dilettanti emanating from the eighteenth century context of the Grand Tour (see also chapter 3), associated with the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.

How had the Vatican institutionalised its interests in classical archaeology when the ICA was established in Papal Rome? The Accademia delle Romane Antichità (established by Pope Benedict XIV in 1740) had been amalgamated with the fifteenth-century Accademia Romana (established by Pomponio Leto) and was redefined as the Accademia di Archeologia in 1810, with the acknowledgment of status as Papal academy (as the Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia, or the PAA) conceded by Pope Pius VIII in 1829, partly in order to distinguish it from its new rival the ICA, established the same year.58

The establishment of the ICA was contemporary with the development of an important tradition of (predominantly German) foreign cultural diplomatic actors in Rome (cf. figures like Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835) and Eduard Gerhard (1795-1867), one of the founders

of the ICA). The PAA was thus remodeled as an official Papal academy as a response to the foreign body of the ICA, which had in turn sprung from that circle of foreign cultural diplomats closely associated with the Vatican. The PAA was thus in a sense an institutional response, not necessarily to a perceived ‘threat’, but to a manifestation of a paradigm shift in the discipline of classical archaeology and its practical application in Italy and the Papal States.

The ICA was funded by donations and subscriptions and was (in analogy with the royal interest in the establishment of the SIR a century later) supported by Prussian Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm (1795-1861); its funding was officially taken over by the Prussian government in 1871, which led to its conversion into the Imperial German Archaeological Institute (the DAIR) in 1873-1874. Ludwig Curtius (director of the DAIR 1928-1938) however related that the conversion ‘in ein von preussischen Staat unterhaltenes Institut’ took place as early as 1859. If so, why did not the French and the British contingents of the ICA ‘react’ sooner? The ICA was housed in a building on the Capitoline hill erected in 1835 (extended and rebuilt 1878-1879 in connection with the establishment of the so-called Bibliotheca Platneriana).

The emergence of the ICA can be understood partly as the result of exigencies relating to the professionalisation of classical archaeology, and

---


partly as an expression of the reforms implemented by Prussian minister of culture and education Wilhelm von Humboldt in 1809-1810. In establishing the University of Berlin, von Humboldt formulated the value of a holistic perspective on formation (bildung), related to the ancient Greek paideia pedagogical programme. Insights into ancient history, philology (and classical archaeology) and other aspects of the ‘cultural canon’ of higher education knowledge structures, formed components in this holistic view of individual acquisition of knowledge. The empiricist and cumulative study of the ancient past could be perceived as parts of this parcel, and systematic ‘scientific’ publication drew inspiration from von Humboldt’s younger brother Alexander (1769-1859), in particular from his pioneering work in biogeography.

The EFR was established in 1873-1875, partly as a reaction to the German ‘takeover’ of the ICA (see below). It was no coincidence that France was the first European state to establish its own academy (in this case ‘school’) in Rome after the breakdown of the international ICA venture, as the French had pioneered the establishment of such a national research institution with establishment of the EFA in Athens (in 1846). The

---

64 Cf. French memorandum regarding AIAC (Grenier?). EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union/Association, textes de base, liaisons internationales’: ‘La captation et la nationalisation de cet Institut [ICA] par l’Empire allemand en 1871 ne suprimèrent pas la double exigence d’appeler à Rome des savants de tous nations et de faciliter entre eux les échanges scientifiques. À partir de 1874
establishment of the DAIR should furthermore be seen in conjunction with the contemporary establishment of the DAIA in Athens (1872-1874).

The establishment of the ICA in early nineteenth century Rome was a first step towards the institutionalisation of a foreign scholarly paradigm in the city, as well as a local indication of a gradual shift towards professionalisation, increasing specialisation and the gradually increasing

(École française de Rome), les Écoles, Académies et Instituts étrangers s'y sont multipliés – ils sont douze aujourd'hui – s'ouvrant librement leurs bibliothèques l'un à l'autre et fréquentant en commun celle de l'ancien Institut de Correspondance archéologique, devenu allemand et dépendant de l'Institut archéologique de Berlin’.

65 The map furthermore illustrates the synchronicity of the establishment of the SIR and the initiation of the SCE (the Swedish Cyprus Expedition), 1925-1927.
academic status of the discipline of classical archaeology. That discipline was, on the whole, generally dominated by German scholarship at that time. The German ‘national’ scholarly output in the field was the object of great reverence and respect throughout the scholarly community of classical archaeologists and ancient historians; respect that was to continue in the post-war period, coupled with the restitution of the four German libraries (and institutions) in Rome and Florence to German control in 1953 (cf. chapter 6, as well as the discussion on perceptions of German scholarship in section 5.8).

The German language was in many circles considered to be the language of scholarship *par excellence* in Roman (foreign) scholarly circles; as French was similarly traditionally considered the language of diplomacy (English was not really to be reckoned with in pre- and post-war Rome). A substantial amount of intra-academy communication took place in Italian. On the whole, this situation called for a truly ‘transnational’ linguistic versatility on the part of foreign scholars in Rome. The world of classical (archaeological) scholarship in Rome had been one of linguistic versatility and flexibility since at least the early nineteenth century.

Discussions of transnational scholarship and national representation need to take the peak of the European nation-building era (approximately ca.

---

66 Interview with Antonio Nogara, Rome, December 13, 2009.
67 On the other hand, in 1943 Sjöqvist complained about Italian scholars’ knowledge of German: ‘[…] det är bedrövligt vad de italienska lärde har svårt med axelbroderns tungomål’. Sjöqvist to Krister Hanell, January 15, 1943. SIR, Billig box 2, *Korr. ink. o. utg. 1939-1947*.
and its integrated colonial dimension into account. Post-unification (post-1860) Italian liberalism was constitutionally weak, which contributed to a sense of passive imposition rather than active participation, in combination with scepticism regarding state institutions. The young Italian state initiated its imperial and colonial activities in East Africa in 1869. Classical archaeology formed an integral part of Italian nation-building almost by default, as the perceived glories of ancient Rome and Pompeii were integral to the historical roots of the ‘national identity’ of the peninsula. Italian archaeological presence was however not confined to Italy itself, but were also tagged on to Italian imperial ambitions. The Italian archaeologist Federico Halbherr (1857-1930), who had excavated on Crete since 1884, was for example instrumental in establishing the Italian Archaeological Institute in Athens in 1909. Halbherr was later to conduct excavations also in the Libyan ‘Italian provinces’ of Cyrene and Tripolitania.

For the French, British and Italian contexts, rich material in the respective national archives sheds light on developments and international connections of for example French archaeological research institutions in Greece, Italy, Egypt, Spain and Britain. The establishment of the École française de Rome (EFR) in 1873-1875 can in this way partly be understood in the ‘pan-Mediterranean’ context as a ‘branch’ of its predecessor the École française d’Athènes (EFA, established in 1846 as the first foreign academy in Athens) as well as for example of the later

70 Cf. Ben-Ghiat and Fuller, eds., Italian Colonialism, 1-11.
French Institute in Cairo.\(^7\) The EFR should however at the same time also be understood as a reaction to the German (initially Prussian) ‘takeover’ of the originally international joint venture of the 1829 ICA, as has been stated above.\(^7\)

The SIR tribute to the EFA on the occasion of its centenary celebrations in 1947 illustrates the self-perception of the foreign academies (in both Athens and Rome), and the spirit in which they operated, through the employment of symptomatic and representative diplomatic rhetoric: ‘In the name of the classical scholarship that unites those who see the most precious possession of our humanity in our common Ancient cultural heritage, independent of national boundaries, the young Swedish Institute in Rome sends its admiring tribute to its French sister institution in Athens for its 100\(^{\text{th}}\) birthday’.\(^7\)


\(^7\) Cf. EFR director Albert Grenier’s post-war narrative, according to which the ICA was established in 1829 by the Duke de Luynes et al. (subventionné par le duc de Luynes’, that is Charles-Marie d’Albert de Luynes (1783-1839), 7\(^{\text{th}}\) duc de Luynes) until the Prussian Crown Prince offered his protection. ‘En 1870, le nouvel Empire allemand annexa [...] simplement l’ancien Institut international et sa bibliothèque. La bibliothèque historique [DHI] annexe de même, en 1938, l’ancien Institut historique autrichien et sa bibliothèque. Quant à la bibliothèque Hertzjana, elle s’était [transformée] en 1937 un centre culturel allemand, centre actif de propagande Nazi’. EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’. File ‘Bibliothèques (Liaison Union et Association)’. This analogy of the annexation of the ICA and the Austrian Historical Institute should be seen in the context of Grenier’s attempts to maintain control of the ‘ex-German’ libraries after the Second World War (cf. chapter 6).

\(^73\) Sjögqvist to the EFA (Robert Demangel and Pierre Amandry), n.d. (1947). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3: ‘I namn av den klassiska forskning, som oberoende av nationella gränser binder samman dem som i vårt gemensamma kulturav från antiken se vår människohets dybaraste egendom, sänder det unga Svenska Institutet i Rom till sin franska systerinstitution i Athèn sin beundrande...
The concepts of ‘foreign academies’ or ‘foreign schools’ were in part inspired by the academies in Athens, and were well-established in Rome at the turn of the nineteenth century. After the First World War, the Italian government had confiscated the libraries of the DAIR, together with those of the DHI in Rome and that of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence. The libraries had been restored to German ownership largely due to interventions by Benedetto Croce, Italian Minister of Education in 1920, on condition that they must not be removed from Italy. The DAIR had remained closed for several years during and after the war. In 1926, AAR director Gorham P. Stevens wrote that the DAIR had [...] resumed its famous open meetings for the first time since the outbreak of the Great War. Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Egypt are erecting Academies in Rome near the British School, in the Valle Giulia, where the City of Rome charges them one lire rent per year and grants them tax exemption. There are now ten nations maintaining institutions in Rome for advanced study for their most talented young men. The future of Rome as an international center for the interchange of thought between these men has never been brighter. The prolific beauty of Classical Italy is the very best environment for such an international community.

74 Cf. BSR annual report 1901-1902.
76 Gorham P. Stevens, director’s report, September 20, 1926. AAR, reel 5750. Nothing became of these planned Czechoslovakian and Bulgarian academies in Valle Giulia – the Roumanian academy had however been established there in 1922 and the SIR was established the same year as Stevens’ report (1926).
The internal traditions at the foreign academies in Rome discussed here illustrate differing research trajectories, closely linked with domestic scholarly frameworks. The most specifically national traditions were in this sense arguably those of the EFR, the DAIR and the AAR. The weight of rivalling national paradigms in the establishment of above all the DAIR and the EFR in the 1870s is clear. The developments in these main (national) trends in classical archaeology in Italy are discussed here through the lenses of the foreign academies in question, assessing and historicising the specificities of ‘foreign’ paradigms in classical archaeology.
The foreign academies generally speaking thrived in Fascist Rome. In 1933, a newspaper article went as far as stating that their recent dynamically expanding life and fortune coincided with that of ‘the new Italy’. In 1934, James Monroe Hewlett, director of the AAR declared that ‘the Italian Government is most active in the encouragement of sympathetic relations between the students of the Italian Universities and schools and those of the foreign academies’. These relations were largely administered through the Istituto Nazionale di Studi Romani, a scholarly body organising conferences and publishing works on the Roman past, established in 1925 by the scholar Carlo Galassi Paluzzi. Hewlett asserted

77 Corriere della Sera, January 31, 1933 (Luigi Bottazzi): ‘Roma centro di studi mondiali. Accademie e Scuole straniere’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boethius’ paper, H 80: 238: ‘Tranne le più antiche, fondate su solide basi e dotate di larghi mezzi, le Accademie e le Scuole straniere in Roma hanno cominciato a vivere una vita fiorentissima solo da pochi anni, tanto che si può affermare che la loro fortuna coincide con quella dell’Italia nuova. Alcune si sono svecchiato, sono diventate più agili e più pratiche. Altre si sono ingrandite materialmente, a misura che i loro programmi diventavano più vasti, lasciando le vecchie case e gli studii poco accoglienti, per i nuovi palazzi dove si vive si studia e si lavora con gioia. [...] Presto a Valle Giulia qualche altra ne sorgerà; forse in un avvenire non lontano nuovi spostamenti dal vecchio centro verso le colline e le ville saranno approvati da quelle Nazioni che non hanno fatto in tempo a provvedersi di una dimora comoda e luminosa. Nella Roma che ringiovanisce anche le Accademie vogliono avere biblioteche senza polvere e studii col sole. [...]i giovani che hanno lasciato o stanno per lasciare l’Università perché si ritemprino alle pure fonti dell’aria o sentano più vicina la voce della storia. Saranno tante un giorno e così numerose che forse, come qualcuno vorrebbe, si dovrà pensare a riunire tutte in una Città Accademica, come si è fatto per la Città Universitaria’ (cf. fig. 4). Bottazzi furthermore discussed the use of the Italian language at the Roman foreign academies: ‘In omaggio a Roma, a tale pubblicazione è stato dato il titolo latino, ma nella compilazione del testo ognuno può adoperare la sua lingua. Però si va facendo strada l’idea di adottare l’italiano non solo per le pubblicazioni negli Annales [Institutorum], ma anche per quelle degli Istituti, che sono numerose e che riflettono le loro multiforme attività culturale. [...] L’idea [...] è stata accettata dal Polacchi, dagli Svedesi e dagli Ungheresi ed ha soprattutto lo scopo praticissimo di mettere tutti in grado di seguire la produzione degli Istituti, senza limitarsi alla più o meno modeste conoscenze linguistiche personali. Noi Italiani dobbiamo guardare con grande simpatia quest’opera che le altre Nazioni svolgono a Roma con le loro Accademie e le loro Scuole: a quelle che mantengono le antiche tradizioni e alle altre che, giunta più tardi, cercano di emularle. Esse riconosceranno il fascino e la potenza del nome di Roma e mostrano di intendere pienamente quanta luce spirituale la Città Eterna ha dato e ancora può dare agli uomini di buona volontà’.
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that ‘under the present regime [Italy] invites the peoples of the world to partake with her of this priceless heritage’.78

FIG. 4. ‘I CENTRI DELL’ARTE E DELLA CULTURA NELLA ROMA DEL FASCISMO’ (CA. 1935)79

78 This excerpt provides evidence for the contemporary endemic use of the term ‘foreign academies’. James Monroe Hewlett, ‘Address [to] the people of America’ (courtesy of the Department of State of the Italian Government), 1934. AAR, reel 5758.

The academies of Rome in general terms traditionally attracted the ‘best’ students and artists through competitive (national) selection processes. In the words of John Walker (AAR ‘associate in charge’, 1938) for example, the years spent by AAR fellows in Europe (and in Rome) ‘represented for them something comparable to the “Journeyman Period” of the Mediaeval craftsman, a time of travel and study between Apprenticeship and Mastery’. This almost exclusively white male environment served the object of ‘subjecting young men studying the humanities to ‘the influence of Rome’, in order to ‘view the past, compare it with the present and formulate his own conclusions as to future values’.

The possibility of admitting female fellows to the AAR was not discussed until 1947. One of the few foreign academies with (albeit rare) exceptions to the male order was the SIR, with a female participant (Anna Munck af Rosenschöld) in the very first archaeological course in 1926.

---

classici a Roma = The Swedish Institute of Classical Studies in Rome, ed. Börje Magnusson and Jan Ahlklo (Roma: L’Istituto Svedese di Studi Classici a Roma, 2010), 70.

80 John Walker to AAR president John Russell Pope, June 5, 1936. AAR, reel 5758.


82 In a ‘tentative post-war program suggested by the committees on schools of fine arts and classical studies’ of the AAR, it was determined that ‘women should be invited to compete for fellowships in the Fine Arts’, and also that ‘the age limit might be raised so as to attract more mature talent […]’. It was [furthermore] agreed that it would be desirable to permit married persons to accept fellowships [and that] visiting artists should include Europeans as well as Americans’. ‘Interim Report – Special Committee on Villa Aurelia – American Academy in Rome’. AAR, reel 5799. For the homogenous constitution of AAR students, cf. Chester Aldrich to Pope, May 1, 1934: ‘I was a little horrified (strictly confidential) at discovering that [two new AAR Fellows] are both Jews, but they are both thoroughly “white” ones, completely Americanized and thoroughly imbued with the desire to get from Rome the special training Rome can give’. AAR, reel 5758.

Similar views were expressed after the war by AAR president James Kellum Smith, whose ‘faith in the Academy’ was ‘based upon an absolute conviction of the importance to Western culture of the classical tradition, and further upon the belief of the absolute freedom of the artist in Rome’. The post-war world was, according to Smith, ‘confronted with a world-wide rebellion against many phases of classical culture. The young artists are indoctrinated so heavily against it, and so little informed about it, that our institution is confronted, it seems to me, with the practical problem of how to attract the most vital of the youngsters, and expose them to that freedom and its influence and opportunities, hoping that the vaccination will take’.\textsuperscript{84}

There are doubtlessly deep structural and historical differences between for example the almost ‘official’ École française and the private American Academy, which had to balance archaeology (primarily after the Second World War) with other humanities disciplines and the creative arts.

The perceived problem of unfavourable ‘indoctrination’ of young artists and scholars quoted above was most strongly felt at the AAR of the foreign academies in question here. The belief in the positive effects of exposure of impressionable young intellectuals to the Italian historical palimpsest was shared by all foreign academies in Rome, and indeed formed an important part of their raison d’être. EFR director Jérôme Carcopino reported in 1938 on the French cultural institutes in Florence, Rome and Naples, that ‘in the same way that our higher instruction in Ancient and Mediaeval history provides our French School of Rome with

\textsuperscript{84}J.K. Smith to Paul Manship, September 7, 1950. AAR, reel 5758.
its future masters, it is desirable that the French Italianists perfect and complete their education in Italy itself, as it is hard to imagine a young man aspiring to teach well the language, literature and realia of Italy without having lived in the country of which the civilisation constitutes the object of his studies’. Carcopino advocated ‘continuous exchanges not only of ideas and services but also of people. The Florentine art historian will spend time in Naples to study Titian, in Rome to study Michelangelo, the folklorist from Naples [will spend time] in Rome to cover [the Abruzzi and Sabina], the Roman archaeologist in Naples to familiarise himself with Herculaneum and Pompeii, etc. [...] we deliberately steer our institutes in a direction which the French School of Rome has taken since day one and to which it owes the renown and the duration of its influence; that is to say by converting them partially into research institutes’.\(^8\)

Carcopino’s report stated clearly that it was ‘a matter of taking advantage of an inextricable situation; and if the results are not more satisfactory, the fault is to be found in the false position we have placed

\(^8\) Report. Carcopino to the ministers of foreign affairs and national education, May 28, 1938 (24 pages). EFR, box ‘Instituts culturels français en Italie’: ‘Or, de même que notre haut enseignement historique de l’Antiquité et du Moyen Age emprunté à notre École française de Rome ses futurs maîtres, il est souhaitable que les italiens de France perfectionnent et achèvent leur formation en Italie même, car l’on ne conçoit pas qu’un jeune homme puisse prétendre à bien enseigner la langue, la littérature et les choses d’Italie sans avoir vécu dans le pays dont la civilisation constitue l’objet de ses études. [...] non seulement entre Florence et Naples mais entre les chercheurs de ces deux instituts et l’École française de Rome j’imagine avec plaisir des échanges continues non seulement d’idées et de services mais de personnes. L’historien de l’art florentin séjournera à Naples pour étudier Titien, à Rome pour étudier Michel Ange, le folkloriste de Naples à Rome pour parcourir les Abruzzes et la Sabine, l’archéologue romain à Naples pour se familiariser avec Herculaneum et Pompeï [sic], etc. [...] ’En premier lieu nous deviendrons délibérément nos Instituts [p. 20] vers la forme qu’a prise, dès le premier jour, l’École Française de Rome et à laquelle elle doit l’éclat et la durée de son rayonnement ; c’est-à-dire en les convertissant partiellement en instituts de recherches’. See also AN, F/17/14585: ‘École française et Institut d’Études françaises d’Athènes, École française de Rome, Instituts de Caire, de Barcelone, de Florence, de Londres, de Madrid. 1917-1948.’
ourselves in and which, in an Italy eternally proud and tetchy which would necessarily [...] restrict our sphere of activities. [...] in a country which flatters itself that it attracts research from every foreign countries, and where the best penetration would always be that which progresses unnoticed, I consider that this [the absence of scholarly research at the French institutes] would be a fundamental error'.

With the passing of time, while the Italian and German governments unite through conventions of cultural exchange, while a press which is not free either wrapping us in impenetrable silence or covering us with criticism, but while there is not one of our compatriots who does not feel that, even in a dictatorship, the government is not always obeyed, that even in a totalitarian state there is room for several streams of idées, that even an opinion condemned to silence is able to take shape and react, we may not abandon to their fate those who have turned to us and on whom, thanks to our institutes, a little French light has been shed, as little as this may be.

86 Report. Carcopino to the ministers of foreign affairs and national education, May 28, 1938 (24 pages). EFR, box ‘Instituts culturels français en Italie’: ‘D’une situation inextricable il arrive à tirer parti; et si les résultats ne sont pas plus satisfaisants, la faute en est à la position fausse où nous nous sommes placés et qui, dans une Italie éternellement fière et ombrageuse devait forcément, non pas en raison de circonstances passagères, réduire la rayon de notre action. [...] Or, dans un pays qui se flatte d’attirer la recherche de tous les pays étrangers, et où la meilleure pénétration sera toujours celle qui cheminera invisible, j’estime que cela fut une erreur fondamentale’. Carcopino felt that ‘[…] in stormy weather or fair, under this regime or that, Italy, to reuse a famous phrase, ‘[l’Italia farà da se]’. ‘La vérité est que sur ce chapitre, par temps d’orage ou par ciel clair, sous la régime actuel ou sous un autre, l’Italie, pour transposer une phrase célèbre, ‘[l’Italia farà da se]’.’

87 Report. Carcopino to the ministers of foreign affairs and national education, May 28, 1938 (24 pages). EFR, box ‘Instituts culturels français en Italie’: ‘Par le temps qui courent, où les gouvernements italien et allemand se lient par des conventions d’échanges culturels, où une presse qui n’est pas libre, ou bien nous enveloppe d’un opaque silence, ou bien nous accable de critiques, mais où il n’est pas un de nos compatriotes qui ne sente que, même en dictature, le gouvernement n’est pas toujours obéi, que même dans un état totalitaire il y a place pour plusieurs courants d’idées, que même une opinion condamnée au silence y est capable de se former et de réagir, il nous est interdit d’abandonner à elles-mêmes les consciences qui se sont tournées vers nous et sur lesquelles, si peu que ce fût, a rayonné déjà, grâce à nos Instituts, un peu de lumière française’. 
Carcopino’s report concluded with a suggested ‘programme of reforms’, which ‘assumes the presence at the head of the Centre and of the institutes of directors who are diplomats and organisers and whose efforts would be more easily coordinated if they obeyed common directives’; with a board (which would include the director of the EFR, providing for ‘the appointment as well as the discontinuation of the directors, teachers and researchers. It is this board which, without interfering in the detail of programmes of French studies or the control of research carried out in practice, would give each year the list of lecturers sent from France and would determine the list of lectures. It is this board, finally, which would coordinate the activities of all the institutes and in doing so increase their output’.  

88

Self-determination (freedom of choice) is an important principle of the modern international order. 89 From the application of this liberal policy

88 Report. Carcopino to the ministers of foreign affairs and national education, May 28, 1938 (24 pages). EFR, box ‘Instituts culturels français en Italie’: ‘Si modeste qu’il soit, le programme de réformes que je me permets, sur votre demande, de vous soumettre, suppose la présence à la tête du Centre et des Instituts de directeurs qui soient des diplomates et des animateurs et dont la convergence des efforts serait plus sûrement acquise qu’ils obéiraient à des directives communes. Celles-ci devraient émaner: a) pour leur tâche d’enseignement proprement dit et leur gestion matérielle, de l’Université de Grenoble ; b) pour leur action générale en Italie, d’un Conseil où l’Université de Grenoble serait largement représentée par son recteur et deux doyens, mais dont la Présidence reviendrait à M. le Ministre de l’Éducation Nationale et le secrétariat général à M. le Directeur des Œuvres au Ministère des Affaires Étrangères, et qui grouperait à côté du Directeur de l’Office des Universités et du Directeur de l’École Française de Rome [...]. C’est ce conseil qui pourvoirait aux désignation des directeurs, des professeurs, à la désignation des chercheurs, à leurs prorogations. C’est lui qui, sans s’ingérer dans le détail des programmes d’études françaises, et le contrôle des recherches effectuées réellement, donnerait chaque année la liste des conférenciers envoyés de France et arrêterait celle de leurs conférences. C’est lui, enfin, qui coordonnerait les activités de tous les Instituts et par la même en accroîtrait [sic] le rendement’.

89 Cf. the ‘liberal order’ dating back to the Lausanne conference 1922-1923 and the League of Nations, 1919-1946.
on groups and nation-states, the United Nations declaration of human rights from 1948 emphasised the scale of the individual.\textsuperscript{90} Self-determination on a local scale is thought of here as one of the main principles of (intrapersonal) interaction among the foreign academies in Rome. Traditions are often established quickly in academic (institutional) contexts, not least in a scholarly paradigm that studies tradition, relies on tradition, lives and breathes tradition.

The institutional context of foreign scholarly presence in Rome should be seen in the light of the allure of the ‘eternal city’ as a receptacle of antiquity, as well as in the gradually changing evaluation of and increasingly ‘scientific’ approach to Roman antiquity since (at least) the eighteenth century educational and formative ‘elite’ phenomenon of the Grand Tour. The changing symbolic significance of the city of Rome in relation to that of Athens to the field of classics forms part of an understanding of the setting of foreign archaeological schools in the Mediterranean.

The concept of foreign academies or institutes entails varying degrees of an inherent pan-Mediterranean dimension, with an analogous institutional scholarly presence in Athens and Rome. The Western powers were in the establishment of their respective foreign academies assuring their control of access and distribution of the source material on which understanding of the cultures of antiquity was based through excavation, research and publication.

This was in part achieved by clinging to broad generic categories and in combination with subtle diplomatic action in balancing sometimes

\textsuperscript{90} Cf. the UN declaration of human rights (1948), article 1: the ‘self-determination of all peoples’.
conflicting interests, such as that after the Second World War regarding the question of the return to Rome of the four German libraries (cf. chapters 4 and 6). This issue was important to the academies of Rome as their wide range of activities and their self-perception was constructed on that premise. This relates to the perceived intra-disciplinary importance of the *Altertumswissenschaft*-tradition, with the DAIR as the first post-ICA national foreign academy in Rome, established in 1871-1874, as the result of the Prussian, subsequently imperial German takeover of the ICA (this archaeological narrative excludes the Académie de France).

American and Swedish classical studies share at least one common perspective – both countries lack ‘indigenous’ material remains of ancient (Mediterranean) cultural traces, and have thus had to ‘import’ antiquity – literally as well as figuratively.\(^91\) The issue of ‘cultural neutrality’ is also tentatively discussed here in relation to the general trend towards international collaboration across national frameworks.

The following presents reflections on the five foreign academies in Rome selected for this study. Other foreign as well as domestic academies and organisations might have been included, such as the ‘Deutsche Künstlerverein’ (established in 1844), the Royal Spanish Academy in Rome (1873), the Deutsche Akademie Rom Villa Massimo (1913),\(^92\) or the (Italian) Accademia dei Lincei.


\(^92\) For the Royal Spanish Academy in Rome and for Villa Massimo, see for example Blüher and Windholz, "Zurück in Arkadien! Der "kalte Krieg" um die Villa Massimo und ihre Übergabe an die Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Jahr 1956."; Windholz, *Et in Academia Ego. Ausländische Akademien in Rom zwischen künstlerischer Standortbestimmung und nationaler Repräsentation*. Archival material...
The focus on the Swedish Institute in Rome is motivated by the unique consistency of the archival material as a result of the specificity of the SIR being the only foreign academy in Rome to have remained operational throughout the Second World War; the SIR can thus provide unique insights into the changing dynamic of the foreign academies in Rome during the war and in the immediate post-war period.

Directors of the five academies covered by this study, 1935-1953:

**AAR**
- Chester Holmes Aldrich (1871-1940), director of the AAR 1935-1940
- Charles Rufus Morey (1877-1955), acting director of the AAR 1945-1947
- Laurance Roberts (1907-2002), director of the AAR, 1946-1960

**BSR**
- Colin Hardie (1906-1998), director of the BSR 1933-1936
- Courtenay Arthur Ralegh Radford (1900-1998), director of the BSR 1936-1945

**DAIR**
- Ludwig Curtius (1874-1954), ‘first director’ of the DAIR 1928-1937

**EFR**
- Émile Mâle (1862-1954), director of the EFR 1923-1937
- Jérôme Carcopino (1881-1970), director of the EFR 1937-1940
- Albert Grenier (1878-1961), director of the EFR 1945-1952
- Jean Bayet (1892-1969), director of the EFR 1952-1960

**SIR**
- Einar Gjerstad (1897-1988), director of the SIR 1935-1940
- Erik Sjöqvist (1903-1975), director of the SIR 1940-1948
- Åkerström, Åke (1902-1991), temporary director of the SIR 1948
- Olof Vessberg (1909-1975), director of the SIR 1953-1955

Pertaining to Villa Massimo may be found in the *Politisches Archiv des Auswärtigen Amtes*, Berlin.
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2.2 ‘OUR NOSTALGIA FOR THE SUN AND THE SPRING’: SVENSKA INSTITUTET I ROM (SIR)

The Swedish Institute in Rome (SIR), also referred to as The Swedish Institute of Classical Studies in Rome, was founded in Stockholm in 1925. The SIR is a private foundation, with state subsidies applied for annually from the Swedish Ministry of Education (Utbildningsdepartementet). Since its establishment in 1925 and the commencement of its activities in Rome in 1926, the SIR has preserved its private character and has functioned as a base for Swedish research in the fields of classical archaeology and the history of art in Rome.93 These two main areas of interest have formed part of a curriculum of an annual taught three-month course in each respective discipline.94 The research profile of the SIR has in recent years come to include cultural heritage preservation and architecture in more general terms. The SIR is thus not a ‘cultural institute’ primarily dedicated to promoting national traditions abroad.

The board and chancellery of the SIR are located in Stockholm. The focus of Swedish archaeological research in Italy since the 1950s has been placed on prehistory and studies of Etruscan culture. Due to restrictions on foreign excavations in Italy until the end of the Second World War, Swedish excavations in the Mediterranean were primarily carried out in Greece, beginning in the late nineteenth century. The first Swedish

93 For the prehistory of the SIR, see RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:F:1; as well as manuscript regarding the establishment of the SIR and its early activities (Axel Boëthius), in ‘Svenska Institutet i Rom. Dagbok från Okt. 1925-15 april 1926’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 241-243.

94 In the 1946-1947 SIR annual report, Erik Sjöqvist offered a ‘definition’ of the aim and scope of the SIR archaeological course: ‘The aim of the teaching has been to shed light on the historical and art historical material with the thus incarnated text on the one hand and the primary archaeological material on the other’. SIR annual report 1946-1947, 5.
excavations in Greece were led by professors Sam Wide (1861-1918) and Lennart Kjellberg (1857-1936) on the island of Kalaureia (Poros) in 1894. The Swedish excavations at Asine (in Messenia) were initiated in 1922 (cf. fig. 19, chapter 3). Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf went there in 1920 on a private tour of Greece. One of the reasons for this choice of country was his interest in archaeology, most likely thinking of himself as an archaeologist in general terms, rather than as a specifically Nordic or classical archaeologist. The Crown Prince had already participated in archaeological excavations in Sweden and believed that Sweden should join in investigating ancient Greece. Looking back on his archaeological achievements (in 1955), the Crown Prince wrote that

[...] my wanderings have taken me to Cyprus, that meeting-place of many forms of culture, where excavations by Swedish scientists went on for 5 years in the late twenties. Then I was lucky enough to make a tour of the world in 1926, during which, amongst other things, I was able to see many of the artistic as well as archaeological treasures in the Far East. Since that time my old enthusiasm for the art treasures of ancient China became ever stronger.

The Crown Prince was the initiator of the Asine excavations, the first Swedish excavation on a large scale in Greece. Swedish archaeologists worked extensively in the Argolid under the direction of professor Axel

---


W. Persson and archaeologist Otto Frödin until the outbreak of the Second World War. The excavations in Greece were coordinated through the board of the SIR until 1948, when the Swedish Institute at Athens (SIA) was established (cf. chapter 5).

In a 1931 newspaper article, author and journalist Agne Hamrin (1905-1982) wrote regarding the SIR, that it was a case of ‘striking while iron was hot. And the iron was struck. The Crown Prince took the initiative. He managed to interest individual donors [...] thus establishing the board of the [SIR]’. 97 In another article it was stated that the SIR ‘has got nothing to do with semi-diplomatic representation’, once more stressing its origins and its connections with the Swedish excavations in Greece. 98


The by-laws and regulations of the SIR dictate that the ‘task of the institute is to bring Swedish culture in close contact with ancient culture by directly promoting knowledge and research about the ancient world, as well as by serving research in the humanities and art’. The establishment of the SIR drew on the experiences of Vilhelm Lundström (1869-1940), professor of Latin in Gothenburg, who was the first Swedish scholar to organise a course through the Swedish university system (on Roman topography and epigraphy) for Swedish students *in situ* in Rome, in 1909; as well as, to a lesser extent, the experiences of philologist and politician Johan Bergman (1864-1951). Bergman was in favour of a Swedish (or Scandinavian) excavation in the Eastern Mediterranean.
(following the Swedish Kalaureia-excavations carried out by Sam Wide and Lennart Kjellberg in 1894) for reasons of national prestige, and advocated the site of Tarsus for such an excavation, in an appeal for funding in 1899 (cf. fig. 19, chapter 3).¹⁰²

Bergman had advocated Swedish excavations at Tarsus three years earlier, in the postscript to his 1896 publication På klassisk mark. Studier och minnen från ett års vandringar i den antika kulturens länder, entitled ‘An unbroken field’ (Ett obrutet fält), focusing on the perceived necessity of underpinning and securing the national prestige of Swedish (and, to a lesser degree, Scandinavian) scholarship. Bergman described the French ‘retaliation’ of the Delfi excavations in response to the German excavations at Olympia (cf. fig. 19, chapter 3). Excavations at Tarsus (for the benefit of the Swedish national museum) would, according to Bergman, be ‘honourable for our country’ and would be a valuable connection for Swedish scholarship.¹⁰³

¹⁰² Bergman promoted his ‘[...] plan för en svensk eller skandinavisk utgräfning i Tarsus, ett förslag som sympatiskt upptagits och understödts, särskilt inom vetenskapliga kretsar i Finland. Men en sådan utgräfning är beroende av ett ekonomiskt understöd, hvars källor ännu ej äro funna’. Bergman put his proposal for a Swedish excavation in Tarsus in a wider international perspective, referring to ‘[...] de tyska gräfningarna i Olympia, Pergamon, Priene och Åten, de franska i Delos och Delfi, de amerikanska i Argos och Korint, de engelska på ön Melos, de österrikiska i Efesos, de italienska i Pompeji’. Bergman, "Skandinavisk sommarkurs i Rom och Pompeji,” 27-28.

¹⁰³ ‘Kulturstaterna hafva på de sista båda decennierna börjat se sig om efter hvar sitt större, mera betydande fyndområde, där de kunna koncentrera sitt arbete på uppdagandet af någon märkligare kultur orts kvarlefvor. [...] Fransmännen taga "revanche" i Delfi [...] , och nyss erinrade vi om amerikanernas i år påbörjade utgräfning af det en gång så väldiga och rika Korintos' kvarlefvor [...] . I det forna Kilikien fanns en stor stad, fräjudad som sätte för hellenisk kultur och ännu mer bekant i den kristna världen såsom fädernehem för en af den kristna kulturens första heroer. Vi mena Tarsoi (Tarsus), Paulus' födelseort'. [...] En summa af 50,000 kronor skulle enligt min mening vara tillräcklig för att gräfva ut Tarsois ruiner till deras väsentliga delar åfvensom att bekosta publikationen af fynden. 50,000 kronor för en värligt gedigen arkeologisk gräfning, hedrande för vårt land, gifvande impulser och uppslag åt våra egna vetenskapsmän och gagnande vetenskapen i det hela – det vore ett värdigt föremål för klassiskt intresserade
Bergman’s postscript focused on arguing for the establishment of a Swedish institute in the Mediterranean, ‘equal to the German, English [sic], French and American institutes’. Bergman suggested the formation of a committee with representatives of Scandinavians from Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland and the United States in order to discuss a joint Scandinavian institution, although Bergman preferred a Swedish institute without other direct Scandinavian involvement if that could be arranged.104

Bergman discussed the location of such an institute; the choice being in Athens or Rome (although Bergman suggested alternative locations such as Thessaloniki, Smyrna ‘or somewhere on the Syrian coast’). Rome ultimately drew the longest straw, for two main reasons: the manuscript collections and archival resources of the Vatican and the accessibility of Rome in relation to the ‘more remote, semi-oriental Athens’.105

104 ‘De stora kulturstaterna hafva i Rom och Atén, huvudcentrena för klassisk odling och ännu i våra dagar huvuddepöterne för denna odlings minnesmärken och för källorna vid forskningen därutinnan, upprättat vetenskapliga institut, såsom förut i detta arbete är närmare omtaladt. Hvarför skulle icke även vi kunna upprätta ett sådant? [Och] skall ett institut upprättas, så bör det icke vara en miniatyrinrättning, som föga kan uträtta och som genom jämförelse med de öfriga nesätter i stället för hedrar vårt land: det bör värkligen vara ett i alla afseenden med de tyska, engelska, franska och amerikanska instituten likställdt’. Bergman furthermore suggested that such a Swedish institute should be associated with the classical legacy of the Swedish author Viktor Rydberg, potentially even named after him (cf. the latter’s Den siste atenaren and Romerske dagar). Ibid.

The SIR was in part modeled on precursors such as the Austrian Institute in Athens, with free lodging and pay to a professor in situ in an initial modest small-scale operation that, it was hoped, would expand rapidly and dynamically.\textsuperscript{106}

The Swedish scholarly pilgrimage to Rome was described by Axel Boëthius, the first director of the SIR, as emanating from ‘our nostalgia for the sun and the spring’; as ‘yet another continuing current towards Italy which unites with the stream of people that hasten towards Rome’. Boëthius romantic attitude (shared by Lundström and other classical scholars of his generation) stretched toward the opinion that ‘the richest periods of our [Swedish] culture can be characterised as those with direct and tight relations with Italy’. The Swedish contributions to the study of the Roman past were perceived as part of the global ‘secular tribute’ to Rome; ‘a voice from the North, with its own accent, with its own traditions, but inspired by Roman universalism, by the grandiose and severe harmony of Roman history, and by the inexhaustible richness of the heart of Rome’:

Dalla nostra nostalgia di sole e di primavere verdi e bionde c’è ancora una corrente continua verso l’Italia che si unisce colla fiumana di gente che accorre a Roma per ogni via. [...] Si può dire che i periodi più ricchi della nostra cultura sono caratterizzati da relazioni dirette e strette con l’Italia. [...] questi nostri studi romani partecipano all’omaggio secolare che il mondo tributa a Roma. È una voce del Nord, con un accento suo, con tradizioni proprie, ma ispirata alla universalità romana, alla grandiosa e severa armonia della storia di Roma, alla ricchezza inesausta del cuore di Roma.\textsuperscript{107}

Boëthius characterised the SIR in 1929 as ‘a Swedish university seminar, located in Rome and with its central area of interest in Roman topography and history’.\textsuperscript{108} The notion of such ‘Roman universalism’ was characteristically abstract, and in essence formed the core of scholarly interest in antiquity and the establishment of foreign scholarly institutions in Rome. The study of classical archaeology and ancient history was established as an independent discipline in the Swedish university system in 1909. The subject matter had previously been studied as ‘realia’, as an aspect of philological formation (in Latin and Greek).

The Swedish minister in Rome, Baron Augustin Beck-Friis, supported by his predecessor Carl Bildt, felt that ‘something should be done’ for the Swedish representation in Italy, paving the way for the establishment of

\textsuperscript{107} Axel Boëthius, "I recenti studi di Storia e Topografia Romana in Svezia," in 

the SIR.\textsuperscript{109} The SIR was however originally discussed as a ‘Scandinavian institute’, with funding from joint Swedish and Danish sources. Early negotiations were conducted by professors M.P. Nilsson (Lund University) and Frederik Poulsen (of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen) from 1921 to 1924; a conflict of interests and aims of the planned institution led to the abandonment of this joint effort by 1925.\textsuperscript{110}

The original idea had been to establish a common Scandinavian (in this case joint Swedish and Danish) institute in Athens rather than in Rome (cf. also section 5.5), upholding the ‘Scandinavian reputation’.\textsuperscript{111}

---

\textsuperscript{109} Cf. *Fyllandsposten*, June (?): 1933: ‘De fællesnordiske Traditioner i Rom. Det skandinaviske Institut’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 238: ‘Efter Krigen indtænkte Sverrigs Minister i Rom, Baron Beck Friis – støttet af den foregaaende Minister Baron C. Bildt [...] at der maatte gores noget for Hjemlandet. Det skulde ikke repræsenteres ved et prunkende Institut, der lagde mere Vægt paa formel Repræsentation end paa Studierne; Sverrig skulde have et Institut, der kunde give Adgang til klassiske Studier, som Norden altid har dyrket med Iver, de Studier, der har indbragt saa mange af vore bedste Videnskabsmænd internationalt Ry’. Carl Bildt had originally preferred to see Johan Bergman, rather than Axel Boëthius, as the director of the SIR. DAIR director Walter Amelung emphasised that the DAIR had ‘catered for Swedish researchers’, asking whether the Swedes needed an institute of their own. Vilhelm Lundström (‘hela institutstankens urfader’) was opposed to ‘the Scandinavian attitudeinست, that I embraced with my heart and soul, and insisted on’ (den skandinaviska inställning, som jag av själ och hjärta omfattade och fordrade). Cf. Boëthius to Anna Munck af Rosenschulte, June 1933: ‘Svenska Institutet i Rom värtemin 1926’, n.d. (1952?). GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 239.


\textsuperscript{111} Cf. Frederik Poulsen to Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf, November 28, 1924. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:F:1. The competition between Axel W. Persson and Axel Boëthius for the professorship in classical archaeology and ancient history at Uppsala further influenced discussions regarding the opportune moment for the establishment of such an institute, in order for it to be directed by Boëthius, as it was likely that Persson would be appointed professor, as a more established scholar (Persson had for example been excavating at Asine since 1922). Cf. ‘Dansk-svensk Samarbejde paa romersk
This ambivalence is reflected in the preamble of the original by-laws of the SIR, with their rhetoric of ‘duties’ to both Rome and Greece. By January 1925, the Crown Prince and Martin P. Nilsson agreed that the planned institute should be located in Rome rather than in Athens, following ‘very strong, even decisive reasons’ in favour of Rome, one of them being the Vatican collections, another the accessibility of Italy in relation to the more distant Greece.

96
By March 1925 the common Scandinavian project had ground to a halt, and the envisioned institute was discussed as Swedish only – in the ‘near future’ it was to be supported by Denmark with Danish participation, but ‘an interscandinavian order must be postponed for the future’. An article in the Danish newspaper *Politiken* in November 1925 related the idea of the establishment of a joint institution in Athens in connection with the Swedish excavations in the Argolid; when the idea recurred in the autumn of 1924 the attention had been shifted to Rome. The Swedish contingent thought this to be ‘practical and profitable’, whereas the Danes saw Rome as more profitable in terms of ‘supporting art and art history’. ‘Archaeology’ was not mentioned in the Danish article in conjunction with the new institute: the two countries were unquestionably faced with a conflict of interests.

---


97
Classical archaeology was on an international level still primarily carried out in Greece at this time; Italy remained on the whole closed for foreign excavations (cf. chapter 3). Topographical studies of ancient monuments and for example the Roman campagna were however possible. The foreign academies in Rome were indeed to a large extent geared towards art history, but also towards ancient history and philology. ‘Profitable’ thus partly meant being able to benefit from the scholarly environment and the work of the foreign academies already in operation in Rome; ‘practical’ to some degree referred to the accessibility of Italy from northern Europe, as discussed above. The shift of attention to Rome from Athens furthermore harked back to debates advocating Swedish institutional presence from the turn of the century, mainly by professors Vilhelm Lundström and Johan Bergman.\footnote{Cf. Bergman, "Skandinavisk sommarkurs i Rom och Pompeji." and Bergman, "Sverige och det klassiska studiet."}

Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf took an active role in the establishment of the SIR, mainly from genuine interests in archaeology – he was not simply employed as a figurehead. A striking image from the publication ‘La Svezia’ (1924), promoting Swedish-Italian trade relations, portrayed Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf as the focal point of a ‘network’ consisting of the quartet of the Swedish and Italian Kings (Gustaf V and Vittorio Emmanuele III) and the prime ministers of the two countries – Ernst

\footnote{1925-15 april 1926’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 241-243.}
Trygger and Benito Mussolini (Trygger was prime minister of Sweden 1923-1924; Mussolini had become Italian prime minister in 1922).117

117 AA.VV., "La Svezia," 2. Johan Bergman wrote to professor Vilhelm Lundström in April 1924 with apologies for two errors in the article – Lundström’s course in Rome 1909 was mistakenly quoted as having taken place in 1904, and the the University of Goteburg (Göteborgs Högskola) was translated as ‘scuola superiore di Gotemburgo’. Johan Bergman to Vilhelm Lundström, April 5, 1924. GUB, handskriftssamlingen, brev till Karl Johan Vilhelm Lundström från Johan Bergman: 'Jag blev för helt kort tid sedan anmodad av Exportföreningen i Sthlm att skriva en artikel i dess för Milanoexpositionen avsedda reklambroschy "La Svezia" angående mina arkeologiska kurser. Jag skrev artikeln, naturligtvis på svenska, och den har översatts nere i Italien men tryckts här i Stockholm och jag uttryckte önskan att få se korrekturat. Detta blev emellertid icke av, utan till min ledsnad fick jag ett färdigt exemplar av skriften tryckt utan att ha fått något korrektur. Jag anmärkte genast på detta, och man ursäktade sig med att det var så bråttom. [...] Jag bifogar ett exemplar av broschyren och tillägger slutligen att porträttillustrationerna äro Exportföreningens eget verk – det skulle aldrig fallit mig in att placera mig själv i paritet med två diplomater!'
**FIG. 5. FROM ‘LA SVEZIA’ (1924)**
The inclusion of Norway and Finland in the original planned Swedish-Danish ‘interscandinavian order’ was temporarily discussed but dropped, mainly due to lack of funding resources and students. The project was thus initially conceived as a joint Swedish-Danish one, with funds covering its first three years of existence (for director Boëthius together with one Swedish and two Danish grantholders), but soon became exclusively Swedish.118

Why did the Danes opt out of the collaboration? What had influenced the change of plans from a common institute in Athens to a Swedish institute in Rome in the space of four months? Part of the answer lies in the conflict of interests discussed above; another in the private nature of the SIR and the issue of funding – the question of which was present from the beginning – from a Swedish perspective available Danish funds for research (such as Ny Carlsbergfondet and Rask-Örstedfondet) were part of the (if not the main) attraction; yet another lies in national prestige.

More than a decade later, in 1937, archivist L.M. Bååth (of the national archives, Stockholm – see also chapter 3) wrote to Axel Boëthius in 1937 regarding publicity for a possible ‘Scandinavian House in Rome’ in the Danish newspaper *Politiken*. Bååth was alarmed, and firmly believed that the SIR administration ‘should always remain Swedish’. Boëthius in essence agreed, and wrote to the editors of *Politiken* advocating a possible separate future ‘Nordic Academy in Rome’ instead of a potential joint Swedish-Danish institute. This ‘Nordic Academy’ (which did not materialize) would then comprise independent national Scandinavian institutes with different (national) characteristics.\(^{119}\)

Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf was a key figure in the establishment of the SIR, and set the tone not only for the ‘traditions’ of the new institute as chairman of its board, but also of the tradition he himself represented through his royal patronage. The Crown Prince called the first set-up of the board of the SIR for its constituting meeting at the Royal Palace in Stockholm on May 8, 1925.\(^{120}\)

The first configuration of the board of the SIR (cf. fig. 6) consisted of the Crown Prince as chairman (he would remain thus until 1950); Carl

---

\(^{119}\) Bååth furthermore suggested the establishment of the SIR in Valle Giulia (‘beyond Monte Pincio’), mentioning the recently erected Dutch Institute building as an example: ‘Why, [Mussolini] can give us free land set aside for building as well’. Bååth to Boëthius, March 17, 1937. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1.

\(^{120}\) The notion of a ‘Scandinavian House’ had been instigated and encouraged by a Marquis di Varano. Cf. Boëthius to *Politiken* (Copenhagen), n.d. (March 1937). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1.

\(^{121}\) The first SIR board meeting protocol was based on a circulated promemoria. Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, I:5; and RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1 (rent – November 8, 1925; receipts). The board was thus constituted in 1925; the institute in Rome was inaugurated in 1926. See also ‘Andringsförslag till P.M. ang. Svenska Institutet i Rom’ (1925). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.F.1.
Swartz (1858-1926), Swedish university chancellor 1917-1926 and prime minister 1917; Martin P. Nilsson, professor of Greek, classical archaeology and ancient history at Lund University 1909-1939, and secretary of the SIR 1925-1936; Axel Hallin (1877-1948), bank manager, chamberlain and SIR treasurer 1925-1948; HRH Prince Eugen (1865-1947), artist (painter), uncle of Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf; Sigurd Curman (1879-1966), director-general of the Swedish National Heritage Board (Riksantikvarie), 1923-1946; Henrik Schück (1855-1947), professor of literature at Lund University 1890-1898 and at Uppsala University 1898-1920, member of the Swedish Academy 1913-1947; Olof August Danielsson (1852-1933), professor of Greek at Uppsala University; Lennart Kjellberg (1857-1936), professor of classical archaeology and ancient history at Uppsala University; Ludvig Stavenow (1864-1950), professor of history at Uppsala University; Axel W. Persson (1888-1951), professor of classical archaeology and ancient history at Uppsala University; and Ernst Nachmanson (1877-1943), professor of Greek at Gothenburg University. The mould was cast for the centre of initiative in the close-knit ‘executive’ inner circle of the board: the Crown Prince as chairman, the secretary, the treasurer and the university chancellor (cf. figs. 6-11).  

The same year as Sigurd Curman became director-general of the Swedish National Heritage Board (1923), he also became secretary of the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities (Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien) and retained the post until 1946. The principal honorary member of the Royal Academy was Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf. Curman advocated setting up a fund for research in

122 For a list of the board members of the SIR 1925-1951, see appendix 7.
the humanities. This ambition was realised in 1927-1928 as *Humanistiska fonden*, with the Crown Prince as chairman and Martin P. Nilsson as board member, together with Otto von Friesen (professor of Swedish at Uppsala University).  

![Diagram of the board of the SIR (1925)](image)

**Fig. 6. The Board of the SIR (1925)**

---


124 The colour code in figs. 6-11 reads as follows: blue = royal, yellow = secretary, orange = university chancellor, green = treasurer, beige = Uppsala University, purple = Lund University, brown = Gothenburg University, gold = Stockholm University and white = 'neutral'. The diagrams illustrate the first configuration of the board of the SIR, followed by every fifth year from 1935-1950. Fig. 11 illustrates the board in 1951, when Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf had become King.
FIG. 9. THE BOARD OF THE SIR (1945)

FIG. 10. THE BOARD OF THE SIR (1950)
FIG. 11. THE BOARD OF THE SIR (1951)

FIG. 12. ERIK SJÖQVIST AND SIR DIRECTOR AXEL BOÈTHIUS, HERE INFORMALLY REFERRED TO AS THE ‘DUCE’ (1926)
In late December 1925, the Crown Prince wrote to art historian Bernard Berenson, with whom he exchanged regular correspondence (mainly regarding evaluation and the provenance of art works), commenting on the newly established SIR: ‘You may have heard that a Swedish school of archaeology and art has been formed in Rome lately. It is on a very modest scale but will, I hope, be of use to our students and to our artists. A clever young fellow, Dr. Boëthius, is at the head of it. He is a very nice man. I give you his name in case you should come across him.’

The SIR was funded by ‘lottery funds’ granted by King Gustaf V between 1926 and 1938. These had to be applied for annually, which was a laborious and time-consuming process. The board of the SIR in essence remained intact when the SIR began receiving annual state subsidies in 1938 (see below). In practice the Crown Prince retained his position as chairman of the board of the SIR until he had himself become King (Gustaf VI Adolf) in 1951. The Swedish university chancellor represented the connection with the governance of Swedish academia (the university chancellor would function on the boards of a number of national institutions), regardless of the political affiliation of the individual chancellor. After becoming King, Gustaf Adolf was replaced by the respective university chancellors as chairman of the board of the SIR after 1951. The King was then appointed honorary chairman (cf. figs 6-11).

SIR board meetings normally took place once a year (in March or April) in the Crown Prince’s residence at the Royal Palace. The minutes of the board meetings account for decisions reached; little or no information regarding preliminary discussions or controversies are offered. Such discussions were dealt with in correspondence (per capsulam) between the board members, primarily between the Crown Prince as chairman and the triumvirate of (i) the secretary (Martin P. Nilsson

giovani che si dedicano alla conoscenza dell’antico romano. Questa conoscenza – del resto – è assai diffusa nella Svezia’; as well as an article by Luigi Bottazzi in Corriere della Sera, January 31, 1933: ‘L’Istituto Svedese ha appena otto anni di vita: il suo scopo è di promuovere gli studii nel campo classico per gli studenti della Svezia, dalla Norvegia, della Danimarca e della Finlandia’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 238.

126 The board of the SIR was seldom represented in full when it convened. One of the few occasions when the entire board was present for the annual meeting was on March 19, 1948. Cf. SIR board meeting minutes.
(professor of classical archaeology at Lund University), 1925-1936, and Axel Boëthius (professor at what was to become the University of Gothenburg – at the time still Göteborgs Högskola), 1936-1955; (2) the university chancellor; and (3) the treasurer (Axel Hallin). Einar Gjerstad (Nilsson’s successor as professor in Lund) exercised an influential position in the board after leaving the directorship of the SIR in 1940 (cf. figs 6-11).

Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf and the secretary of the board exercised considerable authority in the decision-making process. This setup remained intact for some time; it continued smoothly (and autonomously) until the 1940s, when university chancellor Östen Undén began to demand a marked degree of respect for the forms and regulations of Swedish state administration. From 1940 SIR board meeting protocols were filed separately from those of the executive committee (‘arbetsutskott’), in which practical matters (for example the awarding of SIR grants) were continuously dealt with, in meetings or per capsulam. The board on the whole consisted of a close-knit group of individuals, who maintained control over what they to all intents and purposes regarded as ‘their’ institute.

The Crown Prince was present at the opening of the two first archaeological courses at the SIR (in 1926 and 1927). It was no

128 Cf. SIR executive committee minutes.
129 King Gustaf V himself was present at the inauguration of the 1930 archaeological course. Cf. ‘Svenska Institutet i Rom börjar årets verksamhet. Högtidlighet inledningsföreläsning i närvaro av konung Gustaf’. Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning, February 5, 1930; and ‘Konung Gustaf i gamla Rom; intressanta utgrävningar. Arkeologernas fynd blevo föremål för beundran. Kunglig entusiasm.'
coincidence that the establishment of the SIR was more or less contemporary with the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (SCE, September 1927–March 1931), ‘channelled’ through several of the individuals also involved in the near simultaneous establishment and first two decades of the SIR (primarily the Crown Prince, Einar Gjerstad, and Erik Sjöqvist).\textsuperscript{130}
The Swedish consul in Larnaca, Luke Z. Pierides, member of the Archaeological Council of Cyprus, had approached professor Axel W. Persson in 1922, suggesting that a Swedish archaeologist be sent to Cyprus to conduct excavations. Persson accordingly sent his student Einar Gjerstad, who travelled around the island in 1923-1924, excavating four sites himself.\(^{132}\)


\(^{132}\) Gjerstad published the results of his first period in Cyprus in 1926. See Einar Gjerstad, *Studies on Prehistoric Cyprus* (1926).
Upon Gjerstad’s return to Sweden, Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf became the chairman of a committee which was to administrate the planned expedition. As with the establishment of the SIR, the Crown Prince was active in fundraising, attracting a number of private donors, with additional expenses covered by the Swedish state. The SCE consisted of the young group of archaeologists Einar Gjerstad, Alfred Westholm, Erik Sjöqvist and architect John Lindros. During the four years of the expedition, the SCE excavated 21 sites over the island and established a chronology for Cypriot archaeology in the process.\footnote{The sites excavated by the SCE include for example Marion, Idalion, Kition, Ayia Irini, Mersinaki, Enkomi, Kythrea, Lapithos, Oura, Paleskoutella, Petra tou Limniti, Soloi, Styli, Trachonas, Vouni, Amathus, and Ayios Iakovos. Cf. Sleij, "The Sites of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition." In her account of the SCE, Marie-Louise Winbladh wrote that ‘according to the law prevailing at the time, all the finds were divided between Cyprus and Sweden at the end of the excavations during the Spring 1931. The colonial authorities allowed the excavators to export more than half of the finds to Sweden. The total number of finds from [p. 15] the excavations was c.18,000, and the number received by the Swedes was about 12,000 or 65\% and in addition an extensive sherd material of more than 5000 boxes. This material now constitutes the bulk of the collections in Medelhavsmuseet. Winbladh, "The Swedish Cyprus Expedition 1927-1931," 13-15. The results of the SCE were published in Gjerstad, ed., SCE.\footnote{The Dutch Institute in Rome (KNIR, established 1904) for example has the prefix ‘royal’: the personal interest of Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf in the SIR has no real parallel among the foreign academies in Rome. For the KNIR, cf. Cools and de Valk, Institutum Neerlandicum MCMIV-MMIV: Honderd jaar Nederlands Instituut te Rome.}\footnote{Cf. Houby-Nielsen, "Preface."}}

The political significance of the keen royal interest through the Crown Prince in both undertakings (the SCE and the SIR, with no direct counterpart at for example the BSR, EFR or DAIR),\footnote{Whitling, Frederick (2010), The Western Way: Academic Diplomacy. Foreign academies and the Swedish Institute in Rome, 1935-1953 European University Institute DOI: 10.2870/64251} in combination with national scholarly prestige, greatly improved the funding possibilities of the manifestation of Swedish scholarly presence in the Mediterranean.\footnote{Axel Boëthius explicitly stated (in 1934) that the SIR was established ‘together with the organisation of Swedish excavations in...
In his 1936-1937 SIR annual report, Einar Gjerstad emphasised the Greek sphere of the interests of the SIR: ‘The activities of the institute are tied to Rome, but its task is to support studies of ancient culture in general terms, and the institute should especially arrange study trips to Greece to the extent that funding can be achieved, and help grant holders and other researchers to plan and organise studies also in that country’.137

The Swedish Cyprus Expedition provides further historical context for above all Einar Gjerstad’s keen interests in establishing the SIA after the Second World War (cf. chapter 5), and contributes towards illustrating the perception of the Mediterranean ‘world’ as a cultural entity in and of itself.

The director of the SIR was from the beginning perceived as ‘the living link which connects the home country with the research in the field’.138 Gjerstad was advocated and selected as Boëthius’ successor as director of the SIR (1935-1940), most notably by Martin P. Nilsson (then secretary of the SIR board). Nilsson expected Gjerstad to succeed him as professor of ancient history and classical archaeology at Lund University, a position from which Nilsson was to retire in 1939. Gjerstad was asked ‘to spend a few years in Rome’ until he could take over in Lund; there was no real

---

competition for the post as director of the SIR in Nilsson’s view. Gjerstad was indeed awarded the professorship at Lund in 1939; he remained in Rome until May 1940 to supervise the construction of the new SIR facilities in Valle Giulia (cf. chapter 4). As previously stated, the SIR is a private foundation, with annual applications for state subsidies to the ministry of education. Long-term financial state support of the SIR was not discussed when the institute was founded in 1925. The annual revenue of donation funds covered the finances of its infant years. Negotiations for potential state subsidies were delayed by the economic depression of 1929. The so-called ‘lottery funds’ referred to above and donations for the upkeep and maintenance of the SIR were awarded annually, the last time such funds were granted were for the budget year 1938-1939; this situation might have been able to persist during the Second World War, although the likelihood of this is


\[141\] The 1929 depression is often referred to as ‘Kreugerkrisen’ in Sweden, following the bankruptcy and misfortunes of tycoon Ivar Kreuger.
hard to determine. SIR state subsidies were successfully negotiated in the spring of 1938. The final push towards the decision was in the end determined by private funds, as the Knut and Alice Wallenberg foundation was simultaneously prepared to supply the necessary capital for a new institute building in Rome, thus satisfying the Swedish government’s position that it would be prepared to administrate the property, but not to pay for the erection of the institute building itself.\textsuperscript{142}

After the Crown Prince had expressed his gratitude on behalf of the institute for the securing of the finances of the building project in June 1937, Knut Wallenberg replied that

If people who are well off realised the pleasure of being able to support enterprises of use to our country and people, they would not hesitate to provide in their will for gifts of which others will derive satisfaction and pleasure. It may be egoistic to give while one lives but it amuses me.\textsuperscript{143}

An active commitment from the Swedish state was a necessary prerequisite for the bilateral agreement between Sweden and Italy regarding the plot of land on Via Omero in Valle Giulia.\textsuperscript{144} The building


\textsuperscript{143} Magnusson and Ahlklo, eds., L’Istituto Svedese di studi classici a Roma = The Swedish Institute of Classical Studies in Rome, 71.

\textsuperscript{144} The agreement was regulated in 1953, with the Swedish state donating a plot of land on Gården in Stockholm for the establishment of an Italian Cultural Institute (Istituto Italiano di Cultura). The engineer Carlo Maurilio Lerici was closely associated with the Italian cultural institute in Stockholm, the building (designed by the architect Giò Ponti) and premises of which were inaugurated in 1958 in the presence of King Gustaf VI Adolf.
and the property was, as promised by the government, to be administered by Kungliga Byggnadsstyrelsen (now Statens Fastighetsverk).

In a 1937 draft proposition for regular annual state subsidies of the SIR was communicated to King Gustaf V by the board of the SIR (in this case, more specifically by professors Boëthius, Nilsson, Einar Löfstedt and Ernst Nachmanson). The proposition rationalised the need for increased budget stability, but also the necessity of maintaining the institute itself. The foreign academies in Rome were described as ‘one of the most important hearths for research in the humanities’, following a separate promemoria by Gjerstad, then director of the SIR. The draft stated that ‘until 1926, our country [Sweden] has lacked such an institution’. It would in other words be most unfortunate if that institution could not be financially maintained.

Gjerstad’s promemoria furthermore enhanced the necessity of extending the SIR library, described as being by necessity limited to being a ‘reference library’, aimed at teaching, rather than at specialised research, which could be covered by the ‘older libraries in Rome’ (by which Gjerstad presumably most likely referred to the Vatican library, the DAIR library, the EFR library as well as the AAR library).145

The financial stability and relative safety that the new arrangement of state subsidy and new premises entailed was in many ways crucial to the immediate future of the SIR. The Second World War broke out only a year after the bilateral agreement was reached, and the completion of the new building in Valle Giulia was synchronised with the initiation of the

145 SIR board meeting minutes, March 4, 1937, §16, appendix 17a. The extensive DAIR correspondence however does not contain any letters to or from either SIR directors Boëthius, Gjerstad or Sjöqvist.
Italian war effort. Axel Boëthius, then secretary of the SIR board, was pleased to express in the context of the discussions with the Swedish government that 'our cow [referring to the SIR] will thankfully not die while the diplomatic grass keeps growing'.

At the same time it was feared that the liberty and independence of the close-knit group effectively in control of the SIR might be encroached by the Swedish government if the appeal for state funding was successful. To avoid this, the 1925 by-laws in which the board was defined as autonomous, were emphasised. The by-laws survived intact, mainly thanks to the efforts of Nilsson and Boëthius. The only real difference was that as from 1938 the board was officially appointed by the Swedish King, and the Swedish university chancellor was to be its unofficial chairman. In practice however this meant that the King continued the appointment of the existing board, although the Crown Prince reserved the right to chair the actual board meetings. The board in turn preserved the right to appoint the director of the SIR without involvement of the approval of the King. The practical implication of this was that board decisions could not be appealed.

\[146 \text{[...]} \text{vår ko dör ju lyckligtvis inte, medan det diplomatiska gräset växer'. Boëthius to M.P. Nilsson, March 10, 1937. Quoted in Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 110. The Swedish minister in Rome, Beck-Fris, also intervened in the building project by making an official demarche in order to prevent the curtailing of the SIR site by the prolongation of the street (Via Omero): 'faran för beskärande av Institutets tomt genom en gata [är därigenom] avvärd. [Området] tillhör från och med signerandet av den provisoriska överlåtelsehandlingen Svenska staten med jus possesionis'. Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, November 9, 1940. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5. Cf. Gjerstad to Boëthius, November 1, 1940. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B:1: 'Vi ses alltså snart men under tiden sänder jag dig närslutna karta, som jag fått från Erik tillsammans med rapport i tomtfrågan. Bartolini har ju gått med på att Institutets gräns utsträcktes till Villa Strohl-Fern. Realiter ha vi redan ockuperat hela området men det vore utmärkt om saken även ordnades formellt'.} \]
The autonomous ‘scholarly freedom’, cultural neutrality and the independence of the SIR would thus not be compromised, and the new institute building was guaranteed by a private donation (from the Wallenberg foundation). The building itself would create a platform for exchanges with scholars as well as with Italian authorities. An expansion of the SIR staff was however not seriously considered by the board at the time.

The discussions regarding the funding and the independence of the SIR in 1938 were characterised by securing positions and achievements obtained in the past, rather than looking toward the future – a position in part influenced by the general political instability in Europe at the time, but also a tendency that would recur after the war. Independence and autonomy were perceived as key issues that needed preserving; this encompassed both the independence of the board and that of the institute in terms of enabling ways to successfully maintain and develop its activities.147

The director of the SIR was furthermore expected to organise and lead a one-month excursion to Greece as part of the annual archaeological course (from 1937). Such trips to Greece had been planned as part of the configuration of the SIR in its infancy.148 The notion of an excursion to Greece was most notably promoted by Einar Gjerstad. One of the later

147 Cf. Ibid., 112–113.
consequences of the Greek excursions was the post-war establishment of the Swedish Institute in Athens (SIA, 1948, see section 5.9).\textsuperscript{149}

\textbf{FIG. 14. EINAR GJERSTAD WITH HIS WIFE VIVI AT CAPE SOUNION (1937)}

\textbf{FIG. 15. THE SIR EXCURSION TO GREECE (1938)}

\textsuperscript{149} Cf. correspondence in Samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden. See also Whitling, Frederick, "Mare Nostrum: Einar Gjerstad och Svenska Institutet i Athen, 1945-1948," \textit{Hellenika} 133 (2010), 14.
According to the by-laws of the SIR its director has to be a classical archaeologist. Neither Boëthius, Gjerstad nor Sjöqvist had much experience of Roman (or Italian) classical archaeology when they assumed their respective directorships, however. Working with the pedagogical aspect of the archaeological course by necessity entangled them in the sphere of Roman (and Pompeiian) architecture and topography – in this way they simultaneously entered the ongoing scholarly discussion in Rome regarding the inclusion of recent archaeological discoveries in the understanding of ancient Roman material remains.

Einar Gjerstad was already an established name in archaeological circles when he assumed the directorship of the SIR in 1935 following his work with the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (The SCE publication series began in 1934). Gjerstad’s interest in Greek and ‘Eastern’ influences on Italic cultures was manifested in his report from the fourth national Istituto di Studi Romani-congress in Rome on the topic of Rome and the Orient, published in the Swedish newspaper *Dagens Nybeter* on December 30, 1935, with the title ‘Roman Studies’ [‘Romerska studier’]. In this piece Gjerstad advocated international collaborative research on the Roman synthesis, created with ‘impulses from Greek and Oriental culture’. He promoted himself – and the SIR – as the medium through which this collaborative research should be achieved.\(^{150}\) Little became of this, although it is symptomatic of how research of local occurrences in Rome often has had pretensions of claiming to deal with universal history.

\(^{150}\) Cf. Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 174-175. See also for example Einar Gjerstad, "Die Ursprungsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserfora," *Opuscula archaeologica* 3 (1944). This study does however not focus on the scholarly context (topics, journals, etc.) of publications of foreign academy directors.
A new director of a relatively minor foreign academy such as the SIR needed to gain respect and scholarly renown as soon as possible. One way of achieving this was through frequent publication (often in the form of remarks on ancient Roman topography in Italian as well as ‘foreign’ archaeological journals and reviews, some of the most prestigious being the Athenische and Römische Mitteilungen, or AM and RM). Axel Boëthius for example kept lists of scholars to whom extracts of publications were to be distributed. He thus promoted himself and the SIR at the same time, killing two birds with one stone; a reflection of one aspect of the practical application of academic diplomacy on an individual level.151

The SIR was established relatively late (in 1926, thus representing a ‘middle generation’ in relation to the foreign academies and institutes of the late nineteenth century, and those established after the Second World War, such as for example other Scandinavian academies and the Canadian Academy in Rome (established in 1978). The relative prominence of the SIR during the war years partly compensated for lost time. The opportunity of tracing the activities of the foreign academic community in its continuity during the war is in many ways unique to the SIR (cf. chapter 4).

Another aspect of the early research profile of the SIR was the regular publication of volumes in the series Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae. The series included publication of monographs and essays in the field of classical archaeology, in the tradition of the German Archäologische Anzeiger, the French Mélanges, the British Papers and the American

151 Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 159-160.
Memoirs. Twenty such SIR Acta-volumes were published between 1932 and 1952; their publication was financed by a separate publication fund. The series was created by Martin P. Nilsson and was run from Lund University (with Nilsson as editor until 1956, when he was succeeded by professor Krister Hanell). Responding to a comment by Erland Billig regarding the power and control exercised by the Acta-editors after one of his essays (on Pompeii) had been refused publication, Gjerstad asserted that 'there is no question of any scholarly conformity in our published series and I have several times ventilated opinions that were not shared by me and in direct polemics with my own'. It is of interest that Gjerstad felt the need to emphasise that point. The tight editorial control of the SIR publication series was in that way paralleled in the close-knit private origins and structure of the SIR itself.

The SIR Acta-volumes were generally well received by the scholarly community, and contributed to the body of work of Swedish classical scholars active in Italy at the time being referred to as the ‘Swedish School’, or the ‘scuola svedese’. The ‘scuola svedese’ can also refer to the SIR archaeological legacy, then most closely associated with Gösta Säflund’s volume on the Republican city walls of Rome (1932), and Gjerstad’s Forum Romanum-excavations (1939 and 1949), resulting in his Early Rome-publications.

152 Cf. SIR board meeting minutes March 20, 1935, as well as April 12, 1940, §9. The SIR also published articles in the journal Opuscula Romana.
153 Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 163.
155 See Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 166-167.
The SIR archives were first organised in 1947–1948, partly by Erik Sjöqvist. The SIR has furthermore preserved a rich photographic material (in Rome), which is preserved in three albums (covering the periods 1926–1931, 1931–1939 and 1941–1942). The guestbooks of the SIR (from 1926) are preserved in the SIR offices in Rome. The SIR archival material consists mainly of correspondence from and to the various directors of the SIR, as well as with members of the board. The SIR directors in question in this study were Axel Boëthius (1889–1969), director 1926–1935, 1952–1953 and 1955–1957; Einar Gjerstad (1897–1988), director 1935–1940; Erik Sjöqvist (1903–1975), director 1940–1948; and Arvid Andrén (1902–1999), director 1948–1952 and 1964–1966). Three other scholars of considerable importance in the Swedish context of ancient history and classical archaeology briefly functioned as intermediary temporary directors (‘t.f. föreståndare’) of the SIR: Martin P. Nilsson together with Gösta Säflund 1934–1935, and Åke Åkerström in 1948. An extensive amount of correspondence is furthermore preserved to and from the two treasurers of the SIR: Chamberlain Axel Hallin (treasurer 1925–1948); and Admiral Erik Wetter (treasurer 1948–1970).

The educational profile of the SIR was fundamental to the three main archaeological projects carried out under the auspices of the institutes: the ‘big digs’ of San Giovenale (1956–1965), Luni sul Mignone (1960–1963)

---

156 Cf. SIR executive committee minutes, December 17, 1947, §8: ‘Beslöt arbetsutskottet på förslag av skattmästaren, att det skulle uppdragas åt förste bibliotekarien G. Adde att ordna institutets och Asinekommitténs arkiv. För detta arbete skulle ersättning enligt överenskommelse mellan skattmästaren och förste bibliotekarien Adde utgå av institutets donationsmedel, till vilka vid Asinekommitténs upplösning dess tillgodohavande kr. 2.000– lagts’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, I:5. See also Sjöqvist to the Board of the SIR, March 1, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (cf. chapter 1.8).
and Acquarossa (1966–1978 & 1990). Fundamental in the sense that aspiring Swedish students of classical archaeology were offered training possibilities in the context of excavations in Italy. This close link between teaching and practice had further consequences of linking students with topics of (doctoral) research linked with material from these Swedish excavations, strongly identified with and supported by King Gustaf VI Adolf (1882–1973).

The unpublished manuscript by Erland and Ragnhild Billig (cf. chapters 1 and 8) is a valuable source of information for this study, not least as it refers to several documents now lost. It is the only attempt of its kind to produce a historical account of the SIR specifically in relation to the Second World War. The manuscript was subjected to correction work, even though this too remains incomplete, demonstrated by the fragmentary nature of its footnotes and cross-references. The manuscript itself is preserved in boxes at the SIR along with several original documents (mainly correspondence) that have probably been removed from the SIR archives in Rome and Stockholm. Erland Billig himself was partially involved in the organisation of the SIR archival material at RA in Stockholm, as several folders there are commented on in his handwriting.


158 Internal criticism was however raised regarding the enthusiasm for and dimensions of the large-scale Etruscan projects. A sufficient structure for dealing with the analysis and publication of the vast amount of excavated material was (and is still) lacking in the Swedish academic system. The material dimension of the spoils of archaeology, in combination with no comparable resources in later periods to that of royal involvement, has led to a reluctance to initiate later archaeological projects of similar scale. Cf. Magnusson, ed., Humanist vid Medelhavet, 378–379.
Another SIR source material category is constituted by the (unpublished) annual reports to the board (‘Föreståndarens årsredogörelser’). One of these volumes, covering the period 1935-1936 to 1948-1949, is particularly pertinent to this study. These annual reports are important partly due to their unique consistency over the entire period in question (including the war years), partly as they share the consistent structures of the categories of director's report, notes regarding the staff (permanent and temporary), teaching, research, publications, the library, as well as cultural cooperation (‘det kulturella samarbetet’). The different directors of the SIR expressed variations in the offered material as well as diverging personal touches in emphasis. Erik Sjöqvist for example gave considerable weight to a description of the cultural collaboration of the SIR during the war. These annual reports should be understood in a context of maintaining the status quo and ‘business as usual’ – in other words, telling the board what they wanted (and expected) to hear, downplaying conflicts (however petty), as well as the domestic Italian social and political context.

The inclusion of remarks regarding the cultural collaboration and relations of the past year in the annual reports was a clearly expressed aim in the statutes of the SIR – the directors understandably felt the importance of asserting the position and value of the institute within the Italian context as well as in that of the other foreign schools as particularly pressing for the young institution.

The annual archaeological course (initiated in 1926) and the strong pedagogical profile of the SIR stand out as a defining characteristic of the
SIR as it was finding its place in the intellectual framework of foreign and domestic academies and scholars in Rome. Through ardent publication Swedish scholars and the SIR were – at least before the outbreak of the Second World War – associated with the notion of the ‘scuola svedese’, as has been discussed here. The ‘cultural neutrality’ of the SIR and the activities at the institute during the war will be examined in further detail in chapter 3; the immediate post-war years will be addressed in chapter 5.

FIG. 16. THE FIRST SIR ARCHAEOLOGICAL COURSE ON THE FORUM ROMANUM (1926)
2.3 ANGLO-AMERICAN CLASSICS: THE BRITISH SCHOOL AT ROME (BSR) AND THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME (AAR)

The British School at Rome was opened by British ambassador Lord Currie on April 11, 1901; relatively late in relation to for example the DAIR and the EFR, and almost a decade after the establishment of the AAR. The BSR ‘rules’ were ‘modelled on those in force for the British School at Athens [BSA, established in 1886], with such modifications as the different circumstances of the two Schools appeared to require’.

In analogy with the SIR, the BSR was connected with interests in Greece and with planned close connections with the BSA. The BSR was from the outset supported by the EFR, which had donated a ‘set of publications’ to the new institution. The exigency of books was emphasised in the first BSR annual report:

The School has obtained the official recognition of all the authorities and bodies with whom it is necessarily brought into contact. The Italian Ministry of Public Instruction extends to our students all the facilities which it is accustomed to grant to members of such institutions, and the official introduction to the authorities of the Vatican Library has been effected through the kind offices of His Eminence Cardinal Vaughan. With the other foreign schools in Rome, our relations are of the most friendly nature. Without their hospitality our students, in the present incomplete state of the Library, would often be seriously inconvenienced and hampered in their work. Special mention should be made in this connexion of the kindness of Mgr. [l'Abbé] Duchesne, Director of the French School, who secured for the School, from the French Minister of Public

---

159 BSR annual report 1901-1902.
Instruction, a most valuable gift in the publications of the French Schools both at Athens and at Rome.\textsuperscript{160}

The EFR gift was of course generous, but also served the purpose of promoting national (French) research and the institutions (the EFR and the EFA) themselves (through the practice of academic diplomacy). The complimentarity of the 1901-1902 BSR report illustrates the need for the new institution of paying its respects to the domestic and foreign academies already established in Rome. It was judged to be important to express gratitude for access to libraries. The issue of books was emphasised in order to accelerate the accumulation of the new BSR library holdings, considering that the report was intendent for the executive committee of the BSR, and would not likely have been scrutinised by the directors of other foreign academies in Rome.

The BSR was run by an executive committee, which from the outset expressed its appreciation for ‘the assistance rendered to [the BSR], by Lord Currie and the Staff of the British Embassy, one of whom (Sir Rennell Rodd) has consented to join the [Executive] Committee’.\textsuperscript{161} This ‘official’ connection with the embassy through Rennell Rodd stands out in the context of the foreign academies covered by this study.\textsuperscript{162}

The BSR received individual donations by the colleges of the two dominant British universities (Oxford and Cambridge). From the outset, the BSR was closely affiliated with the University of Oxford, partly in terms of scholars and students, but also in terms of funding, with double

\textsuperscript{160} See BSR annual report 1901-1902.
\textsuperscript{161} BSR annual report 1901-1902.
the amount of pre-war (and post-war) grants, subscriptions and donations than for example the University of Cambridge. The first proposal for a British research centre in Rome, with ‘some simple form of organisation for the assistance of British Students in Rome’, came from a group of classical scholars led by Henry Pelham (1846-1907), professor of ancient history at Oxford University in 1898.\textsuperscript{163} The focus on Roman Britain by Oxford ancient historian Francis Haverfield (1860-1919) was influential regarding the connection between the University of Oxford and the BSR.\textsuperscript{164} The BSR building was designed by architect Sir Edwin Lutyens based on his British pavilion in the International Exhibition in Valle Giulia of 1911, and was re-erected and completed by April 1916.\textsuperscript{165} The BSR offered scholarships in archaeology and history as well as visual arts and music, corresponding with the interests of the School’s Faculty of Fine Art (FFA) and Faculty of Archaeology, History and Letters (FAHL). Thomas Ashby, director of the BSR 1906-1925, initiated a BSR legacy of

\textsuperscript{163} See \url{http://www.bsr.ac.uk/BSR/sub_about/BSR_About_01History.htm} (visited June 28, 2010), and Timothy Peter Wiseman, \textit{A Short History of the British School at Rome} (London: The British School at Rome at The British Academy, 10 Carlton House Terrace, London SW1Y 5 AH, 1990).

\textsuperscript{164} For Haverfield and classical archaeology at Oxford and Cambridge, see Dyson, \textit{In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts. A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries}, xiv, 125 & 129. See BSR annual report 1938-1939. The BSR also received individual donations, such as by (Oxford) philosopher and historian R.G. Collingwood (1889-1943). See BSR annual report 1939-1940.

archaeological field surveys and topographical studies through his explorations of the Roman campagna.¹⁶⁶

In the autumn of 1938, C.A. Ralegh Radford (BSR director 1936-1945) reported from Rome that ‘I have arrived here & every thing is to all appearance normal, much more so than in London’.¹⁶⁷ Ralegh Radford's correspondence with BSR honorary general secretary Sir Evelyn Shaw 1939 is largely concerned with the boundaries of the BSR and the issue of ‘the road’ and the BSR tennis court (the land to the north of the BSR), and expresses little fear regarding political developments (cf. Ralegh Radford to Shaw, June 9, 1939). The tone between Ralegh Radford and Shaw was more formal – and generally less relaxed, outspoken and informative – than for example that in Sjöqvist’s correspondence with SIR secretary Boëthius. The issue regarding the land of the BSR was one of planned construction of ‘villini signorili’, which had been changed by the Governatorato di Roma (Don Piero Colonna) to include ‘villini comuni’ (three to four storey buildings) which it was feared would seriously affect the light in the BSR artists’ studios.¹⁶⁸ The BSR had developed good relations with the gentry in power in Rome. On the topic of the BSR façade, Ralegh Radford referred to his contacts with the mayor of Rome, Prince Doria, who ‘had always been a good friend to England’.¹⁶⁹ This once more emphasizes the

¹⁶⁶ Thomas Ashby was in fact the very first Rome Scholar at the BSR. Cf. BSR annual report 1901-1902.
¹⁶⁷ Ralegh Radford to Shaw, October 1, 1938; cf. Ralegh Radford to Shaw, April 10, 1939. ‘Conditions here are absolutely unmoved [and] the reports of the English press seem like news from another world’. BSR, box 63.
¹⁶⁸ Cf. Ralegh Radford to Shaw, March 24, 1939. BSR, box 63.
¹⁶⁹ Ralegh Radford to Shaw, September 10, 1945. BSR, box 63.
role of the foreign academy directors in establishing and maintaining
relations with local authorities.

In a report on ‘the extension and reorganization of the buildings of the
British School at Rome carried out during the session 1937-8’, an appeal
was made to increase the number of BSR scholarships in the Faculty of
Archaeology, History and Letters and to ‘raise their emoluments to a value
equivalent to that of the Rome Scholarships in the Fine Arts […] as a
result of considerably increased support from the Universities of the
Empire’.170 Such ‘imperial’ rhetoric, with a more pronounced ‘colonial’
dimension vis-à-vis the Italian staff of the School, for example, was not
uncommon at the pre-war BSR, more clearly so than at the other foreign
academies covered by this study.

British prime minister Neville Chamberlain visited the BSR in early
January 1939 together with foreign secretary Viscount Halifax.171 The new
East wing of the BSR was inaugurated in the presence of Italian King
Vittorio Emmanuele III and the British ambassador on January 24, 1939.172
Considering the recent Italian imperial conquests in Africa and King
Vittorio Emmanuele being elevated to ‘Emperor of Ethiopia’, honorary
general secretary Shaw felt that Ralegh Ralegh Radford had to be most
astute and politically sensitive in the sense of not describing King George

170 Report on the ‘the extension and reorganization of the buildings of the
British School at Rome carried out during the session 1937-8’, December 1938. BSR, box 63.
Minister and the Foreign Secretary today visited the School at 3.30 and stayed
about 35 minutes. They saw the Common Room ground floor of new wing […] all
the students were presented to them. Both seemed very interested’.
172 Cf. Ralegh Radford to Shaw, December 23, 1938. BSR, box 63: ‘His Majesty the
King Emperor has consented to be present on the occasion of the opening of the
new wing at the British School on the 24th January. It was felt that the School
being a British institution the actual opening should be performed by the British
Ambassador, His Majesty being present on the occasion’.
VI as ‘Emperor of India’ after the inauguration, after Radford’s remark that ‘I think we should give [the King] the title of King of Italy and Emperor of Ethiopia’. There is only one [amendment], with reference to the opening [ceremony], that I cannot accept, as it would startle people over here to see in a descriptive and informal document King George referred to as the King of England and Emperor of India. I can say “H.M. King George VI” or, if contrasted with a foreigner, “the King of England”.174

The BSR closed during the Second World War under the directorship of Ralegh Radford. BSR honorary general secretary Shaw reported that he had ‘asked his [Ralegh Radford’s] advice as to what should be done, in the event of war with Italy, to safeguard the property of the School. He advised that the archive should be handed over to the Director of the Dutch Institute, on the other side of the Valle Giulia, if they cannot be brought home. We should not be at liberty to place them with the Embassy, as the School is not a Government institution and enjoys no diplomatic immunity. As regards the moveable property, books and furniture, this for obvious reasons cannot be transferred to the Dutch Institute, but the Director can be asked to keep an eye on the School and to arrange for the wages to be paid to the Italian servants left in charge’.175

The SIR was still in the process of being constructed at the time, otherwise it is possible that Erik Sjöqvist (or Einar Gjerstad) might also have been approached by the BSR regarding wartime guardianship. The

173 Ralegh Radford to Shaw, February 24, 1939 BSR, box 63.
174 Shaw to Ralegh Radford, February 27, 1939. BSR, box 63.
175 Memorandum, Evelyn Shaw, July 11, 1939. BSR, box 63.
archive in the end remained at the BSR. The same Rennell Rodd that had
joined the BSR executive committee in 1902 (see above), informed the
chairman of the BSR Faculty of Archaeology, History and Letters about
the reasons for closing the BSR after the outbreak of war in 1939, referring
to the importance of remaining in favourable regard from the Italian
regime in an official (published) statement:

In the first place, the male students of the School, as well as the members of the
Directorate, became liable for military service on the outbreak of war, and without
distinction of sex all were anxious to devote themselves at once to work of national
importance. [...] In view of these circumstances and the fact that the Royal Charter
defines the principal scope of the School as the promotion of research and advanced
study by British subjects in Italy, the Executive Committee felt that there was no
alternative to suspending the services of the School until the younger generation could
resume their normal studies. [...] it is permissible to hope that this suspension of
activities may not be prolonged and that, after the restoration of normal conditions, the
School may look forward, with the continued favour of our Italian friends, to a renewed
and lasting period of prosperity and usefulness.176

The British and American embassies, together with AAR director Chester
Aldrich (see below), temporarily acted as guardians of the BSR during the
initial stages of the war. The 1939-1940 BSR annual report declared that

176 Rennell Rodd (chairman of the BSR executive committee) to the chairman of
the Faculty of Archaeology, History and Letters, November 14, 1939, quoted in
BSR annual report 1938-1939. The chairman in question was probably Bernard
Ashmole (1894-1988), BSR director 1925-1928, later keeper of Greek and Roman
antiquities at the British Museum (Ashmole was certainly chairman of the BSR in
1947-1948). The 1938-1939 BSR annual report furthermore stated that ‘The
School buildings have been placed on a care and maintenance basis under the
immediate charge of the Italian Secretary, assisted by a small domestic staff. [...] The
new east wing of the School, the completion of which was recorded in our
last report, was formally opened on January 24th by H.E. the British Ambassador.
H.M. King Victor Emmanuel III honoured the School with his presence on this
class. Mr. Neville Chamberlain and Lord Halifax made an informal visit to
the School during their stay in Rome’.
'until Italy came into the war the School buildings were cared for by the British Embassy in Rome, and thereafter they were put in the hands of the American Embassy. [...] In the early months of the war certain grants were made to Scholars to enable them temporarily to pursue their researches in England, but as they were absorbed into other spheres of activity these grants ceased'. 177 During the war years, BSR business was run mainly from London by honorary general secretary Shaw, who met regularly with director Ralegh Radford at the Athenaeum Club (Pall Mall) in London. The BSR for example invested in war bonds ‘in the national interest, as well as in the [...] interest [of the School]’. 178 The British embassy in Rome occupied parts of the BSR facilities during the end of the war. 179

The BSR library had remained in the School, and reopened on October 1, 1945, ‘for the benefit of scholars and Army officers who are in Rome on duty or on leave’, with a ‘series of concerts and teaparties in the School to bring the Italian academic world into closer touch with British officials

177 BSR annual report 1939-1940. The report went on to state that ‘subscriptions to British and some American periodicals are being maintained. The journals were allowed to accumulate at the London office, but after the intense air attacks on London began it was decided to reove them to less dangerous places, and they are now divided between the Hon. General Secretary and the Secretary to the Faculty’.

178 Cf. BSR annual report 1939-1940. The BSR correspondence is rife with audits and budgetary comments in so-called ‘grey sheets’ (see BSR, boxes 63 and 64). Ralegh Radford kept up the appearance of active directorship from London, ‘as my signature is known to the various authorities in Rome and my appointment presumably valid in their eyes until further notice’. Ralegh Radford to Shaw, December 19, 1942, sent from the Political Intelligence Department of the Foreign Office, London. BSR, box 63.

179 Cf. Ralegh Radford to Shaw, December 17, 1944: ‘The embassy now occupies the whole of the east wing and the upper floor of the north wing, using the kitchen and the dining hall’. See also Ralegh Radford to Shaw, October 25, 1944: ‘Sir Noel Charles [of the British Embassy] and the Resident Minister at AFHQ [Allied Forces Headquarters] are both favourable to the opening of the School Library during the session [1944-1945]. The suggestion is at present on the basis that I should remain Director and be responsible [...]’. BSR, box 63.
stationed in Rome’ (cf. similar ‘leave courses’ at the AAR – see below), although the matter was not considered urgent, ‘as no such [leave] courses could start for at least two months after the cessation of hostilities’.\(^{180}\) Ralegh Radford felt that ‘if the school were opened I should suggest giving one or two small parties in order to bring the Italian academic world into rather closer touch with British officials stationed in this city. [...] After the concert I should propose to offer tea in the courtyard and this would give Italians an opportunity of meeting our own people. [...] The Ambassador with whom I discussed the matter last week was of the opinion that the use of the School for such a purpose would in no way impair its status’.\(^{181}\)

The directorship of the BSR was offered to arcaheologist (and MFAA officer) John Bryan Ward-Perkins in 1945.\(^{182}\) Ward-Perkins informed honorary general secretary Shaw in January 1946 that ‘the moment is very opportune’ for applying for ‘sponsoring' for passage for students to Rome, as the Foreign Office had ‘just agreed to give favourable consideration to opening the English (Papal) College’.\(^{183}\) Ward-Perkins thus saw that as

---

\(^{180}\) Shaw to Ralegh Radford, May 4, 1945.
\(^{181}\) Ralegh Radford to Shaw, April 9, 1945. Cf. Ralegh Radford to Shaw, August 18, 1945. BSR, box 63.
\(^{182}\) Regarding the financial situation of the director, see Ralegh Radford to Shaw, June 25, 1945: ’Ward Perkins has told me of the Committee’s invitation to him to become Director of the School and that he has accepted the invitation. I think that he is somewhat worried about the financial prospects and I certainly should be in his position. [...] I understand that my successor may not enjoy his salary in Italy free of income tax as I did and this would seriously diminish his effective income. [...] I feel that unless some arrangement is made to enable the Director of the B.S.R. to get some priority through the Embassy, he will be immobilized in Rome and I think you will agree that this is undesirable. [...] I gather he will desire to live here with his wife and this will automatically increase his expenses in a way which a bachelor like myself never contemplated’. BSR, box 63.
\(^{183}\) Ward-Perkins to Shaw, January 18, 1946. BSR, box 64.
a lead which the BSR should follow as soon as possible, in order to the School not to lag behind the other foreign academies in Rome.

Among the multitude of issues facing Ward-Perkins and the BSR (and indeed the other foreign academies in Rome) in adapting to post-war Italian legislation and a new ‘climate’ was that of the insurance of its property. Shaw wrote regarding the insurance of the BSR that ‘I know that under Fascist law it was illegal to ensure in England and that is why the Alliance established an agency in Milan, but law or no law we must be sure of recovery in sterling of any loss sustained, especially in the Library’.184

The BSR was to be directed by Ward-Perkins for almost three decades (1945-1974). Ward-Perkins was appointed director by the BSR executive committee on May 23, 1945. He was part-time director from October 1945, and full-time director from January 1946. The 1945-1946 BSR annual report informed its subscribers that ‘the School buildings came through the war unscathed and that the Executive Committee in 1945 appointed Mr. J.B. Ward Perkins as Director, in succession to Mr. C.A. Ralegh Radford. [...] despite the gathering clouds of the impending European disaster, the School extended its activities and the library grew apace. Mr. Radford voluntarily renounced his emoluments in 1939, but offered to assist the administration during the war in any matter on which his advice was sought [...]. His assistance turned out to be of the utmost value, since he was stationed in Rome in the period after the armistice and he was able to take immediate steps for the examination of the buildings and for certain repairs which the lapse of time rendered necessary’.185

184 Shaw to Ward-Perkins, September 24, 1945. BSR, box 64.
185 Ward-Perkins was himself a BSR ‘Rome Scholar’ during the 1934-1935 session. Cf. BSR annual report 1934-1935. Mrs. Eugenie Strong, classical scholar and BSR
Ward-Perkins arrived in Rome in February 1946, when he reported to Shaw on his arrival as well as the recent return of the four German libraries (cf. chapters 4 and 6): ‘I am just writing to let you know that we have arrived safely, complete with our luggage and the books (books accumulated during the war in Britain for the School, as well as Ward-Perkins' private collections]. Considering all things our journey might have been very much worse. We are staying for a few days at the Swedish Institute to cover the initial week of chaos in our own flat, but I hope to move in shortly. [...] A great deal has happened in Rome since my departure. Notably two of the German Libraries are back, and two more are promised. I shall know more shortly.\(^1\)

Ward-Perkins was to continue and develop the legacy of his predecessor Thomas Ashby, in focusing the archaeological activity of the BSR on field surveys (above all at Veii and in Etruria from the 1950s onwards) rather than on excavations per se. Potential BSR excavations were however discussed by director Ralegh Radford as early as 1938, on Malta rather than in Italy, however, as Italy remained closed for foreign excavations at that time. The 1937–1938 annual report declared that ‘in March [1938] he [Ralegh Radford] spent a week in Malta at the suggestion of the Colonial Office to explore the possibility of the School undertaking archaeological research in the island’.\(^2\) In 1947 the urge to excavate was rekindled, at the time mainly based on Ward-Perkins' archaeological interests in Libya (see

---

\(^1\) Ward-Perkins to Shaw, February 12, 1946. BSR, box 64.

\(^2\) BSR annual report 1937–1938.
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below). In March 1947, Charles Rufus Morey (acting director of the AAR 1945-1947) discussed a possible joint Anglo-American excavation at Cyrene with AAR director Laurance Roberts:

John [Ward-Perkins] took me through the photographs of Cyrene, which you will remember back in the early years of this century, was the site where the Americans started an excavation under Norton and DeCou, which was terminated when DeCou was murdered by Arabs. Ward-Perkins is going to propose, with apparently considerable expectation of success, that the British School undertake, what he calls an exploratory operation, amounting at least at first, to cleaning up the edges and completing by scientific recording what the Italians left undone. [...] Perkins seems confident that the British mandate there will be good for several years and suggests that the British effort might be spread to include the Americans in a joint expedition. In view of the politics involved, it is obvious that this should not be talked about too much, but I thought you might wish to discuss the possibility while you were in the United States.188

This joint venture did not take place in the end, but the BSR was to uphold its archaeological interests in Libya (with excavations at Leptis Magna, Sabratha and Cyrenaica). The archaeological legacy of the BSR was to be focused on field surveys in Etruria from the 1950s onwards. Ward-Perkins did however carry out ‘brief trial excavations in the church of S. Salvatore at Spoleto, one of the most disputed monuments of late antiquity’, together with Sjöqvist in December 1946. The results were published in the BSR Papers (Vol. XVII), the publication series of the School.189

188 Morey to Roberts, March 6, 1947. AAR, reel 5798.
The American Academy in Rome (AAR) initiated its own excavations in Italy (at Cosa) in the immediate post-war period (see below, cf. map of excavation sites in the Mediterranean, fig. 19, chapter 3). Partly due to the difficulty of obtaining excavation permits in Italy before the end of the Second World War – a problem shared with the other foreign academies in Rome – and partly due to issues of funding, archaeological research at the AAR was early on focused on topographical issues, in analogy with the SIR and the BSR.191

The *American School of Architecture in Rome* was founded in 1894 as an institution for the formation of young architects in the tradition of the *Prix de Rome* of the Académie de France, much as a result of the input of

---

190 From [http://www.bsr.ac.uk/bsr/sub_libr/extra/BSR_Libr_archive_gettyor.htm](http://www.bsr.ac.uk/bsr/sub_libr/extra/BSR_Libr_archive_gettyor.htm) and [http://www.chart.ac.uk/chart2004/papers/hourihane.html](http://www.chart.ac.uk/chart2004/papers/hourihane.html).

the architect Charles Follen McKim. His efforts were contemporary with those of the Archaeological Institute of America to found an *American School of Classical Studies* similar to that already established in Athens (the ASCSA, 1881). The AAR was chartered in 1905, and its two strands (architecture and classical studies) were fused in 1913.¹⁹²

The AAR was physically established in 1914 in a newly erected building on the Gianicolo hill in Rome, on land acquired by the wealthy J. Pierpoint Morgan in order to rival the Académie de France on the Pincio hill on the other side of the city.¹⁹³ AAR director Jesse Benedict Carter wrote in 1914 regarding the ‘new academy’, that

There is nothing exactly like it, so far as I know, in the world. It bears a strong outward resemblance to the organisation of a university, but this resemblance is formal rather than spiritual. [...] We are attempting to bring into close contact two distinct types of mind. We call these types, roughly, the artist and the scholar. It might perhaps be better to think of them as the artist and the historian. [...] it is this fact, the existence of two distinct kinds of guides, which is the essence of the so-called “two schools” of which the Academy consists.¹⁹⁴

AAR correspondence on the whole seldom commented on its relations with other foreign academies or its contributions to AIAC and the Unione after the war. Rare exceptions can be found in Charles Rufus Morey’s correspondence while acting director of the AAR 1945-1947.


¹⁹³ Fant, "L'Accademia Americana a Roma," 33. Cf. James Monroe Hewlett, ‘Address [to] the people of America’ (courtesy of the Department of State of the Italian Government), 1934. AAR, reel 5758: ‘The Academy asks the united interest and support of America in the maintenance of this foundation on the top of the Janiculum from which we look down upon twenty centuries of progress’.

¹⁹⁴ ‘Memorandum on the relations of the various directors of the Academy among themselves’. Jesse Benedict Carter, May 12, 1914. AAR, reel 5750.
Like the BSR and the EFR, the activities of the AAR were suspended during the Second World War. As clouds were gathering over Europe in 1939, the AAR was considering which policy to adopt in the event of war. AAR president James Kellum Smith informed director Chester Holmes Aldrich in September 1939 that ‘it becomes necessary to direct your thoughts to the gradual drying up of the situation there and preparing to reduce the staff to a minimum point required to exercise responsibility for the properties, in the event that the Academy remains neutral property, and making what plans can be made in the event that conditions should take such a turn as to make it alien property’. In May 1940, Smith reported to Aldrich that ‘it is not outside of the realm of possibility, or even probability, that our properties instead of being “alien”, could within all too short a time, become “Enemy.” […] Whether in the face of these possibilities our position would be improved by offering our plant for hospital purposes, Red Cross, or some humane activity, is of course a consideration which you will want to explore’. President Smith expressed the New York position thus after the outbreak of war in 1939: ‘I think no one here expects that Italy’s neutrality will be maintained very long, and of course, in spite of the strong isolationist sentiment in the country, most people fear or expect that

195 See Aldrich to Smith, January 3, 1939. AAR, reel 5758: ‘You may have read in the papers of some disturbances and perhaps have noted [...] the suggestion that the Italian Government “take over” the Villa Medici, which is the property of the French Government and used as you know for the French Academy. Nothing further seems to have been heard of this or of some similar propositions. I will not indulge in any comments on the uncertain political atmosphere, but only say that so far, we are continuing to receive on every side the cordial cooperation we have always had from the Government authorities’.
196 Smith to Aldrich, September 22, 1939. AAR, reel 5758.
197 Smith to Aldrich, May 24, 1940. AAR, reel 5758.
America will become actively involved, the only problem being, how soon!\(^{198}\)

In April 1940, Smith described the perspective from the other side of the Atlantic: ‘Everything here [in New York] so far as the Academy is concerned seems to me to be proceeding as well as could be expected under the circumstances, but I feel a little as if it is in low gear, none of us quite daring to open the throttle wide’.\(^{199}\) In May 1940 Smith wrote that ‘no one expects conditions to be favorable to the normal operation of the Academy next year, and everyone I think feels that we ought to get the Fellows out of the danger zone before the thing breaks wide open’.\(^{200}\)

In a special meeting of the executive committee of the AAR, September 21, 1939 ‘to consider what policy the Academy should pursue in view of existing war conditions’, it was advised that students at the AAR should return to the US immediately; they were however given the option to remain in Europe to complete their fellowships.\(^{201}\)

\(^{198}\) Smith to Aldrich, September 12, 1939 (cf. Smith to Aldrich, September 22, 1939). AAR, reel 5758: ‘Most of the Committee here felt that it is only a matter of time before war conditions spread to Italy, and even to this country. [...] The mood here is extremely apprehensive, so much so, that several members of the Committee leaned towards closing up immediately in Rome. The parallels of the last war they feel have little bearing’.

\(^{199}\) Smith to Aldrich, April 16, 1940. AAR, reel 5758.

\(^{200}\) Smith to Aldrich, May 24, 1940. AAR, reel 5758.

\(^{201}\) Cf. AAR Fellow Charles Naginski to president J.K. Smith, September 17, 1939. ‘Mr. Aldrich believes I should remain in Rome and that most likely Italy will remain neutral for 3, 4 or 6 months so that the Academy may remain open till then and keep it going with the few fellows we have here [...] why take the risk staying on here till things will become so thick that one will remain bottled up here? [...] there is a boat sailing the 15th of October’. See also J.K. Smith to Margaret Cresson, September 24, 1940: ‘Academy policy has been most difficult to formulate due to the uncertainty of war conditions. We all feel I think that the Academy's services to art and scholarship are not rendered less important by the disorder in the world, but if possible, more so. [...] If the war drags out a long time, we may have to consider setting up a temporary base on this side of the water [...] It is a very difficult time for many educational institutions [...] but I see nothing in the picture to shake our confidence in the importance of our work here at this time or in the future’. Cf. Francis Scott Bradford to Smith, October
In an earlier somewhat contradictory report from November 1939 after a visit to the AAR, J.K. Smith expressed that ‘the Academy’s position in Rome seems to me never to have been better. Relations with the other academies have been developed and smoothed by the Director. [...] Official Rome, representing both the Church and the State, seems to have been very satisfactorily cultivated’.202

‘The thing’, paraphrasing Smith, did however indeed ‘break wide open’. AAR director Chester Aldrich was enrolled by the US Embassy as ‘special attaché’ in 1940 in order to supervise the Villa Medici (the premises of the Académie de France).203 Aldrich and Smith shared concerns regarding the ‘new Axis announcements’, which implied ‘increasing strain in the relations between our country and Italy, which may be reflected in tension and difficulties for the Academy’.204 The maintenance of the AAR at the time was largely dependent on Aldrich, and his illness and death in December 1940, combined with ‘the progressive disintegration of the international situation made many of us here feel that the time had come to close the Academy’.205 After the death of director Aldrich, William Dinsmoor (of Columbia University) had become acting director of the closed AAR during the war; this position was taken over by Charles Rufus

28 (9), 1940: ‘Are we in an emergency? Shall we continue to function? Partly? fully? For how long shall we make plans?’ AAR, reel 5758.
202 Report by J.K. Smith, November 12, 1939. AAR, reel 5750.
203 Aldrich to Smith, June 17, 1940: ‘My sister and I anyway do not expect to leave until the American Embassy does so, if it does. Mr. Phillips has asked me to serve as a Special Attaché of the Embassy. (I had volunteered to help during my spare time with the extra work which the Embassy has to do in caring for the French and British property in Italy; my share at present consists in looking after the Villa Medici, the home of the French Academy)’. AAR, reel 5758.
204 Smith to Aldrich, October 2, 1940. AAR, reel 5758.
205 AAR board meeting minutes (New York City), April 8, 1941. AAR, reel 5758.
Morey (cultural attaché at the US Embassy in Rome) on April 24, 1945 (cf. section 4.3 and chapter 6). 206

In the words of AAR president James Kellum Smith, the AAR was during the hostilities to ‘lay the ground work for re-opening, when conditions are propitious, the avenues to Rome for scholarship and creative work, which I firmly believe will be of immeasurable importance in the post-war world’. 207 Smith’s optimism (and foresight) is striking. In few other national contexts was any real talk of ‘avenues to Rome’ and ‘the post-war world’ entertained in 1941.

The AAR was placed under the protection of the Swiss Legation after the United States entered the war in 1941, and remained closed for the duration of the war, with three members of staff ‘vested with responsibility for administration and maintenance of the property’. 208 In
December 1944, in ‘its first full meeting since the liberation of Rome’, the AAR board of trustees expressed its ‘sense of deep gratitude and appreciation to His Excellency the Minister of Switzerland and the members of the Swiss Legation in Italy, for the unremitting care and energetic supervision of the properties and interests of the Academy during the past long years of separation from American control’.209

Myron Charles Taylor (1874-1959), industrialist, diplomat, US Ambassador to the Holy See, was of central importance for AAR affairs in Rome in 1945, before the appointment of Charles Rufus Morey as temporary director.210 Morey was from the outset considered a temporary solution from the perspective of the AAR trustees in New York. As the trustees’ ‘man in Rome’, Morey was more integrated in post-war scholarly circles than post-war AAR director Laurance Roberts (1907-2002, director 1946-1960), who arrived on the scene a little ‘too late’ to have made a significant impact on the scholarly networks covered by the chronological focus of
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209 William Dinsmoor to ‘His Excellency The Minister of Switzerland In Italy’, December 12, 1944. AAR, reel 5758.
210 Myron Taylor resigned as member and Chairman of the Finance Committee of the AAR in July 1945. See Taylor to J.K. Smith, July 31, 1945. Cf. Taylor to Smith, October 1, 1945: ‘I assume you will make arrangements for direct financing in the future, thus eliminating the necessity of going through the Vatican or myself’; and Smith to Taylor, October 3, 1945. AAR, reel 5758.
this study, although he contributed to discussions regarding the restitution of the four German libraries (cf. chapter 6).

Morey was however in many ways ‘the right man at the right time’, and exercised his double authority as scholar and his position at the US embassy to defend the interests of the four German libraries (see chapters 4 and 6) at the same time as he gave weight to the wider cultural political (international) ambitions that were associated with the return of these libraries to Rome.

As acting director of the AAR, Morey made the somewhat controversial suggestion to AAR president J.K. Smith of proposing that the AAR sell the Villa Aurelia, the residence of the director and in many ways the crown jewel of the academy, as the building had fallen into disrepair during the war: ‘If I may hazard a suggestion, I would advise the sale of the Villa Aurelia. It has always seemed to me to be a very cumbersome place for [the] Director to keep house, and impossible without a considerable staff of servants’.

It is possible that currency speculation would have made the potential sale of the Villa Aurelia a profitable business; the venture would then however have been wholly dependent on fortuitous timing.

The Villa Aurelia was in the end retained by the AAR, following an investigation by a ‘Special Committee on Villa Aurelia’, which determined that the Academy properties had ‘always’ been exempt from taxes, and that the Villa Aurelia should not be sold, partly as ‘the Aurelia parcel

---

211 Morey to J.K. Smith, November 20, 1945, AAR, reels 5758 and 5798. Morey had suggested the employment of architect Alberto Davico (possibly a relation of AAR secretary Riccardo Davico) regarding ‘alternate plans’ for the restoration of the Villa Aurelia. AAR, reel 5799.
comprises 39 per cent of the entire realty holdings [and that] it may be said that the Villa Aurelia is the finest site in Rome, for the views in all directions are unsurpassed by any other situation in the capital City’.

The special committee furthermore envisioned ‘a program which will provide outstanding scholars and artists the opportunity to bring to American institutions and to American art new inspirations based upon a background of study of the best there is available in the Old World. To fulfill this need, we believe that it is desirable, for the present, to keep the physical plant of the American Academy in Rome intact and therefore recommend that no action be taken with respect to the sale of the Villa Aurelia at this time’. 212

The new AAR director Laurance Roberts wrote to Morey in 1947 that ‘the Trustees have just approved in outline [architect] Bruno Zevi’s plans for altering the Villa Aurelia, and have voted funds for same. [...] Needless to say, we are delighted, for this means that not only will the property not be sold, but [...] it does seem as if the Aurelia will at last be useful’. 213

Laurance Roberts, previously director of the Brooklyn Museum, was appointed director of the AAR on May 22, 1946, officially terminating

212 ‘Interim Report – Special Committee on Villa Aurelia – American Academy in Rome’. The report was ‘respectfully submitted [by] Barry Faulkner, Pierre Jay, Allan Johnson, Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman’. In other words Allan Johnson did not want to see the physical plant of the AAR diminished, in line with his discussions with Morey regarding the possible takeover of the Bibliotheca Hertziana in 1944. AAR, reel 5799. Cf. Harold F. Johnson to J.K. Smith, June 16, 1947. AAR, reel 5758: ‘Rebuilding the Villa [Aurelia] is a step [towards keeping abreast with the times], but only a partial one. The only reason I ever favored looking into the sale of the Villa was to find out what facilities the Academy could get in exchange for that investment’.

213 Laurance Roberts to Morey, March 18, 1947. AAR, reel 5798.
Morey's acting directorship. Morey was in practice retained as acting director of the AAR until 1947, however, when Roberts took over at the helm, along with Lamont Moore, who was appointed assistant director in 1947, as well as with the newly appointed classical archaeologist Frank E. Brown (see below). The short-lived wartime attempt to establish an ‘American School of Classical Studies in Rome’ from New York was in many ways connected with the AAR, through its board of trustees. This ‘American School’ pursued the interests and activities of the academy towards the end of the Second World War, contemporary with the liberation of Rome.

The American Academy placed its facilities to the use of the United States Information Services in Italy in 1943, through acting AAR president Henry James (president J.K. Smith was absent on war service at the time). It was felt that the AAR library ‘excellently equipped in the fields of

214 Cf. AAR press release, June 16, 1946: ‘James Kellum Smith, President of the American Academy in Rome, announces the appointment, as Director of the Academy, of Captain Laurance P. Roberts, Signal Corps, now assigned to duty in Washington. [...] The American Academy, closed during the war for the first time in its distinguished history, will be reopened on October 1st, 1946 for eleven holders of war-deferred Fellowships, and anticipates the resumption of competitions for its Rome Fellowships in 1947. [...] Several other foreign Academies in Rome have been reopened during the past few months. Among these are the French Academy, the Swedish School [sic], the Dutch School [sic] and the Rumanian Academy’. Among other names suggested for the post-war directorship of the AAR was that of John Nicholas Brown, advisor on cultural matters to General Eisenhower. Cf. John Walker (AAR Trustee) to J.K. Smith, February 28, 1946. AAR, reel 5758. John Walker was art historian Bernard Berenson’s candidate for the post-war directorship of the AAR. John Walker – Berenson’s candidate for the directorship of the AAR. Cf. Walter Lippmann to Bernard Berenson, July 11, 1945; Ernest De Wald to Berenson, January 7, 1947; as well as the Roberts archives at the Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

215 Roberts to Morey, November 20, 1946: ‘I was delighted that the Executive Committee last night unanimously voted to ask you if you would continue in your present capacity with the Academy for another year under the same terms as before’. Cf. Clarence Mendell (AAR trustee, Yale) to Roberts, November 29, 1946: ‘I am sure that he [Brown] could not take over until September ’47. I should hope that Morey would rather like to continue’. For Lamont Moore’s appointment, see Roberts to Moore, May 9, 1947. AAR, reel 5798.
Italian history and art, will be a valuable center for consultation by U.S. Army and civilian personnel in Rome. It might be especially useful to the officers of the sub-commission for Fine Arts and Archives [MFAA], engaged in the protection and salvage of the artistic and historical monuments of Italy.\footnote{Cf. minutes of the Meeting of the Joint Committee (for the American School of Classical Studies), held at Columbia University, April 13, 1944. The meeting was presided by Professor Allan Johnson (Princeton). Morey was present representing the ‘Mediaeval Academy’. Johnson reported on the receipt of a letter from the President of the AAR, indicating his ‘great interest’ in the ‘proposed new program’ for the Classical School, but advising limited action on the part of AAR trustees until ‘conditions permit’. The tentative plan of the School seems to have been concerned, at least in part, with the selection of ‘representatives from the learned societies who are to have room and board at the Academy’. The designated appointees were to be referred to as ‘associates’. The ‘acting secretary’ of the meeting was Roscoe Guernsey, also Secretary of the AAR. Box 1, Dept. of Art and Archaeology Records; Princeton University archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. For the MFAA, see Dagnini Brey, The Venus Fixers: The Untold Story Of The Allied Soldiers Who Saved Italy’s Art During World War II.}  

The ‘consultation’ referred to here was less for strategic reasons than for the pastime and education of subcommission officers (cf. section 4.3), primarily in the context of the ‘leave courses’ in archaeology (topography) and art history at the AAR, similar to those held at the BSR.  

The AAR was used for such leave courses for discharged military personnel in 1945 (under the G.I. Bill of Rights), consisting mainly of a ‘series of lectures on usual subjects’ given by professor Alfred Van Buren of the AAR.\footnote{AAR president J.K. Smith to B.K. Johnstone, November 30, 1945. Cf. ‘Radiogram’ from Myron Taylor to Henry James, New York, June 9, 1945: ‘Under plan developed by Morey Army leave study groups under three months agreement will attend lectures and use library at Academy upon monthly contribution seven hundred dollars’.} In January 1946, AAR president J.K. Smith wrote to the secretary of war in Washington, D.C. regarding ‘rations’ and privileges in relation to the leave courses: ‘The American Academy in Rome, chartered by Congress for advanced work by students of the Fine Arts and of
Archaeology, has during the past fifty years contributed much to the maintenance of cordial cultural relations between the United States and Italy. In a limited way the Academy has been able to continue this tradition during the past year by conducting Leave Courses in Rome for military personnel [...] the Acting Director of the Academy [Morey], has addressed a request to the Commanding General, Rome Area Allied Command, that these prospective students be admitted to rations, and other privileges, without which they cannot be maintained in Rome. This request has been denied.  

The AAR officially reopened on October 1, 1946, faced by challenges of restructuring both physically and spiritually. AAR associate Harold F. Johnson for example wrote to president Smith in June 1947 that ‘I am convinced that the Academy should serve more people. I don’t think that it now does nor plans to do a job commensurate with its possibilities. [...] Today it is out of scale and out of keeping with the times. I entirely agree that art is necessarily aristocratic, but that has nothing to do with small numbers. Size is no good of itself, but without a sufficient size, I fear a loss of vitality. The crying need is to make this great thing more serviceable [...]. You must admit that from some aspects, the Academy has grown into a respectable curio’.  

218 J.K. Smith to Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, Washington, D.C., January 9, 1946. Smith’s request was caught in a bureaucratic web. Cf. Kenneth C. Royall, Acting Secretary of War, War Department, Washington, D.C. to J.K. Smith, January 22, 1946: ‘[...] it has been determined that the matter is one under the jurisdiction of the State Department; hence, your request has been submitted to it’. AAR, reel 5758.  
219 Harold F. Johnson to Smith, June 16, 1947. AAR, reel 5758.
Director Laurance Roberts however spent a large part of 1946-1947 touring the academic institutions of New England, discussing the AAR with prominent scholars from the major universities. Roberts was approached from a multitude of individuals and organisations regarding the AAR, one of which being the ‘American Society for Cultural Relations with Italy, Inc.’, focusing on the Italian resistance movement and ‘opposition to Nazi-Fascist oppression’; as well as the Associazione Italo-Americana (Milano) and American Art School of Fontainebleau (the Fontainebleau Association), Paris. AAR trustee Mason Holland (of Harvard University) described what was awaiting Roberts as director of the AAR: ‘You will occupy a house which has the finest location in Rome, you will have a position which will enable you not only to do rewarding work with the students but to represent this country in a way which is impossible even for an Ambassador [...]’. I need hardly say that it is the most optimistic news concerning the future of the Academy that I have had – at a time when it has seemed to me very dubious whether there was to be any future for the Academy.\footnote{Cf. Roberts’ New England itinerary, February 1947; as well as Roberts to Paul Sachs, November 19, 1946, regarding the AAR and ‘the most useful [advice] I have ever received’. AAR, reel 5798.}

\footnote{Mason Hammond to Roberts, May 31, 1946. Cf. J.K. Smith to Roberts, May 15, 1946: ‘Our present view is that [the functions of the director] should be extended to include [the] charge of affairs this side of the water too. [...] Henry [Allen Moe, AAR trustee] and I both have the feeling that we have asked you to “buy a pig in a poke”. [...] The salary, while low from American standards, is I believe tax free, and goes considerably further in Italy than it would in this country. When the other prerequisites are taken into account, it has seemed to us that the return in real living value compared very favorably with that of the Presidents of some of the best institutions in this country. This, however, may not prove to be true in the post-war world. [...] P.S. “This is going to be fun!” Roberts reported from Rome that he was indeed thrilled and pleased to be ‘in our beautiful deep freeze’ at the academy. Roberts to J.K. Smith, December 13, 1946. AAR, reel 5798.}
The main difference with regard to other foreign academies in Rome is that the AAR remains a private institution in terms of its organisation and funding resources, run by a board of trustees, with finances generally speaking based on stock market investments.²²² The AAR is run as a trust with no formal connections with U.S. state bodies; it thus does not have to carry the weight of being a national representative of its disciplines in the host country in the same way as for example the EFR or the DAIR (cf. section 2.4). The AAR kept close watch on the development of the Fulbright Bill (which instituted a US program of grants for international educational exchange) in 1947-1948, hoping to benefit from educational exchange as well as on the level of research.²²³ Funding from private sources and trustees entail a need to answer for the activities of an organisation in different modes and degrees than in state-funded enterprises.

²²² The different sources of funding also included the Carnegie Corporation during the 1930s. Cf. Laurance Roberts to the Fulbright committee, April 26, 1950. AAR, reel 5798; as well as the minutes of meeting of the Committee on the School of Classical Studies of the American Academy in Rome (Columbia and the Metropolitan Museum of Art), January 13-14, 1944. Box 1, Dept. of Art and Archaeology Records; Princeton University archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library: 'Recognizing the obligation to finance the various new and enlarged undertakings proposed, the committee voted respectfully to bring to the attention of the Board of Trustees the need to initiate an endowment campaign to raise funds, especially for endowing the Library, Publications, and scholarships. It was believed that the various classical organizations would contribute and assist in such a campaign.'

²²³ See Roberts to Kenneth Holland (Division of International Exchange of Persons, Department of State, Washington, D.C.), February 28, 1947; Roberts to Morey, March 14, 1947; Roberts to Morey, December 18, 1947; and Roberts to Herschel Brickell (Institute of International Education, New York), January 16, 1948: "The Academy's unique position in Europe as the only American institute of its kind makes it actually the focal point of American studies in the humanities and the creative arts.' Cf. Morey to Roberts, August 9, 1946: 'The passage of the Fulbright Bill, with its provisions that sound as if you or I might have written them for the Academy, opens up a big perspective. I am sure we have a competent advocate in Washington in you'. AAR, reel 5798.
Possible AAR excavations were discussed in New York during the war. In January 1944, the committee of the AAR school of classical studies (devoted to ‘the study and investigation of the archaeology, literature and history of the classical and later periods’), ‘voted to recommend to the [AAR] Board of Trustees that steps be taken by the Trustees for carrying on excavations in Italy. It was thought best not to provide for the endowment of the excavations at first, but to secure funds adequate to guarantee continued excavations for five or ten years in the hope that if these excavations justified it a permanent endowment might later be established’.224

Post-war AAR archaeology was most closely associated with Frank E. Brown, who was appointed director of excavations at the AAR in 1947. He would remain in that capacity until 1976. Brown had been at the AAR prior to the war, and had been assistant professor of Classics at Yale University before serving the Office of War Information in Syria and Lebanon during the Second World War. He became director-general of antiquities of the Republic of Syria in 1945, before taking up the AAR position two years later.225 Brown selected the city of Cosa (ancient Ansedonia) near Orbetello, north of Rome, for the first AAR excavations.

224 ‘It was voted to recommend to the Trustees that an effort be made to get a fund of $25,000 a year for a period of five or ten years’. Minutes of meeting of the Committee on the School of Classical Studies of the American Academy in Rome (Columbia and the Metropolitan Museum of Art), January 13-14, 1944. Box 1, Dept. of Art and Archaeology Records; Princeton University archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. The minutes also referred to a previous joint meeting (October 9, 1943) and to meetings of groups of the Advisory Council (December 15 and December 29, 1943).

225
in Italy. The Cosa excavations began in May 1948.\textsuperscript{226} The excavations ended in 1977, with the establishment of a small museum on the site.

American archaeologists had established an early strong presence in Greece, most notably through the Athenian Agora excavations; Italy had remained ‘unconquered’ in this regard before the Second World War. Roman – as well as Etruscan or prehistorical – archaeology was not strongly grounded in the American academic system and field experience was limited.\textsuperscript{227} This can be partly explained by the structure and aims of the AAR, which widely encompassed the arts and humanities (at least during the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s) and did not see the development of American archaeology in Italy as one of its main goals, unlike for example the SIR and the EFR.

Unlike the American School of Classical Studies in Athens (ASCSA), archaeology could not and did not dominate the structure of the AAR. Furthermore, the academy exercised no control of other simultaneous American archaeological projects operating in Italy (such as the Princeton University Morgantina excavations, conducted by Erik Sjöqvist and Richard Stillwell), contrary to the control of the American School in Athens regarding Greek excavation permits, for example.\textsuperscript{228}


\textsuperscript{227} Dyson, Ancient Marbles to American Shores. Classical Archaeology in the United States, 261.

\textsuperscript{228} Cf. Ibid., 265. For the Morgantina excavations, see for example correspondence to and from Erik Sjöqvist and Richard Stillwell, as well as two albums of photographs from the Morgantina excavations, in the archives of the Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University Archives.
The AAR was in full operation after its wartime closure in 1947 (although it officially reopened on October 1, 1946). The institution prospered after the war under the direction of Roberts, as a dynamic cultural and social center, strongly focused on the study of classics.\textsuperscript{229} A substantial part of its scholarly output (articles, monographic studies, excavation reports and conference papers) has been published in the \textit{Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome}, published since 1915.

\textsuperscript{229} Ibid., 262. See also Valentine and Valentine, \textit{The American Academy in Rome, 1894-1969}, 109-118.
2.4 Altertumswissenschaft and the Franco-German Dynamic: L’École française de Rome (EFR) and the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom (DAIR)

Both the EFR and the DAIR trace their origins to the establishment of the ICA in 1829. The international (mainly French and German) ICA crumbled with the Franco-Prussian war 1870-1871. The École française de Rome was first established in 1873 as a Roman section of the EFA, then as the EFR proper in 1875, partly as a matter of national prestige as a reaction to the official nationalisation in 1871 of the ICA as a Prussian, then eventually Imperial German archaeological institution in 1874 (cf. section 2.1 and below; for perceptions of the importance of German scholarship see section 5.8). The EFR was establishe in order to continue French archaeological and philological work in Italy, a paradigm traditionally outside the sphere of activities of the Académie de France, the profile of which focused on the creative arts.\(^{230}\) The issue of national prestige was naturally not the only reason for the establishment of the EFR; its scholarly activities were grounded in interests in classical archaeology, philology and the history of the Popes. The institution was directed at intellectual and scholarly issues (see below), with a focus on the individual inputs of its ‘members’.

The EFR established a pre-war connection with Tunisia, Algeria and (French) North Africa, with excavations carried out under the auspices of the EFR in Algeria before the war. EFR scholarship was largely published in articles in the *Mélanges de l'architecture et de l'histoire*, the review of the École, established in 1881.\(^{231}\) EFR archaeological activity in Italy itself commenced after the war with excavations at Bolsena in Etruria (from 1946) and at Megara Hyblaea on Sicily (from 1949). See map of excavation sites in the Mediterranean (fig. 19, chapter 3).\(^{232}\)

The EFR annual reports from 1937-1960 are conserved at the École in Rome. These are not to be confused with separate (published) ‘rapports’ from the EFR to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres in Paris, covering the period 1931-1980 (excluding the years 1942, 1943 and 1944).\(^{233}\) The EFR annual reports focus on the results of individual studies carried out by its ‘members’, explaining their structures and outcomes in detail, examples of which are abundant. This is partly due to the nature of these documents, which functioned as communications from the director of the EFR to the Minister of National Education in Paris.

The reports are structured as ‘mémoires’ by different scholars, with a similar pattern over a long period. The structure of these reports did not noticeably change, for example with the change of directorship from Jérôme Carcopino before the war to Albert Grenier in the post-war period. The 1936-1937 report, for example, in fact reports nothing *but* such


mémories – highlighting samples of ongoing research and publications, in effect underlining the diversity of the EFR rather than its continuity. The EFR archive is rich in material pertaining to AIAC and the Unione, and in many ways ‘compensates’ for the inaccessibility of the Unione archives (cf. chapters 4 and 6).

The main archives of the EFR are located at the École itself (in Palazzo Farnese, Rome). The École shares the Palazzo Farnese with the French Embassy in Rome, with a unique proximity of official diplomatic channels in the context of the foreign academies covered by this study. The EFR is however associated with the French Ministry of Public Instruction, and archival material pertaining to the EFR at the Archives Nationales (AN) in Paris is located in the archival fonds of said ministry. This material in turn mainly consists of director’s reports (1896-1929) and the nomination of membres of the École from the first sixty years of its existence.234 The archives of the Institut de France (the archives of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres) furthermore contain an archival fond relating to the EFR, containing the papers of the Commission of the French Schools in Athens and Rome (cf. chapter 1.8). The EFR scholarly output was published in the influential EFR Mélanges publications, the EFR counterpart to the German Anzeiger, the BSR Papers, the AAR Memoirs and the SIR Acta-publications.

The EFR was described as a ‘Chateaubriand-Academy for archaeologists in Palazzo Farnese, the stronghold of France in Rome.’  The EFR maintained its connection with French North Africa during the Second World War.  The EFR was directed by historian Jérôme Carcopino from 1937 until 1940, when the École closed for the war.  In 1937, Carcopino stated that ‘in spite of the build-up of clouds caused by politics it is certain that the intellectual relations between France and Italy remain intact’, and that the EFR was on the most cordial terms with the ‘Roman elite’.  Carcopino was undoubtedly anxious to maintain good relations with what he considered to be the scholarly and political ‘elite’ in Rome.

This tune was to change during the remainder of Carcopino’s directorship (until 1940). In his 1937-1938 report, Carcopino reported that ‘since all the schools comparable to ours are speaking out it seems to me that the French School should not keep silent; and the expressions of Italian sympathy which the school has attracted during a diplomatic year of such tension have touched and moved us. I believe that these are

237 Cf. AAR director Chester H. Aldrich to Bernard Berenson, March 6, 1940. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
238 EFR annual report 1936-1937 (October 15, 1937): ‘[…] en dépit des nuages que la politique annoncée, il est certain que les relations intellectuelles entre la France et l’Italie demeurent intactes. […] Je travaillera d’autant mieux à le maintenir que les nouveaux membres de l’Ecole […] sauront nouer pour leur compte plus d’amitiés scientifiques et personnelles avec l’élite romaine’ qui a gardé jusqu’ici sa sympathie et son estime à l’École française de Rome’.
imponderables of some consequence’. Carcopino spoke of ‘Galophobie’, and felt that ‘the year of the Rome-Berlin axis is also that of a noticeable regrowth of scholarship at our three institutes. Without denying the beneficial influence of a friendly policy declared between France and Italy, one is obliged to believe that diplomacy would not succeed in substantially modifying the condition of their existence’.

Political tensions between France and Italy were heightened after Mussolini had joined forces with Hitler in the ‘Pact of Steel’ (May 22, 1939) and such ‘imponderables’ were to be of less consequence nearing the outbreak of war in 1939. In the context of a ‘cycle’ of EFR conferences initiated 1937-1938, Carcopino was hoping for the participation of renowned Italian archaeologist Alfonso Bartoli in his conference cycle. Carcopino described Bartoli as ‘cautious’ – Bartoli had ‘sought

---

239 EFR annual report 1937-1938 (October 10, 1938): ‘Alors que toutes les Écoles émules de la nôtre parlent, il était bon, m’a-t-il semblé, que l’École française ne restât pas silencieuse; et les sympathies italiennes que l’École a su grouper autour d’elle dans une année diplomatique si âprement tendue nous ont profondément touchés et réjouis. Je crois que ce sont là des imponderables de quelque conséquence’.

authorisation to lend us his support in a note he had delivered to the leader of M. Mussolini’s cabinet and that the note had been returned crossed through with the words ‘not at present’ in the hand of Il Duce’.

Carcopino was faced with an academic diplomacy-dilemma, when Bartolomeo Nogara, director of the Vatican Museums, came to his rescue:

[Bartoli’s] last minute evasion could have placed me on the horns of a trying dilemma: either to give up the conference which was already generally expected or to hold the conference without Italian participation. In the first case I would be admitting a lack of authority. In the second I would have appeared to be initiating the very breakdown in relations which others were attempting to impose on me. Thanks to the amiability of Professor Nogara, director general of the Vatican Museums who, less in order to be kind to me personally than to show his disapproval of certain procedures and his sympathy with France, agreed immediately, thus breaking the isolation which threatened me and which I have continued to avoid, by keeping in touch with learned Italians who, while they were not termed opponents, yet remained entirely free vis-à-vis the authorities. 241

Carcopino was pleased to note that even though the Italian ‘savants officiels’ no longer ‘dared speak’ at the EFR, they at least ‘had the courtesy to come and listen to us’. Carcopino was furthermore concerned that he

241 EFR annual report 1938-1939 (October 10, 1939): ‘Sa dérobade de la dernière heure aurait pu me placer entre les cornes d’un fâcheux dilemme: ou renoncer à la conférence déjà attendue dans le public, ou tenir la conférence sans coopération italienne. Dans le premier cas, jeusse avoué mon impuissance. Dans le second, j’aurais eu l’air de prendre l’initiative de la rupture qu’on cherchait à m’imposer. Grâce à l’amitié du professeur Nogara, Directeur Général des Musées du Vatican, qui, moins pour m’être agréable personnellement que pour manifester sa réprobation de certains procédés et ses sympathies pour la France consentit à remplacer au pied levé M. Bartoli, brisant ainsi l’isolement dont j’étais menacé, et auquel j’ai continué d’échapper, en m’adressant à des savants italiens qui, sans avoir l’étiquette d’opposants, demeuraient entièrement libres à l’égard du pouvoir’.
might have been accused of ‘maliciously’ composing the programme of events and of deserting ‘the realm of science for that of propaganda’.242

If so, that was a ‘chance illusion’. Carcopino felt that the EFR ‘should not contribute to [French] propaganda unless unwittingly by the shining example it offers of labours at once diligent, disinterested and fruitful. The École has never shirked this duty during the past university year: from the shameful demonstrations of November 30, 1938 and the noises of war which followed in March and April 1939, it has not ceased to carry out its task in the ordinary way and it seems to me that in its modest way it has won the war of nerves which was declared on us, by working as much and as well as if it had escaped our notice’.243

The EFR closed in 1940 and reopened in 1945-1946.244 The directorships of Albert Grenier (1945-1952) and Jean Bayet (1952-1960) will be discussed in chapters 4 and 6.

242 The scholarly exchange referred to by Carcopino took place ‘when, after Mr. Halphen’s exposé showing that the Frankish intervention in Italy had been requested by the Papacy, M. Pierre Luc came to prove to us that it was Pope Innocent VIII who had attracted Charles VIII to Naples’. EFR annual report 1938-1939 (October 10, 1939).

243 EFR annual report 1938-1939 (October 10, 1939): ‘[…] on aurait pu croire que j’avais malicieusement combiné le programme et que je m’étais évadé du terrain scientifique sur celui de la propagande. Ce n’est là qu’une illusion du hasard. L’École française ne doit contribuer à notre propagande que sans le vouloir, par le seul rayonnement de l’exemple qu’elle donne d’un labeur à la fois ardent, désintéressé et fécond. Elle n’a jamais manqué à ce devoir pendant l’année universitaire qui vient de finir: entre les manifestations honteuses du 30 novembre 1938, et les bruits de guerre qui se sont succédé en mars et en avril 1939, elle n’a pas cessé de remplir sa tâche comme à l’ordinaire et il me semble que pour sa modeste part, elle a vaincu dans la guerre des nerfs qui nous était déclarée, en travaillant autant et aussi bien que si elle ne s’en fût pas même aperçue’. For Carcopino, see also Jérôme Carcopino, Souvenirs romains (Paris: Hachette, 1968).

244 Documents in the Archives nationales, Paris, illustrate Vichy government Franco-German institutions and agreements (similar to the Fascist Italo-German archaeological agreements documented in the ACS). Albert Grenier represented a different (Gaullist) stance when he assumed directorship of the École after the war. The Vichy government also had ‘Mediterranean’ cultural ambitions, with plans to establish a ‘centre universitaire mediterraneen’ in Nice. Cf. AN, Boxes F/17/13396-13618: ‘Grandes écoles spéciales’, F/17/13359: ‘Relations culturels avec
The Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Rom (DAIR) was established in 1871-1874, as a result of the gradually increasing financial – and cultural – Prussian influence over the originally international venture of the ICA, as discussed in section 2.1 above.\textsuperscript{245} This led to the transformation of the ICA into the Prussian archaeological institute in 1871, and the German imperial archaeological institute in 1873, before it was finally transformed into a section of the overarching German archaeological institute (DAI, based in Berlin) as the DAIR in 1874.\textsuperscript{246}

During and after the First World War, the DAIR was under the control of the Italian Government (1915-1921) and was returned to German control by the Ministry of Education through minister Benedetto Croce, with the conditional clause that its library was not to be removed from Italy.\textsuperscript{247} The ICA/DAIR building on the Capitoline – the neoclassical \textit{Casa Tarpeia}, erected in 1835, funded by Prussian Crown Prince Freidrich

\textit{l'étranger} (1940-1958) and box F/17/14585: ‘École française et Institut d'Études françaises d'Athènes. École française de Rome. Instituts de Caire, de Barcelone, de Florence, de Londres, de Madrid. 1917-1948.’ The cultural policies of the Vichy government are understudied and in a sense provide an additional specific sense of the 'Vichy syndrome'. Carcopino was Minister of National Education and Youth in the Vichy government from February 25, 1941 to April 18, 1942.\textsuperscript{245} Cf. Blanck, ”The Instituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica.” See also DAIR Archives, Rome, Box 'Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica. Statuten'.\textsuperscript{246} Cf. \textit{Corriere della Sera}, January 31, 1933 (Luigi Bottazzi): ‘Roma centro di studi mondiali. Accademie e Scuole straniere’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ paper, H 80: 238. For an early history of the DAIR, see Adolf Michaelis, \textit{Geschichte des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts}, 1829-1879 (Berlin: A. Asher & Co., 1879).\textsuperscript{247} Cf. ‘Note sur les Bibliothèques ci-devant allemandes d'Italie et leur administration par l'Union internationale des Instituts romains d'archéologie dhistoire et d'histoire de l'Art' (Grenier), December 1950. EFR, box 'Union 1950-1953'. File ‘Bibliothèques (Liaison Union et Association)’: 'Les quatre bibliothèques [allemands], confisquées par l'Italie en 1915 avaient rendues à l'Allemagne en 1921 par Benedetto Croce, ministre de l'Instruction publique et le Comte Sforza ministre des Affaires Etrangères par un accord culturel aux termes duquel l'Allemagne s'engagerait a ne jamais, sous quelque pretexte que soit, transporter ces bibliothèques, hors d'Italie. L'accord ayant été considerait que les bibliothèques [redevraient] sa propriété'.
Wilhelm – was not returned however, and the DAIR temporarily moved to Villa Amelung (Walther Amelung’s bequest); after which the DAIR rented room in the Evangelical ‘Gemeindehaus’ on Via Sardegna. In 1938 a concordat was signed between Germany and Italy in which, in return for the cancellation of the previous formal restrictions, the German government stated that the DAIR library would not be removed from Italy.

The DAIR library was widely considered the most exhaustive research library resource in the world of ancient scholarship, and its presence in Rome was thus of fundamental importance to the Roman foreign academies. After the end of the Second World War, the US embassy in Rome reported to the US state department regarding the DAIR library, that it ‘even under German control retained to some degree its original international character [referring to the ICA], in that the numerous foreign academies in Rome made constant use of it, and were spared thus, to a large extent, the expense of duplicating the items in their own libraries’.

---


The DAIR employed a hierarchical system of ‘first’ and ‘second’
directors. After the Second World War, ex-DAIR director Ludwig
Curtius related pre-war plans for a new DAIR building in Valle Giulia
(contemporary with the SIR building): ‘With a tight time limit the city of
Rome assigned a building site in Valle Giulia to the German Reich for the
new institute building’. Nothing came of these plans, however.

In 1942, second director Siegfried Fuchs carried out excavations
together with Friedrich Krischen of a late antique villa at Galeata in the
province of Forlì (see map of excavation sites in the Mediterranean, fig. 19,
chapter 3). Fuchs’ and Krischen’s interests lay in exploring and projecting
narratives of Germanic origins via the Lombards and the Ostrogoths on
the transition from the late antique to the early Mediaeval period in Italy,
and interpreted the Galeata villa as a palace or hunting lodge erected by
Theoderic the Great (493-526) in the early sixth century AD.
When the DAIR opened its annual lecture series in December 1942, the SIR was one of the few neighbouring institutions still in operation. At the Herrenessen-reception after the ceremony, German-Italian cultural and personal relations were encouraged by the congregation of German, Italian (and Swedish) scholars, even to the point of suggesting that the DAIR should re-establish itself on the Capitoline hill.\textsuperscript{254} DAI president Carl Weickert claimed in 1948 that the DAIR had never entertained ‘Nazi ideas’ in its scholarly endeavours, a \textit{damnatio memoriae} that disregarded the activities of Fuchs, Kübbing, Krischen et al. (cf. section 4.1).\textsuperscript{255}

During the German occupation of Rome (1943-1944) plans were made to evacuate the DAIR from Italy, violating the 1938 concordat; these plans were put into practice in January and February 1944 (see chapter 4). The plans were challenged by the German embassy to the Holy See.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{254} Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, December 10, 1942. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
\item \textsuperscript{255} Carl Weickert (DAI) to Ludwig Heydenreich, December 6, 1948. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence: ‘Das ehemalige Deutsche Archäologische Institut in Rom ist ein wissenschaftliches Instrument, das allen Nationen zur Verfügung gestanden hat und dessen Fortbestand auch für die Archäologie in Deutschland eine Voraussetzung ist. […] In seiner wissenschaftlichen Haltung hat das Institut sich niemals Naziideen geöffnet. […] Einen Anlass die ehrwürdige wissenschaftliche Anstalt wie das Archäologische Institut in Rom, die während ihrer mehr als hundertjährigen Geschichte ihres Bestehens nur der Wissenschaft und dem Ansehen Roms gedient hat, al seine Einrichtung anzusehen, di sich feindseligen oder kulturschädlichen Einflüssen hingeben hatte, hat das Institut mit den beklagenswerten Vorkommnissen jener letzten zehn Jahre nicht gegeben. Das Römische Institut hat allgemeinen öffentlichen Interessen im weitesten Sinne gedient und von sich aus die ihm drohende tödliche Gefahr vermieden, dass es ganz in die nationalsozialistische Auslandsorganisation einbezogen wurde.’
\end{itemize}
ambassador Baron von Weiszäcker); and what remained of the DAIR in Rome after the evacuation was left in the care of the German Vatican embassy. The library remained accessible to the Roman scholarly community even in the process of being packed.256 The entire staff (except for the scholar Heinrich Fuhrmann, who remained in Rome ‘for personal reasons’) left Italy: ‘Bis auf Herrn Fuhrmann, den persönliche Angelegenheiten noch festhielten, verliess dann auch das Institutspersonal Rom, nachdem die Verwaltung der Räume der Deutschen Botschaft beim Hl. Stuhl übergeben worden war. Während Herr Crous und Herr Kübber einstweilen in Berlin, Herr Deichmann in Jena blieben, nahm der 1. Sekretar [von Gerkan] seinen Wohnsitz in Greifswald’.257

DAIR director Armin von Gerkan (1884-1969) thus found refuge at the University of Greifswald, where castle Niederhof was offered as a
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temporary location for the DAIR.\textsuperscript{258} This solution was soon interrupted by the exigencies of refugees, and the DAIR material in Germany was sent on to Lübeck.\textsuperscript{259}

The German Archaeological Institute (DAI) in Berlin, the central organisation of the institute, is a federal agency affiliated with the German foreign office, The DAIR closed and reopened following the First World War, as discussed above; it pursued its activities after the outbreak of the Second World War, but was to remain closed between 1944 and 1953 as a result of the war, the collapse of the short-lived German occupation of Rome in 1943, and the drawn-out negotiations regarding the future of the German scholarly institutions and libraries in Italy after the war (see chapters 4 and 6). The DAIR finally reopened in 1953, following eight

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
years of discussions and diplomatic efforts (partly by AIAC and the Unione of institutes in Rome, which was established for the purpose of advocating the return of the four German libraries (one of these being that of the DAIR) to Italy after the war (see chapter 9).²⁶⁰

DAIR reports were published in the two important journals Archäologischer Anzeiger (AA) and Römische Mitteilungen (RM), as well as in the Jahrbuch des Instituts. The DAIR annual reports are conserved in the DAIR archives in Rome, along with the unpublished quarterly reports (Vierteljahresberichte).²⁶¹ Institutional correspondence during the Third Reich followed the Führerprinzip of being forwarded to the ‘Zentrale’ of the DAI in Berlin. Partly for these reasons the DAIR archive therefore does not contain a great deal of material covering the period 1944-1953.²⁶²

The overarching entity of the institute, DAI, also regards itself as the ‘successor organisation’ to the ICA (highlighting the legacy of Prussian Crown Prince Friedrich Wilhelm and the scholar Eduard Gerhard). The DAI has been based in Berlin since 1832. The first recipient of the centenary ‘Winckelmann-Medaille’ in 1929 was Swedish Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf, together with the city of Rome,²⁶³ illustrating the close ties

²⁶⁰ ACS, PCM box 4450, 1951-1954, file 5-1, n. 77210 contains an invitation from the newly reopened DAIR for its ‘125th anniversary’ (on April 21, 1954). The anniversary was only indirectly for the DAIR; it really concerned the ICA (established in 1829, cf. this chapter as well as chapter 3).
²⁶¹ See DAIR, file ‘Vierteljahresberichte Rom 1927-1944’. Quarterly reports are missing for the following periods: 1930 (i/1-31/3), 1941 (i/7-30/9 and 1/10-31/12), all of 1942, 1943 (i/1-31/3, 1/4-30/6 and 1/7-30/9), 1944 (i/7-30/9).
²⁶² The DAIR archives have been made accessible to the author by kind permission (and assistance) of archivist Dr. Thomas Fröhlich. The DAIR archives are inaccessible at the time of writing (2008-2010) due to the temporary closure of the DAIR building on Via Sardegna.
between the Swedish study of antiquity with the venerable German legacy of *Altertumswissenschaft*.

The ‘Anglosaxon way’, with a strong focus on the paradigm of classics (ancient history and philology), separated from the discipline of classical archaeology, can be contrasted with the German tradition of the ‘totalitätsideal’ of *Altertumswissenschaft*, in which classical archaeology is incorporated with ancient history in the systematic study of material culture; with philology as a separate field of study.

The French trajectory of ‘savants’ and antiquarians can in a sense be said to lie in between these two paradigms. The Swedish perspective has from the outset (since the establishment of the academic discipline of *Klassisk fornkunskap och antikens historia* in the Swedish University system in 1909) identified with the German branch – with a strong philological tradition running parallel with the empirical historical and archaeological aspects of the study of antiquity.264

---

In modern botany, roots are not merely anchors through which all nourishment is drawn: they produce hormones too. So if humans want to compare themselves to plants, on the basis of what is known about plants today, they should not assume that roots give nothing but stability: they could say that roots also create moods. Everything that is remembered about the past is washed, and often drowned, in nostalgia, pride, illusions and passions of all kinds. Indeed, few people can extract solutions to their problems from their roots. The past no longer speaks with a clear voice; nobody seems to be agreed any more about what the lessons of history are. (Theodore Zeldin, ‘An Intimate History of Humanity’)

3.1 ROMA CAPUT MUNDI ET URBS AETERNA: THE PERSISTENCE OF ANTIQUITY

This chapter focuses on the implications of the Second World War for the foreign academies in Rome as well as for the development of the paradigm of classical archaeology in Italy. Examples of academic diplomacy during the war years will be discussed primarily from a Swedish perspective. The first part of the chapter is devoted to a discussion of aspects of the memory and history debate in recent historiography relevant to this discussion, as well as to an historical evaluation of classical archaeology in Italy (sections 3.1-3.2).

The main part of the chapter consists of sections on the SIR and ‘cultural neutrality’ during the Second World War (sections 3.3-3.8). This is of importance to this investigation of national and international scholarly
interests in Rome, as the SIR was the only foreign academy in Rome in operation throughout the war.

The multifaceted conception of the classical tradition stems in part from the neoclassical movement of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries through the legacy of the Renaissance. Neoclassicism was closely linked with contemporary movements in political thought such as ‘Western’ (Anglo-American) liberalism, which in most aspects of its design is a nineteenth-century phenomenon outdated in the twentieth century. Neoclassicism and Romanticism continued to shape the common gestation of the classical tradition, which is part and parcel of a framework or mindset based on a narrative of Western hegemony, which has relied on abstract references to an established common terminology (e.g. democracy). Maintenance of the classical tradition in the singular survives primarily as an ‘academic’ concern; but continues to run as a forceful undercurrent in traditional conceptions of ‘Western’ culture, art, architecture and politics.

This study places such maintenance of the classical tradition in the context of two post-war international organisations in Rome, AIAC and the Unione, viewed here as ‘precursors’ of large-scale international (pan-European) collaboration ultimately manifested in the organisation of the European Union, still inherently and often unproblematically reflecting

similar shared values as the perceived foundation of possible common cultural traditions and legacies. The classical tradition defies coherent hegemonic characterisation. This study approaches it primarily from the perspective of classical archaeology – not from that of the history of art or the philological dimension of the reception of classical texts.

Claiming a heritage through the classical tradition for Western Europe that could be defined as ‘Eastern’, ‘Oriental’ or ‘African’, can be said to have been part of the agenda of the foreign academies in Rome (and Athens), as well as of the discipline of classical archaeology as a whole – similarly to how the ancient Greek victory over the Persians in the battle of Salamis in 480 BC has often come to signify a ‘victory for European civilisation’. Fig. 18 attempts to illustrate the interest from Western
Europe (and the United States) in the centres of Rome and Athens, which in turn symbolise the classical world, which moved westwards carrying a legacy of ‘Eastern’ influences.

In the pre-war context of scholarly activity at the foreign academies in Rome, the study of the Roman past and ‘the Roman inheritance’ was considered to be of global interest, with Rome as patria omnium, although the national paradigm was considered as the starting point in every sense – each national scholarly paradigm could contribute to the greater whole of the ‘grand international unity’. The cumulative aspect of the paradigm of classical scholarship, most prominent in the case of classical archaeology, connects scholarly legacy with the object of enquiry of this study from a memory and history-debate as well as a cultural heritage perspective.

‘Heritage’ should arguably be discussed in terms of how the past relates to the present, encompassing the consciousness that history has been ‘inherited’ and claimed in the present. Processes emphasising the past (represented by archaeology as ‘science’) can be termed to constitute a historicising approach; processes emphasising the present and the idea of inheritance, etc. might inversely be termed the constructivist approach,

escalating in the 1980s. The work of Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (The Invention of Tradition) – emphasising that ‘roots’ are not necessarily ancient but in fact recent, constructed and ‘invented’ – and David Lowenthal (The Past is a Foreign Country) – focusing on the ‘spirit of the age’ as a mirror of societies, rendering notions of an ‘objective’ past impossible – has been influential to this development, which has emerged side by side with the cultural and biographical ‘turn’ in the social sciences and humanities, parallel with the emergence of the memory and history debate in academia.267

Value-based assessments of the ancient world as the foundation of contemporary culture (with an inherent focus on Italy and Greece), have permeated an extensive amount of the discourse contemporary with the period of interest in this study, emanating from and pertaining to the dynamic of foreign academies in Rome and in Athens. Italy and Greece

have often been regarded as repositories for the roots of European civilisation and at the same time as its pinnacle and crowning achievement; the perceived ‘genius loci’ of the physical remains of Rome and Athens was were ancient monuments were to meet modern research.\textsuperscript{268}

Recent critique of classical archaeology has portrayed the discipline as an instrument of Western society to appropriate the Greek and Roman past, shaping ancient material culture to the projections of Western Europe and substantiating claims of the glory of an imagined past and common ‘roots’ – in analogy with critique of the nineteenth-century conception of Renaissance humanism as both ethnocentric and excluding. The instrument of classical archaeology has thus nourished notions of European superiority and identity, and has contributed to the emergence of European colonialism.

This study takes a critical stance towards ideals, ‘mentalités’ and consequences that spring from the elevation of the classical on an eternal pedestal. ‘The’ classical tradition often comes across as a monolith – as a fixed set of ‘core values’, seldom taking into account the changing fashions in its reception and interpretation (for example from eighteenth century

French republicanism, via nineteenth century nation-building to twentieth century Fascism).

Erik Sjöqvist, the main protagonist of this study, was on the whole a typical classical archaeologist of his time, and ‘belonged to that generation of European scholars which viewed the long reach of classical antiquity as a unified whole’. 269

3.2 Historicising Classical Archaeology in Italy

If history in every country is widened out by archaeology, and if the archaeologists of every country can sustain an international unity of purpose, their work can yet help us all to find [...] that our lot in Europe is fallen to us in a fair ground, and that still, even now, we have a goodly heritage. 270

The published lecture quoted above aimed at reinforcing the narrative of a legacy of common origins – an integral aspect of the ideology of classical archaeology. The following discusses the gradual professionalisation of the discipline of classical archaeology in Italy evolving from antiquarian interest.

This is connected with the emergence of an understanding of archaeology as ‘science’, beginning in the neoclassical latter half of the eighteenth century with Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768), who was in many ways the first archaeologist and art historian with

outspokenly ‘scientific’ ambitions. Winckelmann’s scholarly (empirical and positivist) endeavours were preceded by an established interest in ancient history and antiquarianism, a tradition maintained by domestic as well as foreign savants, collectors and amateur archaeologists.

The legacy of Winckelmann continues to shape and influence the field of classical archaeology. As librarian to Cardinal Alessandro Albani and papal antiquary (from 1763), Winckelmann exercised a considerable influence in contemporary savant circles in Rome. His early death elevated him to heroic status, with more influence to follow posthumously. Winckelmann's legacy contributed to the first establishment of ‘scientific’ study of antiquity in academia at the University of Göttingen in 1767. Although Winckelmann proclaimed Greece the source of Classical art, with smaller expeditions and ‘Grand Tourism’, following the ‘opening of Greece’ in the 1830s;271 his influence in Roman circles and on the development of classical archaeology in Italy was considerable.

The so-called ‘Pacca decree’, initiated by Cardinal Bartolomeo Pacca in 1820 (harking back to a papal mandate from 1802, attempting to limit the export of antiquities from Rome) was an important precursor to the paradigm of the later 20th century government decrees for the protection of archaeological sites and ancient objects (in 1909 and 1939).272

The young Italian nation established laws after 1870 that virtually prohibited foreign excavations in Italy or in its colonies. This, together with Winckelmann’s appraisal of Greece and its unification, strongly

272 Ibid., 22.
influenced a transition of the epicentre of classical archaeology to Greece from Rome, as the Greek state allowed limited foreign excavations (although the export of antiquities had been prohibited). 273

Instrumental in this process of legal restraints in Italy were Ruggiero Bonghi (the first Italian Minister of Public Instruction), Giuseppe Fiorelli and Felice Barnabei. As Dyson has pointed out, ‘by making archaeology an exclusively national [...] enterprise, the Italians risked disciplinary parochialism and increased the potential for the misuse of archaeology for national propaganda’. 274 This potential was certainly misused by the Fascist government after the mythical ‘march on Rome’ and its rise to power in 1922.

Classical archaeology is in general terms a cumulative, positivist enterprise, dependent on continuing commentary through publication of empirical ‘data’. Academic disciplines as ‘the stepchildren of imperialism' continue to illustrate how the past ‘has never been a neutral field of discourse', as it has been ‘deployed by Western archaeologists to construct the non-West, to forge ourselves a cultural lineage and to carve out opposing identities’. Therefore archaeologists ‘must be aware of the potentials of the past', as archaeology ‘has an emotional power linking the present to a particular golden age [...]'. Coupled with this is the theme of ‘origins’ and most often this has been co-opted into the metanarrative of European civilization'. 275

273 The selection of Athens rather than Rome as the venue for the first International Congress of Classical Archaeology in 1905 was linked with this renewed archaeological focus on Greece. Ibid., 131.
274 Ibid., 98-99.
European national governments came to sponsor long-term commitments to large-scale excavation projects, primarily in Greece and in the Eastern Mediterranean, with a focus on the architectural remains of what were considered to be important urban or religious centres. The ‘conservative operational structures’ of this evolving ‘big dig paradigm’ exerted a strong influence on the development of classical archaeology before the Second World War.276
National traditions and identification with specific archaeological sites (such as Germany and Olympia, France and Delphi, the USA and the Athenian agora – cf. fig. 19) within the field of classical archaeology were evolving, partly as an expression of the nineteenth and twentieth century European nation-building process, with national rivalry as a consequence also in cultural terms.

The Swedish Cyprus Expedition (1927-1931) transcended the hitherto dominant focus on urban and religious centres in classical archaeology, with a ‘new kind of confidence in archaeological remains’, giving a voice to the vast ‘silent’ majority.277 In his attention to household pottery and utensils, for example, Einar Gjerstad was influenced by contemporary methods applied in Nordic archaeology: ‘in the 1920s a number of Nordic archaeologists and scientists from related fields had started expeditions

---

and excavations in the Mediterranean area and the Near East (as well as in China and South America) in an attempt to understand the development of Sweden’s cultural heritage from a “world perspective”. One such excavation was that of Asine in the heart of Greece, initiated by among others the renowned and by now legendary Nordic archaeologist Oscar Montelius, and Gjerstad was among the students who learned excavation techniques at Asine’.

In 1896, Johan Bergman in a similar vein stressed the connections between Swedish and Mediterranean prehistorical as well as ‘historical’ archaeology, emphasising that ‘the one can hardly be fully understood without the other’.

This connection between ‘national’ and classical archaeology illustrates the local, national and ‘global’ scales of the enterprise of classical archaeology, with the foreign academies in Athens and Rome as a ‘two-way street’ between their respective national contexts and the ‘classical lands’, with a common (often implicit) ‘anthropological’ dimension, perceiving the rest of the world as a mirror through which it is possible to facilitate the understanding of domestic (national) contexts.

---

278 Ibid., 6.
The creation of colonial mandates after the First World War also had significant implications for archaeological ‘colonial opportunism’ in the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{280} In Italy, the Fascist regime appropriated the late nineteenth century policy of the exclusion of foreign excavations in Italy (which also influenced the clandestine market of ancient objects as well as illegal excavations). The Fascist regime did not obstruct the development of (domestic) classical archaeology in Italy – on the contrary, the regime supported the exploration of all forms of ‘romanità’ – but it certainly contributed to the continuation of the ‘Italianising’ process of the profession.

Italian nation-building culminated in archaeological terms in 1938, with the zenith of the Fascist identification with the concept of romanità. This took physical form in the large-scale exhibition celebrating the two thousandth anniversary of the birthday of Roman Emperor Augustus organised 1937-1938 in Rome, the ‘Mostra Augustea della Romanità’ (organised by archaeologist Giulio Giglioli) at the Palazzo delle Esposizioni on Via Nazionale in Rome.\textsuperscript{281}

Totalitarian regimes are often both frank and mendacious at the same time. What was the ‘use’ of keeping foreign archaeological schools in

\textsuperscript{280} Cf. Dyson, \textit{In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts. A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries,} 172-175.

operation in Italy during the Fascist regime (1922-1943)? The probable answer is twofold: (1) the foreign academies was in a sense doing the ‘dirty work’ for the Italians – this is related to the kind of work the foreign archaeologists had become accustomed to since the establishment of the ICA in 1829 – that of reporting, surveying and publishing; (2) it also related to a question of diplomatic relations and status – the foreign presence and interest in ‘Italian antiquity’ was considered positive and reinforced the Fascist obsession with the abstract concept of ‘romanness’ (‘romanità’).\textsuperscript{282}

Actual archaeological work by foreign scholars more or less non-existent in Italy before the Second World War (although Axel Boëthius and the SIR exceptionally conducted investigations and excavations at Ardea 1930-1932).\textsuperscript{283} This national(ist) Italian archaeological policy was reinforced by the Fascist regime. The foreign archaeologists in Italy at the time were thus mainly confined to surveys as well as topographical and material studies. One such project planned by Boëthius was to gather material for an archaeological map (a \textit{Charta archaeologica}) of Latium, together with Thomas Ashby, then director of the BSR. The project was thwarted by Ashby’s premature death, as well as by the controversies surrounding the final phase of his directorship in conjunction with Mrs. Eugenie Strong.\textsuperscript{284}

While director of the SIR (1935-1940), Einar Gjerstad wanted to clear some remains of walls in the garden of the SIR at Palazzo Brancaccio for

\textsuperscript{282} Cf. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{283} The Ardea excavations were not comprehensively published. Cf. Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 161-162. See also Magnusson, ed., \textit{Humanist vid Medelhavet}, 345 & 358.

\textsuperscript{284} For the Ashby-Strong controversy, see for example Wallace-Hadrill, ed., \textit{The British School at Rome. One Hundred Years}. 
an excavation, but was turned down by Prince Brancaccio. In 1942, SIR director Erik Sjöqvist applied for Swedish permission to excavate the main temple at Veii, the ancient Etruscan city closest to Rome, following the intent of the board of the SIR to effect a ‘Swedish excavation in Italy’.

The application was turned down by Giuseppe Bottai (1895-1959), minister of Education and Governor of Rome, with the ‘surprising motivation’ (to Sjöqvist) that Veii was a location that ‘so close to the heart of national Italian archaeology that foreign work there was not desirable’. Veii was simply too important, and ‘of such central significance to the archaeology and history of Rome, that it should be reserved for domestic scholars’.

The rejection of the proposal however included an invite to apply for a permit elsewhere. Sjöqvist thus considered it opportune to postpone the issue of an application for a Swedish excavation permit until the spring of 1943. Sjöqvist’s report indicates a belief in a rapid decision
regarding a possible excavation permit; it also indicates that only Italian archaeologists were considered sufficiently ‘competent’ and suitable for the excavation of Italian sites of prime ‘national interest’. Similarly to his opinions regarding SIR participation in AIAC and the Unione after the war (cf. chapter 5), the Crown Prince considered it more important to ‘maintain good relations with the Italians’ than to suggest other excavation proposals before ‘circumstances had calmed down’. 288

Both Gjerstad and Sjöqvist did however succeed in securing other excavation permits: for Gjerstad’s excavations on the Roman Forum (of the Lapis Niger and the Comitium) in 1939 and 1949; 289 and for Sjöqvist’s investigations of late imperial walls under the church S. Maria in Via Lata during the war, resulting in the publication of Early Christian wall paintings (cf. section 4.8).

In 1935, AAR director Chester Aldrich wrote to John Russell Pope, president of the AAR, regarding the recruitment of a professor in charge of classical studies at the AAR that


I cannot help feeling that with the salary and house offered, it should somehow be possible to secure eventually someone of unusually distinguished achievement, – if not a Curtius or Boethius [sic]! Whether this choice should involve more emphasis on archaeology in view of the Academy’s location in Italy, is perhaps a question, in view of the preference now given for obvious reasons to Greece by many archaeologists. [...] We are above all eager to improve the standing of the Academy in the Roman world of scholarship.  

The ‘obvious reasons’ which Aldrich referred to were the foreign academies’ problems in obtaining excavation permits in Italy. In 1936, Aldrich somewhat ambiguously wrote that ‘a question has arisen concerning possible permission which may be given to Americans to carry on certain excavations in Italy, and which is being taken up now by the U.S. Ambassador with the highest authorities in the Government here. If any such work is to be considered, the Academy might be called upon for advice and assistance’.  

After the discrediting of the Fascist regime, the U.S. government supported the narrative of the heroic Italian resistance and reinforced conservative currents in the country’s political dynamic (above all Alcide De Gasperi’s Christian Democratic government) as a bulwark against post-war Communism. As was the case in countless aspects of Italian

---

290 Aldrich to Pope, December 27, 1935. AAR, reel 5758.  
291 Aldrich to Pope, November 23, 1936. US Ambassador to Italy William Phillips wrote to AAR Trustee Jerome D. Greene (of Harvard University) on Christmas Eve 1936 that ‘in brief, I am proud of your Academy and of all that it contains and stands for. It is the best [American] exhibit we have in Rome, and perhaps in Italy’, AAR, reel 5758.  
society, the gentry and the ‘rising stars’ in Italian antiquities and archaeology retained power, influence and positions after the crumbling of the Fascist framework they had recently served. Foreign archaeological excavations were encouraged after the war, which had not been the case in Italy since before 1870.\textsuperscript{293}

The ‘opening’ of Italy for foreign excavation after the Second World War was an important paradigm shift in classical archaeology, as Italy was forced to leave its nationalistic recent (Fascist) past behind, with archaeological allotments offered to the foreign academies already established in Italy.\textsuperscript{294} The foreign academies in Rome had waited long for this to happen. This national opportunism did not fit very comfortably with any spirit of international collaboration. The sudden increase of archaeological opportunities partly explains the booming industry of large-scale (national) foreign excavations in Italy of the 1950s with the necessity of national funding in each specific context, as well as a new neoclassically and romantically inspired ‘archaeological balance’ between Greece and Italy (no longer solely a question of a choice between Athens and Rome).

The EFR excavations at Bolsena (from 1946) initiated a post-war focus on Etruscan archaeology at the foreign academies in Rome (cf. the SIR legacy of the 1950s),\textsuperscript{295} partly by default, as sites of prime ‘national interest’ (such

\textsuperscript{293} See for example Dyson, \textit{Ancient Marbles to American Shores. Classical Archaeology in the United States}, 261.

\textsuperscript{294} Dyson, \textit{In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts. A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries}, 228.

\textsuperscript{295} Cf. EFR annual report 1946-1947 (March 6, 1947). In analogy with (Romanelli’s) excavations at Tarquinia and the recent discovery of the great temple there, the EFR (above all French archaeologist Raymond Bloch) wanted
as the Roman Forum or Pompeii) were reserved for Italian scholarship (cf. chapter 6).

The structures of the two Rome-based post-war organisations ALAC (the International Association for Classical Archaeology), and the Unione of foreign and domestic scholarly institutions in Rome (cf. chapters 4 and 6), differed from that of the ICA in the sense that they included Italian scholars from the outset. The Franco-German dynamic of the ‘Germanisation’ of the ICA and the advent of the EFR as a direct response to the establishment of the DAIR in the early 1870s (cf. section 2.4), provides a suitable reference point for this discussion of the dynamic of national and international frameworks in which the foreign academies in Rome operated before and after the Second World War.

From this perspective it can be argued that national hegemony had formed the predominant discourse in the context of foreign academies in Rome for approximately seven decades (approximately 1870-1945). This hegemony corresponded with one of the most intense phases of European nation-building; it was preceded and followed by a more internationally oriented attitude of collaboration after the Second World War, although the theme of national rivalry, as well as national frameworks of funding, persisted in the post-war period.

‘to at least find the temple that must exist at Bolsena’ EFR annual report 1947-1948 (March 1, 1948): ‘Nous voudrions, à Bolséna, trouver au moins le temple qui ne devait pas manquer’. The defiant rhetoric of this ‘expectation’ was in many ways symptomatic of the contemporary paradigm of classical archaeology, working by way of analogies and ‘cultural symmetries’.
3.3 THE SIR AND CULTURAL NEUTRALITY

The potential political implications of establishing the Swedish Institute in Rome in Fascist Italy were not visibly addressed when the SIR was founded in 1925-1926.\textsuperscript{296} That the world of scholarship and science was inherently ‘neutral’ was taken more or less for granted. Science would in this way thus (somewhat naïvely) remain protected from political influence.

Correspondence between Boëthius and M.P. Nilsson in 1936 reveals discussions regarding the perceived potential difficulties in focusing on Rome in the increasingly tense pre-war Italian political climate. Boëthius conveyed to Nilsson that he had received a letter from England declaring that the BSR had been ‘temporarily closed’,\textsuperscript{297} as a result of the Abyssinian war and the threat of a maritime war in the Mediterranean. The tension was heightened from the Swedish perspective by the bombardment by the Italian air force of a Swedish Red Cross ambulance in Abyssinia on New Year’s Eve 1936.

The possibility of evacuating the SIR and transferring its activities to Athens was discussed; Boëthius was however strongly opposed to such a move. He argued that the Italian scholarly community would interpret it as a hostile gesture.\textsuperscript{298} A similar argument would later recur regarding the issue of keeping the SIR in operation during the Second World War (see chapter 4).

\textsuperscript{297} Boëthius to Nilsson, January 6, 1936. Quoted in Ibid., 115.
\textsuperscript{298} Nilsson to Boëthius, January 1, 1936. Quoted in Ibid., 116.
In a post-war statement regarding the ‘international engagements’ of the SIR, Axel Boëthius made clear that these had been ‘intense’ since the establishment of the SIR, stressing the importance of the scholarly network and the agency of the director (‘particularly with Italian colleagues and institutions as well as the American, English [sic] and Dutch Institutes’). Boëthius related the intensified international relations of the SIR during the war, through ‘Sjöqvist’s wise and brave’ steadfastness (cf. chapter 4): ‘As it was equally perilous to [...] be careful and to be brave at the time, Sjöqvist chose the latter option with the full approval of the board, and kept the institute and its library going during the entire war.’ Whether or not this feeling of a ‘full approval’ was truly shared by the entire board of the SIR is another matter (cf. below and chapter 5).

299 For Boëthius’ contact (and friendship) network, cf. Boëthius to Anna Munck af Rosensköld (?), ‘Svenska Institutet i Rom vårterminen 1926’, n.d. (1952). GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H. 80: 239. In this context, Boëthius named Corrado Ricci, Guido Calza, Bartoli, Eugenie Strong, Emile Male, Cumont, Amelung, Ashby, Van Burem, Ashmole, Giuseppe Lugli and Curtius, for example: ‘They thought that our institute lived in companionship like the first Christians’ (‘De tyckte, att vårt institut levde i en gemenskap som de första kristna’).

300 The SIR publication series was also perceived to be most significant for the academic diplomacy and promotion of the SIR. Boëthius to unidentified recipient, November 12, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1: ‘Av stor betydelse för det internationella utbytet är även institutets stora publikationsserie. Dessa internationella förbindelser fingo ett nytt innehåll under krigsåren genom docent Sjöqvists kloka och modiga kvarstående på sin plats. Då det i det dåvarande läget var lika riskfyllt, att vara försiktig och att vara modig, valde Sjöqvist med styrelsens fulla godkännande det senare alternativet och häll institutet och dess bibliotek i gång under hela krigstiden’. Cf. Barbro Santillo Frizell, Gösta Säflund och Erik Sjöqvist – födda 1903, lecture at the SIR, June 11, 2003. SIR annual report 2003, 57: ‘Valet av Sjöqvist till institutsföreståndare föll mycket väl ut under denna svåra tid präglad av krig. Som tillhörande ett neutralt land kunde han ta sig an uppgifter av mycket känslig natur när det gällde kulturvård och på det internationella planet kom han att göra värdefulla insatser. Hans utträttad karakter och språkkunskaper gjorde honom perfekt i rollen. Förutom modernsmålet talade han engelska, italienska, franska, tyska och nygrekiska. Sjöqvist kom särskilt att engagera sig i räddningen av det tyska arkeologiska institutets bibliotek’.
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On the subject of establishing a common library catalogue for the foreign academies in Valle Giulia in 1944, Sjöqvist reported to the board of the SIR that 'the privileged position that we have as belonging to a neutral state seems to obligate [the SIR to participate in the project]. We would thus receive an increased good will among the sister institutions [in Rome] through active Swedish participation in the implementation of this [Swedish] initiative'\(^{301}\)

The SIR began to receive annual state subsidies institution in 1938 (cf. section 2.2); its semi-diplomatic status was however unclear from the outset, as it served no clear representative state function (such as that of a legation, embassy, mission or cultural institute). A distinction needs to be made in this regard between cultural and research institutions, although such distinctions are often unclear (the director of the EFR for example enjoys diplomatic status as director of a research institution). This ambiguous status is shared with most other foreign academies in Rome. ‘Cultural neutrality’, or ‘academic neutrality’, is case-specific and remains understudied.\(^{302}\) This study hopes to contribute to its understanding.

From the advent of the first Swedish students in Rome in organised form in 1909, and the Swedish parliament debate in 1914 regarding the possibility of a permanent national academic presence in Rome,\(^{303}\) the possibility of an annual course using the resources of the DAIR, EFR,

---

\(^{301}\) Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, March 14, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.

\(^{302}\) On exception to the lack of scholarly endeavours in this field is provided by the undertakings of the Swiss researcher Noëlle-Laetitia Perret, who is currently studying the gestation of the Swiss Institute in Rome in the context of cultural neutrality.

BSR and AAR rather than a permanent Swedish institution as such was discussed. These discussions eventually culminated in the establishment of the SIR in 1925. The DAIR had originally questioned the need for a Swedish institute, as Swedish researchers would be welcome to any assistance from the DAIR and its library. This dates back to patterns established in the context of ‘holiday courses’ (feriekurser) given in Rome by the Swedish philologist Johan Bergman in the teens of the twentieth century.\(^{304}\)

Once the SIR had been established, its independence in terms of research resources and its library was considered highly significant, a factor which could hardly have been emphasised to any degree, had Swedish scholars remained dependent on for example the DAIR. Publications, and later excavations, reflected national prestige. In practical terms the board of the SIR mainly objected to the risk of compromising its ‘archaeological independence’, this was stressed above all after the Second World War. It was for example feared, that following the new archaeological opportunities for foreign actors in Italy, permissions for excavations might become subjected to the scrutiny of the Unione established in 1946, and the organisation of Swedish excavations in Italy might be interfered with (cf. chapters 5 and 6). The fact that the Unione was seeking support from UNESCO – which had recently organised a conference on the theme of the conditions of archaeological excavations – very likely contributed to this Swedish scepticism. The Unione hoped to

---

\(^{304}\) For the establishment of the SIR in relation to the DAIR cf. Swedish ambassador A. Beck-Friis to Walter Amelung (director of the DAIR), December 25, 1925: ‘Le Dr. Boëthius m’a fait connaître l’accueil très bienveillant et la grande hospitalité que Vous avez bien voulu accorder à l’Institut Archéologique Suédois qu’on vient de créer à Rome et je me fais un devoir agréable de Vous en exprimer mes remerciements les plus sincères et empresse’.
solve its financial strife by means of yearly grants from UNESCO (it had asked for $50,000 a year; it received $6,000 for 1947 – cf. chapter 6).

The aims of the supranational organisation of the research libraries in Rome through the efforts of AIAC and the Unione (cf. chapter 6) were not necessarily perceived as positive due to the controversy surrounding contemporary domestic Swedish debates regarding UNESCO. Various hesitant ‘what if?’-arguments followed; financial contributions to the Unione from the already strained SIR budget were furthermore not anticipated with much delight. The board of the SIR in this way preferred holding on to the past, clinging to the by-laws and regulations (the SIR had however only been operational for two decades at the time); rather than looking to the future and making use of the potential archaeological and other diplomatic opportunities through more intensified and entangled collaboration with other academies. The SIR remained entrenched in its own paradigms, in a sense trapped in itself, not raising its gaze.

Another case of bad timing was the synchronicity of Erik Sjöqvist’s international engagements with AIAC and the Unione with the establishment of the Swedish Institute at Athens (SIA, founded in 1948), most notably promoted by Einar Gjerstad, former director of the SIR (cf. section 2.2). Gjerstad objected that the Unione was too centred on Rome,


306 Billig and Billig, ”The Billig Manuscript,” 209.
and suggested it instead be based in Bern in Switzerland (or in the United States), in order for it to be able to adopt a neutral stance in the perceived ‘competition’ between Athens and Rome. This displays a lack of insight on behalf of the board of the SIR regarding the actual pragmatic motives of the Unione – the return and reinstallation of the four German libraries to the benefit of the scholarly community in Rome.\textsuperscript{307}

Since its foundation, the SIR had enjoyed relations with the Swedish legation ministers in Rome; the official view being that ‘the institute functions as an active and very useful link in the cultural relations between Sweden and Italy’.\textsuperscript{308} The SIR–affiliated scholar Erland Billig differentiated between two kinds of neutralities, military and political on one hand, and ‘historical’ on the other – in terms of Sweden not belonging to either of the two opposing blocs (the Entente or the Central Powers) during the First World War – with a ‘cultural neutrality’ and flexibility as a result. Billig argued that this was useful in terms of the domestic Italian perception of the SIR during its infancy.\textsuperscript{309}

Billig’s history of the early years of the SIR offers insights into the background and evolving concept of this notion of cultural neutrality in the context of the SIR, which focused on maintaining good relations with archaeological authorities and prominent scholars (conceptualised here as


\textsuperscript{309} Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 33.
academic diplomacy). The role of the director in establishing and maintaining such relations was considerable.

At the same time as Axel Boëthius’ first term as director of the SIR ended in 1935, Italy proclaimed war on Abyssinia, with trade sanctions on Italy (in which Sweden participated) as a result. Abyssinia, or Ethiopia, was – as was Italy – a member of the weakened League of Nations, presided over the previous year (1934) by Swedish foreign secretary Rickard Sandler.

The bombardment of a Swedish ambulance operating in Abyssinia by the Italian Air Force in December 1935 (see above) ignited a debate in the Swedish press, which was in turn reacted to in Italian media. As representatives of the board of the SIR, Boëthius and Martin P. Nilsson observed this with some concern. Ancient Rome and romanità were important elements in Fascist cultural identity discourse, and the foreign academies in Rome had seldom been actively (ab)used by the regime for

---

311 In 1941, Sjöqvist expressed scepticism regarding ‘organisational collaboration, cultural concordats and other expressions of quasi-politics’ (‘Organisatoriskt samröre, kultur-konkordat och andra utslag av kvasipolitik anser jag vara av ondo. Eller hur?’). Sjöqvist to Boëthius, January 9, 1941. His views concerning such matters seem to have changed during the war, considering his active involvement in the establishment of AIAC and the Unione (cf. chapter 4 and 6). See also Sjöqvist to Boëthius, August 3, 1943: ‘mina och Institutets förbindelser här varit av rent vetenskaplig och vänuskaplig art, ej av ”kulturpolitisk”’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B:1.
312 The sanctions on Italy lasted until July 1936. All countries in the League of Nations (for example Austria and Hungary) did not participate in these sanctions. Cf. Göran Hägg, Mussolini. En studie i makt (Stockholm: Norstedts, 2008), 198-199.
cultural or political manifestations, Boëthius and Nilsson feared the situation might now take a turn for the worse.313

Their fears generally speaking turned out to be ungrounded. The reciprocity of interests between the foreign academies in Rome and the Fascist regime through a shared focus on the ancient Roman past, had on the whole contributed to the foreign academies having been left to their own devices (with Fascist presence limited to official visits such as that of Mussolini for the inauguration of the new Dutch institute building on Via Omero in 1933).314 The prestigious presence of the foreign academies served to glorify the ancient ‘Italian past’.

The Fascist regime had several notable domestic adversaries, for example Benedetto Croce (1866-1952) and the circles that published in or were attached to the review La Critica (established by Croce in 1903).315 Italian academia featured prominent scholars of antiquity like Gaetano de Sanctis and Guglielmo Emanuele Rizzo, who had refused to swear the

---

313 Cf. correspondence in Samling Nilsson, Martin P:son, Lund University Library, Sweden; as well as RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B.
oath of allegiance to the regime in 1931, and had as a consequence been forced to leave their positions. Ax

Axel Boëthius showed no scruples in participating in the celebrations of the two thousandth anniversary of the Emperor Augustus in 1937; nor did for example Eugène Strong at the BSR. The same year Boëthius also lectured at the Istituto di Studi Romani on the theme of Swedish research on Augustus and the foundation of the Roman Empire. The intense Fascist promotion of romanità and ancient Rome was in line with the scholarly interests of the foreign academies in Rome. This however is not to say that scholars representing these academies were necessarily sympathetic to the Fascist regime in more general terms.

The SIR board members could be described as ‘loyally neutral’ during the war, in accordance with Swedish national policy. Boëthius was sent on a diplomatic mission to Rome by the Swedish government during the

---

317 This lecture was published the same year (1937) by Boëthius, together with the Norwegian Eiliv Skard, as Gli studi svedesi e norvegesi sulla figura e l’opera di Augusto e sulla fondazione dell’impero romano. Cf. Ibid., 35–36. Boëthius also headed the Swedish (Gothenburg) section of the Istituto di Studi Romani.
318 Boëthius was for example skeptical towards Mussolini, and in retrospect quoted the Latin poet Martial (Martialis) vis-à-vis the Duce: ‘he was first a little of Vespasian and Titus, then a lot of Domitian’ (‘Det var de lyckligare Mussolini-ärens Rom med ett uppbåd av krafter – som ingen förnekar, fast många tveka om Mussolinis förtjänst däri – en renässans i Italiens liv före den ytterliga dekadensen på 30-talet med resultat så varaktiga, att man trots slutkatastrofen icke kan på Mussolini tillämpa Martialis’ ord om Flavierna, även om man tycker, att han verklign först var litet av Vespasianus och Titus, sedan mycket av Tacitus’ Domitianus’). Cf. minister Carl Bildt’s assessment of Mussolini (July 17, 1924, quoted by Boëthius): ‘Min grafologiska studie är nu slut. Resultatet ger en bild vida olika, vad jag hoppats eller trott, men jag är säker på dess sanning. Mannen [Mussolini] har en utomordentlig intelligens, handlingsförmåga och omdömeskärhet, men han är svag, falsk och lögnaktig med tendenser till brottslighet och till galenskap. Då jag anser honom nödvändig för landet i nuvarande förhållanden, vällar denna ‘upptäckt’ mig verklig sorg och bekymmer’. Boëthius to Anna Munck af Rosenschöld (?), ‘Svenska Institutet i Rom vårterminen 1926’, n.d. (1952?). GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 239.
winter of 1939. Boëthius’ mission had to do with the invasion of Finland by Russian troops on November 30, 1939. The issue of whether or not to openly support Finland, and thus to abandon the political neutrality that had been declared on September 1 was discussed intensely in Sweden.319

The new Swedish coalition government, in which Christian Günther (1886-1966) had replaced Rickard Sandler (1884-1964) as foreign secretary in 1939 after the national unity government as a result of the Soviet attack on Finland in November 1939, had decided on December 13, 1939 that Sweden could not afford to take the risk of supporting Finland.320 Axel Boëthius was sent to Rome in late December 1939 to explain the Swedish position in the conflict. Boëthius’ application of academic diplomacy involved using the network of contacts he had established as director of the SIR to disseminate this information. Parts of the network of contacts used by Boëthius in 1939 were Alfonso Bartoli, director of the excavations of the Roman Forum and senatore a vita, Roberto Paribeni, director of Museo Nazionale delle Terme, and accademico d’Italia, as well as Pietro


De Francisci, headmaster of the University of Rome and once a minister in the Fascist government.\footnote{321}

The use of an individual with no connection with the foreign service was far removed from established diplomatic practice; it clearly reflects opting for a pragmatic solution, as few other Swedes could rival Boëthius’ network of prominent contacts in Italian scholarly and cultural life at that time, after having served as the director of the SIR for nine years (1926–1935). Neutrality was fundamental to Swedish foreign policy at the time (it still is); this was magnified by the government decision to ‘abandon’ Finland in December 1939. This context forms part of the background to the context in which Erik Sjöqvist had to operate when he arrived in Rome as director of the SIR in 1940.

Contemporary discussions of Swedish neutrality peaked with the so-called ‘Midsummer Crisis’ of 1941, after the initiation of Operation Barbarossa and the German attack on the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. Swedish neutrality was put to the test when Germany and Finland the same day insisted that Sweden should allow the transport of the German Engelbrecht division from Norway through Sweden to Finland. According to prime minister Per Albin Hansson, King Gustaf V threatened to abdicate unless the transport was allowed; the military transport was indeed granted permission to use the Swedish railway.

Strong national sentiment was the order of the day in most of Europe before the outbreak of war, including in intellectual and cultural circles. This was true also for Italy. Appeals to ‘romanness’ and to the ‘national

\footnote{321 Cf. Billig and Billig, ”The Billig Manuscript,” 197–198.}
spirit’ reached further than the Fascist party. Such ‘cultural nationalism’ also encroached on the sphere of activities of the foreign academies in Rome. The foreign academies in Rome could at times be the cause of envy to domestic archaeologists and Italian scholars, with their well-organised and rich facilities in terms of financial resources, libraries and material assets. These sentiments were most visibly displayed vis-à-vis the DAIR, but also concerned for example the EFR and the AAR, all of which possessed rich libraries. This was at least indirectly to the favour of an institution like the SIR, in the sense that its resources were limited – the SIR thus presented less of a potential ‘threat’ to Italian scholars.

Cultural nationalism took on forms of its own in Sweden, mixed with diverging conceptions of neutrality. 1943 witnessed a conflict between Boëthius and the council (lärarråd) of the University of Gothenburg (at the time still Göteborgs Högskola), when war-related events in Norway sparked an opinion for the breach of all contacts with German scholars – the members of the university council (which included Axel Boëthius) were instructed to cancel all personal correspondence with their German colleagues. Boëthius opposed the decision of the university council. He

322 Erland Billig gives the example of Axel Boëthius’ relations with the prominent scholar Giuseppe Lugli, who did not associate himself with the Fascist party, and was therefore entrusted with the reorganisation of the venerable Accademia dei Lincei after 1943 (the Accademia dei Lincei had been dissolved by the Fascists – cf. chapter 2). This did not keep Lugli from expressing strong national(ist) pathos (in correspondence with Boëthius), for example after the Italian ‘victory’ in Abyssinia. Boëthius, on the other hand, tried to explain to Lugli that he, as a true friend of Italy and its culture, resented the contemporary Italian activities in Africa. Ibid., 36-37.

331 ‘Högskolan bryter med tysk vetenskap’, in Göteborgs Handels- och Sjöfartstidning, December 16, 1943. Professor Hjalmar Frisk, who became principal of the university in 1958, expressed his concerns about the consequences of ‘mixing politics with science’, as this might inconvenience Swedish research as well as German scholars, ‘who are presently in dire straits and cannot be held responsible for the actions of the political leadership’ (‘…tyska vetenskapsmän, vilka för närvarande befinner sig i ett svårt tvångsläge och icke kunna göras ansvariga för

retained contacts with his German colleagues, such as Ludwig Curtius, Armin von Gerkan (both directors of the DAIR) and Jan Crous, the DAIR librarian that was to supervise the move of the archaeological library to Austria.\textsuperscript{324}

When the DAIR was reopened after the First World War in 1924, the group of scholars that was sent to Rome formed a natural part of Boëthius’ scholarly acquaintances, not least due to their scholarly expertise. This group consisted of Walter Amelung, Ludwig Curtius, Armin von Gerkan, Reinhard Herbig and Guido Kaschnitz von Weinberg (who was later to direct the DAIR after its second reopening in 1953).

Boëthius’ contacts were however not limited to the German context. He was affiliated with the American School in Athens (the ASCSA) during his student years as. Boëthius furthermore visited the USA as a guest lecturer from 1931 onwards, and was to spend the last decade of his life in the AAR.\textsuperscript{325} This strong anglo-saxon connection rang true for the first three directors of the SIR, and was to become particularly relevant for Erik Sjöqvist (cf. this chapter, as well as chapters 4 and 5).

Foreign academy directors, as other individuals in official, representative positions, can inherit legacies of personal networks from their predecessors. In the case of the SIR, Einar Gjerstad and Erik Sjöqvist were handed down a list of connections and positions established by Axel

\textsuperscript{324} Frisk to Boëthius, December 17, 1943. Quoted in Ibid., 38-40.
\textsuperscript{325} Cf. Crous to Boëthius, June 23, 1944; and November 13, 1944. Quoted in Ibid., 39. Crous was later sent to the Russian front and was killed at Stalingrad (cf. chapter 4).
\textsuperscript{325} Ibid., 43.
Boëthius during the early years of the SIR. Boëthius had to balance (at least) five separate contact networks: the board of the SIR in Stockholm, the Swedish legation in Rome, official Italian authorities, domestic (Italian) scholars, as well as the remaining foreign academies. Relations were entertained with personal visits and with visiting cards. The director was in this sense the spider in a finely spun web, with an unquestionable personal influence on the day-to-day development of the institution. Domestic Italian institutions and the Vatican was included on the list of addressees of SIR publications.

Neither the foreign office in Stockholm nor the Swedish legation in Rome were directly involved in SIR activities, although the Swedish ambassadors (ministers) at times proved invaluable, for example in the drawn-out negotiations for securing the plot of land for the new SIR building in Valle Giulia in the late 1930s, as well as negotiations (after Dr. Axel Munthe’s death in 1949) regarding Villa San Michele on Capri, donated by Munthe to the Swedish state to be administered through the SIR. The Swedish legation also administered payments and guardianship.


327 Gjerstad had actually misplaced that list when it was time for Sjöqvist to assume the directorship of the SIR in 1940; the original list was not retrieved: ‘Är det möjligt att den s.k. besökslistan (förteckn. över institutioner och personer hos vilka förest. bör avlägga visit) blev kvar i Rom? Jag hade stoppat den i ett kuvert för att överlämna den till Sjöqvist i Stockholm [...]. Om du hittar den, ber jag dig sända mig den pr. omgående’. Gjerstad to André, July 18, 1940. SIR, Korrespondens 1939. See also Sjöqvist to Boëthius, July 17, 1940. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1: ‘Denna lista har han [Gjerstad] äft av Dig men den har tvått förkommit. Äger Du en dubblett vore jag mycket tacksam, om Du ville medbrinna den vid Din hitkomst i nästa vecka’.
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of the SIR facilities in the absence of the director (often through chancellery clerk Gurli Wallbom, who was later to marry Erik Sjöqvist).\(^{328}\)

The SIR had no library at first, and the Swedish students there were evenly distributed between the DAIR and the AAR libraries.\(^ {329}\) Relations with the BSR were cordial from the outset; as for the EFR little or no contact was established initially, the SIR being in closer contact with for example German archaeologists, contacts dating back to the courses in Rome organised by Johan Bergman in the late 1890s and by Vilhelm Lundström from 1909. Boëthius organised recurring lectures and soirées (camerate) at the SIR – he thus realised the diplomatic value of displaying current Swedish research (at the time unofficially pan-Scandinavian, as Sweden was the only Scandinavian country to establish its own institute before the Second World War), as a way of promoting the institute and himself at the same time.\(^ {330}\)

Evidence of the contemporary perception of the significance of the German scholarly libraries can be found in a 1940 letter from Alfred Westholm (of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition) to C.A. Ralegh Radford, director of the BSR. Westholm wrote that

\(^ {328}\) Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 14-15. For Axel Munthe's correspondence with Gurli Wallbom (later Sjöqvist), see RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:2.

\(^ {329}\) SIR annual report 1926, 1-2. Cf. Ibid., 22.

The importance of the library which is attached to the German Archaeological Institute at Rome is well known to all archaeologists and archaeological institutions. The library in question is a centre of research, the activity of which is international and reaches beyond the actual German sphere of scientific work. The keeping of the library up to date is therefore a common scientific interest apart from any political viewpoint. The deplorable events of the last half year have seriously affected the conditions of exchange of publications, to the effect that most of these connexions as regards the institute have been broken. [...] the Swedish Archaeological Institute [sic] in Rome is prepared to transmit such publications for exchange so that they may be continued just like in peaceful times. The Swedish Institute certainly answers for the fulfillment of the exchange from the side of the German Institute. [...] The managers of the Swedish Institute hope that this initiative shall be met with sympathy by other institutions and that it shall be possible to continue the scientific tradition even under present severe conditions'.
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colleague Gjerstad seems to have had (based on Gjerstad's correspondence at Lund University library). Westholm and Gjerstad had often discussed the intermediary role of the SIR as portrayed in Westholm’s letter. Ralegh Radford’s answer to the Swedish proposal was affirmative and addressed to Gjerstad.333

During the early years of the SIR, the institute was more or less synonymous with its director, with no ‘middle men’ (female presence was rare at this point) in communication with the board. This began to change after the Second World War, but was still in many ways the case when Sjöqvist assumed the directorship of the SIR in 1940, as the Crown Prince’s and the SIR board’s ‘man in Rome. This is part of the reason for the focus in this study on individuals and the networks in which they operated.

As the first director of the SIR, Boëthius was dedicated to the cause of recuperating a degree of international collaboration in Roman scholarly circles that had been lost during and after the First World War. This was achieved through intensified scholarly exchanges, through organising lecture exchanges with prominent scholars as well as through a series of soirée receptions.334 The foreign academy framework in many ways appropriated and redefined the function of the (nineteenth century) antiquarian literary and cultural salons in Rome (such as that of German

333 ‘As regards the British School at Rome we decided to accept your kind offer to act as intermediary for continuing the exchange with Römische Mitteilungen’. Ralegh Radford in addition wanted to know if any similar arrangements had been made for the exchange of the Athenische Mitteilungen – i.e. what the current situation was with regard to the DAI in Athens. Ralegh Radford to Gjerstad, March 21, 1940. BSR Archive, Box 63.
archaeologist Wolfgang Helbig (1839-1915) at the Villa Lante on the Gianoccolo hill in the late nineteenth century.335

This representational side of scholarly antiquarianism was well suited for the format of the foreign academies and fulfilled a social function apart from establishing (diplomatic) relations and exchanges of scholarly contacts. The director thus simultaneously promoted himself as well as the institution he represented. At the SIR this tradition began with Boëthius and was to continue with Gjerstad, and notably with Sjöqvist, during and after the Second World War.

3.4 THE APPOINTMENT OF ERIK SJÖQVIST AS SIR DIRECTOR (1940)

The director of the SIR is appointed by the SIR board; the necessary qualification for the position in 1940 was primarily to be a 'scientifically trained archaeologist'.336 There had been little discussion in the board of the SIR regarding the appointment of the first two directors (Boëthius and Gjerstad), partly due to the constituency of the board and the lack of real competition at the time of their appointments (1925 and 1935 respectively). The same did not apply in 1940, when Gjerstad left his post as director for the professorship at Lund University, following the

336 By-laws and regulations of the SIR, June 30, 1938, 3. The interpretation has often been that the director is required to be at least a 'docent' in the Swedish academic system. The direct control of the board meant one thing when the SIR was a private foundation, another as a state-subsidised institution (after 1938). Cf. Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 3-5.
retirement of Martin P. Nilsson in 1939. SIR connections with Swedish academia had so far been relatively smoothly synchronised. This situation was to grind to a halt with the directorship of Erik Sjöqvist (cf. chapter 5).

Sjöqvist had been second librarian at the Royal library (KB), Stockholm 1933-1939. He had defended his doctoral thesis and simultaneously became a docent (at Stockholms Högskola) one month before his appointment as director of the SIR in 1940. This was not actually technically a sufficient qualification for the position, as the candidate was supposed to be declared competent for a professorship. Boëthius admitted that this had been difficult to circumvent; the reason they (Boëthius and Gjerstad) had strived to do so was their ‘great expectations’ and faith in Sjöqvist. Sjöqvist had been both Boëthius’ student and had collaborated closely with Gjerstad in the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (1927-1931). Gjerstad saw Sjöqvist as his successor as SIR director. Gjerstad later made it clear to Sjöqvist that it was thanks to his efforts that Sjöqvist had been appointed director of the SIR.

---

337 Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:4.
338 Cf. Certificate (from University Chancellor Östen Undén), July 2, 1940. File ‘Ansökningshandlingar m.m. från Fil. lic. E. Sjöqvist’, RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:4. Sjöqvist later described how ‘his Cypriote books’ (one of which was his Doctoral Dissertation) ‘came out only a month before the Nazis attacked Norway and cut off every communication between Sweden and the West – the proofs were read in my military tent’. Sjöqvist to Robert Braidwood (Field Director, Syrian Expedition, Oriental Institute Chicago), October 18, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
339 Boëthius to Sjöqvist, May 2, 1940. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
340 Cf. a polemical article in favour of the scholar Gösta Säflund after the appointment of Sjöqvist in Upsala Nya Tidning, May 3, 1940 (cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5). The article argued that the choice should be abrogated, and that the procedure of the appointment of the director of the SIR should be ‘analogous with that of […] professorships’ (specifically those in Stockholm and Gothenburg, not classed as ‘universities’ at the time), as the SIR was dependent on state subventions, and because ‘it attends to national...
In doing so Gjerstad was acting partly in his own interests. He was concerned with the completion of the publication of the material excavated during the Swedish Cyprus Expedition, of which he had been in charge with Sjöqvist as part of the archaeological team, together with Alfred Westholm and John Lindros (cf. chapter 2). With Sjöqvist as director of the SIR as 'his man in Rome', Gjerstad felt that Sjöqvist should then have time to complete his part of the publication of the Cyprus material, the credit for which was mainly taken by Gjerstad. As director of the SIR during the war, Sjöqvist however had little choice but to focus on Italian material, for two reasons: (1) the war limited access to any material outside his own his own institution; (2) Sjöqvist's main priority had to be to manifest himself as a scholar not only in Rome, but of Rome.\footnote{In July 1940, Gjerstad wrote to Sjöqvist regarding the commencement of his directorship that ‘you have my blessing if that is of any help’ (‘[...] söndag natt slutar jag som föreståndare och du träder till. Du har min välsignelse, om det hjälper något’. Gjerstad to Sjöqvist, June 25, 1940. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III: A:3.}

Boëthius focused more on Sjöqvist's merits as a librarian (acquired mainly at the Royal library). Boëthius was well aware of the necessity of a practical and charismatic individual able to administer international relations tactfully; this view was shared by university chancellor Östen Undén (Undén was furthermore Swedish foreign secretary 1924-1926 and 1945-1962).\footnote{Boëthius to M.P. Nilsson, April 8, 1940.}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
education interests’ ([institutet] tillvaratar nationella bildningsintressen’). For Gjerstad and Boëthius' view of Säflund’s 'planless tuition' as temporary director of the SIR 1934-1935, see Boëthius to Undén, December 16, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III: B:1. For a comparative biography of Sjöqvist and Säflund, cf. Santillo Frizell, "1903-2003. Due centenari all'Istituto Svedese: Erik Sjöqvist e Gösta Säflund.”
\end{flushright}
The selection process was complicated. Sjöqvist was competing with candidates already declared to be of professorial competence (mainly Gösta Säflund and Natan Valmin, of Uppsala and Lund, respectively). Gjerstad’s persistent recommendation of Sjöqvist ultimately tipped the general opinion in his favour. Boëthius felt that it was the ‘obligation’ of the board to ‘engage a scholar in Rome who, lacking full competence in scientific terms, has proved particularly well-developed in terms of organisational ability and in handling independent responsibility abroad.’ Sjöqvist’s experience abroad was however at this time limited to the Swedish Cyprus excavations and an extensive study trip around the Mediterranean in 1937. Säflund had at that point worked on the early Republican city walls in Rome for some time; Valmin had accumulated archaeological experience in Greece.

Another consequence of the selection of Sjöqvist as director of the SIR in 1940 was that of highlighting that the position had no connection with the Swedish state salary- and pension system, as a result of the private origins of the SIR. The position was not officially integrated with the Swedish career system, and a chair in ancient history and classical archaeology in Sweden would not become vacant within the next decade or more at the four institutions where the position existed (Lund,

---


344 Related in Boëthius to M.P. Nilsson, May 1, 1940. Quoted in Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 5-6.
Uppsala, Gothenburg and Stockholm) – when it did, competition for it would be intense, with ‘national’ merits and connections valued more than national experience.

When Sjöqvist was appointed director of the SIR in 1940, Boëthius sent him a copy of the board meeting protocol as well as a congratulatory letter with the tone of a teacher communicating with a student. Sjöqvist was regarded as promising, but was not fully independent at this point in time. Boëthius explained to Sjöqvist what he and the board expected from him. He strongly emphasised the importance of the annual archaeological course, and the importance of maintaining a wide base in this regard, as an insurance or bulwark for the SIR: ‘It is clear to me that the courses are fundamental to the life of the institute, both for its regeneration and for the general interest in the funding of this daring outpost. I, who together with the Crown Prince have generated the substantial grants and donations we have received, know that we have received all this mostly thanks to the courses’. These annual courses were in other words to be maintained at all costs.

In instructing Sjöqvist in May 1940, Boëthius described the role of the director in Rome as that of one individual in effect having to be a ‘whole university’. It is striking – and symptomatic of a reluctance to comment

on ongoing political affairs – that the ongoing war was not explicitly referred to even once in Boëthius long letter of instruction and expectation.\textsuperscript{346}

Germany invaded Denmark and Norway on April 9, 1940. On June 10 Italy entered the Second World War as Germany’s ally. Arvid Andrén, the SIR grant holder in archaeology at the time, recalled serious discussions with Gjerstad (who was still director of the SIR) as to what should be done if Germany was to also attack Sweden, which would probably mean that the institute personnel would be deported from Italy. Would they go to France? ‘We put our trust, as did many others, in that the Maginot line [the French fortification line of defenses between France and Germany, constructed after the First World War] would hold’.\textsuperscript{347}

Gjerstad had sent the participants of the 1940 archaeological course back to Sweden in early April (the course was supposed to end in May). Oscar Sitte, the supervisor of the new SIR building (employed by architect Ivar Tengbom), was a German citizen and had been called to military service before the new building was completed.\textsuperscript{348} SIR treasurer Axel Hallin was staying at the institute to assist in the event of complications. Hallin had however taken ill and was allegedly more inclined to identify

\textsuperscript{346} Boëthius to Sjöqvist, May 2, 1940. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
\textsuperscript{348} For Ivar Tengbom and the SIR building in Via Omero, cf. Ivar Tengbom, in \textit{Byggmästaren} (1941); Gauffin, "Ett besök i Svenska Institutet i Rom maj 1946," 403-406. and Klynne, "Ivar Tengboms ’villa suburbana’." See also chapter 2.2.
problems rather than to solve them, partly due to his not very favourable
relations with Gjerstad.\textsuperscript{349}

The SIR building was in the process of being erected when BSR
director Ralegh Radford commented on the development of the
environment of domestic and foreign institutes and academies in Valle
Giulia in February 1939. Ralegh Radford’s comments were intended as
corrections of a text for a promotion brochure for the BSR ‘object, modus
operandi, history’:

The School [the BSR] is now flanked by an Italian Institute designed as a School of
Architecture and faces, across the valley, the Roumanian Academy, behind which lie the
Institutes of Holland, Belgium and Sweden.\textsuperscript{350}

In 1940, the Italian Ministry of National Education founded an office of
comparative scholastic legislation, dependent on its Direzione Generale delle
Accademie, delle Biblioteche, degli Affari Generali e del Personale. The new
office proposed to publish a monthly bulletin of ‘foreign scholastic
legislation’, in order to compare this with its Italian counterpart. Gjerstad
wrote to the Swedish government requesting the relevant information to
be forwarded to the Italian Ministry of National Education, shortly before
handing over the directorship of the SIR to Erik Sjöqvist.\textsuperscript{351}

\textsuperscript{349} Cf. samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden.
\textsuperscript{350} Radford to Shaw, February 24, 1939. Radford added that ‘I suggest this
alteration as the facts are not quite correct in your draft. The Italian School of
Architecture will probably become the Institute of Belle Arti shortly but has not
yet done so’. The School of Architecture has remained thus to this day (as part of
the University of Rome – la Sapienza).
\textsuperscript{351} A. Cantella (of the Italian Ministry of National Education) to Gjerstad, March
25, 1940. Cf. Gjerstad to Kungl. Ecklesiastikdepartementet, April 12, 1940. SIR,
Billig box 1.
Sjöqvist’s arrival in Rome in 1940 was delayed by his military service. The Crown Prince had asked Axel Hallin to ‘take care of’ the institute before Sjöqvist’s arrival. Gjerstad strongly opposed this decision, and informed Boëthius that he personally preferred his protégé Arvid Andrén as a temporary assistant: ‘I beg of you to for God’s sake make sure A. [Andrén] gets the temporary position’. Hallin was eventually persuaded to leave Rome, finally leaving Sjöqvist in charge to prepare his first archaeological course as director of the SIR in the spring of 1941. There was a considerable lack of suitable applicants for the 1941 archaeological course, which led to the board being forced to be more liberal than usual regarding the acceptance criteria. The fear of an empty institute and an unemployed director outweighed concerns regarding the ‘quality’ of the applicants.

Sjöqvist wrote to Boëthius in October 1940, acknowledging that ‘the good will and natural affability that meets me here is surely to a very large degree the fruits of your activity in the service of the institute’. Einar Gjerstad left Rome on July 1, 1940 for the professorship in Lund. SIR treasurer Axel Hallin was simultaneously engaging in profitable currency exchanges of the subvention of 500,000 Swedish crowns from the Wallenberg foundation for the new institute building, which had almost been completed. The new SIR library was organised by Arvid Andrén

---

354 Sjöqvist to Boëthius, October 4, 1940. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1: ‘Den välvilja och naturliga älskvärdhet, som möter mig här, är säkert i mycket hög grad frukten av Din verksamhet i Institutets och det godas tjänst’.
356 The German ambassador to Italy (von Mackensen) donated a gift of 12 etchings (featuring Swedish landscape scenes by the eighteenth century artist
and his wife Karen, it was operational by July 7, 1941. Andrén later recalled that ‘[Sjöqvist’s] only shortcoming was being a bachelor, and my wife had to act as hostess during his first year as director at the receptions that form the social network of the foreign institutes in Rome. He remedied this flaw by marrying Gurli Wallbom after this [first] year, however, who through her employment at the Swedish legation in Rome was well informed regarding many practical issues’.

The Sjöqvists were married in the summer of 1941. Wallbom had been working for the Swedish legation in Rome since 1924. The SIR guestbook illustrates that practically the entire Swedish community in Rome, headed by minister Beck-Friis, was present at the SIR for the inaugural lecture in the new institute building on February 1, 1941.

Sjöqvist began sending invitations to other foreign academies and to Italian colleagues informing its recipients that ‘Il Direttore dell’Istituto Svedese e Signora sono a casa martedì nel pomeriggio’. This host and hostess patron-client situation would have been expected of the director under normal circumstances and were thus continued by the Sjöqvists during the war years. The SIR soon became an established meeting place for archaeologists, art historians and other scholars in Rome during the war: ‘[...] the neutral Swedish Institute was to play an important role as a

---

Jacob Philipp Hackert) for the decoration of the new SIR building. Cf. von Mackensen to Gjerstad, July 2, 1940. SIR, Billig box 1.


360 Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript,” 134.

Ibid.
place where the scholars of the recently belligerent states could meet without constraint’.  

Sweden was the only neutral country with a functioning research institution in Rome during the Second World War (disregarding the Vatican). The director of the SIR was however not part of the corps diplomatique, which was by no means unproblematic during the war, but also proved to be an advantage in terms of flexibility in establishing and maintaining relations and networks. Erik Sjöqvist was not confined to the limitations of official protocol and was not ‘competing’ on diplomatic territory. Sjöqvist confessed to secretary Boëthius before leaving for Rome in 1940 that he did not know what the Italian participation in hostilities would mean for the academies of Rome, as ‘foreigners and the position of foreign property is extremely delicate in a belligerent power’.\footnote{Sjöqvist to Boëthius, June 14, 1940. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1: ‘Jag vet inte vad Italiens inträde i kriget innebär för institutets vidkommande, men så mycket är ju klart att det ytterligare försvarar vår verksamhet. Utlänningars och utländsk egendoms ställning i en krigsförande makt är ju också ytterst omtälig’.} Einar Gjerstad chose to keep the SIR open and functioning after the outbreak of war in 1939, a decision backed up the board (not least by Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf).\footnote{Cf. Gjerstad to Andrén, September 5, 1939. SIR, Korrespondens 1939: ‘[…] att resa till Italien går säkert utmärkt så länge som vi ha fredliga förbindelser med Tyskland och Italien. Åro vi neutrala, då kursen börjar, förmodar jag att stipendiaterna komma ned. […] Jag talade med Kronprinsen därom just idag och han var alldeles överens med mig att vi skola driva institutet, så länge det någonsin är möjligt’.}

After the armies of the axis powers had left North Africa in May 1943, the war gradually became a more tangible reality also in Rome. The Allies landed on Sicily on July 10 and crossed the Messina strait on September 3, 1943. Mainland Italy would thus remain actively involved in the reality of
war for almost two years. The infrastructure remained intact, although
the Italian postal service was under censorship. \(^{364}\)

The AAR, the BSR and the EFR had all been closed at the outbreak
of war. The immediate neighbours of the SIR, the Dutch and Belgian
academies, were financially compromised when the German army invaded
their respective countries in 1940. By remaining operational, the SIR thus
automatically assumed a more important position than it had previously
enjoyed.

The collaborative efforts within the network of directors of the
foreign academies in Rome remained vivacious despite the war. The
exchanges through receptions and lectures were extended to dinners of a
more private nature during which information and news could be
obtained, as well as discussions regarding how to deal with Italian
authorities. The librarians of the academies would moreover collaborate
in terms of synchronising excursions and the logistics of car travel.

In contrast to the theme of collaboration, a competitive pressure in
regard to expectations in terms of representation (and expense budgets)
at the academies was felt by Sjöqvist and the SIR: ‘Other foreign
institute- and academy directors have very different salary resources at
their disposal, and the contrast that is thereby created from the
perspective of representation, can hardly be to the advantage of the
institute’. \(^{365}\) At the time of writing (1942), Sjöqvist could really only
compare his situation with the directors of the German scholarly

\(^{364}\) According to Billig, when the only clerk with command of the Swedish
language working for the Roman censor was on holiday or otherwise
incapacitated of treating post destined for Sweden, he would telephone the SIR

\(^{365}\) Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, February 27, 1942. RA, Svenska Institutets i
Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
institutions, the only other foreign academies in operation at that time; Sjöqvist was however referring to the situation of directors of other academies in more general terms. ‘Academic diplomacy’, or the interaction and relations between the foreign academies in Rome, was – and remains – centered around the bipolarity of collaboration and (friendly) competition.

Swedish neutrality was part of the attraction of the SIR to colleagues and scholars from other academies. It contributed towards creating a sympathetic opinion of the SIR among the remaining community of foreign scholars in Rome representing a variety of nationalities, partly because the SIR became one of the few places in which political tones in conversations would not necessarily be detected or deemed uncomfortable. Sjöqvist soon realised the potential of this newfound status and relative freedom of the SIR. When Swedish scholar Holger Arbman proposed to carry out studies of ‘Germanic relations’ in Italy in 1942, Sjöqvist encouraged this, as it might counteract the ‘longobardian’, aryan-Germanic research carried out by Siegfried Fuchs and the Nazi fraction of the DAIR.366 The Swedish neutral position was close to being

abused, however, when Åke Wiberg, general manager and Swedish member of parliament (Malmö), contacted Sjöqvist regarding the possible purchase of an ‘Apollo torso’ in Parian marble (allegedly the work of Praxiteles), on the market through Ugo Jandolo, a dealer in antiquities in Rome.  

Wiberg required Sjöqvist’s assistance in evaluating the torso, as there were also ‘German interests’ and time was perceived to be running out. The ‘German interests’ came from none other than Hermann Göring, who was interested in purchasing the torso for his private collection (for the price of 200,000 lire, or approximately $2,000). Jandolo however preferred selling it to a Swedish buyer or institution, as ‘the only potential bidders during the war would be Swedish and German’, with a predicted increase in price on the international market after the war.

Sjöqvist obliged, and on the one hand praised the sculpture and was in favour of it reaching Sweden; on the other hand he emphasised that he could not be personally involved in the purchase and export procedures,

---

367 Cf. PM regarding the SIR to Åke Wiberg, June 29, 1942. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B:1. Ugo Jandolo had also contacted Bernard Berenson regarding the provenance of a painting as well as a bust for Berenson’s library. See Jandolo to Berenson, July 7, 1923. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

368 As a point of reference, the exchange rate after the Allied invasion of Italy was set at US$1=120 lire in June 1943, reduced to 100 lire per dollar in July 1943. Exchange rate information for the period of the German occupation of Rome is difficult to obtain. Based on these calculations, Göring’s offer amounted to approximately $2,000, corresponding to the average US annual income ($1,725). Cf. www.thepeoplehistory.com/1940s.html.

due to ‘my sensitive position as institute director here in Rome’.370 The difficulties surrounding the purchase and export of the sculpture in the end lead to the termination of the potential deal.371

Sjöqvist exhibited the goodwill and desire to share the benefits of cultural and political neutrality in terms of intensifying collaboration with Italian scholars who were invited to give lectures at Swedish universities or associations, for example Emilio Bodrero (see below). In exchange Swedish researchers could obtain the desirable visa for a few weeks stay in Italy. One such travel visa was awarded in 1942 (or early 1943) to Krister Hanell, later professor of ancient history and classical archaeology at Lund University as well as secretary of the board of the SIR. The visit of Axel Boëthius to the SIR during the spring of 1943 can also be understood as an example of similar visiting cultural diplomacy, based on the principle of mutually beneficial exchange.372

As wartime director Sjöqvist was intent on maintaining favourable relations with both the host country and the home country. His close

370 Sjöqvist to Wiberg, February 14, 1943. SIR, Billig box 2, Korr. ink. o. utg. 1939-1947: ‘Regarding the export procedure and the potential purchase, as well as investigations regarding the provenance of the artwork, I am sorry to say that I can hardly devote myself to such matters taking into account the sensitive position that I occupy here in Rome [...]’ (Vad själv exportproceduren och det ev. inköpet beträffar likväl som med efterforskningarna om konstverkets proveniens, så är jag ledsen att säga, att jag knappast kan ägna mig däråt med den känsliga ställning som jag som instituts-chef intar här i Rom, men detta ordnar sig nog ändå, om och när Direktör Wiberg beslutar sig för förvärvet).
372 SIR annual report 1942-1943, 10. Cf. correspondence between Sjöqvist and Hanell, SIR, Billig box 2, Korr. ink. o. utg. 1939-1947. Hanell’s arrival in Rome was however delayed; Sjöqvist thus had to read his lecture at the Istituto di Studi Romani. Sjöqvist reported keen interest in Hanell’s visit to Arvid Andrén, but also ‘the Italian scepticism and faith in tradition’ ([…] intresset är nog vaket överallt. Men likaså den italienska skepsisen och traditionstroheten. Ja, Du känner dem båda). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1.
contact with the renowned architect Giò Ponti, at the time editor for the architectural review *Stile* provides one of many examples. When Ponti requested pictures from parks in Stockholm for his review, Sjöqvist wrote to Blom, the city gardener of Stockholm, expressing that he felt that ‘this kind of Swedish cultural propaganda is I believe especially important during the present conditions’. Evidence of such benign ‘cultural propaganda’ is manifold in the archival material, even though it might arguably have been organised by the Swedish legation rather than by the SIR.

Sjöqvist for example wrote to architect Ture Wennerholm in 1943 that ‘although I as an archaeologist and scholar am not involved in Swedish cultural propaganda in general, it is nonetheless a pleasure to answer to the Italians’ rising interest for Swedish culture – in particular architecture and interior design’. Sjöqvist did not hesitate to act as an intermediary in acquiring important publications missing in the scholarly community in Rome via Sweden to benefit Italian scholars. Due to the unique neutral position of the SIR,

---

373 Sjöqvist to Blom, Stockholm city gardener (‘Stadsträdgårdsmästaren’), July 1, 1943. SIR, Billig box 2, Korr. ink. o. utg. 1939-1947: ‘Den form av svensk kulturpropaganda, det här gäller, anser jag särskilt under nuvarande förhållanden ytterst värdefull, och det är därför jag nu vänder mig till Eder med en vördsam förfrågan, om Ni ville tillmötesgå Ponti’s önskemål genom att tillställa mig ett lämpligt urval goda bilder från Stockholms nyare parkanläggningar.’ Giò Ponti was later to design the Italian Cultural Institute in Stockholm (established in 1953, following a bilateral agreement between Sweden and Italy in 1941). The institute building in Stockholm designed by Ponti (and Swedish architect Ture Wennerholm) was inaugurated in 1958.

Sjöqvist was able to utilise the Swedish institute as a medium for his vivacious personal contacts with Italian colleagues.

Stretching the neutrality somewhat, one case of hospitality underpinning the interests of the SIR was that of a potential lecture tour in Sweden of the Italian philosopher Emilio Bodrero. Sjöqvist was given the task to assess whether or not Bodrero (Accademico d'Italia and Senatore a vita), with his connections with the intellectual elite surrounding Mussolini, was ‘reliable’ enough for such an undertaking. Sjöqvist arranged two dinners for Bodrero and his wife, during which he assessed Bodrero to be sound, reporting this back to the board of the SIR (Boëthius). The lecture tour was eventually arranged and was considered a success by the SIR.375

Rome was considered ‘città aperta’ after the war reached Italian soil (in 1943); consideration for the Vatican and for Roman cultural heritage however made the city a seemingly unlikely target for direct attack. This made Rome an attractive destination for refugees from the rest of the country. The SIR was not located in the very centre of the city, nor was it in the vicinity of station areas, railway lines or other military targets. The question of whether or not to completely close the SIR was never seriously discussed; it gradually became clear that the Institute was not

375 For Sjöqvist’s extensive contact network with Italian scholars, cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A; as well as SIR, Billig box 2, Korr. ink. o. utg. 1939-1947. The Bodrero lecture tour warranted a considerable amount of correspondence: Sjöqvist to Boëthius, October 10, 1941; December 18, 1941; May 7, 1942. Boëthius to Sjöqvist October 14, 1941; December 13, 1941; December 25, 1941; January 19, 1942 (a letter as well as a telegram), January 25, 1941; April 27, 1942. Cf. Billig and Billig, “The Billig Manuscript,” 135.
only surviving, but doing unexpectedly well under the auspices of Sjöqvist.376

The situation remained unnerving, however. Sjöqvist informed Gjerstad that he should consider himself glad not to have to see Rome ‘in her abasement and dissolution. [...] Right now a line of tanks is rolling past down in Valle Giulia. There is an even vibration through the building. The tragedy of the “open city”. A persistent passive resistance by a disarmed population against a ruthless enemy’.377

Sjöqvist realised after the end of the SIR archaeological course in May 1943 that teaching the course again the following year would be near impossible; the board of the SIR, however, did not share his view and was planning a course for 1944 (which was ultimately not held). The final collapse of the crumbling Fascist regime occurred on July 25. German forces subsequently occupied Rome from September 8, 1943 to June 4, 1944.378 The remains of the Italian government fled to Bari together with King Vittorio Emmanuele III.

The SIR could receive little help from the Swedish legation, whose chargé d'affaires remained in Rome but found himself in a diplomatic vacuum; Sweden did not recognise the Italian government that established itself at Salò following a German initiative (the Salò

376 Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 120-121 & 130-131. This was not likely present in Sjöqvist’s mind as an outspoken plan, as a way of gaining ‘strategic advantages’ for himself in the day-to-day business of running the operations of the SIR.
377 Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, October 14, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
government had however little or no influence on events in Rome; the executive power in the city was in effect in the hands of the German army).

Sjöqvist acquired the necessary protection for the SIR property from German military and police forces through his connections with the German ambassador to the Holy See, the well-connected Ernst von Weizsäcker, State Secretary in the Auswärtiges Amt (the Foreign Secretary), until 1942.\(^{379}\) Von Weizsäcker formulated letters of protection for the resident scholars at the SIR as well as a notice that was posted on the institute gate, informing that the German Vatican embassy guaranteed the safety of the premises.\(^{380}\) It is quite possible that Sjöqvist used the argument of the protection and preservation of the DAIR library catalogue as a contributing factor in obtaining this privilege.

The war did not in fact pose a truly serious direct threat to the SIR. The new institute building was as good as complete when Italy entered the war. Accommodation was hard to find in Rome during the war years and the SIR had no lack of that. It could thus facilitate its research activities, its director and its grant holders. Sjöqvist wrote to presumptive grant holder Sigurd Walldén (before he was to travel to Italy) in 1940, that

---
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‘Rome – touch wood – still appears to be a city in deepest peace, and the war is mostly seen from the papers from the Roman horizon’.381 This situation was to change with the German occupation of the city 1943-1944 and the Allied liberation of Rome in June 1944. The accommodation possibilities at the SIR were indeed popular, to the point of some SIR students being housed in KNIR director Hoogewerff’s empty student quarters in the neighbouring Dutch Institute in 1943.382 In May 1943, Sjöqvist expressed the essential nature of the continued benignity of ‘the Swedish currency authorities’ to accept the transfer of funds through cheques in Swiss Francs, in order to be able to exchange the real value of the currency, not ‘after locked clearing rates’.383

An important factor regarding the continued activities of the SIR throughout the war was that it remained possible for Swedish citizens to get visas to travel through Germany. The SIR archaeological course was carried out in 1941, 1942 and 1943; and was resumed as soon as possible after the war in 1946.384 Lecture exchanges between Sweden and Italy with individual researchers were organised and the SIR library remained open. Continuity was aimed for at every level.

381 Sjöqvist to Walldén, August 24, 1940. ‘Rom – touch wood – förefaller [alltjämt] som en stad i djupaste fred, och kriget synes från Roms horisont mest i tidningarna. Vårt nya institut är en strålande skapelse både utan och innan och jag hoppas, att det skall stå fullt klart när Ni kommer hit den 1 okt.’.
382 Sjöqvist to Andrén, January 23, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1. Cf. a telegram from Boëthius to Sjöqvist (January 16, 1943), in which Sjöqvist was advised to ‘put two students in every room’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
383 Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, May 4, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
The new building of the SIR was linked with the developments and its persistent ‘survival’ during the war years. Erland Billig would have been well acquainted with this, as he was staying at the SIR during the war on a teaching grant (‘lärarstipendiat’) together with his wife Ragnhild, who held the archaeological grant for three years.\(^{385}\)

Did the belief that the SIR could remain unaffected by the war reflect a ‘business-as-usual’-mentality, or was it an expression of naïve wishful thinking? Swedish university chancellor Östen Undén communicated with Sjöqvist in May 1941 regarding the necessity of reciprocity regarding (Italian-Swedish/Swedish-Italian) exchange grants as the Swedish government had not at that time applied for funding for such grants for the year 1941-1942, due to the war.\(^{386}\) The discussion was based on the presumption that scholars would be able to (and would be prepared to) travel between the two countries despite the hostilities. The exchange grant discussion was rekindled in after the war by the new Italian ambassador (minister) to Sweden, Bellardi Ricci.\(^{387}\)

---

386 Undén to Sjöqvist, May 26, 1941. SIR, Billig box 1. In November 1942, Sjöqvist wrote to Åke Wiberg, general manager of Malmö Strumpfabrik and Member of the Swedish Parliament, regarding ‘Undén’s scepticism’ and Wiberg’s lobbying with cabinet minister Bagge and the Crown Prince regarding additional capital from the government. Sjöqvist to Wiberg, November 28, 1942. SIR, Billig box 2, Korr. ink. o. utg. 1939-1947. Sjöqvist was later (in 1947) part of the judicial council for four competition-based reciprocal grants between Italy and Sweden through IRCE (Istituto Nazionale per le Relazioni Culturali con l’Estero). Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1. See also a fourteen-page memorandum regarding IRCE by Carlo Antoni (its director, cf. chapter 5) to Carlo Sforza, March 29, 1947. ASMAE, Archivio di Gabinetto, 1944-47, box 106, file 49.
387 Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, December 17, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2. In the same letter, Sjöqvist spoke of an article about the SIR that was to be published in the review Sverige-Italien in January 1946. The review was originally founded by Vilhelm Lundström, and published by the svensk-italienska föreningen in collaboration with ‘the Gothenburg section’ of the Istituto di Studi Romani (i.e. Boëthius). It was however only published between 1927 and 1945, and little became of the planned SIR article. The file on Bellardi Ricci (the post-
With the war followed complications in terms of visa applications and residence permits. A visa was required for travel through Germany, which exempted grant holders of Jewish origin. The SIR tried to break this rule once but failed (the person in question was doc. Åke Josephson, the son of the chairman of the Mosaic congregation in Stockholm, Gunnar Josephson). Gjerstad wrote to André from Lund in October 1941 regarding the ‘differentiated mood that currently reigns in the Nordic countries’. Gjerstad elaborated on the same theme a few months later, in discussing André’s travel arrangements from Italy to Sweden: ‘Sweden is in a tight spot regarding the present regime in Norway. It would certainly be preferable if you can acquire a visa through the German Embassy in Rome’. There was furthermore a conflict of interests between the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of the Interior, as the ‘foreign police’ in Rome had to approve of visa applications for a period of longer than 14 days, which they often refused to do.

Donations to the SIR from Consul Axel Jonsson of the Swedish shipping company ‘Amerika Linien’ (Gothenburg), mediated via Rolf Sohlman at the Swedish Foreign Office (UD), Stockholm (1942); as well as discussions regarding Swedish corporate sponsorship (from L.M. Ericsson, ASEA, SKF, Electrolux and Separator) furthermore assisted the

---

389 Gjerstad to André, October 8, 1941. Samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden.  
SIR during the war years, although the financial distress peaked to the extent of being justifiably termed a crisis during the latter half of 1944. SIR treasurer, chamberlain Axel Hallin, quoted correspondence with Sjöqvist at the March 20, 1945 SIR board meeting: ‘if no [financial] additions are made within the next two months, everything available will be spent’ (August 14, 1944); ‘the ship is still afloat, but only just’ (November 14, 1944).

Sjöqvist received much assistance and support from Swedish Consul General Fredrik Adelborg at the courier department of the Swedish foreign office in assisting correspondence and envoys of packages from Sweden during the war. Sjöqvist, in a rare reflection, commented in 1945 on the material setbacks during the war: ‘we found ourselves without gas, electricity, means of transport, toothbrushes, shoelaces; and if the Swedish legation had not organised the sending of necessities from Sweden so adeptly, the approximately 60 members of the Swedish community [left in Rome] would have had to go without food for long periods. Fortunately the institute building had only suffered insignificant damages during the four bombardments of Rome’.

The inflation of commodity prices was unavoidable – this was particularly the case after 1942. The practical

---

391 Cf. Sjöqvist to Axel Jonsson, January 14, 1942; Sjöqvist to Rolf Sohlman, January 17, 1942. SIR, Billig box 1.
392 ‘Ännu flyter skutan, men det är med knapp nöd’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, I:5.
394 Svenska Dagbladet, September 6, 1945.
395 Billig and Billig, “The Billig Manuscript,” 123-125. Cf. also the collection of Per-Gustaf Hamberg’s letters as grant holder at the SIR in 1943-1944 (courtesy of Mrs. Ulla Hamberg).
value of the SIR building with its rent-free accommodation was coupled with its representative function. The SIR maintained this tradition to some extent (on a small scale) during the war years.

As discussed above, receptions following lectures, annual parties, and other recurring public relations activities had been an important component of life and identity at the foreign academies in Rome since their establishment in the late nineteenth century.

AAR director Chester Aldrich raised the issues of (raised) workers’ wages and living costs in Rome (to meet the inflation) with AAR president J.K. Smith in March 1939, having discussed these issues not only with Silvestri, the AAR lawyer, but also ‘with the lawyer of the British School, Sir John Serrao, and with the Swedish and Dutch academies [sic], all of which institutions are on a basis similar to ours, though with somewhat closer connections with their respective governments.’

In the case of the SIR, the increased importance of academic diplomacy and the representative dimension developed as a result of a combination of political and cultural neutrality, Sjöqvist’s charismatic personality and personal ambitions, the resources and protection offered by the building itself. For scholars based in Rome during the war, the SIR library became a place of refuge, a sanctuary, together with the Vatican library.

Sjöqvist was furthermore one of the few foreign scholars in an active official position in Rome during the war. When British (BSR) scholar, archaeologist Eugenie Strong (‘the old “war-horse” of Roman

---

396 Aldrich to J.K. Smith, March 30, 1939. AAR, reel 5758.
397 Boëthus to unidentified recipient, November 12, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1.
archaeology’\(^{398}\) at the BSR since the days of director Thomas Ashby, 1906–1925)\(^{399}\) died in the autumn of 1943, Sjöqvist (her personal friend) was the only representative of the Roman scholarly community present at her funeral, only accompanied by ‘a few nuns’; a ‘gripping end to her long and rich life’.\(^{400}\)

In his narrative of the renaissance of academy activities in Rome in the 1944–1945 SIR annual report, Sjöqvist attempted to make a case for a permanent and timeless ambience of international collaboration in Rome, characteristically downplaying his own personal contribution: ‘During the past year, the international scholarly and cultural collaboration, which has always found an important centre in Rome, has begun to reclaim its forms of old. The Swedish Institute has been able to play a not entirely unimportant role in this beginning return to normal circumstances’\(^{401}\).

The tradition of these ‘normal’ (pre-war) circumstances (receptions, lectures, library exchanges) was to a considerable extent kept afloat at the SIR during the war years. Sjöqvist had, more pragmatically, contributed to saving 40 tonnes worth of Allied military intelligence aerial photographs

---

\(^{398}\) Cf. Chester Aldrich to John Russell Pope, December 30, 1935. AAR, reel 5758.

\(^{399}\) Cf. Wallace-Hadrill, ed., *The British School at Rome. One Hundred Years*.

\(^{400}\) Due to illness, Eugenie Strong was expelled from her hotel in Via Veneto, after which Sjöqvist organised accommodation for her. Strong left Sjöqvist an old steamer trunk with the initials ‘E.S.’; this trunk is now in the care of the Morgantina excavation team on Sicily. Interview with Malcolm Bell, professor, University of Virginia. October 7, 2010. See also for example Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, October 14, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3: ‘Vid hennes [Mrs. Strong’s] begravning den 16 sept. på den fruktansvärt bombhärrade Campo Verano, som av hygieniska skäl ännu måste hållas stängd, var bara ett par nunnor och jag närvarande. Det var ett gripande slut på hennes långa och rika liv’. Cf. Marcello Piermattei to Sjöqvist, October 4, 1943 (regarding funeral expenses); and Eugenie Strong to Sjöqvist, February 23, 1943: ‘Let me take this opportunity to thank you again for all your kindness for the immense help both material and moral which you have been to me’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.

\(^{401}\) SIR annual report 1944–1945, 3.
from destruction after the war, emphasising their potential for archaeological and topographical research. The photographs were to be organised by specially appointed RAF officers; the logistics of workspaces had been prepared at the Swedish Institute, ‘the only institution that could offer this’. The photographic material was closely associated with Ward-Perkins and the BSR.402

The restricted zones off limits to foreigners limited archaeological excursions in Italy. This meant that Campania as well as Etruria were regions inaccessible for the SIR archaeological course, which was confined to Rome and its surroundings as well as to selected parts of Lazio (for example the Villa Adriana at Tivoli). Adding to the problems that Sjöqvist had to face in attempting to organise an improvised and new more limited course syllabus during the war, was the increasing evacuation of important museums in Rome itself due to the perceived war threat; monuments such as the Ara Pacis and the triumphal arches were covered in sandbags as bombshell protection.

SIR annual report 1944-1945, 3. Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, May 6, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2; and Billig, Nylander, and Vian, eds., "Nobile munus”. Origini e primi sviluppi dell'Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia Storia e Storia dell'Arte in Roma (1946-1953). Per la storia della collaborazione internazionale a Roma nelle ricerche umanistiche nel secondo dopoguerra, 9. See also Ward-Perkins to Shaw, July 30, 1945. BSR, box 64: ‘My own suggestion is that the various national Institutes in Rome should combine to house the various regional sections [of the collection of air-photographs], and in fact temporary custody has been in part arranged on that basis. The American Academy has the N. Italian series; the French School has the S. Italian; the rest is at present divided between the Swedish and British Schools [sic] and the Archivo [sic] dello Stato. I would suggest that the British School aim to hold the remaining Central and Southern Italian material (the double merit of being very limited in bulk and of special local interest). Any such scheme will of course have to have the approval of the Air Ministry and of the War Department, and how to approach them diplomatically will require some thought’.
The course participants would work in the SIR library as well as in the German DAIR and Hertziana libraries, both located in close proximity to the SIR (on the opposite side of the Villa Borghese park). Some of the student essays of 1941-1943 were eventually published in the SIR Acta-volumes; ‘business as usual’ was thus maintained to as large an extent as possible.

When Arvid Andrén asked for a salary raise as director of the SIR in 1949, Boëthius agreed with him that the expense account for representation might well be cut back after the war, explaining the ‘temporary [...] social effort’ of the SIR to be a ‘meeting place of the nations’ during the war and Sjöqvist’s directorship. This was made possible by benefiting from currency exchange profits. That ‘social effort’ was in other words both a conscious stance and to be understood as temporary, not as an active part of SIR policy.

Erik Sjöqvist’s research interests in his early years as director of the SIR were primarily focused on late antiquity. Sjöqvist made an attempt to institutionalise the inclusion of the study of late antiquity in a proposed expansion of the SIR research paradigm. A committee was formed which was to investigate the possibilities of the SIR supporting and promoting research in late antiquity and the early middle ages. Sigurd Curman, the

---

403 Bibliotheca Hertziana is located in Palazzo Zuccari, by the Spanish steps, near the Keats-Shelley House.
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director-general of the Swedish national heritage board and SIR board member, was appointed chairman; its secretary was Olof Vessberg, who was working for the Swedish Cyprus Expedition and would become director of the SIR (1953-1955). The committee also featured the much-respected Norwegian scholar H.P. L’Orange. The commission did not achieve much – it is possible that it never even convened. It remains unclear why this Sjöqvist initiative was in effect met with wall of silent treatment.

Sjöqvist had published an investigation of two porphyry sarcophagi in the Sala a croce greca in the Vatican Museums in 1935, together with Alfred Westholm, his colleague in the Swedish Cyprus Expedition. Sjöqvist revived his interests in late antiquity in the winter of 1943-1944, during the German occupation of Rome, when he carried out an archaeological investigation – not technically an excavation – of the ancient walls under the church S. Maria in Via Lata (interpreted as the corner of a group of pre-Hadrianic borrea, or grain depositories).

The investigations substituted plans for a Swedish excavation at Veii, just north of Rome, for which Sjöqvist had unsuccessfully applied for a permit in 1942 (cf. section 3.2, as well as map of excavation sites in the Mediterranean, fig. 19). Sjöqvist had established contacts with the German scholar Erich Schmidt through DAIR director Armin von Gerkan. Schmidt carried out the necessary measurements and

407 Sjöqvist’s connections with DAIR director Armin von Gerkan quite possibly facilitated granting the permission to excavate during the period of German occupation of Rome. It is also likely that Sjöqvist’s good relations with von
drawings, as well as other measurement tasks for the SIR on the Campo Marzio during the spring of 1944. It is unclear if this information (from Billig) also refers to the S. Maria in Via Lata-investigations, as the material has not been retrieved.\textsuperscript{408}

In 1946, Sjöqvist was hoping for a SIR monograph publication of the results; the SIR editors (Nilsson, Gjerstad and Boëthius) instead opted to include it as a part of the fourth volume of the institute review \textit{Opuscula archaeologica} (which among other things meant that it would not be reviewed). It was to be Sjöqvist’s only published Rome-related scholarly work as director of the SIR.\textsuperscript{409}

3.6 ERIK SJÖQVIST, THE SIR AND THE ‘SEGREGATION AFFAIR’ (1943–1944)

The Allied army attempted to break the deadlock at Montecassino by landing troops behind German lines at Anzio in January 1944. The distance from the frontline to Rome was less than 30 kilometers. The Italian currency subsequently collapsed, with an exploitation of the lira on the black market as a result. The winter of 1943-1944 was the unfortunate peak of Gestapo and SS-activities in Rome, with the need for

\footnotesize

Weiszäcker, German ambassador to the Vatican, contributed to securing the permission of investigations in the piazza of the Collegio Romano. Sjöqvist had also been in touch with the scholar Friedrich Müller-Skjold of the (fine arts research institute) \textit{Doerner-Institut}, Munich, in July 1943 regarding expertise assements of frescoes in the context of the S.Maria in Via Lata-investigations. SIR, Billig box 2, \textit{Korr. ink. o. utg. 1939-1947}.

\textsuperscript{408} Billig and Billig, “The Billig Manuscript,” 177-178.

hideouts increasing rapidly. The SIR was spacious and relatively well protected. Sjöqvist realised the risk in hiding individuals, and was reluctant to jeopardise the institute. No Allied officers, Italian partisans or political emissaries were taken in. Sjöqvist did however make an exception on humanitarian grounds, one with a tragic outcome.

FIG. 21. MARIO SEGRE

410 Prof. Malcolm Bell relates Gurli Sjöqvist later describing the presence of refugees in the SIR and a visit by the police, risking having to account for footprints in the snow in the courtyard of the institute, and the Sjöqvists 'holding their breath'. Interview with Malcolm Bell, professor, University of Virginia. October 7, 2010. For assessment of the period of German occupation of Rome, see for example David W. Ellwood, Italy, 1943-1945 (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1985), and Emilio Lussu, La difesa di Roma (Cagliari: Edes, 1987).

The Jewish-Italian epigraphy scholar Mario Segre (1904-1944) had been given the task of editing the numerous Greek inscriptions of the Rhodian archipelago, by the governor of the islands (in 1937). This work was hindered by the laws ‘in difesa della razza'; the situation was worsened further by the advent of the ‘repubblichetta di Salò’. Segre married the Roman Jewish woman Noemi Cingoli in 1941. Segre arrived in Rome from Greece with his wife and son in October 1943. After the first raid of deporting Jews from Rome by the Nazis in October 1943, Segre escaped together with his wife Noemi and their son Marco, and found refuge at the SIR, thanks to ‘the courageous Eric Sjöqvist’ [sic]. Sjöqvist offered Segre to stay at the SIR with his wife and their three-year-old son. The Segre family accepted the offer. As of February 1944 the Segre family started to go for shorter walks in the nearby Villa Borghese park; in March they began venturing out for small errands.

One morning at Easter 1944 (on Maundy Thursday), Segre went without a hint of disguise with his family through the city to pick up some belongings in his old apartment in the Prati region of the city. Segre was recognised and was taken to the nearest police station from which he was handed over to the SS (this involved a financial reward): ‘in April 1944, having left for a short walk in the company of Filippo Magi, vice director of the Vatican Museums, they were captured by two policemen

---

414 For Mario Segre, see for example Ibid. and Berlitzani, “L’opera di Mario Segre. Da Pausania alla passione epigrafica.” Sjöqvist’s almanac (1943) for example records lunch and dinner with Segre on December 20, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:3.
in the service of the Duce in Salò, and were immediately handed over to the *Schutzstaffel*, despite an immediate intervention by the Pontifical Secretary of State, informed by Magi’.\[^{415}\]

Pope Pius XII granted Sjöqvist an audience, but did not personally intervene in the matter. The German ambassador to the Vatican, Ernst von Weizsäcker – who had been of assistance to Sjöqvist on previous occasions – was powerless as the Segre family was already in the hands of the SS. It is likely that von Weizsäcker however did intervene in order to spare the SIR any further unpleasantness as a consequence of the sad Segre affair. The Segre family was deported to the Auschwitz-Birkenau concentration camp, where they all perished in the horrors there in the beginning of May 1944, ‘a tragic and absurd death’.\[^{416}\]

\[^{415}\] Pugliese Carratelli, "Ricordo di Mario Segre (Torino 1904–Auschwitz 1944)." 1. Cf. the interview with Sjöqvist in *Svenska Dagbladet*, September 6, 1945. The deportation to Auschwitz was confirmed soon after the war by Axel Gauffin, director of the Swedish national museum, among others. See Gauffin, "Ett besök i Svenska Institutet i Rom maj 1946," 407-409. John Rohnström, 1st librarian at the Royal Library, Stockholm, was a grant holder at the SIR at the time, and accompanied Sjöqvist as his ‘secretary’ during a visit to the police station where the Segre family was imprisoned. KB, Stockholm, Acc. 1997/37, 12-13: ‘Sjöqvist och jag gick till kommissariatet i gryningen med alla de kläder de rimligen kunde behöva, om nu det värsta skulle inträffa. Och mer kunde vi inte göra, dystert nog. Kommissarien hade ansvaret för dem till tyskarna kom. Jag minns, att Sjöqvist sade till honom: Ni håller väl åtminstone ögonen på den där figuren som förrådde dem?. Och han svarade: Ni kan vara alldeles lugn – han skall inte komma undan! Och sedan vet vi inte mer än att de kom till Auschwitz, ganska snart. Och resten är tystnad’. Rohnström later compiled Sjöqvist’s legacy of academic publications, in John Rohnström, "The published writings of Erik Sjöqvist," *Opuscula Romana: annual of the Swedish Institute in Rome* 9 (1973). The details regarding the discovery and capture of the Segre family differ slightly in different accounts. In an assessment of Erik Sjöqvist for the centenary of his birth in 2003 by SIR director Barbro Santillo Frizell, the Segre family had ‘[...] left the institute for their home in order to pick up a sack of potatoes that they had left there, and were recognised and reported on the street outside their home’. Barbro Santillo Frizell, *Gösta Säfjord och Erik Sjöqvist – födda 1903*, lecture at the SIR, June 11, 2003. SIR annual report 2003, 58.

Regarding Segre’s scholarly legacy, Francesca Berlinzani relates that ‘fortunately, the precious inheritance of manuscripts in progress was retrieved by Doro Levi in a suitcase at the Swedish School [sic].’\textsuperscript{417} Segre’s manuscripts were given to Giovanni Pugliese Carratelli, who took on the task of ensuring their publication. Segre’s \textit{Iscrizioni di Cos}, the first of two volumes, was published in 1993, after his files had been discovered at the SIR.\textsuperscript{418} Pugliese Carratelli poetically associated Mario Segre with ‘la fede antica nell’eternità dello spirito’.\textsuperscript{419}

Segre’s family were however not the only Jewish refugees at the SIR (though they were the only ones to have entered the official narrative). Swedish philologist and diplomat Sture Linnér (1917-2010) recalled an incident one night in the kitchen of the Sjöqvist’s private residence (in one wing of the SIR, to which Linnér had been given a key by Gurli Sjöqvist due to the food shortage in the city). Upon entering the kitchen, Linnér encountered ‘at least six or seven terrified people’.

He apologised for the intrusion, left immediately and confronted Sjöqvist about the incident the following day. Sjöqvist had told Linnér not to worry about it, and confirmed that the people he had seen in the kitchen were Jewish refugees. Sjöqvist had however not informed any of

\textsuperscript{417} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{419} Pugliese Carratelli, "Ricordo di Mario Segre (Torino 1904-Auschwitz 1944)," 2.
the grant holders and staff of the SIR about the situation, as he did not want to compromise their safety.\textsuperscript{420} No other refugees apart from the Segre family at the SIR have previously been acknowledged.

In October 1945, the Italian Ministry of Public Instruction received a report of activities at the SIR during the war from the Italian legation in Stockholm transmitted via the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, based on a translation of an interview with Sjöqvist during his return to Sweden for a SIR board meeting in the summer of 1945. The piece featured in the Swedish newspaper \textit{Svenska Dagbladet} (September 6, 1945); the Italian translated summary was entitled ‘The cultural relations between Italy and Sweden’, and followed an article by the recently appointed Italian minister in Stockholm, Bellardi Ricci, regarding the intentions of educational exchanges between Italy and Sweden published in the same newspaper on September 5.\textsuperscript{421}

In this rare reflection on the war years, Sjöqvist declared that the SIR ‘had been able to work almost undisturbed until June 1943, [when] the

\textsuperscript{420} Sture Linnér was grant holder in philology at the SIR in 1941-1942. Linnér spent some time at the SIR in 1942-1943, before transferring to Munich to assist the German \textit{White Rose} resistance movement (after having discussed the matter with Boëthius). Cf. Sture Linnér, \textit{Ingen människa är en ö} (Stockholm: Norstedts, 2007). See also SIR annual report 1941-1942, 1. Linnér worked as a Red Cross delegate in Greece in 1943-1945. His confrontation with the Jewish refugees most likely took place in the autumn of 1943. Interview with Sture Linnér, Stockholm, April 2009. I pressed Linnér for further details, but to no avail. Sjöqvist did not relate the fate of any other refugees in his interview in \textit{Svenska Dagbladet}, September 6, 1945.

\textsuperscript{421} When Sjöqvist spoke of ‘the Swedish institute’ in this context, he to a large extent spoke of himself. The article was reported as a telegram (‘telespresso’) from the Ministero degli Affari Esteri (Servizio Aff.Gen. Ufficio 1) to the Ministero Pubblica Istruzione, Belle Arti, October 1945 (‘Oggetto: Dichiarazione alla stampa del Dott. Erik Sjöqvist Capo dell’Istituto Archeologico svedese di Roma. Per opportuna conoscenza si ha il pregio di trasmettere di uno stralcio della rassegna stampa svedese dalla R. Legazione d’Italia e Stoccolma, concernente un’intervista concessa dal Dott. Erik Sjöqvist, capo dall’Istituto Archeologico svedese di Roma’). ACS, Min.Pubbl.Instr. Dir.Gen. AA.BB.AA. box 178, file 3204.
major part of the Swedes left Rome and I alone remained with my wife and two assistants.’ Sjöqvist was referring here to the Billig couple. The article in Svenska Dagbladet (the title of which was ‘Jewish professor hidden in the fan of the Swedish Institute’) confirmed the fate of the Segre family: ‘After September 1943 we [Swedes] were faced with the consequences of the process of the dissolution of a regime. […] We were able to host Swedes evacuated from the North of Italy, as well as poor refugees persecuted by the Gestapo. We had thus hidden Mario Segre, Professor of Greek at the University of Milan, until the Professor one day went for a walk with his family, was taken by the Gestapo and we knew no more about it.’

For Sture Linnér, both Sjöqvist and Boëthius exemplified a degree of moral courage – in Sjöqvist’s case in terms of the risk, courage and integrity in hiding Jewish scholars at the SIR. In Carl Nylander’s obituary of DN Rome correspondent Agne Hamrin, Nylander related Hamrin’s account of the war years at the ‘sanctuary’ of the SIR in his memoirs: ‘Erik and Gurli Sjöqvist elevated the activities [of the SIR] from mere humanistic scientificity to true and profound humanism and offered refuge to several persecuted individual with threats to their lives […], and contributed to compassion and international understanding in an evil time. This was and remained the “finest hour” of the Swedish Institute’.

---

423 Interview with Sture Linnér, Stockholm, April 2009.
Sjöqvist used the term ‘moral courage’ (‘civilkurage’) himself in commenting on DAIR director Armin von Gerkan’s ‘protection’ of ‘non-Aryans’ during the war (the actual meaning of this remains unclear), as well as regarding von Gerkan’s attempt to ‘sabotage the transfer of the [DAIR] library’. It was the same kind of ‘moral courage’ with which Sjöqvist described von Gerkan that Sjöqvist himself displayed during the final two years of the war.


426 Another expression of such ‘moral courage’ on Sjöqvist’s part was his protection of the DAIR library as a neutral representative, when the (American) Allied army allegedly briefly entertained plans to evacuate the DAIR and to transport it to the United States. DAIR associate Ernst Homann-Wedeking (1908–2002) had asked Sjöqvist if he could step in and protect the institution. There is no other evidence for such (American) evacuation plans, and it is unclear when this would have taken place; presumably in conjunction with the liberation of Rome in June 1944 – although the library had then already been evacuated to German territory. The incident is related by professor William Childs, who heard it from Sjöqvist in the autumn of 1968: ‘Sjöqvist may have embroidered it and I probably recall it erroneously’. Interview with William Childs, professor, Princeton University. Nicosia, Cyprus, July 3, 2010.
3.7 The Director in Relation to the Board of the SIR

The director of the SIR was not a member of the board and did not take part in its meetings – the secretary officially conducted communication between the two parties. The only time that the presence of the director was requested in Stockholm during the years 1926-1948 was for the first board meeting after the end of the war, on September 29, 1945. The Crown Prince then officially expressed gratitude to Sjöqvist on behalf of the board for his efforts for the upkeep and continued activity of the institute during the war years.

At the same time the Crown Prince did not try to conceal his scepticism of Sjöqvist’s use of the position of the SIR in relation to the establishment of AIAC. The Crown Prince felt that the attention of AIAC should be placed on the local cooperation between the academies of Rome and their libraries – which was in effect the function of the Unione, which in this sense had evolved out of discontent with the broad sweep of the scope of the planned ‘international’ activities of AIAC (cf. chapter 6). The attitude of the board of the SIR was one of scepticism regarding factual matters of international collaboration after the Second World War.

The role and influential position of the secretary of the board was considerable during the early decades of the SIR (Martin P. Nilsson, succeeded by Axel Boëthius). If the secretary felt it necessary he might seek the opinion of the Crown Prince regarding a specific decision,

---

437 SIR board meeting minutes, September 29, 1945, §11. Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5, and RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, I:5.
sometime also of the treasurer (Axel Hallin); if not, some decisions would in effect be made by the secretary alone. After Östen Undén had become a board member as university chancellor (1937-1951), the secretary would increasingly run planned decisions by him as well. The connection with Undén furthermore entailed a direct connection with the government and Swedish foreign policy. The decision-making process at the SIR during its early years was in effect a balance act carried out by the director and the secretary of the board. All communication took place in writing; there were still no telephone connections between Sweden and Italy.

The financial perspective regularly came into play in SIR board decisions; the board was cautious to enter into obligations that it could not afford to cover financially – this partly explains the reluctance to support participation with AIAC and the Unione, but does not go very far in explaining the often instructing and somewhat parental tone of the board vis-à-vis Sjöqvist. Sjöqvist was young, not yet a professor, he had been Boëthius’ student and Gjerstad’s younger colleague, as discussed above. The paternal stance towards Sjöqvist was thus at least in part linked with issues of hierarchy and age. Sjöqvist was – probably without consciously meaning to do so, forced to make decisions on a day-to-day basis in Rome during the war, with poor possibilities of communication with Sweden – subverting the inherent conservatism of the young institution by carrying out his international tasks, and by making day-to-day decisions in order to keep the SIR afloat during the war years. Sjöqvist was thus the board’s ‘man in Rome’, but only as long as he served

its interests and purposes. He was at the same time from many perspectives regarded by the Crown Prince, Boëthius and Gjerstad as their personal envoy when it suited their interests to do so.

Sjöqvist’s annual reports were primarily intended for the board of the SIR, and it is to be expected that he was interested in presenting his actions as benignly as possible. At the same time he might have expanded this theme extensively, for example judging by the multitude of tasks and assignments he carried out in the scholarly world in Rome at the time.\textsuperscript{430}

3.8 ASSESSING THE ACADEMIC DIPLOMACY OF ERIK SJÖQVIST

Sjöqvist acted as a discreet and judicious counselor to colleagues with pressing exigencies during the war, and in this way established a generous amount of trust that would serve him well during the remainder of his directorship.\textsuperscript{431} The board in Sweden was often unaware of events that took place at the SIR during the war. The members of board for example did not officially react to events following the German occupation of Rome.

Sjöqvist’s reports from the SIR during the first years of the war had admittedly conveyed the mantra of ‘business as usual’; this was however

\textsuperscript{430} Cf. SIR annual reports 1943-1944 and 1944-1945.
\textsuperscript{431} Sjöqvist for example assisted Scarlat Lambrino, the director of the Roumanian Academy (and his future companion in the board of the Unione), as he was preparing to leave his position. Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 140-141. He also acted as ‘middle man’ with requests for colleagues such as Hoogewerff, the director of the Dutch Institute, ‘as it for obvious reasons is impossible for a Dutchman resident in Italy to have correspondence with foreign countries under the present circumstances’. Sjöqvist to Eva Bergman, Hallwylska museet, Stockholm, September 16, 1941. SIR, Billig box 1.
the preferred perspective of the board throughout, even when it could no longer be said to apply in Rome. The board announced the scholarships for the archaeological course for the spring of 1944 as per usual, and potential candidates were discussed and selected.\textsuperscript{432} At the same time, the likely place for an Allied maritime invasion was discussed in Rome (which materialised as \textit{Operation Pebbles} on January 22, 1944).

Internal communications among members of the SIR were scant during 1943-1944. Sjöqvist kept secretary Boëthius informed through several letters during the second half of 1943. The information was passed on to the Crown Prince, but was seldom disseminated further. Boëthius and the Crown Prince wrote instructions to Sjöqvist to the effect of keeping the institute open, and acting depending on the demands of specific situations, as censorship would not allow detailed instructions.\textsuperscript{433}

In his 1943-1944 annual report to the board, Sjöqvist was anxious to purge the SIR from any potential suspicions of malign collaboration: ‘During the German occupation and the coinciding neo-fascist regime the institute had no official connections with the authorities. However [...] the German ambassador to the Holy See, Baron von Weiszäcker, who to a large extent acknowledged the difficulties that might face the institute and who appreciated the efforts the director had made to protect the libraries of the German scientific institutions during the period July 25-September 10, kindly issued necessary recommendations directed at the German civilian and military authorities. Thanks to these the employees of the institute were saved from German and neo-fascist labour service,

\textsuperscript{432} SIR board meeting minutes, December 5, 1943, §2.
\textsuperscript{433} Boëthius to Sjöqvist, October 17, 1943. See Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 142.
and at one critical moment the men of a German armoured patrol were prevented from pursuing a planned house search.\textsuperscript{434} The exact reason for the planned house search is unclear.

The 1943-1944 annual report did however comment on the contemporary library situation at the foreign academies in Rome: ‘The German institute libraries, whose role as research centrals is well known, were closed already in September [1943] and were eventually transported to Germany’. Sjöqvist implied the increasing importance of the SIR library by reporting that ‘the confusion within the Italian administration has made the Italian libraries [in Rome] more or less inaccessible’.

In discussing the context of ‘cultural collaboration’, Sjöqvist remarked that ‘the favourable position of the Swedish Institute in the fraternity of foreign scholarly institutions in Rome has been well maintained during the year [1943-1944]. A strong contributing factor to these favourable relations has been the reverence and respect that Sweden’s general politics and position during the world war has enjoyed from the most diverse camps. Thanks to its neutrality, the Swedish institute has become the most natural platform, on which scholars from different nations have been able to meet, and where informal but valuable contacts have been able to be established to the benefit of common scholarly interests. This tendency has developed in an especially striking way after the liberation of Rome, when it has been a great satisfaction to mediate the

\textsuperscript{434} SIR annual report 1943-1944, 1-2. Sjöqvist conspicuously did not mention the one concrete action that can be concretely verified, the moving of the DAIR library catalogues to the SIR, an omission also observed by Billig. Cf. Ibid., 200. For the planned house search by the Gestapo, see also the interview with Sjöqvist in Svenska Dagbladet, September 6, 1945.
reestablishment of the contacts between British, American and French archaeologists on the one hand and our Italian colleagues on the other’. 435

The SIR board could in other words not claim that it was unaware of Sjöqvist’s understanding of the advantages of Swedish neutrality. This was not necessarily the case either, even though the issue was seldom, if ever, discussed. Sjöqvist was at the same time characteristically downplaying his own agency. In the 1943-1944 SIR annual report, Sjöqvist interestingly also formulated the relative benefit of the disappearance of the DAIR from the SIR perspective: ‘In connection with the German archaeological institute together with its invaluable library leaving Rome, the potential value of our library increased as the most complete and easily accessible archaeological reference library in Rome. From this followed a strongly increased foreign frequency, which to a large extent has contributed to strengthen the ties between the Swedish institute and the international scholarly world’. 436

Sjöqvist was in other words clear about this in part being a potentially positive development, at least from a Swedish perspective. At the same time, he had attempted to synchronise the library catalogues of the ‘local’ foreign academies in Valle Giulia with the aim of compensating for the loss of the departed DAIR library with the combined resources of the SIR and the Dutch institute, together with the Belgian and Roumanian


436 SIR annual report 1943-1944, 3.
academies. Sjöqvist was hoping that the BSR as well as the library of the Etruscan museum in Villa Giulia were to connect with this local library network at a later date. The library of the Villa Giulia museum joined the common catalogue in 1945. The SIR had intervened through of a special board decision to assist the funding of Sjöqvist’s common library catalogue project when the Roumanian Academy regretfully was unable to contribute as planned. In his report, Sjöqvist at the same time did not mention the SIR adhesion to the Roumanian initiative of a common night-watch collaboration contract with the Roman *Istituto Vigilanza Privata dell'Urbe* regarding the ‘four foreign institutes in Valle Giulia’.  

In the *Svenska Dagbladet* article in September 1945, Sjöqvist accounted for his part in negotiations for cultural exchanges with Italy: ‘Regarding the future cultural exchanges between Italy and Sweden I have negotiated with representatives of the Italian state institute for foreign relations, connected with the foreign ministry, and I have been able to establish that on the part of the Italians [referring in part to the interview with Italian minister Bellardi Ricci, published the day before] one is preparing to put two study grants at Swedish disposal as soon as possible. Regarding the

---

437 SIR annual report 1944-1945, 2. Roumanian director Scarlat Lambrino was however in favour of the project. Cf. Scarlat Lambrino to Sjöqvist, May 12, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4. See also Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, March 14, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.  
Swedish Institute I estimate to retrieve our usual six scholarship holders in the beginning of next year [1946]. We now have a lot to do. Our library has an increased international importance after the transfer to Germany of the German Institute in Rome [sic], which possessed the richest library in the entire archaeological world. Following a Swedish initiative, a catalogue has been made of all the archaeological libraries in Rome [the catalogue of the Valle Giulia libraries].

Sjöqvist however did not mention his own part in this ‘Swedish initiative’, a noteworthy omission, as this interview was suitably timed to serve the double motive of promoting himself as a library man in Sweden as well as functioning as PR for the newfound position of the SIR among the foreign academies in Rome, partly intended for the board of the SIR. Sjöqvist concluded that ‘another of our desires [referring to the SIR] would be that our institute might enjoy anew the [financial] allotments from before the war. It is important not to miss the good occasion that is presented in Italy right at this moment when the scholarly collaboration in Rome has begun its recovery’. It would be fair to say, however, that this occasion for opportunism was in many ways missed by the SIR.

Italian academia and scholarly networks were on the whole characterised by continuity than change in relation to the recent pre-war Fascist past. Many of the Italian actors in Sjöqvist’s network had been in close contact with both Boëthius and Gjerstad during their directorships in Rome. Sjöqvist for example acted as middleman for library exchanges of Italian publications through his contacts with archaeologist Giuseppe Lugli at the

Sjöqvist’s correspondence with Amedeo Mauri (Director of the National Museum, Napoli) in the spring of 1947 offers examples of highly courteous ‘academic diplomacy’. Sjöqvist wrote to Mauri regarding the coming SIR archaeological excursion to Pompeii and ‘your reign in Campania’ (‘il Suo regno nella Campania Felix’).

As an illustration of Sjöqvist’s manifold tasks during the war years in Rome, he reported to the board of the SIR in 1944 that he had during the past academic year been – and the list is quoted here in the order given by Sjöqvist himself – (1) a member of the board of the Scandinavian Society for Artists and Scholars in Rome (Skandinaviska Föreningen för Konstnärer och Vetenskapidkare i Rom – established in 1860), (2) vice chairman of the advisory committee for Swedish-Italian cultural issues (rådgivande kommittén för svensk-italienska kulturfrågor), (3) chairman of what he called the ‘book-committee’ (bokkommittén – its meaning is unclear), (4) guardian (‘troman’) of the DAIR (Sjöqvist was here referring to the guardianship of the DAIR library catalogue) and for the Kaiser Wilhelms Institut für Kunstwissenschaft (more accurately the Kaiser Wilhelm-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften, from 1948 the Max Plank-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften) in this context that is to say for the Biblioteca Hertziana (from September 5, 1943 June 5, 1944, when these posts where taken over by the Swiss legation and the Allied military government), (5) chairman of the parish council of the Evangelical Church, (6) executive

RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.


It is unclear what this guardianship entailed. German forces occupied Rome at the time. What would this task have meant in practice, and who commissioned it?
board member of the Association to the Memory of Keats and Shelley (also in 1942-1943 – see below),\footnote{Sjöqvist’s almanac (1944) for example records a meeting with the Keats and Shelley committee April 9, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:3.} (7) chairman of the cooperation committee (samarbetskommittén) for the scientific libraries of Valle Giulia, (8) member of the mixed commission for the investigation of the reasons for the burning of the Nemi-ships as well as (9) chairman of ‘the provisional committee for the preparation of an international archaeological institute in Rome’.

Sjöqvist was, then, not only the board’s ‘man in Rome’, but – at least during 1943-1945 – a ‘defender of the faith’ for a number of interest groups. Several things about this list are noteworthy: it is striking, and symptomatic, that the mention of his work with the provisional committee of what was to become AIAC was mentioned last – Sjöqvist knew it would be a sore point for the board in general and for the Crown Prince in particular, and he chose not emphasise it – it is also interesting to note that Sjöqvist mentioned his engagements in the Evangelical Church in the same breath as his guardianship of the DAIR and the Hertziana, as well as his work for the protection of the Keats-Shelley House.

That the list should begin with Sjöqvist’s membership of the board of the Scandinavian Society (a commendable institution, but not perhaps of an equal importance in the Roman scholarly context as for example the DAIR), should probably also be seen in the light of Sjöqvist emphasising modesty in communicating with the board.

\footnote{SIR annual report 1943-1944, 1.
Sjöqvist’s impressive list of ‘extracurricular activity’ should arguably have been the cause of delight for the board of the SIR. If this was the case, it was not outwardly portrayed, no sign of any real such recognition was shown. On the contrary Sjöqvist was made to understand that he was crossing the line, venturing out of the confined freedom offered by Swedish neutrality. Sjöqvist was in this way not only ‘thinking outside the box’; he was in fact literally stepping outside it. The predominance of German institutions on Sjöqvist’s list – a sensitive issue in 1944 – may also have contributed to the general unease of the board. The framework of the board on the whole remained that of national prestige rather than that of international collaboration. It was above all characterized by the careful stance advocated by the Crown Prince.

One of Sjöqvist’s entrusted guardianships was that of organising the care of the Keats and Shelley Memorial House in Rome. The house (at the foot of the Spanish steps on Piazza di Spagna) was run by a private British foundation. After several Italian museums and collections in Rome had been evacuated to the surrounding countryside in 1942, the Keats and Shelley material (mainly books) was transferred to the monastery at Montecassino, where it was believed to be safe (which two years later proved not to be the case, with the bombing of the monastery in the wake of the German retreat northwards). Sjöqvist arranged the transfer, probably through contacts with the Vatican.445

Before the destruction of the monastery during the 1944 frontline attacks, the monks at Montecassino managed to evacuate their library to the Vatican, including the Keats and Shelley material. Bartolomeo Nogara (director of the Vatican Museums) analogously negotiated with Field Marshal Kesselring regarding objects of art and pieces to be returned from its temporary storage at Montecassino to the Vatican.

The Union Jack was hoisted at the BSR when Rome was liberated in June 1944. The Keats-Shelley library reopened shortly after the liberation of Rome. In writing about the planned ‘leave course’ for army personnel at the BSR in 1945, director Ralegh Radford used the perceived ‘monopoly’ of the Keats-Shelley library from the perspective of the BSR as an argument for reopening the BSR library ‘[...] and to allow its use, both by scholars normally resident in Rome, and by those officers of our own army who are here on duty or on leave, and desire to learn something more about Rome than can be gained from the casual guide. In this connection the Keats-Shelley library, which has been open almost since the liberation of Rome has been receiving more visitors than in normal years, and in fact financial disaster to this memorial has only been staved off by the entrance fees collected from visitors, almost entirely from visitors belonging to the British and American armies. I mention this fact to show that there is a genuine need for British libraries of this sort in Rome, and this need is likely to grow after the armistice as it is hoped to allow to a greater proportion of our forces some opportunity for visiting

the art centres of Italy’. Seen in conjunction with the AAR leave courses, this indicates a lack of Allied coordination, and a reinforcement of institutional status, prestige, and mild ‘competition’ for interested army personnel and scholars resident in Rome.

Sjöqvist in fact received an OBE (Order of the British Empire) after the war (on April 3, 1948). This is not widely known, and if so, it is then presumed that Sjöqvist received the OBE for his work with the return of the German libraries in the context of AIAC and the Unione (cf. chapter 5). Sjöqvist in fact received the OBE for the maintenance of the Keats and Shelley House and its library during the final stages of the war.

Sjöqvist was presented with the OBE (‘Honorary Officer, Civil Division’) at the British Embassy in Rome on June 10, 1948. Sir George Leveson Gower, KBE (Chairman of the Keats Shelley Memorial Association) thanked Sjöqvist ‘for the admirable skill and presence of mind with which you, together with two other gentlemen, have succeeded in preserving the objects of interest in the Keats House at Rome. Leveson Gower asserted ‘our deep gratitude, as well as that of all English speaking people and indeed of all lovers of culture and of poetry for your spirited and disinterested action’.

Correspondence between British Ambassador Sir Victor Mallet and Sjöqvist indicates that Sjöqvist had not been informed about the OBE

---

448 Radford to Shaw, April (?), 1945. BSR, box 63.
449 Cf. interview with Ross Holloway, professor emeritus, Brown University, USA, December 2008. Holloway was Sjöqvist’s student at Princeton University, and recalls seeing Sjöqvist’s OBE while looking after the Sjöqvist’s house in Princeton.
before Sir Victor read about it in ‘a Stockholm paper’. Sjöqvist was delighted: ‘My joy and gratitude are mixed with a clear feeling of “Domine, non sum dignus”. My very humble membership of the Keats-Shelley Committee during the years of the war gave me only pleasure, and I am only too glad that I got the chance to assist in saving the beautiful Memorial Library from possible war risks’.45f

45f Sjöqvist to Sir Victor Mallet (British Ambassador to Italy), April 11, 1948. Cf. Sir Victor Mallet to Sjöqvist, April 3, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:4. Sjöqvist described the ceremony to Boëthius: ‘I received an OBE from Sir Victor Mallet on the King’s Birthday a while ago, accompanied by a Carabinieri orchestra and whisky and soda. It was grand and gripping!’ Sjöqvist to Boëthius, June 23, 1948.
Capta est urbs quae totum cepit orbem\footnote{‘Captured is the city which once held the whole world captive.’ St. Jerome (regarding the sack of Rome by Goths in 410), quoted in Duffy, Saints and Sinners. A History of the Popes, 46-47.}

4.1 THE EVACUATION OF THE GERMAN LIBRARIES (1943–1944)\footnote{The ‘German libraries’ referred to the libraries of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome (the DAIR), the German Historical Institute in Rome (DHI), the Bibliotheca Hertziana (also located in Rome), as well as of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence.}

This chapter analyses the implications of the issue of the removal from Rome of the four so-called ‘German libraries’ at the end of the Second World War (see this section; the German libraries will be discussed in relation to post-Second World War cultural property restoration policies in section 6.1). Sections 4.2–4.5 are devoted to the Allied liberation of Rome and the reawakening of the academies of Rome from the perspective of Erik Sjöqvist and the SIR, followed by an investigation into collaborative enterprises (such as the collegium and AIAC) in sections 4.6–4.7. The chapter ends with a discussion of the role of the Vatican in relation to the foreign academies in Rome during and after the Second World War.

Both Great Britain and France declared war on Italy on June 10, 1940, which led to the immediate closing of the BSR and the EFR. The AAR
had closed at the outbreak of war. At the outbreak of war, German forces occupied the Netherlands, Belgium and Poland; their respective academies in Rome were struggling and were in effect also closed for the duration of the hostilities. The German institutes in Rome remained open until early 1944 (see section 4.1).

Alan Cassels emphasises that ‘after Fascist Italy’s entry into the Second World War on 10 June 1940, Italian policy came to be decided more than ever in Berlin rather than Rome’. After the war, the AAR retrospectively declared that ‘when Italy declared war on the United States on 11 December 1941, [...] the property of the Academy was placed under the protection of the Swiss Legation. From that time until the liberation of Rome the Academy was subjected to threats of sequestration by the Italian government and occupation by the Germans. Thanks, however, to the prompt action of the Swiss Legation, to the interest in the Academy of the Hon. Myron C. Taylor, the personal Representative of the President of the United States to the Vatican and a Trustee of the Academy, and to the efforts of the staff, the Academy properties were kept in as good condition as possible and remained untouched by the belligerents’.

Before the war, Myron C. Taylor (also associated with the United States Steel Corporation), had commissioned an unofficial report on the BSR, EFR and AAR by his friend, artist Frank Salisbury (in 1934). In the report, which was imbued with ‘academy rivalry’, Taylor had for example

454 Interview with Dutch Institute in Rome (KNIR) historian Hans De Valk, March 26, 2009.
456 AAR report 1943-1951, 5.
learned that the BSR was ‘dying of dry rot’. The Swiss Legation functioned as a parallel ‘neutral foreign power’ to the SIR in Rome during the Second World War; the Swiss Institute in Rome was however not established until 1948–1949 (cf. chapter 3).

The brief German hegemony in Rome seemed doomed to be short-lived; the Allied forces at Montecassino were only months away from reaching the city. The DAIR was in two minds regarding what was to be done. As a powerful German authority in Rome it advocated the library remaining open as long as possible – i.e. as long as German forces controlled Rome. This stance was notably shared by DAIR director Armin von Gerkan and librarian Jan Crous.

The authorities in Berlin (the Auswärtiges Amt) initially argued against this policy, as it would unquestionably lead to a surrender of German citizens and property, but eventually succumbed – partly due to support by the Vatican. What this support entailed or was worth in practical terms other than its potential symbolic value is debatable; this is one of the issues that will be discussed in this chapter. An illuminating source not used by Billig can be found in the ‘Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’, written by Sjöqvist sometime between

457 Myron C. Taylor (‘Villa Schifanoia, 115 Via Boccaccio, Florence’) to John Russell Pope, June 29, 1934: ‘I now quote in confidence from a letter just received from Mr. Salisbury: “My visits to the three schools at Rome were very disappointing. I think they are all in a very bad way. The British School is in the worst plight. […] All I can say that the wrong students are being sent, and that it is a great mistake to send female students […]’. See also Taylor to Pope, n.d. (1934). AAR, reel 5758.
June 1944 and May 1945 (possibly October 25, 1944 – cf. footnote – quoted in full in appendix 1).\textsuperscript{458}  

When the Second World War broke out in September 1939, the German Historical Institute (DHI) had recently merged with the Austrian Historical Institute as a result of the German Anschluss in 1938.\textsuperscript{459} The ‘DHI library’ in 1945 thus in effect consisted of both the DHI and the Austrian libraries. According to Ernest De Wald (of the subcommission –

\textsuperscript{458} Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1). For previous contributions to assessments of the evacuation of the German libraries, cf. Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli," 222. See also Billig, Nylander, and Vian, eds., "Nobile manus. Origini e primi sviluppi dell’Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma (1946-1953). Per la storia della collaborazione internazionale a Roma nelle ricerche umanistiche nel secondo dopoguerra, 4. and Kurt Bittel, ed., Beiträge zur Geschichte des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 1929 bis 1979, vol. 1 (Mainz: 1972). Arnold Esch refers to a ‘confidential report’ by Sjöqvist, mentioned by Morey in a memorandum to the US ambassador in Rome, May 3, 1945 (from the US Office of War Information); as well as a separate memorandum by Sjöqvist, possibly dated October 25, 1944 (mentioned in a list of ‘relevant writings’ from September 20, 1945). It is possible that the pro-memoria in appendix 1 and this hitherto elusive 1944 memorandum are one and the same. Esch quotes Morey’s 1945 memorandum: ‘One reason why Director Sjöqvist’s report is confidential is the possibility that the Germans might destroy the libraries if it became known that the people here are taking an interest in them!’. Cf. Arnold Esch, "Die deutschen Institutsbibliotheken nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs und die Rolle der Unione degli Istituti: Internationalisierung, Italianisierung – oder Rückgabe an Deutschland?" in Deutsche Forschung- und Kulturinstitute in Rom in der Nachkriegszeit, ed. Michael Matheus (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2007), 75. 

\textsuperscript{459} Cf. ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’, appendix 9: ‘The German Historical Institute was constituted in 1938 by the amalgamation of the long-established Prussian Historical Institute [1888] with the Austrian Historical Institute, which had been re-founded in 1930 and transferred in 1937 to a new building in the Valle Giulia’. The Austrian library consisted of 6000 volumes and the Prussian library of 39000 volumes (‘Duplicates, it is understood, were sold off’). The Croce agreement of 1920 was spoken of as ‘a subsidiary agreement of the Versailles Treaty, which regulated the re-establishment of Italo-German cultural relations after the war. A clause of this agreement bound the library in perpetuity to Italian territory’. But did it really? Did the agreement not formally apply only to the DAIR library? ‘The amalgamated German Institute figures in the Nazi-Fascist Concordat of 1938, whereby the German Government declared its solemn intention that these libraries should never leave Rome’.  
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see section 4.3), Sjöqvist was the only scholar in Rome who was aware of this situation (in November 1945). In March 1939, AAR director Chester Aldrich reported that

I represented the Academy last week at the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the German Historical Institute here and its installation in the building in the Valle Giulia which had just been completed for the Austrian Academy at the moment of the Anschluss last year.

Sjöqvist wrote a promemoria regarding the Austrian historical library in December 1945, in which he related that the ‘Austrian Institute ceased to exist’ after the German takeover: ‘Dr. Gottfried Lang, ‘the last Austrian member of the Institute […] remaining in the Institute and being accepted as a member of the German Historical Institute without taking the Nazi ticket, tried to prolong the process of amalgamation of the two libraries’. The re-cataloguing and incorporation was ‘not yet finished when all the books were taken to Germany at the beginning of 1944. At that occasion, Dr. Lang remained in Rome and succeeded in saving the original catalogue of the Austrian library, a catalogue which is still in his hands here in Rome’.


461 Aldrich continued: ‘Near this building [the Austrian Institute] are the two new buildings being put up just now for the Belgian and Swedish Academies. The architect of the latter, Mr. Tengbom was with us last year and is coming again this spring. Mr. Ostberg [sic], the Architect of the Stockholm Town Hall has also promised to come and visit us at the Villa Aurelia next month’. Aldrich to Smith, March 30, 1939. AAR, reel 5758.

462 ‘Memorandum Concerning the Austrian Library in Rome’, Sjöqvist, December 5, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5. ‘To sum up: The Austrian Institute in Valle Giulia and its library was taken over by the Germans in March,
The Kunsthistorisches Institut (in Palazzo Guadagni) in Florence closed on January 27, 1944. Its director 1935-1943, Friedrich Kriegbaum (1901-1943), died in an Allied bomb raid on Florence on September 25, 1943.\(^{46}\) Kriegbaum was succeeded by Ludwig Heinrich Heydenreich (1903-1978). The executive board of the society (the ‘Society for the Promotion of the Institute of Art History in Florence’, established in 1898) insisted on the evacuation of the Kunsthistorisches library to Germany. On February 20, 1944, the 700 crates of books were

1938. The property was allotted to the German Historical Institute and the process of fusing the two libraries into one was begun in January 1939, and was still going on in January 1944 when the books were brought to Germany. A complete catalogue of the original Austrian library is in Rome [...]. Dr. Gottfried Lang, surviving member of the ex-Austrian Institute and other influential Austrians in Rome, are greatly in favour of the idea of re-establishing both the Institute and the library in their old residence in Valle Giulia'.

\(^{46}\) Kriegbaum was obliged to comply with state guidelines and to increase the emphasis on German art in Italy and on German-Italian relations. In 1938, all ‘non-Aryan individuals’ were banned from the Kunsthistorisches Institut. See also ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’, appendix 9: ‘The library of this Institute [the Kunsthistorisches Institut] was sequestrated during the first world-war and only subsequently restored to Germany under the same terms as the library of the Prussian Historical Institut’. Regarding the 1938 concordat, the 1946 Unione memorandum stated that ‘on the basis of these clear agreements, the Institute not only was accorded special privileges by the Italian Government as an Ente Morale, but received also gifts and legacies from Italian state and private sources’. The Kunsthistorisches Institut differs from for example the Hertziana by giving public lectures in Italian and English. Since the institute became part of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft in 2002 it has operated a ‘consular’ system of two simultaneous directors. For the history of the institute, cf. Das Kunsthistorische Institut in Florenz 1888, 1897, 1925. Wilhelm von Bode zum achtzigsten Geburtstage am 10. Dezember 1925 dargebracht vom Kunsthistorischen Institut in Florenz in Dankbarkeit und Verehrung, (Florence: 1925), Feier zur Eröffnung des neuen Hauses und zum fünfundsiebzigsten jubiläum am Sechzehnten Mai 1964, (Florence: Kunsthistorisches Institut Florenz, Via Giuseppe Giusti 44, 1965), Hans W. Hubert, Das Kunsthistorische Institut in Florenz. Von der Gründung bis zum hundertjährigen jubiläum (1897-1997) (Florence: Il Ventilabro, 1997), Daniel Schöningh, Der erste kunsthistorische Ferienkurs in Italien für Lehrer höherer Unterrichtsanstalten. Posen 1909. Über die Gründung eines Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz. Denkschrift des Vorstandes, 1899 (Posen: 1909), Max Seidel, ed., Storia dell’arte e politica culturale intorno al 1900. La fondazione dell’Istituto Germanico di Storia dell’Arte di Firenze (Venezia: Marsilio Editore, 1990). See also [http://www.khi.fi.it/en/institut/geschichte/index.html](http://www.khi.fi.it/en/institut/geschichte/index.html) (visited May 21, 2010). The Jubiläumsberichte are preserved at the institute for the following years: 1902/03(1903)–1939/40(1940); 1953/55(1955)–1976; 1980; 1985–1999/2001(2003).
transported to Germany on a chartered train, and stored in the Kochendorf salt mines near Heilbronn (180 metres below ground).464

The German occupation of Rome proved to be a curtailment for the DAIR. Plans had to be made in order to secure its assets in the event of being forced to leave Rome, and contacts were established with ‘neutral and Vatican locations’ for this purpose. The ‘neutral location’ referred to was the SIR.465

‘Every forward-looking activity was construed as sabotage’, wrote DAIR scholar F.W. Deichmann, looking back in November 1945. The Vatican had declared itself willing to take on the German institutes, and ‘as Vatican statements were binding, the German angle was to be prepared to leave the institutes in case of an Allied occupation of Rome. Now began the fight against a whole gang opposed to this project.

464 In May 1945, Heydenreich wrote to art historian Bernard Berenson, asking him ‘a great favour’: ‘I should be very grateful to you, if you would help me to obtain contact with the Allied Art Commission and in the same time to let me have a laissez-passer by the Allied Military Government, which gives me the permission to move freely and to travel in case of necessity. Heydenreich to Berenson, May 6, 1945. Cf. Berenson to Frederick Hartt, August 30, 1944: ‘I wonder whether you can/could give me information about [the?] address of Wing Commander RAF Cooper, Allied Arts Commission. Poor Heydenreich is desperately anxious to get in touch with this gentleman who some time ago was in Milan & [seems] to have spoken of employing him [Heydenreich]. He is dying of inactivity & longs for work. He would do everything/anything he undertook loyally & well. Remember me to De Wald & other common friends’. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
however, supported by the in party circles wholly suspicious ambassador von Weiszäcker’. 466

This image of von Weiszäcker does not correspond with Sjöqvist’s perception of the ambassador to the Vatican (cf. appendix 1). The NSDAP party contingent of the DAIR (Siegfried Fuchs, together with secretary Mannz and ‘intendent’ Edgar Kübber) argued in accordance with the ‘Einsieg’-discourse (1943-1944) – the library had to be evacuated immediately. According to Sjöqvist, they (Fuchs and his group) were supported by Werner Hoppenstedt (vice director of the Bibliotheca Hertziana), and ‘had spoken threateningly of the necessity of saving the libraries from the “ungrateful Italians”.’ [They] were decidedly hostile against Messrs Deichmann and Crous and hardly tolerated their director, von Gerkan’. 467

The need for immediate evacuation of the DAIR library was clearly stated in a letter from Siegfried Fuchs (‘second director’ of the DAIR) to Dr. H.W. Frey at the German Ministry of Education


467 ‘Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945; possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1).
(Erziehungministerium) dated November 28, 1943. Following the evacuation of the DAIR, Fuchs was offered a position (in ‘Germanic pre- and early history’ at the University of Erlangen by the Reichsminister Frey.

Fuchs argued that the German libraries had to leave Rome for the presumed safety of northern Italy and eventually Germany; he offered four motives in favour of this argument: (1) the Vatican would be able to provide ‘moral support’ when the Bibliotheca Hertziana would most likely protest that the will of ‘the Jewess’ Henriette Hertz was circumvented; (2) transport would be dangerous, but the libraries were to be considered ‘cultural heritage of the German people’ (‘Kulturgut des Deutschen Volkes’), thus the risk of losing parts of them in transit had to be taken; (3) the German institutes were historically bound to Rome, but

468 Siegfried Fuchs to H.W. Frey. Bundesarchiv, Berlin, R/4901/14064. See also Fröhlich, "Das Deutsche Archäologische Institut in Rom in der Kriegs- und Nachkriegszeit bis zur Wiederöffnung 1953." Fröhlich, "The Study of the Lombards and the Ostrogoths at the German Archaeological Institute of Rome, 1937-1943." For the perceived importance of Frey, cf. General G.R. Upjohn to Secretary of State Carlo Ragghianti, July 19, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5: ‘What, if any, changes of status [of the four German libraries] were negotiated by Ministerial-Counsellor Frey in, or about, 1940? It is important that detailed and accurate information on these points should be forthcoming, as they are certain to be raised at a later date’. 469 See DAIR, file ‘Berichte Rom, Jahresberichte 1943 1944/5’. Jahresbericht der Zweigstelle Rom 1944/45: ‘Herr S. Fuchs beendete mit Hilfe eines Urlaubs aus dem Wehrdienst seine Habilitation an der Universität Erlangen, wo er vom Herrn Reichsminister auch eine Dozentur für die germanische Vor- und Frühgeschichte erhielt, neben seinem Amt als Zweiter Sekretar an der Zweigstelle Rom’. 470 Henriette Hertz (1846-1913) donated Palazzo Zuccari and her library in her will in order to establish the Bibliotheca Hertziana. See for example Julia Laura Rischbieter, Henriette Hertz: Mäzenin und Gründerin der Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rom (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004), 113. Cf. Memorandum regarding the Bibliotheca Hertziana, May 30, 1945 (Sjöqvist). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5: ‘Miss Henrietta [sic] Hertz was a rich German lady of Jewish origin [...]. She died in 1913, and in her will she gave away her house, the library and a considerable sum of money to create a scientific institution called Bibliotheca Hertziana, open to competent students of all nations and put under official sponsorship of the German Government. It was administered as a freestanding institution under the [...] foundation “Kaiser Wilhelms Institut”‘.
for ‘security reasons’ they should be moved due to the presence of individuals, mainly at the DAIR, who had long been in opposition to Germany and the regime (Fuchs was here presumably above all referring to director von Gerkan); (4) the infrastructure for transport of the libraries was problematic, yet possible to arrange in the near future.471

Fuchs’ account can be contrasted with that of the Unione of institutes in Rome (cf. section 6.1), who presented an abundance of background information for the UN, in one of many attempts to secure funding for the post-war maintenance of the four German libraries:

The library of the German Archaeological Institute together with the library of the German Historical Institute in Rome, and that of the German Institute of the History of Art in Florence were confiscated by the Italian government after the First World War, and restored to German ownership at the instance of Benedetto Croce, Minister of Education in 1920 on condition that they be not removed from Italy. The Hertziana did not figure in the Convention of 1920, since it had not been confiscated; Henrietta [sic] Hertz, in her will bequeathing the library to the Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft, stipulated that it too should not be removed from Rome.472

472 The memorandum furthermore stated that ‘A Concordat was signed between the Nazi and Fascist governments in 1938 in which the previous restrictions on the use of the libraries of the Archaeological Institutes and of the Institute of the History of Art in Florence were annulled. In this agreement the German government solemnly asserted its intention not to remove the libraries from Italy. The Florence library was at last accounts at Kochendorf near Heilbronn (Baden), under control of the Section of Fine Arts and Archives of the Economic Division of AMG [Allied Military Government], Germany. The library of the German Historical Institute was at last accounts at Pommersfelden near Bamberg, presumably under the same control. By letter of the Minister of Education, of January 7, 1946, the Italian Government agreed to temporary custody on the part of the International Union of all four of the German libraries above mentioned. Such custody was approved by the Civil Affairs Section of the Allied Commission for Italy, by letter of February 23, 1946, pending “definitive decision by the U.S., British and other Governments concerned as to future custody of the libraries”’. It was seemingly important to the Unione to stress this...
According to former DAIR director Ludwig Curtius, the paragraph in the 1920 cultural agreement regarding the prohibition of the removal of the [DAIR] library from Rome was annulled following suggestion of undersecretary Frey (cf. the 1938 German–Italian concordat – see section 2.4). The matter was allegedly settled by a ‘Führerbefehl’ (an order by Hitler invalidating all other orders) that reached Rome on December 9, 1943; demanding the closure of all German research institutes in Italy and the transfer of their contents to German territory. It is however not certain what shape that ‘Führerbefehl’ actually took – spoken orders can at times find themselves transformed into narratives in retrospect for reasons of legitimacy; fabricating a ‘Führerbefehl’ would have transferred the blame from the DAIR itself to Berlin. The description of the approval. ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’, 5-6.


Führerbefehl in Sjöqvist’s promemoria rhymes well with the form these often took – i.e. not as written orders, more as ‘spontaneous’ verbal instructions.475

The order reached Rome through Hertziana director Leo Bruhns who was given the painful task of carrying out the transfer of the German libraries.476 Sjöqvist related that ‘at an informal conversation in my house soon after his arrival Prof. Bruhns deplored the necessity of his mission, but tried to make me believe that the real reason for the evacuation was that the Allies had the intention of bombarding Rome and that at least the German property had to be saved. On my questioning how such an hypothesis could be reconciled with the bringing to Rome of all the material from Montecassino, he remained slightly embarrassed’.477 The

475 Cf. Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1).
476 Leo Bruhns (1884-1957) was director of the Bibliotheca Hertziana 1934-1943. He succeeded Ernst Steinmann (director 1920-1934). Steinmann had selected Bruhns himself as his successor. Bruhns viewed the Hertziana as a ‘research institute in Italy established through German means’. The Bibliotheca Hertziana was closed in 1943 when Italy itself became a war zone. Bruhns wanted the library to stay in Italy, even though he paradoxically was placed in charge of its transport. Cf. Thoenes, ”Geschichte des Instituts.” For the history of the Hertziana, see for example Julia Laura Rischieter, Henriette Hertz: Mäzenin und Gründerin der Bibliotheca Hertziana in Rom (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004), 113, as well as http://www.archiv-berlin.mpg.de/wiki/english.php (visited May 21, 2010). The archives of the Max-Planck Society were established in 1975. Approximately 90% of the Hertziana archival correspondence is located in in the archives of the Max Planck Society, Berlin. The remaining archival material remains at the Bibliotheca Hertziana, along with the (unpublished) annual reports (Jahresberichte). See also J.B. Hartmann, ”Biblioteciari all’Hertziana. Accanto a Hoogewerff nella riapertura della biblioteca,” in “Nobile Munus”. Origini E Primi Sviluppi Dell’unione Internazionale Degli Istituti Di Archeologia Storia E Storia Dell’arte in Roma (1946-1953). Per La Storia Della Collaborazione Internazionale a Roma Nelle Ricerche Umanistiche Nel Secondo Dopoguerra, ed. Erland Billig, Carl Nylander, and Paolo Vian (Rome: Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma, 1996).
477 ”Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential”. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1).
alternative of depositing the libraries in the care of the Vatican was also discussed but not realised.478

It is possible that Bruhns may have had ‘no alternative’ but to answer to his superior Werner Hoppenstedt within the framework of the Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft-organisation. Hoppenstedt was appointed vice director of the Bibliotheca Hertziana in order to establish a ‘Kulturwissenschaftliche Abteilung’ of the Hertziana in 1933-1934. This ‘Kulturwissenschaftliche Abteilung’ was supported by the German foreign office, and was dedicated to propaganda efforts through lectures, concerts and art exhibitions.479


479 In 1934, the Hertziana was transformed into the ‘Kaiser Wilhelm-Institut für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften’. The suffix ‘Bibliotheca Hertziana’ was changed to ‘im Palazzo Zuccari’ in 1938, avoiding naming the name of the benefactor of the institution. Hoppenstedt was made a ‘Wissenschaftliches Mitglied’ in 1936, and focused his activities on ‘Wechselbeziehungen’ between Germany and Italy. Philosopher Anne-Lise Meyer wanted to reinstate the ‘Kulturwissenschaftliche Abteilung’ after the war, without success. Cf. Thoenes, "Geschichte des Instituts,” 22-24. Hoppenstedt and the Hertziana became a target for post-war accusations of Nazi usurpation of the German scholarly institutes before and during the war (also directed at for example Friedrich Bock, Zweiten Direktor of the DHI, and Siegfried Fuchs in the corresponding position at the DAIR). Cf. Arnold Esch, "Die deutschen Institutsbibliotheken nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs und die Rolle der Unione degli Istituti: Internationalisierung, Italianisierung – oder Rückgabe an Deutschland?” in Deutsche Forschungs- und Kulturinstitute in Rom in der Nachkriegszeit, ed. Michael Matheus (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2007), 91.
The four German libraries in Rome had left the city (via rail) by February 20, 1944 (although the exact date of their departure has been debated). Sjöqvist’s account of their departure deserves to be quoted:\textsuperscript{480}

\textsuperscript{480} From Ibid. For minister of state Theodor Lewald, see for example Julia Laura Rischbieter, 
\textsuperscript{481} The date is given by Billig (Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli," 222.). According to the Vatican, the libraries left Rome as early as December 1943. \textit{Biblioteche ospiti della Vaticana nella seconda guerra mondiale col catalogo dei cimeli esposti nel Salone Sistino}, (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1945), 9. H. Goldbrunner claims that the libraries departed in the beginning of January 1944 (Goldbrunner, \textit{Von der Casa Tarpea zur Via Aurelia Antica. Zur Geschichte der Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom, Das Deutsche Historische Institut in Rom 1888-1988}, 63.) According to Reinhard Elze and Bernard Andreae the libraries may have left Rome in either January or February 1944. Vian, ed., \textit{Speculum Mundi}, 174 & 197. Sjöqvist’s promemoria (appendix 1) is a rich source of information regarding the evacuation and transport of the German libraries. Cf. Billig, Nylander, and Vian, eds., “Nobile munus”: \textit{Origini e primi sviluppi dell’Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma (1946-1953). Per la storia della collaborazione internazionale a Roma nelle ricerche umanistiche nel
The packing was going on when on the 22nd of January the Anzio landing took place. Everybody concerned believed now that the evacuation was rendered impossible, and that the final result would be that the remaining library should be deposited in the Vatican partly packed as it was in its cases. I am told that Baron von Kessel again tried to make his influence felt in this direction, but again the same phenomenon was repeated as that noticed after the Salerno landing. When it got clear that the liberation of Rome was not immediately impending, the momentary panic of the Germans vanished, and was replaced by a doubled energy. At the beginning of February the two first railway trucks loaded with book cases and hooked on a soldiers’ leave train were sent northwards towards Brenner. At Terni the train was bombarded when on the bridge; the bridge was hit and some of the carriages plunged into the river. A part of the train including the two trucks with the book-cases were saved and parked close to the burning railway station. Miraculously enough they remained intact and could be sent on after some days delay. [...] Some weeks later two further carriages were sent in the same way, in spite of Prof. Bruhn’s attempt to arrange a lorry convoy which would have been able to travel on side roads at night and this run less risks. However, the second couple of carriages came through without any incident, and on February 21st the rest of the library forming a special train was sent off along the coast line.482


Sjöqvist was appalled: ‘The German institutes have closed, and as if that was not enough they have packed their libraries and are at present transporting them to Germany […]. An insane, pointless, desperate and defeatist enterprise […]. The worst part is that they openly confess that it is improbable that they [the libraries] will ever return. Germany’s bombed out university libraries will require the books that are available after the war […]. It is nothing less than a catastrophe for Roman and classical research’.483 This passage clearly illustrates why the issue of the return of the four German libraries to Rome after the war was perceived to be absolutely fundamental to classical scholars and the foreign academies in Rome – their activity and identity in many ways depended on them.

Once the transfer of the libraries was unavoidable, Armin von Gerkan wanted to make sure the valuable DAIR library catalogue was spared the risk of extinction. Von Gerkan wished to deposit the library catalogue in the relative safety of the ‘protected neutral oasis’ of the SIR.484 Sjöqvist was approached by both Leo Bruhns of the Bibliotheca Hertziana and von Gerkan regarding the potential safeguarding of material at the SIR.

Von Gerkan, ‘although well aware of the personal risks he might run by applying for foreign protection of his Institute – these risks were especially high, as he was personally on very bad terms with the German Embassy at the Quirinal in general and especially with the Ambassador Herr von Mackensen – […] did not hesitate after our preliminary

---

483 Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, January 11, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III: A:3.
conversation to send me [a] letter dated Aug. 17th asking me to take care of the interests of the Institute [the DAIR] in the event of the Germans having to leave Rome, which he foresaw would happen very soon. [Von Gerkan] did not feel inclined to cooperate with the Vatican, if he could prevent it, this in view of his strongly anti-Italian instincts.\footnote{485}

The ‘academic diplomat’ Sjöqvist thus chose to put the neutral status of the SIR to practical application once more and offered its premises as a safe haven for the precious German library catalogues. Von Gerkan appealed to Sjöqvist’s ‘important moral authority and experience’, and placed the DAIR and its employees in Sjöqvist’s hands.\footnote{486}

The DAIR material deposited at the SIR included texts relating to ‘the late antique round buildings [in Rome and Lazio] belonging to the German Reich’ (exactly what was referred to remains unclear),\footnote{487} and personal scholarly material belonging to von Gerkan.\footnote{488} The most important deposit was however the library catalogue – the ‘Standart-Katalog der Bibliothek. Möbel in Form eines doppelseitigen Stehpulten, das in 6 verschliessbaren Fächern 36 Kästen mit dem Zettelkatalog nach Standortnummern enthält’. The deposit also included catalogues of the

\footnote{485} Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1).

\footnote{486} Von Gerkan to Sjöqvist, August 17, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5: ‘In erster Linie bestätige ich Ihnen, dass Sie mit der Uebernahme des Schutzes auch das uneingeschränkte Verfüngsrecht je nach den eintretenden Umständen selbst haben. Die Institutsangestellten, seien es Italiener oder Deutsche, stehen damit zu Ihrer Verfügung und haben Sie zu unterstützen’.

\footnote{487} Deposited September 9, 1943. Cf. letter of thanks from F.W. Deichmann to Sjöqvist, February 27, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.

so-called ‘Bibliotheca Platneriana’ (DAIR), as well as the oldest collections of the DAIR archive. The material was deposited at the SIR on October 15, 1943. Von Gerkan was hoping that Sjöqvist might at some point be able to send this material to the DAI in Berlin via Sweden, through Axel Boëthius.489

The early nineteenth century ICA statutes and early correspondence were thus preserved at the SIR; indeed a fitting location, considering its later position as the seat of the preliminary discussions for the establishment of AIAC and the Unione (cf. this chapter and chapter 6). The logistic of the deposit itself was organised by von Gerkan’s assistants Deichmann and Crous.490

DAIR librarian Jan Crous was personally overseeing the packing of the DAIR library (the process was arranged with great haste), and it is noteworthy that the library catalogues – essential to its organisation – could escape scrutiny. Sjöqvist was convinced that ‘the failure to withdraw this material was not part of the official plan but was a

489 Cf. receipt – list of DAIR material deposited at the SIR – September 9, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5: ‘Material des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts in Rom, das dem Schwedischen Archäologischen Institut in Rom zu treuen Händen übergeben worden ist’, with additional material such as copies of Pompeian wall paintings. The ‘autorenkatalog’ however remained at Via Sardegna, ‘um die Möglichkeit zu geben, hier ein Buch zu finden’. Von Gerkan to Sjöqvist, August 17, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5. F.W. Deichmann signed the receipt for the list of objects pertaining to the DAIR kept at the SIR upon their return to Via Sardegna on August 28, 1947.

490 ‘Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1): [Deichmann and Crous] asked me to allow them to deposit in the store rooms of the Swedish Institute the most valuable catalogue of the library (the shelf index) and the archives of [the DAIR] from 1829 and onwards, a thing which I granted them with pleasure. The deposit was brought in Sept. 9th. The deposit at the SIR was not even hinted at in the official DAIR reports. Cf. DAIR, file ‘Vierteljahresberichte Rom 1927–1944’. ‘Vierteljahresbericht des archäologischen Instituts des Deutschen Reiches Zweigstelle Rom 1. Januar–31. März 1944’.
deliberate oversight on the part of the librarian, Crous. For obvious reasons its existence must therefore be treated as a highly confidential matter to avoid any possibility of reprisals.491 Crous was drafted in the German army in December 1944 and was killed shortly thereafter.492

What was at stake for Sjöqvist? He was probably taking more of a personal risk than compromising or endangering the SIR itself. Sjöqvist was doing von Gerkan a personal favour, although he also wanted to do all he could to keep the DAIR library in Rome. It is unlikely that Sjöqvist imagined that his actions would entail any increase in personal prestige after the end of the hostilities. Sjöqvist was indeed still to some extent a librarian at heart, and most probably felt genuine sadness that the prestigious German libraries were leaving Italy. Keeping the library catalogue in Rome would make the administration of permanent organisation of the library in Germany more complicated.

491 ‘Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1).
Sjöqvist cannot however have perceived the risk involved with the safeguarding of the catalogues as too pressing or apparent, as he reported the deposit of the ‘most important parts’ of the DAIR archive, its ‘photographic catalogue’ as well as its library catalogue to the executive committee of the SIR shortly after the departure of the German libraries in February 1944.\textsuperscript{493}

The DAIR was, as hinted at above, not the only German institution to deposit material at the SIR; the archives provide evidence for a similar deposit from the Bibliotheca Hertziana.\textsuperscript{494} The DAIR and Hertziana material was in effect primarily protected from ‘other Germans’ (the fractions in the two institutions sympathetic with the Nazi regime). Adding to that, the publisher Bretschneider, who had ‘been the institute’s commissioner for [its] publication series for many years’, had been in an Allied camp, and the list of objects temporarily stored at the SIR during the war (the ‘neutral oasis’ gradually becoming a cluttered repository) was further augmented by the (undefined) ‘Bretschneider storage’.\textsuperscript{495}

Shortly after the war a certain Vollbach tried to frame DAIR ex-director Ludwig Curtius, anonymously accusing him for being responsible for the transport of the German libraries, thus attempting to transfer the

\textsuperscript{493} Sjöqvist to the executive committee of the SIR, February 14, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
\textsuperscript{494} Receipt for material from the Bibliotheca Hertziana deposited at the SIR, September 28, 1943: ‘Material, das dem Schwedischen Institut in Rom, Via Omero 14 von dem Kaiser-Wilhelm-Institut für Kunstgeschichte in Rom Via Gregoriana 28 zu treuen Händen übergeben worden ist’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5. Cf. ‘Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix i): ‘Sept. 28\textsuperscript{th} [1943] the librarian of the Bibliotheca Herziana [sic], Dr. L. [Schudt], asked me to house the most valuable catalogues of his library too, at the Swedish Institute. They were brought over the same day’.
\textsuperscript{495} SIR annual report 1944-1945, 1-2.
blame from Hoppenstedt, Fuchs et al. Sjöqvist wrote a long certificate in favour of Curtius, as ‘the accusation was to absurd’; the Vatican also intervened on Curtius’ behalf. The allegations amounted to nothing in the end.\textsuperscript{496}

4.2 THE FOREIGN ACADEMIES AND THE LIBERATION OF ROME (1944)

In February 1944, Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli wrote to his fellow art historian Bernard Berenson regarding his hopes that a ‘coscienza politica’ would be able to mature in Italy after the end of hostilities, and that whoever was to win the war would be capable of acting in the interests of ‘the real Italy’, ‘as soon as Rome is conquered (or what is left of Rome), afterwards it may be too late’.\textsuperscript{497} In the words of Christopher Duggan, ‘Italy emerged from the Second World War, as it had done from the
unification process in 1860 and the Great War in 1918, deeply split and profoundly uncertain as to its identity. [...] It was almost as if people were happy to be liberated not just from fascism but from ‘Italy’.

Early in the morning of June 5, 1944 a detachment of an American artillery regiment placed their firearms on a lawn in the northern part of the Villa Borghese park, approximately 100 metres to the east of the SIR. They fired, aiming for the retreating German troops moving northwards along Via Flaminia; the Germans did not retaliate. Sjöqvist himself intervened. He had observed some German soldiers hiding on the as yet unoccupied land directly to the west of the SIR (on the future site of the Danish Academy in Rome). According to (eyewitness) Billig, Sjöqvist approached the German troops and convinced them that they should give themselves up. Sjöqvist led the six soldiers down Via Omero to the American battery where he handed them over to an officer.

---

498 Duggan continues: ‘For over twenty years fascism had striven to appropriate state and nation, embracing the monarchy, seeing itself as the rightful heir of the Risorgimento with all its aspirations to unity, spiritual revival and political greatness, and proclaiming itself the embodiment of more than 2,000 years of history in the peninsula. [...] To those conscious of history, there was a horrible sense of déjà vu – the same vices (the eternal Italian psychology of looking to foreigners for salvation’, as the Florentine academic and anti-fascist Piero Calamandrei lamented) requiring, it seemed, the same remedies: ‘Once again we need to make Italians ... We have to turn them from subjects into citizens’. Duggan, The Force of Destiny. A History of Italy since 1796, 532-534.

499 Billig and Billig, “The Billig Manuscript,” 142-143.

500 Sjöqvist himself believed that he had been personally involved in the capture of possibly ‘the last German patrol in Rome’, which may have been true or not, one might only speculate why this was emphasised (and possibly exaggerated) in an annual report to the board of the SIR. The intervention had occurred ‘close to the Belgian Academy’ on Via Omero. SIR annual report 1943-1944, 2. Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, August 17, 1944. Billig also mentioned, in his characteristic anecdotal style, that a group of SIR residents went out an hour or two after Sjöqvist’s return to observe some ‘real fighting’. The Swedes brought back some shell cases as souvenirs, which were used as umbrella stands at the institute for a while, as ‘the only traces of ‘the shooting war’ at the institute’. Cf. Ibid., 143.
Resistance was on the whole meager in the ‘open city’ – the American headquarters were set up in Via Veneto without fracas on June 5, 1944. The Allied civil administration of the city was organised as the ACC (Allied Commission for Civil Affairs), a body with which Sjöqvist established official relations only a few days after the liberation of Rome. As a consequence, the SIR promptly received a notice declaring its property as off limits for the victorious military forces, thanks to Sjöqvist’s intervention. At the same time, the SIR also functioned as Sjöqvist’s private residence. While protecting the SIR and its interests, Sjöqvist was in effect also protecting himself and his wife. A director’s home was in this sense his castle.

This study does not aim to provide a coherent account of the administrative situation in Rome and the government of the city by the Allies in the immediate post-war period. Further enlightenment regarding the structures within which the individuals discussed here operated could provide an avenue for further research.

The Italian bank system ceased to be operational after the German retreat; Dollars and Swiss Francs functioned as valid currencies. The postal system (the post was administered via Casablanca) was not up and running until Christmas 1944. The situation was worsened due to combined inflation and deflation as the Allied military personnel in Rome were pushing the consumer prices up at the same time as the large influx of Dollars exhausted the limited market with a devaluation of the Dollar rate as a result, which in turn affected the general mood in the city.
BSR director Ralegh Radford reported on the situation for the Italian staff (‘servants’) of the BSR in March 1945: ‘My own view is that they are not ungenerously treated by comparison with Italian employees but life is hard in Rome this winter, harder than last winter when the city was occupied by the Germans and their feeling of disillusionment is the greater in that they had felt that as employees of an English institution they should benefit over the average Italian’.501 ‘The inflation in practical terms had to be met in terms of an increase in the scholarships offered by the SIR for the scholars still at the SIR, at that time primarily for the Billig couple, as Erland and Ragnhild Billig had remained at the SIR during the war.’502

4.3 The Subcommission

The first appearance of British and American military officers at the SIR was in July 1944.503 The SIR and the foreign academies were in the frame of interest of one particular division of the ACC, the Subcommission for Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives (referred to here as the subcommission).504 This subcommission was in effect controlled by two

501 Ralegh Radford to Shaw, March 4, 1945. BSR, box 63.
502 Cf. SIR board meeting minutes, March 20, 1946, appendix 5.
persons: Ernest De Wald, professor of art history at Princeton University; and the aspiring British archaeologist John B. Ward-Perkins.

Ernest Theodore De Wald (1891-1968) had served as Lieutenant in the First World War and as assistant military attaché in Bern 1916-1919. As Major, he was head of the subcommission in Italy 1945-1946, before returning to Princeton. De Wald’s doctoral thesis (on Pietro Lorenzetti, accepted in 1916) had been supervised by fellow Princetonian Charles Rufus Morey (see below). John Bryan Ward-Perkins (1912-1981) – cf. section 2.3 – did his military service during the Second World War after having been employed at the Museum of London 1937-1939 and being active as an archaeologist in England and France. After serving in North Africa during the war, Ward-Perkins was promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel and transferred to the subcommission. He became director of the British School at Rome in October 1945, and eventually returned to England in 1979.\footnote{505}
In August 1944, Sjöqvist reported to Boëthius that the ‘standing of the institute is sound’, and that ‘the collaboration with the Allied colleagues in the Commission for Historical monuments [the subcommission] is cordial and amicable. A stream of officers-archaeologists pours through our house [the SIR]: De Wald from Princeton, Cott from Worcester, Perkins [sic] from the British Museum, Greenley et al. Tired of office work and mess-life they often spend their evenings with us’. The SIR had gradually become ‘a concourse for Swedish-Americans in particular and culturally interested people in general'. Minister Beck-Friis helped organise a concert in the SIR library with invitations extended to ‘several hundred people’, in order to ‘contribute to a generally desired and sorely missed direct contact between the Allied authorities and cultural circles in Rome’.  

Ernest De Wald was posted in Vienna in the autumn of 1945. His lobbying influence there contributed to accelerating the process of the return of the

---

506 Sjöqvist quoted in Boëthius to the Board of the SIR, August 26, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1: ‘Jag måste säga att Institutets anseende är solitt, och att samarbetet med de allierade kollegerna, som sitta i Commission for Historical monuments, är hjärtligt och vänskapligt. Genom vårt hus går en ström av officerare-arkeologer: De Wald från Princeton, Cott från Worcester, Perkins från British Museum, Greenley m.fl. Tröta på office job [sic] och nässliv tillbringe de ofta sina kvällar hos oss, där så småningom skapats en träffpunkt också för svensk-amerikaner i synnerhet och kulturintresserat folk i allmänhet. [...] Om en vecka har vi ett stort svep här på Institutet med konsert i biblioteket och ett par hundra personer, detta för att i vår ringa män bidragna till att etablera en av alla parter önskad och saknad direkt kontakt mellan Allied Authorities och kulturella Rom-kretsar. Förslaget är från början Ministerns, som på allt sätt hjälper oss också i denna angelägenhet, och jag hoppas att vi skall kunna realisera idén till nytta och nöje för samtliga intresserade’.  
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four German libraries to Rome (were decisions were made regarding their return by December 1945). Sjöqvist was most likely pleased to reestablish contacts with the Anglo-Saxon scholarly world through De Wald and Ward-Perkins – contacts that had been more or less inaccessible to him since the outbreak of the war. Common scholarly interests furthermore united the three scholars. Sjöqvist could provide services to the subcommission as a true expert of the city in terms of knowledge of monuments and topography, as well as with a wide range of personal contacts.

De Wald, Ward-Perkins and Charles Rufus Morey (1877-1955), professor at Princeton University, cultural attaché at the US embassy in Rome and acting director of the war (cf. section 2.3), asked Sjöqvist to give orientating lectures about Rome for officers on permission and to offer guided tours of the city for military personnel. Sjöqvist furthermore functioned as go-between, forwarding contacts between the subcommission and Italian scholars. Sjöqvist was probably happy to oblige, also knowing that the development of contact networks might prove to be valuable for the cultivation of his own career.

In lieu of the cancelled SIR archaeological course in the spring of 1945, Sjöqvist thus spent part of the year participating in the tuition of AAR ‘leave courses’ such as ‘An introduction to ancient Rome’, arranged by the American Red Cross for officers and soldiers on shorter leave, as well as ‘The Ancient Mediterranean World’, for university students at the AAR.507 These courses served the dual purpose for Sjöqvist of developing

507 See SIR annual report 1944-1945, 1. Cf. the AAR account of these leave courses: ‘Dr. Charles Rufus Morey, [...] who had come to Italy in April 1945 on the staff of the Office of War Information, generously consented to serve as

acquaintances with American academia in general terms, as well as establishing what would prove to be a valuable close collaboration with Charles Rufus Morey — for Sjöqvist personally as well as for the scholarly community in post-war Rome, once more with Sjöqvist and the SIR as go-between.508

A policy of general caution regarding these activities was strongly advocated by the board of the SIR in general and Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf in particular. Sjöqvist was to ‘create good relations with the new lords, but should not throw himself in the arms of the victors’.509 These

Acting Director of the Academy in May 1945. [...] At Dr. Morey’s suggestion, leave courses for officers and enlisted men of the American Army were inaugurated [...] at the Academy on June 11, 1945 [...]. These courses, which proved quite popular with all ranks, lasted until October 11, 1945. AAR report 1943–1951, 6.

508 The AAR offered part of its premises (the Villino Bellacci) to be occupied by some American officers of the subcommission after a series of break-ins. See Van Buren, de Daehn and Davico to Myron Taylor, January 11, 1945. Cf. Myron C. Taylor (‘Personal Representative of the President of the United States to His Holiness the Pope’) to ‘the Commanding General of the Royal Carabinieri, Rome’, January 12, 1945; ‘I am sure you would not want to contribute to an unfavorable impression abroad of conditions of public order in Rome by having any further misadventure take place in respect to these properties. The reaction would not only be unpleasant toward the city of Rome, but toward its police authorities and that might do great harm in international relationships. I am sure you will do something to remedy the situation without further delay’. Cf. the reply (translation), January 13, 1945, ‘I have issued orders that the commanding Colonel of the legion of the Royal Carabinieri in Rome get at once in touch with the Director of the [American] Academy in order to institute at the earliest moment a permanent surveillance service [...] and to bring the culprits responsible for the theft before justice’. AAR, reel 5758. There was however no director of the AAR at the time — William Dinsmoor was officially acting director until Morey was appointed as such on April 24, 1945.

instructions (from Boëthius) were intended to take the Italian scholars with SIR connection into consideration, connections of which many had been established by Boëthius himself. The scholarly and intellectual circles in which the SIR operated had stood united against the German occupation, the distance between the Allied victors and circles of Italian scholars however at times remained considerable; the SIR and Sjöqvist in effect acted as mediators in this regard; the ‘concourse’ of the Swedish Institute, enabling contacts between the Allies and the established cultural circles in Rome, as one example of such mediation.

Boëthius advocated a balance between cordial proximity and restrained distance, in essence a cornerstone of academic diplomacy, a balance that had in effect been put to practice by Sjöqvist during the war years. This role was particularly well suited to the ‘liberty’ ensured by Swedish neutrality politics.

Early manifestations of this policy can be discerned in social events organised by Sjöqvist at the SIR just after the liberation of Rome: a dinner party for the members of the subcommission in June, a concert with a newly founded Italian chamber orchestra on July 24, 1944, as well as the 70th birthday celebrations of the German scholar Ludwig Curtius (director of the DAIR 1928-1936) on December 13, 1944. Curtius had remained in Rome during the war; he was briefly interned upon the Allied assumption of power, but was soon released, partly thanks to interventions by Sjöqvist. The birthday reception for Curtius was
politically charged. Italian archaeologists as well as scholars representing the academies of the Allied countries were invited.\footnote{10}

In 1946, Ward-Perkins stated in his first annual report as director of the BSR that ‘until 30 November 1945 the Director [Ward-Perkins] was still in military service as Director of the Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives Subcommission of the Allied Commission in Italy, but, being stationed in Rome, was able to give sufficient time to supervise the administration of the School. [...] He took up residence in Rome on 10 February 1946. [...] reviving the [BSR] library after six years’ closure. [...] In particular, a start was made towards the resumption of exchanges of publications and the filling of wartime gaps’.\footnote{11}

When Ward-Perkins and his wife Margaret arrived in Rome in November 1945, they stayed with the Sjöqvists at the SIR until the BSR had been done up after its closure during the war.\footnote{12} These close relations

\footnote{10} The reception was vividly portrayed by Billig (Ibid., 146.) and by Sjöqvist (Sjöqvist to Boëthius, January 2, 1945. Sjöqvist’s description was related by Boëthius in Boëthius, Bland svenska minnen i Rom, 72-74. Cf. also Billig, Nylander, and Vian, eds., “Nobile munus”. Origini e primi sviluppi dell’Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma (1946-1953). Per la storia della collaborazione internazionale a Roma nelle ricerche umanistiche nel secondo dopoguerra, 16. and Vian, ed., Speculum Mundi, 506.

\footnote{11} BSR annual report 1945-1946. Ward-Perkins’ appointment as director of the BSR explains the presence of the substantial MFAA archival material at the BSR (with duplicates and additional material at the AAR). In 1945, Ward-Perkins was ‘trying to cut clean of MFA [sic] responsibilities [...] as soon as possible; but it raises all sorts of administrative difficulties and may take a few weeks’. Ward-Perkins to Lt. Col. Sir Leonard Wolley (War Office, London), October 8, 1945. Ward-Perkins suggested the employment of Fanny Bonajuto as his secretary as director of the BSR. Bonajuto had ‘worked for my subcommission for over a year and for whose capacity I have a high respect’. Ward-Perkins to Shaw, September 17, 1945. BSR, box 64.

\footnote{12} Ward-Perkins to Sjöqvist, November 17, 1945: ‘[...] your very kind offer to house us until we can get ourselves installed. It is going to make all the difference to our arrival, and I should hate anything to go wrong with Margaret’s first impressions of Rome and Italy. In your hands I know they can’t, and it will be putting me even more deeply in your debt’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv,
were to serve both directors well in the immediate post-war period and thus certainly did no harm to neither AIAC nor Unione in terms of facilitating the organisation of the two organisations (cf. this chapter and chapter 6).

4.4 CHARLES RUFUS MOREY AND THE BIBLIOTHECA HERTZIANA (1944)

In November 1945, 'subcommissioner' Ernest De Wald wrote to Erik Sjöqvist regarding the situation of the Hertziana library in Austria: ‘[...] we now have [it] in one place ready to be done with whatever the powers-that-be want done. The German [Archaeological] Institute one is also together and in our hands’.513 DAIR secretary Edgar Kübber confirmed that De Wald was in charge of the custody of the DAIR and Hertziana libraries in January 1946.514

During the war, the opinion was raised in the US that ‘there is no reason why an allied victory should provide undeserved advantage for the Italians; and now, if ever, is the time to see that American scholars secure

---

513 De Wald also wrote that Sjöqvist should make sure ‘[...] to have Rufus [Morey] sign you up for Princeton!’ De Wald to Sjöqvist, November 11, 1945 (sent from 'HQ US Forces in Austria'). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4.
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some of the legitimate facilities to which they are entitled’. On that theme, Charles Rufus Morey wrote to Allan Johnson, his colleague at Princeton University (who presided over the contemporary American School of Classical Studies) in March 1944, regarding a conversation with members of the Faculty of the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University concerning the possibility of claiming Bibliotheca Hertziana for the AAR:

‘The Germans have taken this over [the Hertziana], but it is on English foundation from start to finish, having been endowed by the Mond family. [...] It was suggested that the library be turned over to the Allies after the war as a specie of reparations. The English would seem to have the first claim on it, but in the event that the library should be offered for sale, it would solve the problem of the expansion of the [American] Academy’s library in the direction of the history of art pretty well, being a magnificent collection with an extraordinarily fine catalogue’. Morey recommended Allan Johnson to get in touch with art historian Richard Krautheimer regarding the matter, as Krautheimer had worked in the Hertziana ‘both as a student and on the staff’.

515 Philip McMahon (?) to unidentified recipient, 1943. Box 1, Dept. of Art and Archaeology Records; Princeton University archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. Regarding potential future (American) excavations in Italy, McMahon furthermore felt that ‘the Italians, for example, would be securing new material for which they paid nothing and for which they made no effort, but they would get half of the total finds instead of the whole as formerly’.

516 Morey to Allan Johnson, March 6, 1944; American School of Classical Studies in Rome (1943-1944). Cf. Allan C. Johnson to the Joint Committee on Classical and Mediaeval Studies of the American Academy in Rome, October 24, 1944: ‘It is reported that the Germans have taken the library of their Archaeological Institute and the Bibliotheca Hertziana to Germany. The latter may ultimately be returned, but if not, it will eliminate from Rome a valuable instrument of research in mediaeval art’. Box 1, Dept. of Art and Archaeology Records; Princeton University archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. Allan Johnson had been a member of
Morey wrote to Richard Krautheimer a month later commenting on suggestions made by Krautheimer: ‘I am ever so much obliged to you for the memorandum on the Hertziana. [...] There is only one possibility that might change the picture. If the Germans destroy the American Academy before they leave Rome, I would dearly love to see the Academy acquire the Herziana [sic – Morey here also referred to Palazzo Zuccari where the Hertziana had been located – this would have given the AAR an ‘excuse’ to take over both the property and the library], if this could be done, as a much more sensible place in which to house itself and its students than the distant Janiculum’. Morey however conceded that this was a ‘somewhat fanciful suggestion’.517

After that opportunistic and vindictive moment had passed, Morey actively supported the cause of the return of the Hertziana to Palazzo Zuccari, as president of the Unione after 1946, although he at the same

517 Morey to Richard Krautheimer (Washington, D.C.), April 18, 1944; American School of Classical Studies in Rome (1943-1944); Box 1, Dept. of Art and Archaeology Records; Princeton University archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. Cf. also Whitling, “The Unione in 1946: Reflections on Academic Diplomacy and International Collaboration,” 214-215. Richard Krautheimer was also acquainted with Sjöqvist. Cf. Krautheimer to Sjöqvist, July 9, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4. Palazzo Zuccari was placed in the care of the Vatican after the German evacuation. After the liberation of Rome, the main reading room was used for storage of medicines and food supplies. See Thoenes, "Geschichte des Instituts," 25.
time entertained the opinion that the AAR might seize the opportunity and take over said palazzo after the end of the war.

What did Morey mean by the notion that the Hertziana was ‘on English foundation from start to finish’? The matter can be clarified by the following excerpt from a memorandum (in English) on the Hertziana by Sjöqvist in May 1945:

Under and after the first World War the Bibliotheca Hertziana had considerable financial troubles [and] was [...] substantially supported by an intimate friend and collaborator of Miss Hertz’s, Mrs Frida Mond, an English lady of German birth, whose son, Sir Robert Mond, after his mother’s death was the chief donator of the institution. It was only thanks to them that the institution could survive the crisis and continue its activity. [...] The main character of the institution was maintained even under the Nazi regime, and it functioned very well under the leadership of first Prof. Steinman (+1934) and then of Prof. Bruhns. [...] None of the two directors took the Nazi ticket, and both understood in a surprisingly high degree how to withstand official pressure of political character. The first violation of the donator’s will took place in 1938 when on order from Berlin the name of the institution was changed to Kaiser Wilhelms Institut für Wissenschaft. Thus its Jewish origins should be concealed; at the same time a bust of the donator was removed from the entrance hall. The second and more grave violation of the will took place [in] 1943/44 when the library – again on order from Berlin – was removed to Germany, although it was legally bound to Rome. The Director Prof. Bruhns uttered to me grave anxiety for the future of the institution, fearing that under these conditions, what he called the “legal heir”, i.e. the Mond family should raise claims on the property. [...] I concluded that similar claims – if raised could be successfully maintained. Therefore it seems worth while to investigate the legal status of the Bibliotheca Hertziana, whatever plans may be contemplated for its future.\footnote{518 Memorandum regarding the Bibliotheca Hertziana, May 30, 1945 (Sjöqvist). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.}
In August 1945 Sjöqvist added that ‘the Bibliotheca Herziana and annexes, created to a large extent by British contributions, has [an] ambiguous legal position, and cannot without further investigations be proved of German property. It is of my knowledge that up to this day no action whatsoever has been taken against any of the institutions mentioned above [the DAIR, the Austrian Academy [sic] and the Bibliotheca Hertziana]. The considerable international interests tied up with all these institutions may induce competent authorities to interfere in order to prevent hasty unilateral action’.\textsuperscript{519} The Hertziana library was returned to Palazzo Zuccari in September 1947.\textsuperscript{520}

\textbf{4.5 L’INSTITUT, C’EST MOI: THE 1944 EFR REPORT}\textsuperscript{521}

During his time in Athens organising the SIA in 1947-1948 as its first director, Erik Holmberg was himself referred to as ‘the Swedish Institute’,\textsuperscript{522} which serves as a useful reference and illustration of the role of individual directors and their function in the domestic context in which he or she operates. AAR director Chester Aldrich similarly envisaged (in general terms) Ludwig Curtius as synonymous with the DAIR, Boèthius with the SIR and French scholar Emile Male with the EFR in 1936.\textsuperscript{523}

\textsuperscript{519} ‘Pro Memoria concerning the German libraries, etc.’, August 1, 1945 (Sjöqvist). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
\textsuperscript{520} Thoenes, "Geschichte des Instituts," 26.
\textsuperscript{521} The (para)phrase ‘L’institut, c’est moi’ is not a quote, but the coinage of the author.
\textsuperscript{522} Cf. Erik Holmberg to Sjöqvist, February 23, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
\textsuperscript{523} Aldrich to Dr. J. C. Egbert (Columbia University), August 20, 1936. Cf. Aldrich to Smith, August 21, 1938, regarding the possibility of the AAR ‘getting’ Prof. Rostovtzeff (from Yale), ‘in order to increase our prestige and number of applicants’. AAR, reel 5758.
There is an inherent constant risk of overemphasising the importance and function of the individual in this type of discussion; individual influence needs to be balanced with the inherent force of tradition and the ‘voice’ of an institution (a mosaic of decision-making processes, funding structures, scholarly legacies, and so forth). This sliding scale opens up different spaces and potential flexibilities depending on different (national) contexts and institutional traditions, illustrated in this study through national and international interests at the foreign academies in Rome.

Ward-Perkins’ appointment as director of the BSR after the war serves as an illustrative example of the importance of the role of the individual and of fresh perspectives, with his considerable input in the gestation of the Unione in 1946 and his contributions to the discussions concerning the return of the German libraries in the post-war period (cf. chapter 6).

It is for example not equally certain that the BSR would have readily joined these post-war scholarly collaborative undertakings had Ralegh Radford remained director. Ward-Perkins background in the subcommission steered the BSR further towards active collaboration than it had before the war. To Ward-Perkins, Sjöqvist probably seemed like an established figure in the world of Roman scholarship, when the former assumed the directorship of the BSR in 1945.

The tone and emphasis of the EFR post-war annual reports have no real equivalent in the other foreign academy reports included in this study.\footnote{Cf. for example EFR annual report 1947-1948 (March 1, 1948). The SIR annual reports could in this sense in general terms be said to represent the very opposite}
In the EFR annual report for 1943-1944, written in 1945, reference is given to an account from April 28, 1944, by Jérôme Carcopino (the pre-war director of the EFR, succeeded by Albert Grenier). Regular scholarly publication was deemed necessary in terms of scholarly prestige, reflecting on both the director and the institution itself.

The 1944 EFR report stressed that the members of the EFR once more had to give merit to its name, to ‘finally breathe that sweet perfume, so penetrating and so special [...] which Veuillot [journalist Louis Veuillot, 1813-1883] called the perfume of Rome’. EFR activities had to be recommenced as soon as possible: ‘Material difficulties are no obstacle to those who dream of enriching their spirit, and there is no lack of subjects of study for our young missionaries. Rome, thank God, is more or less intact. The libraries, the archives and the museums have or are preparing to reopen and there are still treasures to be extracted from the Italian soil. [...] It matters that France is present in Rome, if she wishes to expand or just defend her scientific positions. The Minister of National Education, in placing our associate M. Albert Grenier at the head of the École, has without delay showed the intention of the government to give a vigorous boost to work necessary for the good name of our country.’

This passage is symptomatic of the conservative framework of classical archaeology, as a combination of scientific endeavour and treasure hunt, of the EFR reports, in which the role of the director was strongly emphasised, contrary to the SIR reports, in which it was regularly downplayed.


No issue of the EFR *Mélanges* review had been published since December 1940, which was perceived as an acute problem. In 1945, Carcopino remarked that ‘if this insolvency were to be prolonged, it would risk damaging the radiance of our École’. EFR, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l’année 1945, 467-476.
immersed in national pathos. In a positivist empiricist spirit, ‘French hypotheses’, libraries, archives and museums were considered necessary tools for further research that needed to be carried out. This pre-war spirit did not end with the hostilities; on the contrary the potential in the ‘opening’ of Italy fuelled it, which certainly worked against the ‘spirit of international collaboration’. This colonial aspect of the foreign academies in Rome had in other words not suffered visibly from the war; Italian archaeologists were regarded as inferior (not only by the EFR) from the perspective of preserving and researching ancient Roman remains, viewed as international heritage.\footnote{Cf. EFR, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Comptes rendus des séances de l’année 1945, 467-476.}

What did the transition from Carcopino to Grenier entail? Grenier was certainly one of the most persistent and active Unione representatives regarding the issue of international control of the returned German libraries (see chapter 6); from this perspective alone, his individual impact on the ‘profile’ of the EFR was profound during the immediate post-war years.

The transition from Carcopino to Grenier should furthermore be understood in political terms. Carcopino was associated with the Vichy government 1941-1942 (as minister of National Education and Youth); Grenier from this perspective represented a ‘fresh start’ for the EFR as it reopened after the war years. The EFR was quick off the mark in commencing its activities in 1945 (cf. section 5.1).
4.6 **THE COLLEGIUM (1935–1943)**

AIAC (established in 1945, see section 4.7), and the Unione (established in 1946, see section 6.1), both had to relate in some way to its short-lived pre-war precursor – the *Collegium Annalium Institutorum de Urbe Roma* (here referred to as the collegium), founded in 1935 (preceded by a consulting committee, or ‘comitato di consultazione’ in 1934).\(^{528}\)

The collegium was preceded by the *Associazione Internazionale degli Studi Mediterranei* (approximately 1929-1936), an international scholarly venture established in the context of the centenary of the ICA in 1929. The ‘International Mediterranean Research Association’ (as it was known in English) was presided and to a large extent organised by Count Davide Costantini in the Villa Celimontana in Rome.\(^{529}\) The scantily documented association published a bulletin (the *Bollettino dell’Associazione internazionale degli studi mediterranei*) between 1930 and 1936, and organised competitions (for example for reconstructions of the newly discovered

---

\(^{528}\) The collegium would require further study. The collegium, in conjunction with the ambition to publish a common *Annales Institutorum* for the foreign academies in Rome in 1928, has been discussed briefly in Windholz, *Et in Academia Ego. Ausländische Akademien in Rom zwischen künstlerischer Standortbestimmung und nationaler Repräsentation*, 15.


---
Republican temples in the *Largo Argentina*, Rome).

The excavations at Ardea, south of Rome, in which Boëthius and the SIR took part, were furthermore organised by the association.

In a circular letter from August 1930, the organisational ambitions regarding foreign excavations in Italy were clearly stated:

New opportunities for research in Italy and its colonies: The Italian Government has adopted a new and liberal policy toward foreigners who wish to engage in Archaeological research in Italy or its colonies. The Government has created a special institution, called “The International Mediterranean Research Association”; the purpose of the Association is to deal with the many applications to which the new policy will give rise.

I. Excavations. Responsible foreign organizations or individuals may excavate in Italian soil under very reasonable conditions. Such work of excavation is to be carried out in accordance with Italian laws and under the inspection of Italian Government officials. The money subscribed by foreigners is to be controlled by the contributors themselves. Baiae near Naples, the best known summer resort of the Emperors and wealthy Romans in general, has been suggested as one of the possible sites.

II. Archaeological material for foreign museums and universities. Applications for duplicates [sic] of objects found during the process of excavation will be given just consideration.

III. Apprenticeship of foreign students to Italian excavators. Students will be granted permission to act as unpaid assistants to Italian officials in charge of

---

530 See for example ‘Due concorsi dell’Associazione per gli studi Mediterranei’, *Il Resto del Carlino* (Bologna), December 2, 1929. Cf. two articles with the same title in *La Sera* (Milano), December 4, 1929, and in *Il Popolo d’Italia* (Milano), December 3, 1929; as well as in *Scuola Media Fascista* (Roma), January 15, 1930. In *Svenska Institutet 1 okt 1928*². GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 241-243.

Government excavations; they will be assigned, at the request of their own organizations, a subject for special study or publication.532

Following the Associazione Internazionale degli Studi Mediterranei, the short-lived collegium was a new phenomenon in scholarly circles in Rome, in the sense that it was established with the objective of intensifying relations and contacts between foreign as well as domestic scholarly institutions in Rome, as well as to safeguard these interests for the future. One of its main contributions was the annual publishing of an annual report (an annuario). The collegium was presided by the British scholar Eugenie Strong (of the BSR), representing ‘the foreigners’, and senator Pietro Fedele (vice president of the Consiglio per gli Archivi del Regno and director of the Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo), representing its Italian contingent. Pietro Fedele had also been associated with the international Associazione.533

The motives behind the organisation of the collegium are not entirely clear, nor are the underlying reasons for the joining of forces at that moment in time; the driving force appears to have been the desire to fill

532 The International Mediterranean Research Association – ‘Circular N.o 1 August 7th., 1930’. The organisational structure of the association was related as follows: ‘President. Count D.A. Costantini. Vice-presidents: H.E. Roberto Paribeni, General Director of Antiquities and Fine Arts for Italy; Gorham P. Stevens, Director of the American Academy in Rome. Treasurer: Ludwig Curtius, Director of the German Archaeological Institut [sic] in Rome. Secretary: Guido Calza, Director of Excavations at Ostia’. In ‘Svenska Institutet 8 feb. – 1930’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 241-243.

533 For Fedele’s associations with the Associazione Internazionale degli Studi Mediterranei, see for example ‘Importanti scoperte archeologiche nei territori di Ardea e Minturno’, Corriere della sera (Milano), November 6, 1931. In ‘1931’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 241-243. It had been decided against establishing the collegium as Ente legale with its own statutes, but to instead remain a free association. In 1936 the collegium received the official support of the Accademia d’Italia. Cf. “Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma. Verbali assemblee 6.2.1946 – 27.6.1958,” 7.
the gap in communication between the foreign academies and their Italian counterparts on the local scale in Rome, mainly through the publication of an *annuario*, in essence the rationale of the establishment of the Unione in 1946 (cf. section 6.1). AAR director Chester Aldrich described the idea of the collegium as quite a novelty in a report to AAR president J.K. Smith.534

Mario Recchi, the driving force behind the coordination of the academies as ‘intellectual embassies’ in the collegium, and editor of the *Annales institutorum* (established in 1928-1929 in a collaboration with an ‘official character’), died in the summer of 1938.535 The collegium was deprived of its leadership when its two presidents Eugenie Strong and

---

534 Aldrich to Smith, June 22, 1938. AAR, reel 5758: ‘I also represented the [American] Academy at a meeting of the Collegium Annalorum [*sic*] composed of the heads of all Academies, Italian and foreign, in Rome’.

535 Mario Recchi was the director of the *Annales institutorum* and a member of for example the *Associazione Italiana biblioteche*. For the *Annales institutorum*, see also [http://www.archivi.beniculturali.it/Biblioteca/damosto_html/01_html](http://www.archivi.beniculturali.it/Biblioteca/damosto_html/01_html) (visited June 28, 2010). For the academies as ‘intellectual embassies’ and the *Annales*, see *Le scuole straniere a Roma* – n.d. (1929, Gino Massano): ‘Sarebbe questo il 19. Istituto straniero in Roma e quindi la 19. vera *Ambasciata intellettuale* secondo la felice espressione di un diplomatico inglese. E tutti volgono i loro sforzi allo studio dell’arte e della vita, che si sono succeduti in Italia nei millenni, dai primordi delle civiltà ai giorni nostri. [...] Di questi 19 istituti, “*quaee provebendis humanoribus disciplines artibusque colendis a variis in urbe erecta sunt nationibus*” escono ora gli *Annales*. Editore il dottor Mario Recchi, che della iniziativa è il fondatore ed il direttore; collaboratori i capi degli stessi Istituti. Coordinatori del lavoro: Eugenio [*sic*] Strong, Govert [*sic*] Hoogewerff, Mario Recchi e Vincenzo Golzio [...]’. In ‘Svenska Institutet 1 okt 1928’°. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 241-243. See also *Corriere della Sera*, January 31, 1933 (Luigi Bottazzi): ‘Roma centro di studi mondiali. Accademie e Scuole straniere’. GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 238; in which the Collegium was explained in terms of an initiative of a group of ‘studiosi’: Eugenie Strong, Hoogewerff, ‘il dott. Vincenzo Golzio e il dott. Mario Recchi, coi quali, per gli argomenti di arte moderna, collabora il dott. Bertini-Calosso – gli Istituti straniere decisero nel 1929 di iniziare una pubblicazione comune che, senza sopprimere le singole iniziative culturali, riunisse in un quadro d’insieme le loro attività. Sorsero così, con una collaborazione di carattere ufficiale, gli *Annales Institutorum* dei quali a prezzo piuttosto alto (ma sono acquistati dalle biblioteche e dagli studiosi che fanno volentieri sacrifici) si pubblica ogni anno un volume. Gli *Annales* sono giunti sani e salvi al terzo volume e promettono di avere una lunga vita, dando ancora una volta la prova che le Nazioni, quando vogliono, si mettono facilmente d’accordo’.

---
Pietro Fedele also passed away during the war (they both died by 1943). The collegium ceased to function as no new presidency was established during the war. The publication of the annuario was suspended, but the council or ‘Giunta d’Intendenza’ of the collegium continued, following a request by Mario Recchi’s widow, Velia Recchi. Erik Sjöqvist emphasised the importance of the Unione therefore maintaining an ‘Annales institutorum’ in some shape or form.\footnote{"Verbali Unione," 7-8. Cf. Gjerstad’s ‘legacy’ in SIR annual report 1938-1939, p. 5: ‘As a member of the consulting committee of the Annales Institutorum the director [Gjerstad] has contributed to the organisation of the international collaboration between the scientific institutions existing in Rome’.

\footnote{Ibid., 9-10.}}

The judicial non-existence of the collegium, Sjöqvist maintained, in combination with the impossibility of it carrying out its activities in the present situation, gave the Unione ample moral reasons to protect the interests of the collegium after the war. The Unione in this regard took over its function and at the same time expanded its horizons, almost by default, by having to deal with the issue of the return of the four German libraries to Rome and Florence after the war (cf. chapter 6). In a letter dated February 16, 1946, Velia Recchi asked that a clause be added to the Unione statutes declaring that the collegium existed prior to the Unione, and that the two organisations did not differ in intent. This was not an unreasonable request, but a difficult one to meet, as it was argued that the Unione statutes had already been formulated and approved on February 6.\footnote{Ibid., 9-10.}

This connection with the little-known collegium does to some extent balance the narrative of the Unione being established on the laurels of the ICA in 1829; the Unione was, at least in the eyes of Velia Recchi, in 1946...
for all intents and purposes continuing the work and legacy of the collegium. The short-lived collegium however did not fit into the Unione narrative of resuming the more than century old spirit of genuine and benign collaboration perceived to have been embodied in the ICA.

4.7 ‘FACING THE FUTURE WITH CONFIDENCE’: THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AIAC (1945)

When interviewed in the Swedish newspaper *Svenska Dagbladet* in September 1945, Sjöqvist reported that ‘the Allies have sent their most excellent specialists together with Italian experts in order to as far as possible reconstruct the immortal monuments damaged by the war. The Swedish Institute has taken part of these good relations [...] and I have just been entrusted with the confidence of acting as president of the provisional council which is about to organise a new scholarly society in Rome, “The International Association of Classical Archaeology” [AIAC], in which ten countries are represented at present’.538 In the summer of 1945, the young organisation was however yet to emerge from being a

---

mere ‘living expectation’. Sjöqvist furthermore recorded a radio talk (via RAI in Rome), commissioned by the Swedish Radiotjänst, and transmitted in Sweden on November 27, 1945.  

Preliminary Allied inquiries after the liberation of Rome soon established that the Allied Control Commission (ACC) would require an organised structure that might assume custody for the German libraries before arrangements of their return to Italy could be made. The ACC thus negotiated the return of the libraries to Rome, even though the issue of what was to happen to them when they arrived remained unclear. The creation of AIAC was sketched in a letter of late 1944 by an international group of scholars (the ‘provisional committee’) characterised by its Allied domination (Swedes, Swiss, Americans, English, French and Italians; the committee was made up of representatives of ten countries in all). 

This group met repeatedly as of December 18, 1944 during the spring of 1945 under the presidency of Erik Sjöqvist. A circular letter was sent out

539 ‘[AIAC] är ännu så länge endast en levande förhoppning’. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, July 16, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2. The Swiss archaeologist and philosopher Federico Pfister (1898-1975) took part in the discussions in the group of scholars (archaeologists) involved in establishing an organisation of ‘international character’: ‘Riunendo le varie energie individuali in uno sforzo comune, scevro da ogni altra considerazione che non fosse quella dell’interesse della scienza e della cultura, una organizzazione del genere avrebbe potuto anche servire, al momento opportuno, quale utile ed appropriato strumento per ricostruire quello che gli eventi bellici rischiavano di disperdere, forse, in modo irreparabile’. Pfister formulated the AIAC statutes together with Sjöqvist (‘and others’), and was nominated its secretary-general, and Pfister became the main AIAC representative in the Unione from 1946 onwards. AIAC was given the task to systematise the DAIR library in the July 7, 1947 Unione session. Pfister was in charge of its transport and installation at Via Sardegna. The DAIR library was reopened on December 13, 1947. Cf. Statement regarding Federico Pfister, signed by Grenier, Sjöqvist and Morey (n.d., 1951?). EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Historique. L’UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953’.

540 Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5. The recording has unfortunately not been preserved by Sveriges Radio.
during the winter of 1944-1945, and AIAC was formally constituted on May 5, 1945.\textsuperscript{541} In commenting on its scope, Sjöqvist described the contents of the circular letter and of AIAC as ‘a preparation for the practical peacetime work within our field or research, and an attempt to increase the space for competent international work within the field of Italian archaeology’. Sjöqvist was hoping for Swedish (financial as well as moral) support, and reported that the USA, France, Belgium and the Vatican had so far joined the association.\textsuperscript{542}

Transcending such rhetoric, AIAC was established primarily for the express pragmatic cause of working for the return of the DAIR library to Rome. The association was established before the war actually ended (the German army eventually capitulated on May 17). Erik Sjöqvist was in many ways the ‘spider in the web’ of the scholarly network from which AIAC evolved. Sjöqvist’s almanacs from this period provide evidence for regular meetings with (among others) Ernest De Wald of the Subcommission,

\textsuperscript{541} The minutes from these four meetings have been preserved. A certain abstraction of the matter at hand was a characteristic trait. During the course of the third meeting Sjöqvist, ever the pragmatic, proposed that the return of the DAIR library should be at least mentioned at some point in the AIAC statutes. This did not materialise. Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, May 6, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2; and Billig and Billig, ”The Billig Manuscript,” 205. See also Vian, ed., Speculum Mundi, 47-48. The circular letter (dated March 10, 1945, Via Omero 14, with later additional lists of members (with Erik Welin representing the SIR), n.d. – between 1957 and 1959), can be found in EFR, box ‘AIAC 1946-1959’. File ‘Associazione Internazionale d’Archeologia Classica’ (as well as in box ‘Union 1950-1955’. File ‘Union 1950’). See also AIAC, box ‘Statuto’ – containing for example the files ‘Statuto dell’A.I.A.C.’, ‘Statuto approvato’, ‘Documenti costitutivi’ and a (draft) diagram of the organisational structure of AIAC: ‘Consiglio permanente – Presidente – Comitato esecutivo – Direttore – Segretario […].’ Cf. also AIAC, boxes ‘Biblioteche Tedesche 1 & 2’. AIAC archives, Palazzo Venezia, Rome. Dr. Olof Brandt (of the Pontificia Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana) has discussed the preliminary stages and alternative statutes of AIAC in an as yet unpublished article. No list of recipients of the circular letter seems to exist in the AIAC archives.

\textsuperscript{542} Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, July 5, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3: ‘Det är ingenting annat än en förberedelse till det praktiska fredsarbetet inom vår forskning, och ett försök att ge ökat utrymme till kompetent internationellt arbete inom italiensk arkeologi’.

European University Institute
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Scarlat Lambrino of the Roumanian Academy, Ludwig Curtius (ex-director of the DAIR), the Keats and Shelley committee, and Gaetano de Sanctis, president of the Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia 1930-1957 (of which Sjöqvist was made a ‘Socio corrispondeante residente’ in December 1944).

In March and April 1945 Sjöqvist met regularly with Bartolomeo Nogara (director of the Vatican museums), De Wald, Ward-Perkins, Morey and Federico Pfister (who was to be closely associated with AIAC until the restitution of the DAIR library in 1953); often at the SIR. The first mention of an AIAC meeting in Sjöqvist’s almanacs was on April 7, 1945. The first ‘official’ AIAC session took place at the SIR on February 13, 1946.

---

543 Cf. the following extract from Sjöqvist’s almanac from January 1945: ‘4/1 Lambrino, the Swedish legation, Keats & Shelley, 5/1 Keats & Shelley, 8/1 ‘Billig’s reception’, 13/1 Radford (BSR), 14/1 De Wald, 16/1 De Sanctis, 17/1 Lunch with Curtius, 18/1 Palazzo Farnese (EFR), 20/1 De Wald, 25/1 Calza (at the Accad. Pont.) and De Wald’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:3 (translated by the author). For the Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia-diploma (1944), see RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:4. Sjöqvist’s almanacs do not seem to have been taken into account by Erland Billig. For Gaetano De Sanctis (1870-1957), see Antonella Amico, Gaetano De Sanctis: Profilo biografico e attivita’ parlamentare (Tivoli (Rome): Tored, 2007), Carlo Pietrangeli, ed., La Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia: Note Storiche, vol. IV, Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia. Serie III: Memorie (Roma: ‘L’Erma’ di Bretschneider, 1983).


545 AIAC, Verbali Assemblee.
In part, AIAC sprung from a context of other locally based ‘international associations’, such as the Associazione Internazionale degli Studi Mediterranei, the Associazione Internazionale Artistica, and the Rome-based collegium of institutes (cf. section 4.6). Both AIAC and the Unione were furthermore to some extent inspired by overarching organisations such as the International Union of Academies (Union Académique Internationale) in Brussels (established in 1919).

AIAC expanded rapidly; after a decade the association comprised the majority of individuals (scholars and archaeologists) as well as institutions (libraries and museums) associated with classical archaeology in Rome. This distinction is important, as the association was exclusively directed at and tailored for archeologia classica from an international perspective, with the Unione inheriting the role of the collegium (cf. section 4.6) in catering for the foreign and domestic academies, schools and institutes in Rome, thus at the same time being more local and ranging further than AIAC.

On a larger scale and in a long-term perspective, AIAC was to strive towards an internationalisation of classical archaeology in the Mediterranean – a process stifled by war – through exchange of information and ‘centralised’ planning of excavations. The structural problem facing both AIAC and the Unione was in this sense the issue of how to transcend national funding frameworks.

In a memorandum printed in 1946 directed at the UN and UNESCO with the hope of receiving funding for the Unione, the purposes of AIAC were stated to be

(i) To interest itself in legislation relating to archaeological research. (ii) To promote coordination and cooperation in surveys, excavations, conservation of finds, and publication of results. The Association has attracted financial support in Sweden, and especially in Switzerland [through Sjöqvist and Pfister], to a degree that will enable it to carry on at its own expense a periodical summary of archaeological discoveries, replacing and continuing the indispensable *Archaeologischer Anzeiger* of the ex-German Archaeological Institute [the *Fasti*]. The International Association for Classical Archaeology is the obvious instrument, in the opinion of the Union, wherewith to operate the library of the Archaeological Institute under international control, at Rome, which is the seat also of the Association. It can command the intellectual support of all archaeologists in all countries, and can also command, as above indicated, financial contributions on an international basis.548

The distinct affiliation of AIAC with classical archaeology created specific problems regarding the role of the organisation in relation to the fate of the four German libraries, as the ACC had no intention of separating the DAIR library from the historical and the two art historical libraries (cf. section 6.1). AIAC had furthermore not satisfactorily resolved the issue of the relative input of each of its members.549

549 Cf. memorandum regarding AIAC and the Unione, Jean Bayet, January 25, 1953. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union/Association, textes de base, liaisons internationales’: ‘[...] localement, cet organisme [AIAC], s’il reconnaît en
In December 1945, Sjöqvist informed Boëthius about the problems AIAC was encountering, for example regarding Greek participation in the Rome-based international venture: Sjöqvist was trying to mediate, with ‘assistance from the French’. Greek archaeologists were not altogether pleased with the focus on Rome. On the other hand, Sjöqvist could also report that AIAC was about to receive substantial contributions from Swiss sponsors (thanks to Federico Pfister), and had the interest on the capital of one million Swiss Francs at its disposal, hoping to issue a first volume of the planned annual archaeological report *Fasti Archaeologici* in 1946. The *Fasti* was planned to fill the gap left by the absence of the German AM and RM (‘Mitteilungen’) publications at the end of the war.550

This planned Swiss contribution fell through, however (it instead tellingly ended up as the important financial foundation of the Swiss Institute in Rome), and a lobbying campaign was initiated in order to raise money for the *Fasti* publication. In writing to the board of the SIR in January 1947, Sjöqvist was hoping that the SIR could participate in the *Fasti* project by contributing $500.551

Sjöqvist was probably also responsible for a memorandum commissioned by Morey for the AAR with the same fund-raising

---

objective. Morey wrote to AAR director Roberts that ‘I would like very much to let the editorial board know that it can depend upon [a $500 contribution from the AAR]. This seems to me to be something that the Academy cannot ignore, and also that American support at this time may bring support from other nations. [The] collapse of the Swiss contribution was a serious blow but it may be that we can get some of that back after the foundation of the Swiss Academy in Rome’. The appeal was successful, and the money was indeed raised for the initial Fasti publication. The advent of this issue was simultaneous with internal AAR budgetary discussions regarding its excavation program; it is likely that AIAC came across primarily as an archaeological, rather than as an international, association from the perspective of the AAR.

EFR director Albert Grenier similarly wrote to the cultural counsellor at the

---

552 The memorandum was addressed at Via Omero, 14 (the address of the SIR, and therefore the first address of AIAC). It explained the objectives of the Fasti, as well as the developments of the Swiss donation. AIAC set out ‘to establish an internationally based information service, indispensable to archaeologists and students of antiquity after the long period of war. [...] A generous swiss citizen offered the sum of 100,000 sfrs., but the swiss government, who had to be consulted with this matter by reasons of taxation, opposed itself to this donation particularly preoccupied by the possible consequences which might arise for Switzerland regarding international relations. [...] For the time being, the first subvention indispensable for the beginning of the work has not yet arrived, – therefore it would be of greatest satisfaction and highest importance to the Association if the American Institute of Archaeology [sic] might either directly or indirectly assume this task’. ‘Memorandum Concerning the publication of the Annual Bulletin of Classical Archaeology promoted by the International Association for Classical Archaeology’. AAR, reel 5798.

553 Morey to Roberts, January 15, 1947: ‘I am enclosing a copy of the memorandum of the International Association for Classical Archaeology describing the Fasti Archeologici, referred to in this memorandum as The Bulletin, for which, as I told you, Ward Perkins is going to ask his Trustees for a hundred pounds. Please keep this memorandum if it will be of any use to you in taking up the matter of a contribution of $500 which we discussed the other night with the Trustees’. Cf. note (Roberts): ‘$500 Approved Feb. 11, 1947’. AAR, reel 5798.

554 A similar $500 contribution to the publication of the Fasti was for example made by the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, largely through efforts by Myron C. Taylor. AIAC archives, Palazzo Venezia, Rome.
French Embassy in Rome (Vieillefond) in November 1950, hoping for a $1500 UNESCO subvention for the publication of the *Fasti*.\(^{555}\)

AIAC sent a second circular letter to its members in December 1947 – essentially a further appeal for donations to increase its funding – justifying its two-year ‘silence’ with ‘the difficulties of this post-war period’, and ‘normal intercourse between nations [being] impeded on all sides’. In the letter (quoted in appendix 4), AIAC expressed its gratitude to ‘all those who have contributed either directly or by means of their valuable collaboration, notably the American Academy, l’École Française d’Archéologie et d’Histoire [sic], the British School and the Swedish Institute in Rome, whose comprehensive and generous assistance has enabled us to realize our project’. The ‘fundamental idea’ of AIAC was described as ‘international collaboration in the scientific field, and therefore with obtaining adherence wherever there are kindred archaeological interests’.\(^{556}\)

Ward-Perkins organised the British connections for the *Fasti* (regarding Roman Britain), and was in August 1946 discussing with Sjöqvist how to ‘tackle Spain and Turkey’. The BSA had been ‘thoroughly converted’; AIAC was thus catching on, even in Greece.\(^ {557}\) In his 1949-1950 report, Ward-Perkins considered that ‘with the publication of the third [*Fasti*] volume (for 1948) it is reasonable to hope that this important


\(^{556}\) Circular letter from AIAC to its members, December 15, 1947, EFR, box ‘AIAC 1945-1959’ (appendix 4). The French version of the letter was dated March 10, 1945 (‘Via Omero, 14’).

\(^{557}\) ‘The secretary of the BSA was ‘staying with us in Rome [at the BSR] in October – a casa Sjöqvist meal should do the trick, I think!’ Ward-Perkins to Sjöqvist, August 26 (?) , 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4.
venture in international collaboration has come to stay. The School has from the outset been closely associated with it, and the Director and Librarian are both active in the work of editing. Volume IV (for 1949) is in preparation for press.\textsuperscript{558} At the same time, AIAC had not received the anticipated funding from UNESCO for the installation and temporary administration of the DAIR library by December 1947; the expenses had to be carried by AIAC (and the Unione), with negative consequences for the budget of the \textit{Fasti}.\textsuperscript{559}

In his 1944-1945 SIR annual report, Sjöqvist explained to the board that the thought of practical cooperation in order to prepare measures to be taken for the promotion of research in archaeological circles in Rome was awoken at the time of the German occupation. Sjöqvist wrote that these plans had taken firmer shape after the liberation of Rome on June 4, 1944. A provisional committee with participants from ten nations was constituted for the formulation of a program and for the elaboration of a practical agenda; its work resulted in the creation of [AIAC] on May 5, 1945. The director [Sjöqvist], who had led the negotiations of the provisional committee following a request from the other participants, was therefore elected chairman of the provisional council of the association.\textsuperscript{560}

Sjöqvist in other words stressed the ‘inevitability’ of AIAC before making it clear to the board that he had acted on the request of other academy directors and not following his own initiative, as he probably presumed that the board would express skepticism regarding his

\textsuperscript{558} BSR annual report, 1949-1950.
\textsuperscript{559} Cf. circular letter from AIAC to its members, December 15, 1947, EFR, box ‘AIAC 1945-1959’ (appendix 4).
\textsuperscript{560} SIR Annual Report 1944-1945, 2-3.
participation in this international venture. Sjöqvist furthermore emphasised the transitional nature of the organisation, and downplayed his own role by stressing the word ‘provisional’ in order to dampen potential criticism from Sweden. This is even clearer in the passage that followed, in which Sjöqvist referred to himself in the third person (a ‘transnational’ common practice in this context):

‘It would be inaccurate however to conclude from this that he [Sjöqvist] was the initiator of the new assembly, as his role has chiefly been to coordinate differing propositions and spontaneous initiatives from various directions, as well as the concretisation of these to functioning meeting agendas. It is furthermore worth noting that all members of the committee have acted as private citizens and as scholars interested in and believing in the necessity of a post-war collaboration within their field of research; not as representatives of the institutions to which they are attached, even less for the countries to which they belong’. Neutrality was a sensitive issue at this time, also to the board of the SIR. The notion that the foreign academy directors could act outside of their role as directors in this regard may have been somewhat naïve. This issue relates to the perceived possibility of separating science from politics and personal engagement from official representation.

As for the future of AIAC, Sjöqvist reported that ‘it is still too early to judge if the association will be able to solve its tasks, as this is wholly dependent on the way the initiative is received in different quarters. Influential circles in the USA, Belgium, France, Italy and the Vatican seem to be prepared to actively participate, although the attitude in
England [sic] – particularly in Oxford – appears to be more negative. In any case results obtained already have contributed to reestablishing scholarly and cultural relations, severed for a long time, and the Swedish Institute has functioned as a natural platform in this, enabling scholars from different nations to meet for an open and informal exchange of thoughts and ideas.⁵⁶¹

Sjöqvist thus made no deliberate secret of the importance of the SIR in underpinning the work of AIAC as well as for the maintenance of the goodwill of the scholarly international collaboration in post-war Rome. In doing so, Sjöqvist’s own agency and contributions were (intentionally) repeatedly omitted.

As a result, Sjöqvist stressed that he acted as a private Swedish citizen in AIAC in communicating with the board, and not as the director of the SIR. This indicates a problem relating to a lack of mandate. Each member of the board of AIAC ‘represented’ their country, without any official diplomatic representational mandate to do so, however. Sjöqvist emphasised that he acted as a private citizen and would not obligate or involve the SIR in any way; as Billig correctly pointed out this disregarded the fact that the reason he was selected as a candidate for the presidency of both AIAC and the Unione was that he was director of the SIR.

Despite Sjöqvist’s precautions the board of the SIR (particularly Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf) remained largely skeptical of the new organisation, as foreseen by Sjöqvist. It was crucial to the board that ‘international misunderstandings’ should be avoided, hence the suggestion

⁵⁶¹ SIR annual report 1944-1945, 3.
(by Einar Gjerstad) of placing the direction of AIAC in Switzerland or in the United States, ‘in consideration of Greece and the archaeological circles in Athens’. On the other hand, Sjöqvist was present (in Stockholm) when the SIR executive committee (arbetsutskottet) formulated the official position of the board of the SIR regarding AIAC (in September 1945).

Sjöqvist was presumably hoping for a more constructive and pragmatic discussion than the abstractions discussed by the board of the SIR, which regarded AIAC was regarded more as a potential threat than as a useful scholarly tool and collaborative effort. This reflected a conflict of interests on the part of the board in relation to Sjöqvist and the Roman scholarly community.

In 1953, Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf had become King, which increased his ‘symbolic value’ when he suggested the establishment of a friendship association for the promotion of the Fasti, eight years after the initial Swedish (Royal) hesitation regarding AIAC. The project, the Amici dei Fasti Archeologici (cf. section 6.5), was outlined in a memorandum by Prof. Adriano Prandi. Boëthius, once more director of the SIR (1952–1953), was most likely involved in the procedure, which, it was hoped, would finally

---

562 SIR board meeting minutes, September 29, 1945, §11. Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5, and RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, I:5. The plans to ‘relocate’ AIAC to Switzerland (to Berne) nearly became tangible when Sjöqvist, Billig and Axel Hallin discussed travelling to Bern (November 1946); the trip did however not materialise. Cf. Billig to Sjöqvist, November 22, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1.
solve the financial plight and dire straits of the *Fasti*, and create the necessary prerequisite through ‘a certain tranquility’.\textsuperscript{564} It is however noteworthy that the precondition for the Royal Swedish involvement was the parallel involvement of the Italian President Luigi Einaudi (1874-1961). The delayed reaction is also symptomatic of pragmatic and careful Swedish policy; sounding out a phenomenon before committing to it.

4.8 THE VATICAN AND THE FOREIGN ACADEMIES IN ROME, AIAC AND THE UNIO NE

The Vatican archives opened to scholars in 1881 by order of Pope Leo XIII. This important initiative sparked a continuous wave of research by foreign scholars investigating national histories and research paradigms through the Vatican collections. Roman historical institutes, for example the EFR, can be understood as collegiate bodies in Rome for historical research, notably in the Vatican archives. The scholarly output of the EFR for example enjoyed a long connection with the Vatican (through the study of papal registries, for example). This output is documented in the EFR annual reports, for example when ‘the prefects of the library and archives of the Vatican [...] expressed to M. Grenier their sincere joy of seeing the return of French researchers’ (after the Second World War). This was however likely based on an exaggerated misinterpretation of mere formal cordialities, although the Vatican was probably glad to see the rekindling of French scholarly engagements with Papal registries and archival resources.

The following discusses the role of the Vatican in relation to the foreign academies in Rome during and after the Second World War, commenting on the nature and scope of Vatican (cultural) diplomacy. The Vatican represented a locus of power in the post-war power vacuum, and was thus influential, partly as the institution had ‘survived’ the Fascists and


the war. This particularly applied after the fall of the monarchy in 1945-1946, before the establishment of the Italian republic and constitution.

Bartolomeo Nogara can be said to have represented Vatican cultural ‘policy’ before, during and after the war, through his important position as director of the Vatican Museums (1920-1954), ‘the first real director in the modern sense of these collections’, and through his wide-ranging network of contacts. Nogara for example well acquainted with Jérôme Carcopino, the pre-war director of the EFR; and was on good terms with his successor Albert Grenier. Nogara was guided by a similar ‘juridical wisdom’ (‘sapienza giuridica’) to that of his nineteenth-century predecessor Bartolomeo Pacca, in terms of his importance for the ‘protection’ of ancient monuments and cultural heritage.

Connections between the (Vatican) Segreteria di Stato and the Vatican library have traditionally been intimate, often based on close personal relations. The Vatican archives were not evacuated during the war years, and Sjöqvist maintained ‘diplomatic’ relations with above all Monsignore Angelo Mercati of the Archivio Segreto. In 1943, Swedish archivist (‘arkivrådet’) L.M. Bååth (of the Swedish national archives, RA), wrote to Sjöqvist with a research inquiry regarding the ‘Diplomatarium Suecanum’

---

569 Cf. Sjöqvist to L.M. Bååth (archivist at RA), September 29, 1941. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
the publication of which he was in charge, expressing the hope ‘that the
war has not yet stopped or will ever hinder the peaceful and diplomatic
work of the Vatican’.573

This continued scholarly activity highlights issues of representation: it
was necessary for Bååth and the Swedish national archives to maintain
good relations with the Vatican archives specifically, not necessarily with
the Vatican as a whole.

Enquiries were made by AAR president J.K. Smith in 1941 as to ‘the
possibility of making some arrangement with the Vatican under which the
Prefect of the Vatican Library might act as custodian for our Library, and
perhaps our properties in general, in the event that the international
situation further deteriorates, and Americans are forced to leave Italy’.573
Vatican custody was ‘an angle which we have not considered here
officially, so we can take no responsibility for activity in this direction.574
These discussions took place after the death of director Chester Aldrich

572 L.M. Bååth to Sjöqvist, February 6, 1943. In his reply, Sjöqvist however pointed
out that ‘even the Vatican sometimes has to bend for force majeure’ (May 7,
1943). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2. Cf. also correspondence
between Bååth and Boëthius regarding the ‘Diplomatarium Suecanum’ (1945) in
RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1.
573 J.K. Smith had discussed the issue with Amey Aldrich (Chester Aldrich’s
sister, who remained at the AAR after his death) in March 1941. According to her
an agreement with the Vatican was at that time ‘not feasible’. Cf. J.K. Smith to
William C. Phillips (US Ambassador to Italy), December 10, 1941. This was
confirmed by Ambassador Phillips: ‘I fear that events have moved so rapidly that
nothing now can be done to effect an arrangement with the Vatican Library.
However it might be worth a try, if only to secure an expression of interest in the
Library from the Vatican authorities’. Phillips to Smith, December 16, 1941.
AAR, reel 5758.
574 Cf. J.K. Smith to Amey Aldrich, March 14, 1941. AAR, reel 5758: ‘The
suggestion keeps arising of making our properties the headquarters of some
organization involved in the relief of suffering, until such time as we can again
send students there’.
in 1940, which turned out to be too late for the organisation of Vatican protection of the AAR during the war.

AAR relations with the Vatican were mainly channelled through Myron C. Taylor, chairman of the AAR finance committee, and US ambassador to the Holy See. This connection was perceived as a useful ‘backup’ by the AAR during the hostilities, and as correspondingly superfluous after the war.575

British diplomatic channels with the Vatican were involved in an even more pragmatic case regarding the BSR when the issue arose in 1942 whether or not a certain Count Salazar and his wife might be able to stay for some time in the evacuated premises of the BSR. The issue was channeled through the British legation to the Holy See. BSR honorary general secretary Evelyn Shaw was hesitant, and suggested that director Ralegh Radford ask the opinion of Sir Stephen Gaselee at the Foreign Office, as ‘hitherto the School has been entirely unmolested, doubtless owing to the fact that it is known to be closed and in the hands of Italian caretakers. The presence of a British subject in the School might rouse

575 Cf. J.K. Smith to Lindsay Bradford (AAR treasurer), October 3, 1945. AAR, reel 5758: ‘I am enclosing a letter from Myron Taylor bearing on the Vatican situation. I am replying to him today that the importance of opening up normal channels and closing the Vatican channel is recognized by the Treasurer and the Chairman of the Finance Committee, and that they are working on it’. Cf. J.P. Morgan & Co. to AAR secretary Richardson Pratt, June 1, 1945: ‘With reference to our letter of May 11th, we are today crediting the account of the Amministrazione Speciale della Santa Sede $27,641.36, representing funds received with your letter of May 9, 1945; and Richardson Pratt to J.P. Morgan & Co., att. Arthur M. Anderson, June 5, 1945: ‘Please credit the enclosed check for $2,732.64 to the account of the Holy See. This payment is made to reimburse the Special Administration of the Holy See for the following advances made to the American Academy in Rome [for repairs to the roof of the AAR main building]’. 
suspicion, especially among the ignorant, with possibly serious consequences to the safety of the School'.

Ralegh Radford communicated the decision to turn down the residency request of Count Salazar to D.G. Osborne at the British legation to the Holy See in January 1943, as the BSR did not want to risk ‘the quasi-diplomatic privileges’ it enjoyed at the time: ‘After careful consideration we feel that the proposal that Count and Countess Sarsfield Salazar should reside at the School is not one to which the Committee could agree. In view of the fact that the Swiss legation, who are now custodians of the [BSR] buildings, do not display any enthusiasm for the project we fear that [...] the Italian authorities might well accuse us of desiring to use the school buildings for our own purpose in time of war, and might cease to extend to the buildings the quasi-diplomatic privileges which they now enjoy. This would, we fear, lead to sequestration involving difficulties both during and after the war’.\(^{577}\)

Regarding the sometimes precarious but unquestionably powerful (national) role of the Vatican as unifying symbol, Christopher Duggan writes that ‘the collapse of fascism and the humiliation of surrender in

---

\(^{576}\) Shaw to Ralegh Radford, December 22, 1942. BSR, box 63. A certain (unidentified) Hirst wrote to Shaw regarding the matter a few days later. He expressed doubts regarding Radford’s judgment: ‘Hirst (?) to Shaw, December 26, 1942: ‘I should vote against the Count being installed in Valle Giulia. [...] These Irish attachés really belong to the Vatican. Let them show some signs of that catholic charity which is expected of others. So far, they have done little to discourage Fascist hooliganism in Italy that is the risk involved here. [...] I can only suggest that he [Ralegh Radford] be relieved of the difficulties of acting officially on behalf of the Committee for I cannot feel that he is able to see things in their proper perspective’. See also Hirst (?) to Shaw, January 30, 1943: ‘[Ralegh Radford] has been shown to be hopelessly wrong in his estimation of the power of Musso’s gang and yet he is asked to do [jobs] for the [Government] in which his opinions must be fairly useless’.

\(^{577}\) Ralegh Radford to D.G. Osborne, British legation to the Holy See, Vatican City, January 6, 1943.
1943 presented Pope Pius XII with a golden opportunity, it seemed, to ‘reconquer’ Italy for Catholicism. And the fact that millions of Italians looked spontaneously towards the Papacy for solace and leadership amid the wreckage of defeat appeared to justify the hope that Italy could be turned into a flagship of ‘Christian civilization’. In the 1944-1945 SIR annual report, Sjöqvist discussed the SIR in relation to the Vatican in terms of ‘cultural neutrality’: 'The collaboration with the other neutral state that disposes an archaeological institute and an academy in Rome, that is the Vatican, has been especially fruitful'. The institute in question was the Pontificia Istituto di Archeologia Christiana (PIAC); the academy was the Pontificia Accademia di Archeologia Romana (PAA).

Sjöqvist thus discussed the Vatican in terms of ‘cultural neutrality’, as the other neutral state with cultural activity in Rome at that time. For Sjöqvist, the rapport with the Vatican was based on little more than an

---

invitation to ‘usher in the academic year at the Pont. Accademia di Archeologia Romana’. Sjöqvist was naturally not asked to give this lecture at the Papal academy of Roman archaeology because he was Swedish, but because he was well accustomed with the topic, which was furthermore of religious interest (based on his recent investigations under the church of S. Maria in Via Lata – cf. section 3.2). His efforts were rewarded with his election as ‘corresponding member’ of the papal academy in 1945.\footnote{SIR annual report 1944-1945, 1. The papal academy offered to publish Sjöqvist’s S. Maria in Via Lata-study in its Memorie-series, which he declined due to prior arrangements with the SIR publication series. Cf. Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, July 5, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3; and SIR annual report 1944-1945, 1.}

The role of the Vatican in connection with the removal and return of the four German libraries remains unclear, suffice to say that the agency of Baron von Weiszäcker, German ambassador to the Holy See, was of considerable importance (cf. this chapter). It seems that the Vatican had tried to prevent to the removal of the libraries in 1944; communications between the Pope and German scholars (not specified by Erland Billig) hints at the intention of the Vatican to work for a restitution of the libraries to Italy. The perceived schedule or the form of such support was not clearly framed. Few, if any, German sources offer any details, and Sjöqvist ‘never mentioned it’, according to Billig. When the return of the German libraries was organised in late 1945, the Vatican was seemingly not involved, even though the source material situation for this period is fragmentary.\footnote{Cf. Erland Billig’s papers. The most recent pontificate accessible at present in the Vatican archives is that of Pius XI (1922-1939). The Vatican State Secretary archives apply a 75-year rule.}
The DHI library was however deposited in the Vatican after the Unione had been denied concession of Palazzo Vidoni in 1947 (see section 6.2), and remained there until its restitution to German control in 1953 (cf. chapter 6).\footnote{See also memorandum (Grenier), December 14, 1950. EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’. File ‘Union 1950’.
\footnote{Sjöqvist to Pope Pius XII, February 6, 1948: ‘Beatissimo Padre A nome dell’[AIAC], incaricata dalle Autorità Alleate ed Italiane del grave compito di amministrare ad interim la Biblioteca dell’Istituto Archeologico Germanico [...] rivolgo alla Santità Sua un commosso ringraziamento per il grandioso dono che la Santità Sua ha generosamente voluto fare a favore della Associazione. Tale dono significa molto di più di un appoggio materiale, sebbene di entità assai ragguardevole, offerto all’Associazione in un momento critico della sua vita. Esso rappresenta anche e soprattutto un alto incoraggiamento morale ed un segno}}

The Vatican donated 300,000 lire as a contribution to the management of the DAIR library. In 1948 Sjöqvist wrote to Monsignore Montini, ‘substitute secretary of state’ of the Holy See, expressing the gratitude of AIAC for the donation, as support for and encouragement of ‘our efforts meant to serve international humanist studies’.\footnote{Sjöqvist to Pope Pius XII, February 6, 1948: ‘Beatissimo Padre A nome dell’[AIAC], incaricata dalle Autorità Alleate ed Italiane del grave compito di amministrare ad interim la Biblioteca dell’Istituto Archeologico Germanico [...] rivolgo alla Santità Sua un commosso ringraziamento per il grandioso dono che la Santità Sua ha generosamente voluto fare a favore della Associazione. Tale dono significa molto di più di un appoggio materiale, sebbene di entità assai ragguardevole, offerto all’Associazione in un momento critico della sua vita. Esso rappresenta anche e soprattutto un alto incoraggiamento morale ed un segno}
In concluding this chapter, the foreign academies in Rome were closed during the Second World War (with the exception of the DAIR, which closed in 1944, and the SIR which remained operational throughout the war). The foreign academies reopened after the war, the EFR for example resuming its activities in 1945; this will be discussed further in chapter 5. As regards the position of the academies vis-à-vis the four German libraries, their absence was generally speaking sorely missed by the foreign as well as the domestic academies in Rome. The issue of their return is dealt with in chapter 6.
This chapter investigates the nature and extent of international collaboration among the foreign academies in Rome in the immediate post-war period (1945-1948), focusing on the role of the SIR. The first part of the chapter is devoted to a discussion of national (scholarly) prestige in relation to the foreign academies in Rome and AIAC; sections 5.3-5.6 investigate Erik Sjöqvist, the SIR and the post-war establishment of the Swedish Institute in Athens (SIA). The theme of national prestige and national interests returns towards the end of the chapter, which closes with an evaluation of perceptions of German scholarship in relation to the discussed return of the German libraries after the end of the war.

What is referred to here as academic diplomacy is conceptualised as the sum of intentional outcome of established official policy (political as well as scholarly), and intentional as well as unintentional consequences of individual ‘diplomatic’ action. The article regarding the Swedish role in the return of the German libraries 1943-1948 by Erland Billig is a valuable contribution to the present discussion, this chapter in part builds on Billig's work, although that was limited in terms of use of archival material.

584 Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli."
at RA, LUB and GUB, taken into account in this study, which ranges further contextually than Billig’s work; its perspective and focus (academic diplomacy and international collaboration) also differs from Billig’s more traditional historical approach.\textsuperscript{585}

After the war, the Italian classical archaeologist Paolino Mingazzini (1895-1977) wrote to Erik Sjöqvist expressing the desire that ‘perhaps good sense will triumph and we may have the normality and peace that all desire after 35 years. As a scholar, I feel that very strongly’.\textsuperscript{586} In that respect, Mingazzini probably not only spoke for the majority of the post-war scholarly community, but for Italian society at large.

In 1946, AAR president James Kellum Smith was approached regarding a proposal for establishing a global system of ‘international universities’: as ‘a living symbol of peace and dedicated to the integration of people from all nations in the common pursuit of learning’. The AAR chose not to participate, partly as the project disregarded the \textit{problematique} of overcoming the boundaries and limitations of reliance on national funding.\textsuperscript{587}

The year before, the AAR was attacked by Luigi Criscuolo (New York), editor of the Italian-American magazine \textit{The Rubicon}, for its

\textsuperscript{585} Billig also used for example DAIR scholar F.W. Deichmann’s diaries as well as interviews with Deichmann for his account. Deichmann was in Rome (at the DAIR and as assistant for Early Christian Art at the Hertziana) during the period concerned here, except for the period March 1944-1945; his diaries are not taken into account in this study. Cf. Bittel et al., eds., \textit{Beiträge zur Geschichte des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 1929 bis 1979}, 9.

\textsuperscript{586} Paolino Mingazzini to Sjöqvist, June 3, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4: “Tuttavia può darsi che [il] Buon Senso trionfi e si abbia veramente la normalità e quella pace che tutti desiderano da trentacinque anni. Io, come studioso, lo desidero assai.”

\textsuperscript{587} Arthur W. Potts to J.K. Smith, August 12, 1946. Cf. Smith to Potts, September 4, 1946. AAR, reel 5758.
election of sculptor Sidney Waugh as AAR trustee (based on a piece by Waugh in the *New York Times*, September 6, 1945). Criscuolo wrote to AAR president J.K. Smith that ‘they’ (*The Rubicon*) were ‘going to use our best efforts in Italy to prevent your Academy from functioning in Italy and from having any privileges there and we are giving the matter the fullest publicity in Italy and here. Your Academy acts in the Fascist manner that many hypocrites in this country have been condemning with their tongues in their cheeks’.588

Smith, not surprisingly, begged to differ, which provoked Criscuolo to publish the following plea to his readers (quite possibly not a large number): ‘we also ask Premier DeGasperi [sic] to start the works moving to kick the American Academy out of Rome and substitute one with Italian Americans as members. We can raise enough money to support it. [...] We urge our readers to write to their senators and representatives, protesting against Waugh’s record and the Academy’s high-hattedness’.589

The paradigm shift in classical archaeology through the opening of Italy for foreign excavations gave rise to new opportunities for the foreign academies in Rome (cf. chapter 3), depending on financial resources and the diplomatic skills of its boards and directors.

This provided one reason for collaboration, or dialogue at the very least, another was a genuine desire for restoration after the dissension, factionalism and discord on an international level before the Second World War, a dissension that for the foreign academies in Rome had been restricted to a polite but suspicious rivalry before the war. This dissension

588 Luigi Criscuolo to J.K. Smith, December 19, 1945. AAR, reel 5758.
589 *The Rubicon*, January 1, 1946. AAR, reel 5758.
did not vanish in thin air in the post-war period, but the steps taken by a close-knit circle of directors and academic diplomats (mainly represented by Sjöqvist, Morey and Ward-Perkins) were arguably essential for attaining an attitude of collaboration and the readiness to resolve issues of common interest. The foreign academies in Rome however continued to operate primarily in the sphere of national representation and scholarship, with the academies as figureheads of national (scholarly and cultural) traditions.590

National rivalry was omnipresent, even among friends. Boëthius for example spoke of the BSR and Great Britain as a ‘less luxurious nation than ours’.591 The SIR was reluctant to enter into any form of institutionalised collaboration during the war, even with other Swedes. In 1942, Swedish ambassador Baron Beck-Friis wanted to establish a Swedish so-called ‘cultural council’ (kulturråd) for Swedish-Italian cultural exchange in Rome (encompassing media coverage, tourism, scholarly collaboration and ‘general cultural exchange’). Minister Lagerberg was in charge of its organisation, and wanted to include Sjöqvist. Analogously with Sjöqvist’s post-war involvements in AIAC and the Unione, the issue had to be approved by the board of the SIR.

Boëthius had previously entertained similar plans himself; but despite the seemingly harmless configuration of the planned council, Sjöqvist was restricted from the outset by the Crown Prince to ‘only participate in decisions regarding scholarly collaboration and general cultural work’

590 Cf. the perception of the SIR during the early war years in Upsala Nya Tidning, May 3, 1940 (RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5).
591 Boëthius to Arvid Andrén, January 24, 1949. SIR, Korrespondens 1939."
(which incidentally corresponded with what Sjöqvist had suggested himself).\textsuperscript{592} A similar attitude was displayed in discussing Sjöqvist’s role in the Unione three years later (see this chapter and chapter 6).

Holger Arbman (of the Historical Museum at Lund University) had the impression (in 1947) that it was the SIR ‘that above all represents Sweden in Rome’,\textsuperscript{593} which was perhaps not wholly inaccurate. For the SIR, the prominent position of the SIR and its library attained during the war was also to some extent evaluated in terms of national prestige, as the value of the SIR as ‘Swedish cultural representation’ was acknowledged.\textsuperscript{594}

Although the SIR had remained operational and officially open during the war, the German occupation of Rome in 1943-1944 effectively stifled most of its activities. In December 1945 Sjöqvist felt that it was ‘important to get started again after this long two-year break. The French in Palazzo Farnese [the EFR] are the only ones who have so far managed to get going. [...] The Americans and English are aiming at Autumn 1946. I am as usual eager that we take the lead’.\textsuperscript{595}

\textsuperscript{592} Boëthius to Sjöqvist, December 2, 1942. Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, November 19, 1942 (‘I have naturally offered my services in regard to this proposal’); and Sjöqvist to Boëthius, December 10, 1942. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.

\textsuperscript{593} Holger Arbman to Sjöqvist, December 3, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4: ‘[det är] Svenska Institutet, som framför allt representera Sverige i Rom.’

\textsuperscript{594} SIR board meeting minutes, September 29, 1945, §8: ‘Under krigsmånaderna då flertalet bibliotek i Rom sattes ur funktion har biblioteket haft en alldeles särskild betydelse för det vetenskapliga livet i Rom och framträtt som en mycket observerad kulturell representation för Sverige’. Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5, and RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, I:5.
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Funding was a key issue in this regard, not least for the BSR, which might have opened earlier (in 1945), but it was considered too expensive and impractical to send British students so soon after the end of the war. The same must reasonably have applied for the EFR, but the (national) prestige involved in being the first to return to ‘the scene’ (disregarding the Swedes not having left) was considered to be worth the extra expenditure. BSR director Ralegh Radford reported that

The French Government is, for reasons of prestige, sending out a full complement of students to the École française (not as far as I can gather to the Académie de France). I am a little uncertain whether all will arrive but I believe that they will make a big effort and in fact some artists may also arrive later in the session. When last I talked to the Americans no decision seemed to have been made, though the Academy will be “open”. The same holds good for the Dutch and Belgians. I have talked informally to a number of Italians and there is a very real desire that the British School should function again next session.\footnote{Part of the reason for the delay in sending students in 1945 were practical, such as ‘questions about rations (the black market has impossible prices), transport, travel in Italy and supplies’. Ralegh Radford to Evelyn Shaw, August 18, 1945. BSR, box 63.}

Ralegh Radford felt that it was important that the BSR should not lag behind the other foreign academies in Rome: ‘In view of the fact that a new Director has been appointed in the American Academy and in view of the proposal which I understand is being put forward by the French School for the holding of lectures on classical subjects by French professors I feel it desirable that the British School should not remain entirely closed during the present session’.\footnote{Ralegh Radford to Noel Charles, British embassy, Rome, 1945 (?). BSR, box 63.}
The AAR similarly considered it ‘unwise to postpone the opening of the Academy later than next Fall. The French and Swedish Academies are already open with almost a full complement of students. The British School expects to open soon with several students. The Embassy has inquired somewhat pointedly as to the date of the opening and in view of the Italian attitude of looking to the United States for leadership at the present moment it would be unfortunate for the Academy to lag so far behind the others in resuming operations’.598

The race, in other words, was on. A real ‘return’ to the perceived collaborative ideals of the ICA (in terms of the Unione acting as a replacement of that one ‘universal’ institution) in 1945 was nigh impossible; with national prestige as integral an integral element of the nature and scholarship of the foreign academies in Rome. The challenge lay rather in finding ways for outspoken international collaboration and cooperation. Italian scholarship took a hit during the war, but Sjöqvist felt the Italians were bouncing back both forcefully and quickly, writing in May 1945 that the Italians were ‘finally beginning to regain their self-respect, which has been badly tarnished these last few years. They have gained a different posture which seems to me to forebode a new era’.599

598 ‘Memoranda for Mr. [Lindsay] Bradford’, February 20, 1946. It did not seem clear to the AAR trustees that the SIR had never actually closed during the war. See also telegram from Morey to Stuart, March 19, 1946: ‘Four Academies open and operating French and Swedish Eight and Twelve students respectively [...] strongly advise full operation [of the AAR] next fall’. AAR, reel 5758. Cf. AAR secretary Riccardo Davico to Morey, March 14, 1946. AAR, reel 5798: ‘I have heard that the French, Romanian and Swedish institutions [sic], have resumed their full activities, and that soon also the British School will do the same; but I have no direct information’.

It is at the same time no less symptomatic that the Swiss donation that was intended to fund the AIAC *Fasti* publication (organised by Federico Pfister) fell through (for tax reasons and the denial of currency export permits), and instead ended up becoming the first major financial contribution to the establishment of the (national) Swiss Institute in Rome (cf. section 4.7).\footnote{See also Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, January 22, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.} The symbolic value of a donation intended for an international collaborative project ending up sponsoring an entirely national institution indicates that national prestige was very much present in the ‘post-war world’ and the alleged new international order.

In a 1953 memorandum on the return of the German libraries, the libraries were declared to be ‘closely tied to the cultural and scholarly life of the cities of Rome and Florence’. A transformation of the ‘grandiosi centri di studi’ constituted by the four libraries into centres controlled by (Italian) cultural propaganda and politics was to be avoided at all costs.\footnote{Memorandum, February 20, 1953, regarding the ‘accordo per la restituzione delle Biblioteche germaniche’. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949. File ‘Historique. L’UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953’: ‘[Le Biblioteche sono] strettamente legate alla vita culturale e scientifica delle città di Roma e di Firenze (ciò che era sancito dall’accordo Croce dopo la prima guerra mondiale, più tardi sostanzialmente violato dalle autorità germaniche).’}

National prestige was similarly integral to the issue of the resumption of scholarly publications after the war. The lack of any published volume of the EFR *Mélanges* between 1940-1945 was for example phrased in terms of ‘a deficiency that risks to detract from the influence of our School if it is prolonged’.\footnote{Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres (CRAI) 1945 EFR report for the year 1943-1944: ‘[...] aucun volume des *Mélanges* n’a pu paraître depuis le cinquante-septième qui a été déposé sur votre bureau le 27 décembre}
5.2 ‘HOSTILITY TOWARDS FRENCH EXCAVATIONS’

The Italian perspective is sometimes overlooked in discussions of the foreign academies in Rome; national rivalry in this context certainly included Italy and domestic scholarship. The question of Italian views of antiquity as ‘national’ heritage is indeed complex; but is with little doubt connected with the outspoken policy and clear tendency of preserving sites of prime ‘national interest’ (e.g. the Roman Forum, the Palatine hill, Pompeii and, as we have seen, Veii – cf. section 3.2) for Italian archaeologists and to leave ‘lesser sites’ for the foreign academies. 603

At the same time, the foreign academies in Rome contributed to an accumulated (national) scholarly prestige in taking an active interest in the ‘Italian’ ancient past; to be sure the total scholarly output and the accumulation of funds outrivaled anything that Italian scholars and institutions would have been able to produce in self-sufficient isolation.

The 1946-1947 EFR annual report prophesied that ‘in the face of the renaissance of Italian nationalism, foreign [scholars] will no longer be able to undertake archaeological research of any interest in Italy.’ 604 After having resumed its activities in the autumn of 1945, the EFR reported that

1940; y a là une carence qui risquerait, en se prolongeant, de nuire au rayonnement de notre École’.
604 EFR annual report 1946-1947 (March 6, 1947): ‘[…] devant la renaissance du nationalisme italien, les étrangers ne pourront bientôt plus entreprendre des recherches archéologiques de quelqu'intérêt en Italie’.
it had ‘revived an ancient and too soon interrupted tradition on Italian soil,’ with excavations at Bolsena.  

The new EFR director Albert Grenier had, in contrast to for example Erik Sjöqvist, no scruples regarding stressing his own agency in relation to ‘his’ institution. The importance of the opening of Italy for foreign archaeological undertakings was emphasised in the 1946 EFR report to the Académie in Paris: ‘the director [Grenier has investigated the region where it seemed possible to utilise as soon and as well as possible the faculty open to our researchers, by an Italy which has again become more liberal regarding the exploitation of its archaeological soil than it has been for half a century, to carry out excavations there once more. […] M. Grenier is reckoning on undertaking excavations [at Bolsena] as soon as he possesses the predicted funds.’ Grenier then intended to attempt to proceed to Vulci, where he thought that ‘one might have a future site’. 

Director Grenier represented an outspokenly national French stance, was well-connected at the Quai d’Orsay), and was no ‘friend of compromises’. The EFR annual report for 1946-1947 declared that Adrien Bruhl, the ‘recently appointed secretary-general’ of the EFR, had been in charge of surveillance of the École in the interim period after the end of the war until Grenier’s arrival in Rome in November 1946. 

The new EFR excavations at Bolsena (led by Raymond Bloch) had been delayed by the landowner. Grenier interpreted this in terms of ‘hostility towards French excavations’ (‘Il s’agit d’une hostilité déclarée aux fouilles françaises’). Grenier understood this in the context of two articles

---

and a note published in the journal *La Tribuna della Domenica* (or *La Tribuna Illustrata della Domenica*; the author of the piece has not been identified) during the summer of 1946, texts that manifested a jealousy towards work accomplished in Italy by foreigners. Grenier thought this issue serious enough to warrant getting in touch with the renowned and influential Italian art historian and archaeologist Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli (1900-1975, then director of the *Direzione Generale delle Belle Arti*).607

Bianchi Bandinelli had assured Grenier that there was no need to worry about or take this ‘campagne de presse’ into serious account. No legal action was required according to Bianchi Bandinelli’s counsel. Why did Grenier then feel that this should be mentioned in the EFR annual report? Foreign excavations in Italy was a novelty after the war; examples therefore needed to be made as soon as possible in order not to hinder future foreign (in this case French) archaeological campaigns. Grenier stressed his personal relations with Bianchi Bandinelli as fundamental for the assurance of excavation permits. Grenier probably felt that he needed to establish this in writing in a long-term perspective in case Bianchi Bandinelli left his position. Bianchi Bandinelli had encouraged Grenier to renew the archaeological permit for another three years for this very reason.608

---

607 EFR annual report 1946-1947, 1. Grenier simultaneously established contact with Bianchi Bandinelli through his association with the Unione and Bianchi Bandinelli’s interventions regarding the possible concession of Palazzo Vidoni for the Unione (cf. section 6.3). Cf. Whitling, “The Unione in 1946: Reflections on Academic Diplomacy and International Collaboration,” 209-212. As an anti-fascist (and a Marxist), Bianchi Bandinelli was appointed director of the new post-war Italian government’s fine arts and antiquities ministry (*Antichità e Belle Arti*). He was its director from 1945 to 1948.
The situation improved and the perceived hostilities faded away. In his 1947-1948 annual report, Grenier instead focused the attention on other issues – mainly the relatively favourable ‘material situation’ at the time, highlighting benefits resulting from raised salaries and increased travel opportunities in Italy. Grenier discussed the maintenance of good scholarly relations as well as to the prestige of the École, and stressed the importance of the library exchanges for the EFR: ‘We are currently in trouble with the Italian customs authorities regarding some parcels with books sent from our Parisian library. The intervention of services from the Embassy so far remain without effect [...] one speaks of a customs union for the future, this is not yet put into practice concerning books’.  

The 1946 EFR report praised ‘the good will shown by the [Italian] Direzione Generale di Antichità e Belle Arti’, and expressed the perceived importance of scholarly national and institutional prestige. The report was directed at the funding institution in the home country, hence the possible heightened expectation of a self-glorifying narrative.

The EFR perspective rhymed well with the nationalist pre-war domestic Italian policy that only Italian archaeologists would be sufficiently suitable for the excavation of sites of prime ‘national interest’ (cf. Sjöqvist’s application for excavations at Veii, 1942 – section 3.2); but can be contrasted with the joint minor excavation carried out by the SIR and the BSR in 1946. Sjöqvist excavated the church San Salvatore in Spoleto in December 1946 (the excavations were limited to three days) together with BSR director Ward-Perkins. Sjöqvist had received the

---

excavation permit and was to publish the results; this task was however taken over by Ward-Perkins, even though Sjöqvist himself stated that he had handed over the publication right to the Danish student Erik Fischer, providing a counterpart to the common contemporary rhetoric of the prestige of national scholarship. Why did Sjöqvist not contribute to the publication of the results himself?610 This possible act of generosity may have been the result of Sjöqvist being too busy with the publication of the S. Maria in Via Lata to process the Spoleto-project at that time.611

Excavation permits were hard to come by, and were distributed ‘with little enthusiasm’; the Swedish archaeologist Natan Valmin was for example recommended by Sjöqvist to be prepared for a long application procedure (involving the Italian Ministry of Education, the Direttore Generale delle Antichità, the local Sovrintendente and the archaeological council) regarding a proposed excavation on Sardinia (in Cagliari).612 Despite the change of policy regarding foreign excavations and the ‘opening of Italy’ after the Second World War, the Italian authorities remained reluctant to concede an abundance of excavation permits; the thorny legal framework contributed to the obstacles facing the foreign academies in Rome in this regard.613

611 Cf. Sjöqvist, Studi Archeologici e Topografici intorno alla Piazza del Collegio Romano.
613 For the legal framework of classical archaeology, see for example P.E. Arias, “Il mito del’archeologia italiana: Due ‘patres conscripti’ all’inizio delle leggi sulle antichità dopo il 1870,” Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche dell’Accademia dei Lincei 9, no. 6 (1993), L.C. Bowkett, Diana Wardle, and S.J. Hill,
5.3 THE POST-WAR DIRECTORSHIP OF ERIK SJÖQVIST AND THE SIR BOARD (1945–1948)

Although the SIR had officially remained open during the war, a ‘reopening’ ceremony was held on February 2, 1946, in connection with the inauguration of the 1946 archaeological course. Approximately 180 individuals were present, including the ministers of the Nordic countries (the SIR was still the sole research institute representing the Scandinavian countries in Rome). Enrico Paresce (Italian undersecretary of state), representatives from the foreign ministry; all institute, academy and museum directors (without exception, according to Sjöqvist); as well as (unspecified) ‘representatives of Italian research’ and the new students for the yearly archaeological course.

Sjöqvist, as master of ceremonies, gave an introductory welcome speech (in Italian),\(^{614}\) Paresce conveyed a salute from the newly formed Italian government, and Hoogewerff (the director of the neighbouring Dutch Institute) spoke on behalf of the ‘sister institutions’ – that is to say the other foreign academies in Rome. It is notable that seemingly all of the academy directors in Rome were present, including those of the Italian (state) museums (possibly also including the Vatican museums). The presence of emissaries from the Italian government is testimony to Sjöqvist’s radiance as well as to the importance of the SIR itself to the scholarly community in Rome during and after the war.\(^{615}\)

\(^{614}\) Sjöqvist’s speech is preserved in the file ‘Diverse tal, etc.’ in RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.

\(^{615}\) SIR annual report 1945-1946, 6.
The ‘reopening ceremony’ was however originally intended to be presented as a celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the SIR. This had sparked a minor controversy as Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf did not find this suitable – he did not want any such celebrations to be held before the twenty-fifth anniversary of the SIR. Sjöqvist was instructed to emphasise the wartime activities of the SIR; it was feared that anniversary celebrations in 1946 would be too much of a (political) statement. Sjöqvist received clarified instructions from Boëthius on January 10, 1946, instructing Sjöqvist to cancel the planned celebrations. He was no doubt disappointed.\textsuperscript{616}

The reluctance vis-à-vis earlier anniversary celebrations illustrates the lack of interest on the part of the board of the SIR (particularly of the Crown Prince) in seizing the opportunity to promote the SIR in the Roman scholarly context after the war. National prestige was not an issue at the SIR in the same way as with for example the EFR, and ‘cultural neutrality’ in this case amounted to general hesitancy and missed opportunities. Looking back in 1949, Sjöqvist’s successor Arvid Andrén lamented that the SIR had not promoted itself more in 1946, when the Swedish state granted money to ‘almost all that was asked for’, in the name of ‘scientific rearmament’.\textsuperscript{617}

\textsuperscript{616} The instructions were repeated in another letter from Boëthius to Sjöqvist, February 1, 1946. The issue was raised by Sjöqvist on January 2, when he informed Boëthius that he had involved the Swedish foreign office (UD) in order to contact the Crown Prince and the board of the SIR regarding the planned celebrations (Sjöqvist to Boëthius, January 2, 1946). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III: A: 2. Cf. Billig and Billig, “The Billig Manuscript,” 11 & 151-152.

\textsuperscript{617} Arvid Andrén to Boëthius, March 22, 1949. SIR, Korrespondens 1939: “Synd bara, att Institutet icke höll sig framme vid guldregnet 1946, då statsmakterna i den vetenskapliga upprustningens namn (och av rädsla för atombomben) beviljade pengar till snart sagt allt som begärdes.”
The first post-war archaeological course at the SIR took place in the spring of 1946. From the perspective of the board, the SIR essentially resumed its core pedagogical activities after their interruption in the summer of 1943. The SIR library maintained its increasingly important role obtained during the war; this was connected with Sjöqvist’s growing influence in international scholarly collaboration in Rome.618

Sjöqvist had got used to acting on his own initiatives during the war years, as correspondence with the board of the SIR was not always practically viable. The board had since the mid-1930s been characterised by Boëthius’ mediating conciliatory stance.

When Einar Gjerstad joined the board after his return to Sweden in 1940, he energetically intervened in specific board-related issues (cf. figs. 6-11, chapter 2). Boëthius was generally speaking the most well informed member of the SIR board in his function as secretary (a fair assumption based on the available correspondence), and was for example kept regularly up to date by Sjöqvist regarding the issue of the German libraries from the establishment of AIAC in May 1945 onwards.619

Sjöqvist’s list of his post-war entrusted assignments and guardianships (during 1945-1946) was diminished considerably in relation to that of the previous year, after the end of the hostilities, but was impressive nonetheless. Sjöqvist had been chairman of no less than three organisations: of the parish council of the Evangelical Church, of the cooperation committee (samarbetskommittén) for the scientific libraries of

618 For registers of attendance, cf. the SIR guestbooks.  
Valle Giulia, as well as of the provisional council of AIAC. Sjöqvist had furthermore been appointed secretary-general of the Unione (cf. section 6.1), as well as treasurer of the Association to the Memory of Keats and Shelley. Sjöqvist also reported that he had been appointed a Knight of the Swedish Royal Order of the North Star (*Kungl. Nordstjärneorden*), as well as Commander of the Order of the Italian Crown (*Italienska Kronorden*).620

To the board, Sjöqvist emphasised the necessity of the regular accession of the SIR library, which needed to keep up with the other foreign academies as they resumed their activities after the war.621 Between the lines, Sjöqvist thus indirectly highlighted the relatively advantageous position gained by the SIR during the war years.

Sjöqvist did so partly as the question of whether or not to prolong Sjöqvist’s directorship was one of the main priorities of the board of the SIR at the time. This arguably amounted to a structural choice: Sjöqvist personified a policy of international collaboration between the academies of Rome that did not necessarily compute with the ‘neutral’ interests of the SIR. Would the board support this profile, or would it prioritise its own interests (a degree of low-key collaboration, as long as it did not burden the standing and budget of the institute)?

The director of the SIR was generally appointed for successive three-year periods. The total number of such periods was not limited by the by-laws

---

620 SIR annual report 1945-1946, 1. The Order of the North Star and the Order of the Italian Crown certificates are located in RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:4.

621 SIR annual report 1945-1946, 4.
and regulations. Sjöqvist was however informed that the board wished to replace him after the end of his second period (on June 30, 1946).\footnote{Cf. Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 153-157. Martin P. Nilsson wanted to replace the director as early as March 1946. Cf. Gjerstad to Sjöqvist, February 4, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.}

The reasons for the perceived need for a change in the SIR directorship at that time are manifold – the board was of the opinion that Sjöqvist would no longer be eligible for positions in the Swedish university library system if he remained in Rome. Sjöqvist had not acquired the scholarly merits expected by the board during the war years. More importantly Sjöqvist seemed too progressive for the taste of some board members, and was therefore considered slightly unpredictable; his involvement with the German libraries was furthermore perceived to be a little uncomfortable.

Sjöqvist was pushing the parameters of the institute’s hitherto predominantly self-contained range of activities by actively involving in locally based supranational organisations. It did not really seem to matter that Sjöqvist keenly emphasised that he did so as a private individual and not as official spokesperson of the institute, although it might be argued that the private and official role of an academy director would be difficult to distinguish or separate. The library position excuse and the concern for Sjöqvist’s possible career opportunities in Sweden thus provided the board with an official reason to replace him.

In fairness the opinion of the board was divided regarding the issue of Sjöqvist’s directorship in 1946. Einar Gjerstad and Martin P. Nilsson (respectively professor and professor emeritus at Lund University) wanted
to replace Sjöqvist immediately in 1946; Axel Boëthius was in favour of prolonging his directorship with a third three-year period (until July 1, 1949), two other board members (treasurer Axel Hallin and Gregor Paulsson, professor of art history at Uppsala) advocated the somewhat radical solution of appointing Sjöqvist ‘indefinitely’, without the three-year limitation (cf. figs. 6-11, chapter 2).623

The eventual outcome of the board decision was, it turned out, a classic compromise. Sjöqvist’s appointment as director was indeed prolonged, but for one year at a time only.624 The same procedure was repeated in 1947, with the reservation that a ‘third year’ (i.e. 1948-1949) would be out of the question.625 This complete breakdown of interests that also entailed the question of what to ‘do’ with Sjöqvist when his directorship in Rome ended, amounted to a minor crisis which was not

resolved until January 1948, when Sjöqvist was offered a position by the Crown Prince as his personal secretary (handsekreterare) from October 1949, which Sjöqvist accepted.626

The compromise was unfortunate in many ways. The double one-year extensions of Sjöqvist’s directorship indicate that (parts of) the board of the SIR believed Sjöqvist should remain in Rome. At the same time, any long-term planning for the institute, for the development of international collaboration in scholarly circles in Rome or for Sjöqvist’s own future was obstructed.

Einar Gjerstad expressed a clear frustrated dissatisfaction with Sjöqvist at the time; Gjerstad was not pleased with the fact that Sjöqvist had not completed his part of the publication of the work of the Swedish Cyprus Expedition (SCE) during his directorship in Rome. Gjerstad did not openly acknowledge the time- and energy-consuming difficulties of directing the institute through the war as an explanation for Sjöqvist not

626 After a year as visiting professor at Princeton University (1948–1949), Sjöqvist returned to Sweden as the personal secretary (handsekreterare) of the Crown Prince as of October 1, 1949. Cf. Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf to Sjöqvist, February 10, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5. Cf. certificates signed by King Gustaf V, December 31, 1949 and King Gustaf VI Adolf, December 30, 1950 ('docenten vid Stockholms Högskola, filosofie doktorn, riddaren av Vår Nordstjärneorden Erik Sjöqvist'. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:4. At Princeton one was certainly keen to ensure that Sjöqvist would return. Cf. De Wald (?) to Morey, June 24, 1949. 'I was somewhat upset when I received, first, your letter of April 21st and then the subsequent one of May 18th, indicating that the political situation in Rome made it impossible for us at this time to try to work out any part-time arrangement with Sjöqvist'. Box 9, Dept. of Art and Archaeology Records; Princeton University archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library. Regarding Sjöqvist’s appointment as secretary, see telegram from Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf to Sjöqvist, January 1948 (?): "Tack brev Stop Aer oriererad om dina Amerikaplaner Stop Av speciella orsaker mycket oenskvaert du omedelbart hitkommer for viktig oeverlaeggning Stop Soek ordna flygresa snarast saa att du aer aater Rom innan forsta februari Stop Kostnad ersattes av mig = Gustaf Adolf". For Sjöqvist’s correspondence as the personal secretary of the Crown Prince, cf. KB (Stockholm), L 137:8 (1951). Sjöqvist was succeeded in this position by Carl Fredrik Palmstierna.
being able to complete his part of the SCE publication. Gjerstad had for example approached Swedish scholar Arne Furumark in 1946, asking Furumark if he might consider taking over the publication of Sjöqvist’s part of the Cyprus material. Sjöqvist notably referred to the absence of the DAIR library as influential factor in his own reluctance to continue with the Cyprus publication.627

Sjöqvist was at one point (in March 1946) under the impression that Olof Vessberg (who was working with the Cyprus collection in Stockholm) would succeed him as director in Rome, and communicated to Gjerstad that if so, he would himself actually prefer a research position associated with the Cyprus collection to a Swedish library position. Sjöqvist thought that the board would consider both Arvid Andrén and Åke Åkerström ‘too old’ for the SIR directorship, as the campaign for his replacement was surely motivated by ‘the advantage to the Institute of young and dedicated directors’.628

Gjerstad reminded Sjöqvist that his appointment as director of the SIR was largely Gjerstad’s doing back in 1940, and that Sjöqvist had not fulfilled his part of the ‘deal’ in completing his part of the publication of the Swedish Cyprus expedition, for which Gjerstad was responsible.629

627 See Furumark to Sjöqvist, November 25, 1946; and Sjöqvist to Furumark, December 5, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3. Sjöqvist however also ventilated frustration and disillusionment with Gjerstad; on receiving an answer from Gjerstad regarding the planned SIR excursion to Greece in 1948, Sjöqvist commented (to Holmberg) that the reply was probably due to the fact that Gjerstad needed something for himself in return. Sjöqvist to Erik Holmberg, March 10, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3: ‘Jag har skrivit till Einar om ev. biljettköp i Sverige, och har – mirabile dictu – också fått svar. Detta berodde sannolikt på att han samtidigt ville passa på att be mig om en sak för egen räkning’.

628 Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, March 1, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.

Gjerstad’s essentially self-serving ‘vendetta’ thus had implications for the chosen course and profile of the SIR through the replacement of Sjöqvist as its director.

In 1947, Sjöqvist reported to the board of the SIR that he had retained all of the international commissions accounted for in the 1945-1946 annual report. He had furthermore been appointed a ‘corresponding member’ of the association for medieval research in Rome (not specified). Much less attention was given to the ‘cultural collaboration’ (‘det kulturella samarbetet’) in the 1946-1947 annual report than in that of the previous year. The need to emphasise the connections between the SIR and its surrounding (international) context was less pressing. Sjöqvist had also learned that trimming the emphasis on ‘international’ ventures in his reports to the board might reduce complications regarding the role of the SIR in relation to the position of the director.

Sjöqvist instead chose to stress academic exchanges during the past year: ‘Close contacts have been established between the members of the institute and foreign students, and the academic exchange has been rich. The particular resonance of Nordic fellowship, as a result of the presence of Norwegian and Danish visiting scholars and students, has especially pervaded this year’s work, as have the reestablished connections with Greece’. These ‘connections with Greece’ primarily referred to the 1947 SIR excursion (cf. sections 2.2 and 5.5). Sjöqvist also reported that he had been asked to give a lecture in the Lycaeum Romanum on the subject of

630 SIR annual report 1946-1947, 1.
international cooperation in the field of science in Rome (‘cooperazione internazionale sul campo scientifico in Roma’). \textsuperscript{631}

Sjöqvist in other words chose to emphasise a lecture he had not actually yet given, as he felt that it was important to stress its orientation as a commentary on international collaboration. It is also noteworthy that the issue of Sjöqvist’s possible library career in Sweden and the issue of his tenure as director of the SIR after 1946 was not addressed in his ‘official’ correspondence with the board of the SIR. \textsuperscript{632}

\textsuperscript{631} SIR annual report 1946-1947, 11. Sjöqvist however did not report the (failed) complicated negotiations for a sequestered villa in Grottaferrata outside Rome, which a certain Gustav Eberlein (a German citizen, then resident in Locarno in Switzerland) wanted to donate to the SIR, as the villa was threatened by sequestration. Cf. Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, n.d. (After February 16, 1946; before April 23, 1946). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5: ‘En av Svenska Institutets trofasta vänner, Dr. Helgo Lindstedt, Rom, var under en vistelse i Schweiz i januari år i kontakt med en herr Eberlein, som är ägare till en villa i Grottaferrata, invid Via Anagnina, 21 km. söder om Rom. Såsom antinazist och icke-ariern lämnade han först Tyskland och sedan Italien för att slutgiltigt bosätta sig i Schweiz, kvarlämnande den ovannämnda fasta egendomen i sitt rätta ombuds hand med vidsträckta fullmakter. Han har nu uttryckt sin önskan att skänka den till Svenska Institutet i Rom utan andra förbehåll än att den nye ägaren icke får sälja egendomen inom de närmaste fem åren och att den gamle ägaren må ha möjlighet att under eventuella Italienvistelsen [sic] åtnjuta bostad i huset’. See also RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.

\textsuperscript{632} Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
5.4 ERIK SJÖQVIST AND THE SWEDISH LIBRARIES (1946–1948)

When Erik Sjöqvist was appointed director of the SIR in 1940, he already had his foot in the door in the higher levels of the Swedish library system as second librarian at the Royal library (KB), Stockholm. The SIR board requested that Sjöqvist be granted leave of absence from his position for an initial period of three years (1940-1943). This did not keep the Swedish head librarian (riksbibliotekarie) Oscar Wieselgren from asking Sjöqvist in 1941 if he was planning to return to KB the following year.

---

633 SIR board meeting minutes, April 12, 1940, §14.
(1941-1942), or if he intended to definitely ‘remain with science’ (‘kommer Du definitivt att stanna för vetenskapen’).\textsuperscript{634} The two concerns seemed incongruous; Sjöqvist would, seemingly inevitably, eventually be faced with a choice.

Sjöqvist’s three-year leave of absence from KB was prolonged due to the war. Sjöqvist was not entitled to count his years in service as SIR director for a raise or toward his (Swedish) pension – an appeal to count the director’s position as state service was made to the King (Gustaf V) but was denied no less than three times (two of these occasions were after the war – in 1945 and 1946, respectively.\textsuperscript{635} The board of the SIR pushed the issue with little success, emphasising the importance of supporting ‘cultural representatives abroad’ on their return to Sweden.\textsuperscript{636}

Such representatives abroad were clearly not in very high regard in Sweden, of which Sjöqvist was soon aware. The way in which he was treated in his application for a position as second librarian at Uppsala University library after the Second World War illustrates the lack of flexibility of a (national) attitude regarding the incorporation and willingness of taking merits acquired abroad into account. Six years of


\textsuperscript{635} The matter was also raised by Einar Gjerstad in the SIR board meeting in September 1945. SIR board meeting minutes, September 29, 1945, §16. Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5; and RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, I:5. Had the Crown Prince – later King Gustaf VI Adolf – been in charge of the matter the outcome may well have been different.

\textsuperscript{636} SIR board meeting minutes, March 20, 1947, §5.
service as director of the SIR was worth little at Uppsala, and Sjöqvist was passed by.

These conditions stem from the legacy of the private origins of the SIR; the mentality and context in which they were received in Sweden was in many ways the fault of the Swedish academic system, the inflexibility of which in combination with its self-perceived international ‘inferiority’ could result in a close-knit group of individuals being promoted by their local colleagues. There is little doubt that the combination of Sjöqvist’s ongoing self-promotion in Sweden as a library man – and his recent work with AIAC and the organisation of the Unione regarding the recovery of the German libraries (cf. chapter 6) – influenced the fact that he devoted almost one fourth of his 1945-1946 annual report to discussing the post-war situation of the SIR library. Sjöqvist also reported that he had made a ‘documented compilation’ of the war damage on monuments and museums in Italy in two extensive essays in the Swedish art history journal Konsthistorisk Tidskrift.\(^{637}\)

Sjöqvist emphasised the benefits of having employed a librarian at the SIR (Gino Filipetto), but overemphasised the credit due to the board of the SIR in this regard (as he himself was largely influential in employing Filipetto and had proposed it to the board, rather than the other way round): ‘the experiences of this first year speak their clear language and show how well thought-out the reorganisation of the position as librarian is by the board’.\(^{638}\)

\(^{637}\) SIR annual report 1945-1946, 7.
\(^{638}\) Sjöqvist also reported that preparations had been made to purchase the extensive collection of books belonging to the heirs of the deceased Mrs. Eugenie Whitling.
Sjöqvist furthermore related his recent input in AIAC and to the Valle Giulia library catalogue in his 1945-1946 annual report. He declared that he had been ‘the chairman of the archaeological special assembly AIAC since its genesis; [AIAC] has also been able to carry out a substantial amount of practical work, for which the Swedish Institute has become a natural meeting point. One undertaking that has fortunately been brought to a preliminary end is the common catalogue for the Valle Giulia scientific libraries [which] comprises the libraries of Sweden, Holland, the Villa Giulia museum and Roumania, as those of Belgium and Great Britain [sic] still have not joined.”

Sjöqvist was left with little choice but to take the opportunity of attempting to promote himself in a higher degree than the institute (primarily through his work with AIAC and the Unione) in order to progress from his position as director of the SIR. Sjöqvist’s second three-year period as director expired on October 1, 1946. As late as October 16, Sjöqvist was uncertain whether or not he would remain at the SIR for the archaeological spring course 1947. Rumour had it that his Swedish colleague Åke Åkerström had been appointed as his successor.

In November 1946, the SIR executive committee granted Sjöqvist a certificate of his services as director of the SIR. The certificate emphasised Sjöqvist’s ‘international’ library achievements in Rome to date (the establishment of the Valle Giulia library catalogue and the

---

*Sjöqvist to Boëthius, October 16, 1946. Quoted in Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 9.*
'guardianship' of the DAIR library July 1943-March 1944), as well as his function as president of AIAC, the planned Fasti and his association with the preservation of the Keats and Shelley Memorial Library.\footnote{SIR executive committee minutes, November 25, 1946, §5: 'Styrelsen har att vitsorda i alla avseenden utmärkt skötsel av Svenska Institutet i Rom och dess bibliotek. Tidsomständigheterna ha varit sådana, att därför vid sidan av ledarenskaper och organisationförmåga krävts både mod och besinningsfullt omdöme. Docent Sjöqvist har vid sin ledning av Institutet städs och i mycket krävande lägen visat sig äga bådadera, något som även klart betygas av det allmänna förstående, han vunnit i Rom, och av de nyss omnämnda internationella förtroendeuppgången under kriget och vid reorganisationen efter detsamma. Utöver den erfarenhet, som ledningen av Svenska Institutet och dess bibliotek skänka, har docent Sjöqvist sålunda förvärvat sig sällsynt vidsträckta internationella förbindelser och erfarenheter av modärn [se] organisation ej minst på biblioteksväsendets område'. Cf. Boëthius to Gjerstad, May 17, 1944, regarding Sjöqvist’s 'förstklassiga omdöme, klokhet och besinningsfulla kraft'. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B:1.} 

On October 18, 1946, Sjöqvist wrote to his old colleague Robert Braidwood (Field Director, Syrian Expedition, Oriental Institute Chicago), that 'this is probably the last year of my mandate in Rome, and I assure you that I will leave this wonderful place and my interesting job with great regret. Especially so, as I don’t know what will happen to me afterwards. Archaeological posts are rare in Sweden. Do you think I could make myself useful in your Institute or in the Syrian field work?'\footnote{Sjöqvist to Braidwood, October 18, 1946. Braidwood replied that he would '[...] pass your possible availability along to colleagues in America' (November 15, 1946). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.} 

At the same time, Sjöqvist knew that Boëthius was in favour of extending his mandate with another three-year period (until 1949).\footnote{Sjöqvist to Boëthius, February 28, 1946; and Boëthius to Sjöqvist, February 7, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2. See also Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, March 1, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.} Billig related an inquiry from Åke Åkerström (Uppsala) to the Swedish Institute (SI) in Stockholm (for which Erland Billig was working at the time) regarding the future collaboration with the SIR that would be initiated
when Åkerström was appointed director’ (of the SIR). 644 Arne Furumark (also at Uppsala) had also expressed an interest in the position. 645

As already mentioned, Gjerstad could scarcely hide his disappointment in Sjöqvist not having completed his part of their arrangement (of Sjöqvist completing his part of the Cyprus publications during the war years). At the same time, Gjerstad and Boëthius were concerned with Sjöqvist’s prospects and to some extent felt a responsibility to assist him. Gjerstad wrote to Boëthius that there was a position as ‘first librarian’ available in Uppsala, which was to be applied for by June 4 (1946): ‘It is hardly likely that Erik will get it, but out of principle he should apply for it in my opinion. I ask you to inform me if you agree. In that case I will telegraph Erik and instruct him to apply’. 646

Gjerstad did indeed telegraph Sjöqvist that he should apply for the position by the fourth of June. 647 Sjöqvist obliged, but at the same time

644 Billig to Sjöqvist, October 9, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1: ‘Man bör icke fresta papperet att rodna, men jag vill ändå berätta om en docent i Uppsala, benämnd Åkerström, som varit uppe på den institution vars namn återfinnes i övre västra hörnet av detta papper [SI] och förhört sig om det framtidiga samarbetet som skall inledas när han blir chef för det icke obekanta arkeologiska institutet i Rom’. It is relevant to note that contacts between the SIR and the SI in Stockholm (from 1946) were based on the communications and close relations between Sjöqvist and Erland Billig.


asked Boëthius to find out what his chances really were. If they were not sufficiently substantial he planned to back out.\textsuperscript{648} Boëthius replied by advising Sjöqvist to withdraw his application, thus going against Gjerstad’s advice, encouraging Sjöqvist to apply for another position as librarian in Uppsala instead; if he got that job he could then be on leave from the SIR until October 1, 1947. Sjöqvist followed Boëthius’ advice and applied for the Uppsala position in November 1946. Boëthius promised Sjöqvist a year’s extension as director of the SIR, should the application fall through.\textsuperscript{649} Sjöqvist backed up his application with certificates and references from Luigi De Gregori (the Italian inspector of libraries) and Anselmo Albareda (of the Vatican library – cf. chapter 6).

By July 1946 Sjöqvist had realised that he would probably have to lower his sights and sacrifice his aversion to applying for library positions other than in Uppsala; in November Gjerstad communicated to Boëthius that there were two positions available at Uppsala with a deadline for applications in early December. Gjerstad was disappointed however that Sjöqvist had not applied for a position at the Royal library (KB) in Stockholm, a position that Gjerstad’s sources informed him that Sjöqvist would have been offered if he had only applied for it. This may or may not have been case; at the same time, Sjöqvist however wrote to Boëthius in November 1946, dryly communicating that he would be willing to

\textsuperscript{648} RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
\textsuperscript{649} Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, June 3, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2: ‘Om det visar sig att det är absolut lönlöst så tar jag tillbaka, hellre än att schavottera som ett åtlöje. Vill Du göra mig den oändligt stora tjänsten att ge mig en signal om det visar sig utsiktslös?’

Boëthius to Sjöqvist, October 22, 1946. Cf. Billig and Billig, ”The Billig Manuscript,” 156.
apply for ‘whatever you like, apart from [a position] as midwife in Karesuando [in the remote North of Sweden]’. 650

Half a year later, Sjöqvist’s disillusionment regarding the issue made him refer to it as ‘Don Quixote’s battle against the windmills with its entire symbolic significance, but without its poetic escape – and without Cervantes’ pen’651. Gjerstad expressed an unmistakable irritation with the ‘inbreeding principles’ of the ‘typically narrow Uppsala position’ (‘Uppsalavkroksynpunkten’), and deplored the lack of attention to Sjöqvist’s merits acquired in Rome; 652 even though he also made clear that ‘the board – and certainly not I – have unfortunately no power to command the library authorities’. 653

When Boëthius eventually urged Sjöqvist to apply for a position as second librarian for the third time, Sjöqvist bluntly refused. Boëthius replied that he understood perfectly well why Sjöqvist had given up applying. 654 The clash of positions and opinions was clearly exposed, together with the mild desperation of the situation. Boëthius most likely felt that he was doing what he could to help, while Sjöqvist gradually realised that he found himself caught in a trap regarding his potential Swedish library

650 Sjöqvist to Boëthius, quoted in Gjerstad to Boëthius, November 24, 1946. Samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden. See also RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B.
651 Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, May 18, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
career, as his foreign merits were not worth much in the Swedish system. Uppsala had its own candidates.

Another unfortunate outcome of the internal recruitment at Uppsala was that the library direction there publicly declared Sjöqvist as incompetent for the positions he was applying for in order to justify its selection, which effectively blocked Sjöqvist’s potential return to a Swedish library career. Sjöqvist did clearly not lack competence and merits for the position; the problem was the reluctance to acknowledge his experiences obtained abroad. Such inflexibility was arguably non-conducive to a progressive development of the Swedish academic system. After having had lunch with Gjerstad in October 1947, Erland Billig had inquired whether Sjöqvist was still intending to apply for a position as librarian in Uppsala, hoping this was not the case.

Tönnes Kleberg (head librarian at Uppsala) however offered Sjöqvist a third round of applications for a position at Uppsala in December 1947; although Sjöqvist had already ‘in amplissima forma’ been denied the recognition of merits and qualities required for the profession as librarian. When Kleberg once more offered Sjöqvist a fourth round of

---

655 Cf. Ibid.
657 Cf. telegram, Boëthius to Sjöqvist, December 16, 1947. What made the matter even worse was that Uppsala University library (‘Carolina’) had disseminated Tönnes Kleberg’s report on Sjöqvist’s candidacy to various Swedish institutions (for example in 25 copies to the Swedish Institute (SI), Stockholm, which is probably how Sjöqvist found about it – through Erland Billig). ‘If a new director is to be installed here [at the SIR] this year, I would rather take this chance [Princeton] than the undefined years of drought [‘Rakel-år’] that await me in Uppsala’. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, December 27, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
applications in January 1948, Sjöqvist no longer wanted anything to do with the matter.\textsuperscript{658}

The determination in discussing the replacement Sjöqvist in his position as director of the SIR after the war, points to a profound underestimation on the part of the board regarding his achievements in the scholarly community in Rome during and after the war years. Removing one of a mere handful of individuals with a direct influence on the outcome of the issue of the return of the German libraries also directly challenged the scholarly environment in which the SIR had to continue to operate. The compromises at the root of the repeated extensions of Sjöqvist’s directorship illustrate a lack of long-term perspective and direction on the part of the board of the SIR.

Arvid Andrén (and many others) thought the Swedish library authorities treatment of Sjöqvist ‘scandalous’; ‘after your lengthy successful, arduous and responsible activities as head of a Swedish state-run research- and tuition institution in Rome with an extensive library’. Andrén therefore well understood Sjöqvist’s decision to choose Princeton rather than an insecure future in Sweden.\textsuperscript{659} Following the library position debacle, the Crown Prince’s proposal of the position as his secretary

\textsuperscript{658} Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, January 13, 1948; and Boëthius to Sjöqvist, January 3, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
\textsuperscript{659} Andrén to Sjöqvist, April 22, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1: ‘[…] vi och många med oss känt oss allvarligt upprörda över det sätt, på vilket svenska biblioteksmyndigheter behandlat Dig efter Din mångåriga framgångsrika, mödosamma och ansvarsfulla verksamhet som chef för en svensk statlig forsknings- och undervisningsanstalt, därtill med ett stort bibliotek, i Rom. Det är helt enkelt skandalöst, och vi förstå väl att Du efter detta hellre far till Princeton och viftar med kalla handen åt dessa herrar här hemma’. 
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handsekreterare) was to be a transitory position, as Sjöqvist may have accepted the offered professorship at Princeton as early as April 1950.660

Erland Billig shared Andrén’s sentiment regarding the 'scandalous' treatment of Sjöqvist. An exchange of letters between Billig and Axel Boëthius in March 1946 reveals several otherwise rare comments from Boëthius regarding Sjöqvist’s tenure and the role of the SIR. Boëthius for example spoke of Gjerstad’s ‘moody but truly tenable friendship’, and answered Andrén’s and Billig's criticism of the attitude of the board, which Boëthius found ‘ridiculous’: ‘If we had questioned the [lack of] a pension scheme, we would never had been granted an institute [by the government]’. The underlying idea of the system of 6 to 9 year tenures in Rome was to rotate ‘as many as possible in every generation’ on the post.661 Boëthius’ and Gjerstad’s integration with the Swedish university system was (at least informally) considered the ‘retirement norm’ for the post as director of the SIR.

The board of the SIR arguably followed this rotation policy somewhat rigidly in Sjöqvist’s case, disregarding the fact that the first five years of his directorship took place during the war. Boëthius argued that the feeling of the board was that ‘the only [library] positions available will be in 1946-1947’ (without explaining the reasons for this). Gjerstad expressed

660 A year later (April 27, 1951), Baldwin Smith (Princeton) wrote to Sjöqvist that ‘[I] am glad to hear that you have broken the news to the King, although I can realize that there are still complications’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:1. Cf. Ingrid Edlund-Berry, Erik Sjögqvist: Swedish archaeologist and international scholar at Princeton University, lecture at the SIR, June 11, 2003. SIR annual report 2003, p. 50: ‘The choice to invite Erik Sjögqvist to Princeton University in 1948 was the result of an international political situation in which scholars from Princeton played a major role’.

similar concerns, convinced that Sjöqvist’s ‘only’ chance of resuming his library career in Sweden would be to do so during 1946.  

Boëthius confidentially asserted that ‘should Sjöqvist change his mind and venture abroad (as I was thinking) or if he does not get the [Uppsala library] position in Sweden, it is of course completely permissible for us to extend [his directorship] – but this must not be expressed’. Boëthius agreed that the Swedish reluctance to rate merits gained abroad was deplorable and called for examples to be enacted.  

Billig also confronted Gjerstad with similar criticism; Billig’s opinion that the board did not sufficiently appreciate Sjöqvist’s achievements did not sit very well with Gjerstad, who clearly expressed his irritation (to Billig). Gjerstad clearly had no intention of obstructing Sjöqvist’s career possibilities – Sjöqvist found himself in an awkward position, however, regardless of whether or not the members of the board appreciated him.

---

as a person, as a scholar or his direction of the SIR (which would be difficult to criticise).

Sjöqvist reported his decision not to run for a third round of applications for a library position (viewed by Sjöqvist as ‘a pointless mental strain’) at Uppsala to the Crown Prince in December 1947. The decision was not however to be interpreted as ‘a sign of a lack of loyalty to my board’. Uppsala had taken no heed to Sjöqvist’s years of service at the SIR, and Sjöqvist’s (probably correct) conclusion was that ‘as an expatriate Swede I am regarded as an unwelcome intrusion in a Swedish institution’.

From most perspectives it does seem absurd that Sjöqvist’s achievements on the library field in Rome not only failed to assist his chances of obtaining positions in Sweden, but that they actively worked against him and were viewed as an imposition. Sjöqvist’s international engagements did not help in this regard; other outspoken as well as hidden agendas also influenced the situation, one of which being the preliminary discussions regarding the establishment of the Swedish Institute in Athens (SIA).

---

666 Sjöqvist to Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf, December 29, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutsens i Rom arkiv, III:A:5: ‘Årets sista månad har bragt mig det definitiva beskedet, att jag blivit slagen i båda de konkurrensen om bibliotekariebefattningar i Uppsala vari jag deltagit. Till min tjänst vid Svenska Inst. har ingen hänsyn tagits, varför jag i ena fallet blivit satt i efterhand på gr. av tjänsteårsberäkningen, och mina vetenskapliga meriter ha i det andra fallet nedskrivts så, att jag därvidlag förbigåtts av en medsökande med endast hälften så många tjänsteår som jag. Den slutsats, som jag härav i första hand har att draga, är otvivelaktigt, att jag som utlandssvensk betraktas som en ovälkommen inträngning i en svensk institution [...]. Att för tredje gången genomgå samma procedur, där utgången återigen är ytterst oviss, men där jag med säkerhet har att räkna med en mättland förklarlig avoghet, har jag ansett vara en meningslös själslig ansträngning. Det är min förhoppning att EKH icke tolkar detta mitt beslut som bristande lojalitet mot min Styrelse, som kanske gärna sett, att jag fortsatt med mina bemödanden’.
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After the Second World War, Einar Gjerstad claimed that he had been promised financial backup (individual donations as well as contributions from Swedish companies) for establishing a Swedish Institute in Athens (SIA) as early as 1939. According to Gjerstad, the 1939 plan was to establish a ‘small-scale, entirely archaeological institute’, drawing on previous discussions on the same theme throughout the 1930s. Gjerstad went to Greece in 1944 discussing the potential establishment of a Swedish institute there after the end of the war (cf. the discussion of the (pre-war) Swedish Cyprus Expedition in section 2.2).

Professor and diplomat Sture Linnér recalled discussing a future institute in Athens with Gjerstad in Greece, as they met there while Linnér was working with the so-called ‘white boats’ of the Red Cross. Linnér viewed the situation as ‘taking the opportunity’ to establish Greek-Swedish relations with the manifestation of a Swedish Institute in Athens. He had himself contacted several of the leading companies of Swedish industry (for example AGA, Cellulosa and Electrolux – the latter company even offered Linnér employment – with the view of establishing a joint channel for export and contacts with the Middle East, sharing a building

---

667 Gjerstad to Boëthius, March 1, 1946. Samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden. The desire to arrange study trips in Greece under the auspices of the SIR was strongly emphasised in the by-laws. Cf. SIR Annual report 1936-1937, p. 14 (Appendix 1).
668 Cf. Gjerstad to Sjöqvist, November 24, 1943. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
with a cultural or archaeological institute. The Swedish archaeologist Natan Valmin entertained similar ideas.\textsuperscript{669}

When Linnér confronted Gjerstad with this in Athens, he was told to stay out of the matter, as Gjerstad was already discussing the planned institute in Athens with the Crown Prince.\textsuperscript{670} This again illuminates the influence and importance of the Crown Prince – both the SIR and the SIA could from this perspective be described emanating from a paradigm of ‘Royal academies’, rather than as research institutes – it also harks back to the discussions in the early 1920s (involving the Crown Prince, Martin P. Nilsson and Frederik Poulsen) regarding the establishment of a ‘Scandinavian institute’ in Athens. Gjerstad seemed to have reason to believe that the SIA was a done deal in 1946; it is not unlikely that he even entertained plans to direct it himself, with leave of absence from Lund University.\textsuperscript{671}

The constitutive meeting of the SIA took place in Stockholm in April 1946. Analogously with the establishment of the SIR, the Crown Prince

\textsuperscript{669} Natan Valmin received a similar treatment from Gjerstad, urging Valmin to leave the matter to him. Cf. correspondence between Gjerstad and Valmin (LUB, Samling Gjerstad). See also Natan Valmin, ‘En svensk kulturuppgift’, \textit{Dagens Nyheter}, January 8, 1946; in turn related to Valmin, “En fransk kulturgäning. École française d’Athènes fyller etthundra år.” Valmin was a successful archaeologist; his ambiguous stance regarding the German regime however did not assist him vis-à-vis Gjerstad and the board of the SIR regarding Valmin’s potential input in the issue of establishing the SIA. Interview with Sture Linnér, Stockholm, April 2009.

\textsuperscript{670} Interview with Sture Linnér, Stockholm, April 2009.

was elected chairman of the board of the SIA. The issue of the post-war establishment of the SIA was furthermore linked with the question of Sjöqvist’s continued appointment as director of the SIR (cf. sections 5.3 and 5.4), as the board was faced with both issues simultaneously. Gjerstad confirmed this in March 1946: ‘the question of your successor as director in Rome is so far uncertain and depends on several elements, not least on plans of establishing a Swedish Institute in Athens’. Gjerstad revealed that the plan was for him to organise the new institute and function as its director ‘for a year or two’. Sjöqvist’s situation would most likely have been different had Gjerstad been granted leave from the professorship in Lund for this purpose, if this in turn might have been offered to Sjöqvist as a temporary position, for example.

In Gjerstad’s draft proposal for supporting Sjöqvist’s applications for Swedish library positions in 1946, he was unusually generous in acknowledging Sjöqvist’s merits as director of the SIR: ‘Two previous directors, Boëthius and Gjerstad, have obtained a professorship [in Sweden]. This will not be possible for Sjöqvist. When Sjöqvist was made director, he was an amanuensis at the Royal Library [KB] and intends to resume his library service after the mandate expires. The board strongly supports his application to count years of service [as director of the SIR]. His considerable services for the institute, his successful action in preserving Swedish cultural interests in Italy during the war, his particular

---

672 Boëthius to Sjöqvist, April 26, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
673 Gjerstad to Sjöqvist, March 30, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3: ‘[…] frågan om din efterträdare som föreståndare i Rom är ännu oviss och beror på flera faktorer, icke minst på planer att upprätta ett svenskt institut i Athen. Kommer detta institut till stånd […] har man uppmanat mig att organisera detsamma och fungera som föreståndare under 1 å 2 år’.
merits as a librarian also documented in Rome as well as his organisation of the cooperation between the libraries of the foreign institutes all motivate a successful outcome of his application according to the board.\footnote{See Gjerstad to Boëthius, May 20, 1946. Samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden.} This was then Gjerstad’s ‘official’ position; it illustrates that he was well informed about Sjöqvist’s engagements in Rome, although he did not explicitly refer to Sjöqvist’s work with AIAC or the Unione.

Sjöqvist’s international engagements in Rome on several occasions clashed with the interests of the members of the SIR board. This was clear in the singular case of the SIR excursion to Greece in May and June 1947. The SIR excursion to Greece intervened with an UNESCO meeting in Paris that Sjöqvist had been asked to attend by the Unione. The SIR excursion was an initiative of Gjerstad’s, dating back to 1937 (cf. section 2.2). Gjerstad wanted to resume the trip to Greece as part of the annual archaeological course in Rome until a Swedish institute had been established in Athens.\footnote{Accommodation for the Swedish students during the 1947 SIR excursion was provided at the British School at Athens (BSA). Cf. Sjöqvist to Helen Thomas (BSA), June 30, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2; as well as Gjerstad’s correspondence with the BSA, RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B. In the 1946-1947 SIR annual report, Sjöqvist expressed his gratitude to the BSA for providing lodgings during the Greek excursion (May 22-June 13, 1947). SIR annual report 1946-1947, 6. A similar excursion to Greece was planned for 1948. Cf. Sjöqvist to Erik Holmberg, February 19, 1948; and Erik Holmberg to Sjöqvist, April 27, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.}

Sjöqvist might have personally objected to carrying out the trip in 1947, but openly objecting did not seem to have been a feasible alternative at the time. Sjöqvist had to follow the decision of the board, and was thus forced to decline participation in the UNESCO meeting in Paris in May 1947, a
meeting dedicated to the organisation of the repatriated German libraries in Rome and Florence. This priority leaves little doubt as to the reduced importance of this issue to the board of the SIR. Sjöqvist undertaking the trip to Athens in 1947 was at that time considered more important than him pursuing his work with the Unione.

The board of the SIR tended to prioritise short-term projects over the development of long-term interests, such as the potential for an expanded and more pronounced position of the SIR in scholarly circles in Rome. The excursion to Greece in 1947 was one example of such short-term focus; it was however hanging by a loose financial thread as late as April the same year, which implies that the board members were not in unanimous accord. Gjerstad very likely also underestimated the necessary time required for arranging the funding of the excursion. Sjöqvist was informed about the planned 1947 SIR excursion in April the same year (one month before it was to take place); Gjerstad also informed Sjöqvist that the excursion had to large extent been the suggestion of the Crown Prince. Sjöqvist replied that he was working very hard to condense his teaching in Rome in time to be back from Greece ‘by Midsummer’, when

---

he would have to deal with the ‘final’ installation of the German libraries.  

The SIR board was at the same time having a hard time trying to arouse interest in the new position as director (‘directeur d’études’) of the planned SIA. Considering the simultaneous discussions regarding Sjöqvist's directorship in Rome in late 1946, it is noteworthy that the board asked most other eligible classical scholars in Sweden at the time except Sjöqvist to direct the new institute in Athens – none of whom expressed great interest in the idea, mainly as they were tied up elsewhere, partly as the job was underpaid – before Sjöqvist was asked.  

Why was Sjöqvist then not suggested as director of the new SIA? Part of the answer lies in Gjerstad's personal disappointment with him in relation to the SCE publication (cf. section 5.3); Gjerstad was furthermore aware of the hitherto low status of the new position in Athens: it would in his view in effect work against the development of Sjöqvist’s career and his expected return to Sweden.  

With the number of potential applicants dwindling, Gjerstad even considered provisionally taking on the job

---

678 Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, April 5, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.  
679 Among the Swedish scholars who were unwilling to take on the Athens position at that time (the available candidates consisted of a limited circle of scholars) were Åke Åkerström, Arne Furumark, Arvid Andrén and Olof Vessberg. Cf. Gjerstad to Boëthius, April 8, 1947. Samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden. Cf. Gjerstad to Sjöqvist, May 2, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.  
680 Sjöqvist referred to Gjerstad’s somewhat reactionary position (to Sjöqvist sometimes synonymous with his perception of the attitude of the board as a whole) regarding the issue as ‘Stensäter mentality’ (‘Stensättermentalitet’), after the location of Gjerstad's summer cottage in the North of Sweden. Cf. Gjerstad to Sjöqvist, April 21, 1947; and Gjerstad to Sjöqvist, April 3, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3. Gjerstad first mentioned the position in early April 1947. See Gjerstad to Sjöqvist, April 3, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
himself: ‘As much as I have worked for the institute in Athens, it is naturally my firm intention to do everything [I can] to realise it’.  

The position as director of the SIA was eventually (temporarily) given to the scholar Erik J. Holmberg, for one year only (1947-1948) – which was Holmberg’s criteria for taking it in the first place – before Åke Åkerström took over in 1948 (he was to direct the SIA until 1956, and once more in 1971-1972). The matter had not been settled even in late November 1947, when Gjerstad wrote to Boëthius that he had contacted Holmberg, but the establishment proper of the SIA was awaiting consent from the Greek government, confirming a promise made to Gjerstad personally – it was delayed, as ‘the political situation in Greece does not seem to have improved and the economic situation in Sweden has worsened’.  

Boëthius wrote in 1948 that ‘the Athens institute is now opening thanks to [Åkerström] and Herbert Jacobsson’s impressive generosity’. Erik Holmberg was however hoping that his successor in Athens would be Sjöqvist – Holmberg’s endeavours to work towards the successful establishment of the SIA were ‘with the hope that you would be

683 Boëthius to Andrén, January 28, 1948. SIR, Korrespondens 1939-. Herbert Jacobsson was chairman of the Swedish Orient Line (Svenska Orientlinjen) and a benefactor of the SIA and a member of its board. The representative of the Orient line in Greece, general consul Eugenios Eugenides, was also involved in the establishment of the SIA.
succeeding me. And I know that [Swedish minister] Thyberg has been thinking along the same lines.\textsuperscript{684}

In April 1948 Sjöqvist complained to Erik Holmberg about what he referred to as the general ‘Schweigen im Walde’ surrounding the SIA; Holmberg replied that he had at that time heard nothing from the board regarding the future of the SIA, even though it had convened more than a week earlier. ‘One Swede down here [in Athens] who can hear Stockholm on his radio has heard that the board has followed my suggestion and decided that the institute should be opened this spring [...] and that Åke Åkerström has been elected as my successor’.\textsuperscript{685} The SIA was officially inaugurated on May 10, 1948 (in the Gennadion library of the American School in Athens (ASCSA), as the SIA had not yet succeeded in securing its quarters).\textsuperscript{686}

\textsuperscript{684} Erik Holmberg to Sjöqvist, February 23, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3: ‘när jag här har arbetat för ett institut, var det faktiskt med förhoppning, att Du skulle komma att avlösa mig. Och jag vet, att även Thyberg gått i samma tankar’.

\textsuperscript{685} Sjöqvist to Erik Holmberg, April 21, 1948; and Erik Holmberg to Sjöqvist, April 27, 1948: ‘Jag sitter nämligen här och väntar förgäves på besked, hur [styrelse] sammanträdet den 19 avlöpte, men ingenting kommer ännu, fast det nu är 8 dagar sedan och de vet, att vi spänt vänta på resultatet. I alla fall har en svensk här nere, som kan höra Stockholm på sin radio hört, att styrelsen beslutat enligt mitt förslag att öppna institutet redan i vår, när studenterna komma, vilket jag är mycket glad åt att få vara med om efter allt förarbetet här, samt att Åke Åkerström blivit vald till min efterträdare, vilket DU väl förmodligen vet men som [jag] i alla fall skriver, därför att det gläder mig mycket’.

\textsuperscript{686} The director of the SIA has ‘official’ diplomatic status (with for example CD plates), as opposed to the SIR.
The SIR activities of 1948 was covered by two separate SIR annual reports, one by Sjöqvist for the academic year 1947-1948, and one by the interim temporary director Åke Åkerström, who was about to become take over the newly established SIA.\textsuperscript{687} Arvid Andrén, Sjöqvist’s successor in Rome, was appointed director of the SIR as of January 1, 1949.\textsuperscript{688}

Åkerström’s assessment of the ‘cultural collaboration’ of the SIR during the autumn of 1948 included a report on the final stages of the negotiations of the return of the libraries: ‘Regarding the important issue of the ex-German libraries in Rome and Florence a decision has been made that these will be handed over to the Italian state, which in turn for a period of 99 years will hand them over to the Unione with full right of disposal. The required funds for their management have been provided by UNESCO’.\textsuperscript{689} The board of the SIR had already been kept à jour with this issue through Sjöqvist; Åkerström was in this case reporting on the consequences of efforts by Sjöqvist and the Unione. This decision would not be followed through (cf. section 6.4); the four libraries eventually being restored to German control in 1953, after years of drawn-out discussions.

\textsuperscript{687} The Åkerström SIR 1948 annual report exists in two copies (both typewritten, as was customary), one dated ‘January 1949’, the other more specifically ‘January 10, 1949’. Cf. also Sjöqvist’s correspondence with Holmberg, RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.


\textsuperscript{689} In terms of ‘cultural collaboration’, Åkerström had himself been invited to give a talk at the annual closing session of PIAC on December 30, 1948. SIR annual report 1948 (Åkerström), 7-8.
Contrary to Åkerström’s brief 1948 report, Sjöqvist left a forceful legacy in his final SIR annual report for 1947–1948. Sjöqvist stated that he had spent the summer of 1947 in England (visiting Ward-Perkins and his family) as well as in Sweden. He had revisited Greece as the SIR representative at the centennial celebrations of the French School at Athens, September 6–20 1947. He also reported a visit to Stockholm in January 1948 (possibly for unofficial meetings with the board and the Crown Prince (regarding his position as the latter’s personal secretary. During his last year a director of the SIR, Sjöqvist had also been elected a foreign member of the committee for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the excavations at Pompeii (1748–1948), and had taken part in the committee for the preparation of an international archaeology congress on Sicily.

In his 1947–1948 report, Sjöqvist declared that he had ‘gradually phased out and retired from the international and other commissions of trust that were accounted for in the annual reports 1945–1946 and 1946–1947’. He was here mainly referring to AIAC and the Unione. In connection with leaving the directorship of the SIR and his ‘transition to other activities’ (as visiting professor of classical archaeology at Princeton University), Sjöqvist mentioned being awarded the OBE, as well as having been elected as foreign member of the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (one of the highest academic honours in Italy) after the war.

690 Cf. Sjöqvist’s correspondence with Robert Demangel, director of the EFA, RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
691 Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
692 SIR annual report 1947–1948, 1. Cf. also RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:4. Boëthius was delighted about Sjöqvist’s OBE and his election as ‘Lynceus’. Boëthius had himself been made a ‘socio straniero’ of the Lincei in 1947. Sjöqvist received an abundance of praise for his directorship during the war as he was about to leave the SIR. Cf. Boëthius to Sjöqvist, June 29, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
Sjöqvist no longer had to frame his achievements in as benevolent terms as possible to the board of the SIR, and a change of tone is noticeable: ‘considering the fact that I will retire from my position as director this year, I feel entitled to respectfully direct the attention of the board to the incongruence between the raised living costs and the unchanged salary benefits of the director [the effective value of the director's salary had decreased by 37% after the end of the war, according to Sjöqvist's own calculations]. As the salary furthermore has not yet reached the 1938-1939 level [it was cut from 13.125 to 9,000 Swedish crowns annually when Sjöqvist was appointed director in 1940], one could rightly say that the salary situation of the director is far from fortuitous.

During the present fiscal year I have to a large extent had to resort to writers fees in order to be able to balance my private budget, which [...] in the long run is not compatible with the interests of the institute and the research tasks of the director'.

Sjöqvist was uncharacteristically brief in evaluating the role of the SIR in the international (scholarly) context; in part possibly based on previous experience, but also as the issue was no longer one of his priorities. The general mood of collaboration had already begun to subside after the initial post-war enthusiasm: ‘There is no news from the cultural cooperation front this year. The vested sound relations with Italian authorities and foreign institutions have continued, and the connections between the members of the institute and foreign as well as Italian student circles remain cordial’. On the other hand, ‘the ‘internordic’ collaboration under the auspices of the institute has seldom been so lively and rewarding

\footnote{SIR annual report 1947-1948, 45.}
as now, and the constant stream of Swedish visitors seems to indicate that
the institute is well anchored in the consciousness of the home country.\footnote{SIR annual report 1947-1948, 10. Sjöqvist was at the same time described as ‘the column that supports our international cultural endeavours’ (‘kolonnen som stöder vårt internationella kulturarbete’). Gunhild Bergh (possibly Björk), January 7, 1947. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B:2.}

The 1948-1949 SIR annual report was the first by Andrén as director, and
illuminated the transition from Sjöqvist to Andrén and interpretations of
his immediate legacy. Andrén faced a number of novelties in the SIR
administration during his first year as director, such as the appointment of
Erik Wetter as treasurer, succeeding Axel Hallin, as well as the
administration of Dr. Axel Munthe’s bequest of Villa San Michele on
Capri, following Munthe’s death in 1949.\footnote{SIR annual report 1948-1949, 9-10.}

In commenting on ‘cultural collaboration’ and Sjöqvist’s legacy,
Andrén reported that: ‘the sound and trustful relationship between the
members of the institute and Italian authorities as well as Italian and
foreign cultural institutions and scholarly colleagues has continued
without change’.\footnote{SIR annual report 1948-1949, 18.} The examples offered of this ‘sound and trustful
relationship’ were however limited to Gjerstad’s and Åkerström’s
colorae to Cerveteri, respectively).

Andrén furthermore optimistically summarised, as did Åkerström, the
issue of the return to Rome of the German libraries: ‘The management
and maintenance of the ex-German libraries in Rome and Florence [...] has been secured through the disposal of a billion lire from ex-German
interests and debt dues in Italy to the Unione for the maintenance and
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growth of the libraries, following a communication to the Italian government from the governments of the United States, England [sic] and France’. 697

Sjöqvist heartily congratulated his successor Arvid Andrén in 1948: ‘I am sure you understand the feeling of safety and comfort of the old engineman, when he knows that the slightly delicate machine he has been operating a few years and has learned to love and appreciate is in the hands of an expert who knows how it works and has better qualifications than anyone else for its successful maintenance.’ 698

Looking back in the context of the fiftieth anniversary of the SIR in 1976 Andrén acknowledged Sjöqvist’s importance, remembering feeling ‘like someone walking to a set table. Erik Sjöqvist had skillfully managed to guide the institute unscathed through the many difficulties of war and the post-war period. He had also made an important contribution by arranging what the institute sorely needed through its rapidly expanding library, exchange of publications and increased correspondence: a permanent secretary and librarian [Gino Filipetto].’ 699

698 Sjöqvist to Andrén, April 14, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1: ‘Du förstår säkert vilken känsla av trygghet och tryvnad det bereder den gamle maskinisten, när han vet att den fina och rätt ömtäliga maskinen som ha handhaft under några år och lärt sig älska och uppskatta, kommer i händerna på en expert, som vet hur den fungerar och som har större förutsättningar än någon annan att sköta den elegant och gnisselrikt’.
699 Andrén furthermore took pride in stressing that he had encouraged researchers and scholarship holders no to limit themselves solely to the study of antiquity, but to learn ‘something about the Rome that has actually existed and been of some importance also after the end of antiquity’. Östenberg, ed., Svenska Institutet i Rom 1926-1976, 36.
The scholarly community in Rome as a whole thought highly of Sjöqvist, who was generally considered highly influential in the preparatory work for AIAC and the Unione. Malcolm Bell, one of Sjöqvist’s later students at Princeton, for example wrote to Gurli Sjöqvist after Sjöqvist’s death that the renowned archaeologist Pietro Romanelli had ‘singled out Mr. Sjöqvist, with moving words, and spoke of his role in the formation of the international committees after the war’.\textsuperscript{700} Sjöqvist’s display of diplomatic and administrative talents during the war was eventually also (posthumously) officially recognised by Einar Gjerstad.\textsuperscript{701}

Sjöqvist’s SIR legacy was emphasised also in his Princeton memorial resolution: ‘in those [war] years there were many fleeing the enormities of fascist Europe who found refuge through the energetic agency of this seemingly innocent archaeologist from a neutral power. [...] Erik Sjöqvist will be remembered as an unusually gifted teacher [and as a] man of infectious enthusiasm and sparkling wit, [one who] took joy in the company of his colleagues, gave generously of his rich knowledge and experience, and won the affection of all who knew him’.\textsuperscript{702}

Malcolm Bell added that ‘Professor Sjöqvist was an extraordinary man, the finest I shall hope to know. He sometimes used the phrase ”a scholar

\textsuperscript{700} Malcolm Bell to Gurli Sjöqvist, October 8, 1976. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:1.
\textsuperscript{702} ‘Memorial resolution for Erik Sjöqvist’, Princeton, December 1, 1975. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:1.
and a gentleman” and no one ever seemed to deserve it more than he.703 Other than the OBE (1948) and his election into the Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia (1944), Sjöqvist’s list of honours included being elected Commander of the Italian Order of the Crown (by ‘Umberto di Savoia, Luogotenente Generale del Regno’, May 1, 1946),704 Knight of the Swedish Royal Nordstjärneorden (June 6, 1946), ‘Socio corrispondente’ of the Deputazione Romana di Storia Patria (March 7, 1947), fellow of the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei (1948), fellow of the DAIR (1953), University Seminar Associate on Classical Civilization, Columbia University (July 1, 1960–June 30, 1962), fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (May 8, 1963), Honorary Citizen of Korea ‘In appreciation of assistance rendered Korean Relief’s Hunger & Sickness Campaign’, February 15, 1966), member of the Norwegian ‘Videnskaps-Akademiet’ in Oslo (March 24, 1966), member of Kungl. Vitterhets Historie & Antikvitets Akademien, Stockholm (June 6, 1967), as well as member of the board of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.705

Sjöqvist would quite likely have subscribed to the view of Swedish Prince Eugen (1865–1947 – SIR board member, artist (painter), uncle of Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf), who believed that ‘life continues down here [on Earth, after death], our actions, be they important or insignificant,

---

703 Malcolm Bell to Gurli Sjöqvist, July 18, 1975. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:2 Cf. also Alfred Westholm’s and Gösta Sahlund’s Sjöqvist obituaries of Sjöqvist in Dagens Nyheter, July 19, 1975 and Svenska Dagbladet, respectively. (RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:2).

704 This honour was continuously officially conferred until 1951, despite the advent of the Italian Republic in 1946.

705 Cf. certificates and diplomas in RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:4.
continue to take effect with unabated force.\textsuperscript{706} The outspoken Prince Eugen was not considered ‘comfortable’ by the Swedish political establishment; he was ‘neither neutral, quiet or discreet’, and actively took a stand against the Nazi regime. Prince Eugen has been described as ‘an excellent role model for exactly the ‘cultivated democracy’ he himself spoke of’, with democracy as ‘a ‘pace’, or a way of walking, rather than a road or a final destination.\textsuperscript{707}

\section*{5.7 National Interests and National Prestige}

Axel Boëthius wrote in 1937 that the foreign academies in Rome (in the context of a discussion of the potential emergence of other potential Scandinavian institutes) ‘should evolve organically out of the educational traditions of the specific country, completely independently grown out of its own memories in Rome. The ideal would be that each one of our countries had its own distinctive, independent institute.’\textsuperscript{708}

\footnotesize


\textsuperscript{708} Boëthius to Politiken (Copenhagen), n.d. (March 1937). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1: ‘Dessa institut börja för att äga någon styrka organiskt
Emphasis on national contexts was clear also in for example the reorganisation of the BSR library, which was emphasised in a 1938 report: ‘It is intended to develop this section of the Library [‘dealing with the norther [sic] and western provinces of the Roman Empire and more particularly with British Archaeology’] in order to make more easily available to scholars in Rome the result of archaeological work carried out in the British Isles’.709

This form of national promotion through scholarship regarding local (national) aspects of the Roman past had its counterparts at the EFR (Roman Gaul) and the DAIR (cf. the ‘longobardian-Germanic’ archaeological enterprises of Siegfried Fuchs and Friedrich Krischen – see chapter 2.4), but was not available for example to the AAR or the SIR.

The identity and continued existence of the foreign academies in Rome after the Second World War relied on the maintenance of pre-war structures and a general reluctance regarding change. It is not unreasonable to wonder whether the Unione would have been established had it not been for the war and the breakdown of international relations, in politics as well as in the world of scholarship.

AAR president James Kellum Smith wrote to the US House of Representatives in May 1947 regarding an AAR resolution on the program of information and cultural exchange conducted by its Office of

709 Report on the ‘the extension and reorganization of the buildings of the British School at Rome carried out during the session 1937-8’, December 1938. BSR, box 63.
Information and Educational Exchange. The AAR furthermore benefited from an ‘Italo-American Agreement on Surplus Property Disposal’, and the sale of ‘60 million dollars worth of surplus Army and Navy property to the Italian Government to be paid for in lire and the lire to be spent for the exchange of students and the support of USA educational activities in Italy’. This is to be understood in the context of other post-war foundations, the initiation of the Marshall plan, the Fulbright resolution and other means of facilitating academic and cultural diplomacy.

AAR president J.K. Smith wrote to the two AAR trustees in Washington, D.C. (John Walker and Whitney Shepardson), urging them to formally constitute themselves as the ‘Congressional lobby of the American Academy in Rome’, ‘with a view of advising us how best to obtain for the Academy any proper benefits which might accrue from this source’ (the sale of ‘surplus property’ to the Italian Government and the consequent credits available in lira to the United States for Italy). 

711 ‘Memoranda for Mr. [Lindsay] Bradford’, February 20, 1946. AAR, reel 5758.
The issue lay with ‘the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs (under William Benton),’\textsuperscript{714} as a measure to implement the Fulbright Resolution: ‘substantial funds will be available for cultural purposes in Europe, regardless of whether or not the Fulbright Resolution is past. This fact is particularly confidential. [...] I suggest that someone approach Mr. Benton on behalf of the Academy [and] gain his sympathy for the Academy’s work in Italy. It would also be helpful if on the Board you could find a friend of Senator Fulbright’s, and could also call on him. [...] It seems to me likely that the Academy’s lire budget could be paid by the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. If this were the case, we could double our enrollment, and really make the Academy of great service to this country’\textsuperscript{715}

President Smith was excited: ‘Of course if we really get this source open, there are certain rather extraordinary opportunities there which could be exploited with some more cash. At last we have been promised some opportunities to excavate. [...] An extra $15,000 or $20,000 would appear to finance such a dig very comfortably. [...] There is a lot we could do with the money, if we can get it.’\textsuperscript{716} The necessary funds for excavation were estimated as an augmentation of at least one fourth of the (pre-war) annual AAR budget.


\textsuperscript{715} John Walker to J.K. Smith, April 11, 1946. The available funds were indeed substantial (the interest for 1946 was ‘roughly $2,000,000’). For reference the pre-war AAR (annual) budget was ‘some $65,000, and about 580,000 lire (i.e. ‘about 2,352,000 lire’). See J.K. Smith to Walker, April 17, 1946. AAR, reel 5758. It is however unclear to what extent such state funding could be integrated with the AAR status as a private trust.

\textsuperscript{716} J.K. Smith to John Walker, April 17, 1946. AAR, reel 5758.
This influenced the AAR to express its admiration for the new government office; its official appraisal was however phrased in terms of the promotion of peace and humanism: ‘in the opinion of the Board of Trustees of the American Academy in Rome, the program of information and cultural exchange is a vital element in the preservation of peace by increasing mutual understanding among nations, and especially by correcting misapprehension and even distortion of American ideas, ideals, and policy’.\footnote{Resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the American Academy in Rome, May 23, 1947. AAR, reel 5758: ‘Whereas the Office of Information and Educational Exchange has been recommended for establishment by the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Department of State has asked the Congress to appropriate $31,000,000 for the operation of this office during the fiscal year 1947-48’.}

The DAIR distrust and skepticism of Italian scholars and officials (of Fuchs, Hoppenstedt et al. – cf. section 4.1), was in a mild form shared by the AAR. In commenting on AAR secretary Riccardo Davico, AAR president James Kellum Smith expressed an expectation of Italians ‘working both sides of the street’:\footnote{J.K. Smith to Lindsay Bradford (AAR treasurer), October 3, 1945. AAR, reel 5758. Cf. the replacement of BSR architect Rossi (with architect Michailoff, advised by Sir John Serrao) in 1945, as ‘Rossi as a convinced Fascist has eliminated himself’. BSR, box 63.}

‘[...] perhaps you will permit me to express an emotional opinion. To my mind, our honorable Secretary in Rome, Riccardo Davico, has been working both sides of the street for years. Leon Fraser and I thought we ought to get rid of him in 1939; but he was an ardent Fascist, and with that gang in power, it seemed too risky, so we continued him. He has been given great credit for “carrying the Academy through the emergency”. To my mind he has just buttered his bread. He has some usefulness to us until we can get our reorganization. But I suppose if you know the Italians as well as some of us do, you have got to expect them to work both sides of the street. Should you now think, in view of
these opinions and the international situation, we should start putting on the heat, I would not think the administration in Rome would be seriously complicated. [...] It is my feeling that we should call a few direct shots and get this mess off our agenda.’

Axel Boëthius instructed temporary SIR director Åke Åkerström in 1948 that ‘Sjöqvist has informed me that the Italian aversion to foreign research, suppressed by Mussolini and the circumstances surrounding the peace, is now reawakening; the magnificent tributes to Sjöqvist had an undertone of “we have had it up to here with the foreign academies, but we appreciate you [the SIR] very much”. We have a here a capital of good will that requires your friendly touch. No brusque speeches!’

Sjöqvist had sent out invitations to the scholarly community for the inauguration ceremony for activities at the SIR in February 1946. Art historian and archaeologist Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli (cf. section 5.2) could not attend the ceremony, but wrote appreciatively of Sjöqvist’s directorship and the fact that the SIR had ascended to a high level during the war years (through the work of individual Swedish scholars) ‘not only among the institutes of Rome, but [also] in international scholarship’. Sjöqvist was contacted by the Istituto di Studi Etruschi in Florence in April 1946 regarding possible participation in a committee in preparation of the ‘internationalisation’ of the Etruscan institute after the war (as a

---

719 Boëthius to Åkerström, September 3, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkv, III.B.1: ‘Sjöqvist har gjort klart för mig att italienarnas motvilja mot främmande forskning, kuvad av Mussolini och tidsomständigheterna kring freden, nu åter kvicknar till vid de storartade hyllningarna för Sjöqvist fanns det en underton av att ”de främmande instituten stå oss upp i halsen, men Er tycka vi mycket om”. Här ha vi ett kapital av good will att förvalta, som kräver just Ditt vänliga handlag. Inga bryska tal!’

720 Bianchi Bandinelli to Sjöqvist, February 7, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkv, III:A.4: ‘[...] l’Istituto Svedese che sotto la sua guida ha saputo, in questi ultimi anni, postarsi ad un posto con alto non solo tra gli Istituti di Roma, ma nella scienza internazionale [...] e noi italiani dobbiamo esser grati a Lei e al suo Istituto’.

---
representative of Swedish Etruscology). Sjöqvist did not really believe in the project; he considered it to be an opportunist façade with no real substance, set up with the sole intention and hope of increased funding (from AIAC and other sources): ‘What [the Istituto di Studi Etruschi] mean by an international institute is totally different to our understanding’, with funding to emanate from ‘foreign sources’, but with the direction to remain Italian. ‘It is just an empty slogan and nothing else’.721

The Unione was seen as the very opposite – the organisation was propelled by an abundance of international pathos, but lacked a defined funding structure (cf. chapter 6). Pietro Toesca, member of the board of the Unione, informed Ward-Perkins in April 1946 that the newly established Unione was regarded with suspicion by the Italian IRCE (Istituto Nazionale per le Relazioni Culturali con l’Estero), who ‘suspect the Union of dark designs upon its prerogatives’.722

In 1948, Sjöqvist reported to Boëthius that the Roumanian Academy had left the ‘fraternity’ of the Valle Giulia foreign academies after the

---


Communist takeover: ‘All who did not sign a declaration of joining the Communist party were thrown out and [...] lost their Roumanian citizenship. To once again be forced to witness the brutalities of totalitarianism outrages me more than I can say’. The Roumanian scholars ‘are now on the street after a 48-hour warning! [...] the Academy is now a bolshevik student casern’.\textsuperscript{723} He had put a lot of effort into collaborative projects between the Valle Giulia academies, and the developments at the Roumanian academy – also indicative of the near-exclusive conservative political ideology of the foreign academies in Rome – were reasonably upsetting to Sjöqvist.

\section*{5.8 Perceptions of German Scholarship}

Writing on national contributions to classical archaeology soon after the First World War, British scholar Percy Gardner stated regarding German systematic publications of ‘classes of monuments’, that

It must be confessed that work of this kind comes almost exclusively from Germany; other peoples do not seem to dispose either of the trained workers or the large funds necessary for the production of great series of plates or comprehensive corpuses. The corpus, adequately publishing all known monuments of a certain class, is a work involving enormous labour; but it is without a rival from the point of view of science. The German Archaeological Institute [in Berlin], with the aid of government funds, has published, in the last half century, wholly or in part, Corpus of Greek Inscriptions, of Roman Inscriptions, of Greek Terra-Cottas, of Sarcophagi, of Attic Sepulchral Reliefs.\textsuperscript{724}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{723} Sjöqvist to Boëthius, January 13, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
\item \textsuperscript{724} Percy Gardner, \textit{Recent Discovery in Classical Archaeology} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1919), 21.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
This quote is revealing, and says much about the positivist nature of the study of classics and of classical archaeology, but also about the widespread respect for German scholarly output. In 1942, Axel Boëthius spoke of the ‘hope of the emergence and spiritual victory of free Germany’ he had shared with later DAIR director Ludwig Curtius (in Uppsala) in 1919; this hope had now turned into ‘an anguished concern, full of autumnal doubt instead of morning light’.\textsuperscript{725} When the German libraries left Rome in early 1944, Curtius was in despair and spoke of ‘die ruhmreiche Vergangenheit’.\textsuperscript{726} Curtius had told Sjöqvist after the departure of the libraries, primarily referring to the Nazi contingent of the German institutes in Rome, that ‘they are all mad, and have no idea of the consequences of their acts’. Sjöqvist added that ‘I am sure that his opinion is shared by all responsible German scholars concerned’.\textsuperscript{727} The hope that German (apolitical) scholarship would triumph over German (political) nationalism was shared by many classical scholars during and after the war, transcending national boundaries and identities.

Bernard Berenson, the American art historian (and owner of the Villa I Tatti outside Florence, later donated to Harvard University), was outspokenly in favour of returning the German libraries ‘to German scholarship’ after the war; as its contributions were ‘at least as great as made by any one of us [...]. Let me add that these [German contributions

\textsuperscript{725} Boëthius to Sjöqvist, December 12, 1942. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
\textsuperscript{726} Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, January 11, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
\textsuperscript{727} ‘Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1).
to archaeology and art history] remained almost unaffected by the Nazi regime, and that it would not be difficult to find German scholars of the best attainments to fill posts even of a subordinate rank. These libraries moreover being collected by Germans and in the first place for Germans, have inevitably as German a character as mine for similar reasons has an English-language one.\footnote{BERNARD BERenson to ‘PAUL Bonner Esq. American Embassy, Rome’, February 17, 1948. In a letter to Bianchi Bandinelli in April 1946, Berenson declared that he was ‘as German minded as possible’. Berenson to Bianchi Bandinelli, April 3, 1946. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College (appendix 2). Cf. memorandum (Morey) to Bonner, December 18, 1948; Bonner to Albert Grenier (with a copy of Berenson’s letter), February 19, 1948; and Grenier to Bonner, February 24, 1948. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union 1946-1949’. See also Arnold Esch, “Die deutschen Institutsbibliotheken nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs und die Rolle der Unione degli Istituti: Internationalisierung, Italianisierung – oder Rückgabe an Deutschland?” in Deutsche Forschungs- und Kulturinstitute in Rom in der Nachkriegszeit, ed. Michael Matheus (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2007), 89; and Bernard Berenson, The Passionate Sightseer: From the Diaries of Bernard Berenson, 1947-56 (London: Thames and Hudson, 1960), as well as The Selected Letters of Bernard Berenson, Edited by A.K. McComb (London: Hutchinson, 1963). AAR director Chester Aldrich reported that ‘Mr. Berenson of Florence, whose interest […] constant and helpful’ was staying at the AAR in the spring of 1939. See Aldrich to Smith, March 30, 1939. AAR, reel 5758.}

Sjöqvist was similarly of the opinion that the experience of the German staff of the libraries still present in Rome (cf. Schriebmüller at the Hertziana) should be utilised in the maintenance of the libraries. The employment of pre-war staff was however debated and not accepted by the Unione – cf. for example Leo Bruhn’s repeated but unsuccessful attempts to be reinstated as director of the Hertziana 1946-1949, supported by Otto Hahn of the Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft. Bruhn had been actively working towards a restoration of the ‘honour of German science’ in 1945.\footnote{Cf. Lilly Bruhns (Leo Bruhn’s wife) to Sjöqvist (from Merano), May 17, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, II:A:5.}
The four German libraries were considered to be of great importance, not only because they were, simply, the best and most extensive research libraries available in Rome at the time, but also as they were symbolically important. There was a range of motives in simultaneous operation regarding this issue (cf. chapters 4 and 6).\textsuperscript{730} Arnold Esch relates reports between the US ambassador in Italy and the US secretary of state regarding ‘considerable opposition not only from Italians and Neutrals but also from many German scholars’ to the transport of the German libraries from Italy – this was considered a ‘yardstick for future cooperative undertakings in postwar scholarship’.\textsuperscript{731}

German scholarship was easily and often wrongly confused with and mistaken for German nationalism in the discussions regarding the return of the German libraries to Rome and their potential restitution to Germany. Some of the main protagonists in these discussions were French (Grenier), American (Berenson) and Italian (Gaetano de Sanctis, Carlo Ragghianti, Carlo Antoni\textsuperscript{732} – et al.). After the breakdown of the ‘four

\textsuperscript{730} Cf. \textit{Jyllandsposten}, June (2) 1933: ‘De fællesnordiske Traditioner i Rom. Det skandinaviske Institut'. GUB, Hadskriftssamlingen, A. Boethius' papper, H 80: 238; regarding the DAIR, ‘som navnlig er kendt for dets ypperlige Fagbibliotek, det bedste i Rom, samlet gennem Aaringer med tysk Pertentlighed'.


\textsuperscript{732} Carlo Antoni (philosopher of history) was the director (or ‘commissario straordinario’) of the IRCE (\textit{Istituto Nazionale per le Relazioni Culturali con l'Estero}, Piazza Firenze, Rome, established in 1938, not to be confused with the \textit{Istituto Nazionale dei Cambi con l'Estero}). IRCE applied for UNESCO subsidies in 1947. See ASMAE, Archivio di Gabinetto, 1944-47, box 106, file 49. Cf. Walter Paatz (Heidelberg) to Klauser, June 15, 1949. See also an article by Carlo Antoni in \textit{Il Mondo}, June 11, 1949, entitled ‘Immunità della Cultura – Hitler è stato fatale agli studi scientifici tedeschi a Roma. Non bisogna completare la sua opera’. Antoni advocated the creation of ‘una Croce Rossa della Cultura’. See Arnold Esch, "Die
powers treaty’ in 1949 (cf. section 6.4), the Accademia dei Lincei published an official protest and an appeal for the necessity of the regular opening and updated accessions of the four German libraries (1950), signed by a number of illustrious Italian scholars.733


A separate open letter, signed by a multitude of Italian scholars, represented by Gaetano De Sanctis, protested against the possible ‘subtraction’ of the German institutes from the world of scholarship in Italy. It was argued that the German institutions (along with the libraries) ought to be returned to German control, as the ‘provisional administration’ of the libraries (through the Unione) had demonstrated that it was not capable of maintaining the German libraries ‘at the high level that had been reached before the last war and to which it is necessary that they are returned as soon as possible’; characterised by a ‘respect for culture that does not know races, borders or political contrasts’.734

The planned petition by approximately 100 Italian ‘Gelehrten unter Führung von Francesco [sic] De Sanctis’ was discussed by Ludwig Heydenreich (former director of the Kunsthistorisches Institut) and F.W. Deichmann (of the DAIR) in December 1950.735

Altertumswissenschaft in Deutschland’. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.

734 ‘Protesta dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei per le assurde rivendicazioni di alcuni studiosi tedeschi’, n.d. (1950). AIAC archives, Palazzo Venezia, Rome: ‘in eventuale sottrazione alla Germania degli Istituti Culturali ad essa per lungo tempo appartenenti, susciterebbe nell’animo loro un senso di dolorosa protesta. [...] I sottoscritti si permettono di esprimere alla E.V. [...] che la Germania venga reintegrata nel possesso o [...] nella gestione dei suoi Istituti Culturali. [...] manteneteri a quell’altezza che essi avevano raggiunta prima dell’ultima guerra e alla quale è necessario vengano al più presto riportati. [...] il rispetto per la Cultura, che non conosce razze, frontiere e contrasti politici.’

In yet another promemoria regarding the ‘ex-German libraries’, three contrasting points of view were clarified regarding the libraries: one German, one Allied and one Italian (see appendix 5). The Italian claims to the libraries were backed up by ‘the historical interests and rights of Italy’, as the ‘problem’ of the German libraries had its own specific ‘cultural profile’. The promemoria suggested a general solution of ‘reconciliation’ of the three perspectives, with German as well as Italian participation in the management of the libraries, ‘not excluding the possibility’ of an international ‘formation committee’.736

It is clear from Sjöqvist’s testimony regarding the removal of the four German libraries from Rome, that the Nazi contingent of the DAIR was more concerned about what the ‘ungrateful Italians’ rather than the Allies would do to the German property after the war.737 This lack of faith in Italian scholars – and to some extent Italian society in general – was shared by (for example) EFR director Albert Grenier.738 Domestic Italian
opinion was divided regarding the issue of the potential restitution of the libraries to German administration. Unione board member Pietro Toesca believed that the Unione would need to employ ‘some Germans in the ordering and running of the library’. Ward-Perkins remarked that ‘it’s well that [that opinion] should be able to come from an Italian’. 739

In the era of the Morgenthau plan – the planned partition of Germany into two (northern and southern) independent states, with an additional international zone (1944–1947, replaced by the Marshall plan in US policy) – Grenier had told Sjöqvist that Germany could not be allowed to be a part of the discussion regarding the future of the libraries for at least a decade. 740

Grenier saw the restitution of the libraries to Germany as a humiliating political defeat, and did not want to be seen as one of the ‘serviteurs du Roi de Prusse’. Discussing the Fasti Archaeologici in relation to the DAI Archäologischer Anzeiger, Grenier held the Fasti to be ‘designed on a larger level and in a purely scientific spirit, whereas the Anzeiger was made above all for the glory of German scholarship’. 741 This perceived dichotomy between pure science and the glory of national scholarship did not take the potential ‘glory’ of ‘pure science’ into serious account.

740 See Erland Billig’s papers.
In August 1945, besides reporting on contacts with the Allied subcommission (‘my meetings with Capt. Keller, Lt. Cott and Lt. Col. De Wald [...] and Mr. Cooper (from the British Museum’), cf. section 4.3), Ludwig Heydenreich gave a personal account of the post-war emotional rapture, and belief in the ‘internationale of science’:

I dare not say, that I am happy, the weight of suffering is too heavy. Aside any personal facts [...] it is the terrific [sic] doubt, whether the spiritual values of that Europe, we loved and lived for, can be maintained after all that happened and is going to happen. But precisely fighting against useless melancholy (which in the field of science and spirit signifies always weakness), I am concentrating my energies on the project of rallying a group of active and congenial persons, tending to some sort of that, what you called so well the “Internationale of Science”. I should be immensely happy for an occasion to see you again and to speak with you upon all our common interests, and in a special way – too – upon the future of my Institute [the Kunsthistorisches Institut]. But, I think, this has to be postponed for some time.742

Heydenreich’s account was in reply to a letter from Berenson, in which the latter stated that ‘there are various Internationales beside the Communistic ones. I need not enumerate them. There is one to which you and I belong. It is the Internationale of STUDY. It has nothing to do with the politics of the moment. Its values are not of the stamped herd, and its activities should be based on good will, mutuality and above all understanding. I know that you have done everything in your power for Unsereiner and Unsereines spiritual interests and instruments. I am truly

742 Heydenreich to Berenson, August 19, 1945 (from Milan). The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
grateful and ready to do all I can for everybody of your category. You foremost’.\textsuperscript{743}

The common respect for German scholarship rhymes well with the belief in such an ‘internationale of study’, or of research. For the academic diplomacy of German scholars and politicians regarding the restitution of the German research institutes in Italy after the war, see section 6.5.

\textsuperscript{743} Berenson to Heydenreich, June 18, 1944. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
6 THE UNIONE AND THE RETURN OF THE GERMAN LIBRARIES

Human affairs [...] in which nearly everything is political. (Immanuel Kant, 1784)\textsuperscript{744}


The Unione degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell’Arte in Roma (referred to here as the Unione), was established in Rome in February 1946. Apart from the desire to increase the integration of the foreign academies in Rome with their Italian counterparts, the main pragmatic reason for its establishment was to negotiate and lobby for the return of the four so-called German libraries to Rome after the Second World War.

The expansion of the field of interest of the Unione (in relation to AIAC) to include history and art history was based on the nature and scope of the four German libraries (archaeology, history and art history).\textsuperscript{745} Arnold Esch has identified the scholarly libraries as the core of the foreign academies, and has correctly illuminated that the Unione’s efforts were directed at libraries rather than at institutes.\textsuperscript{746} The fate of the four


\textsuperscript{745} The ‘German libraries’ referred to the libraries of the DAIR, the DHI, the Bibliotheca Hertziana and of the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence (cf. section 4.1).

German libraries needs to be set against a complex and evolving policy
toward the restoration of cultural property after the Second World War; a
fertile field of recent scholarship.  


The Unione was established as a suprainstitutional body in order to in every way possible restabilise scholarly collaboration in Rome after the war. The Italian archaeologist Massimo Pallottino in retrospect emphasised the need to reassemble or reconstruct ‘an international solidarity that would reassert the impartial and universal foundations of culture’.748 ‘Culture’ was equated with Western European (and North American) culture; the ‘impartial and universal foundations’ of Western culture was thus taken for granted. A similar rhetoric can be discerned in Pallottino’s narrative regarding the foundation of AIAC and the Unione, emphasising that the idea was to ‘revive the spirit of the ancient Institute of Archaeological Correspondence’ (ICA).749 EFR director Albert Grenier similarly narrated that ‘Le 10 mars 1945, des savants américains, anglais, belges, français, italiens, néerlandais, suédois et suisses créaient l’Association Internationale d’Archéologie Classique, dans l’esprit même de l’ancien Institut International de Correspondance archéologique’.750 This narrative here is significant: the scholars (‘les savants’) that created


748 Vian, ed., Speculum Mundi, 9.: ‘[…] bisogno di ricomporre una solidarietà internazionale riaffermando i fondamenti imparziali e universali della cultura’.


750 French memorandum regarding AIAC (Grenier?). EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union/Association, textes de base, liaisons internationales’.
AIAC did so based on scholarly exigencies, not primarily as representatives of their respective countries.

At the same time, the main reason for the establishment of the Unione was the pragmatic cause of organising the return of the German libraries to Italy, one beyond the scope of AIAC (‘there is as yet no international governmental organisation under which the proposed I.A.C.A. may acquire title to the three libraries in question’).\textsuperscript{\textbullet} Massimo Pallottino, Albert Grenier and other prominent scholars asserted that the scholars from varying backgrounds that founded the Unione were united in a ‘common desire for reconstruction, of the recovery of values of colleagueship and collaboration too long forgotten, of the reappropriation of a Rome that was once again the fatherland and home of one and all’.\textsuperscript{\textbullet} Was Rome ever regarded in such an idealised way, and if so, by whom?

The scholars that created the Unione combined idealism with pragmatism, in trying to function as a scholarly, but also political unit (through its lobbying campaign for the restitution of the German


\textsuperscript{\textbullet} Vian, ed., Speculum Mundi, 11.: ‘[…] unite da una comune volontà di ricostruzione, di recupero di valori di colleganza da troppo tempo dimenticati, di riappropriazione di una Roma che tornava a essere patria di tutti’. Pallottino, who was on close terms with Erik Sjöqvist, also praised Sjöqvist as almost the sole guarantor of a human colleagueship and study, and ‘the most passionate actor in the work of reconstruction’ (‘quasi il solo garante di una colleganza umana e […] il più appassionato attore dell’opera di ricostruzione’). Vian, ed., Speculum Mundi, 11-12.
libraries), representing several academic disciplines. Through the establishment of AIAC and the Unione, these scholars believed they were attempting to recall and ‘internationalise’ the values of the lost culture that had once inspired the creation of the *Circolo degli Iperborei Romani* in 1823, which eventually led to the creation of the ICA, or at least the perception of what the ICA had seemed to be and represent. Emphasis was placed on commonalities and the object of research rather than differences and national research paradigms. Would the Unione ever have been established had it not been for the exigency of the return of the German libraries to Rome after the war?

The prehistory of the Unione can be traced back to a lobbying process in the media and with influential politicians, beginning with the liberation of censorship in June 1944 when the four libraries started to be referred to as ‘German’ within quotation marks. At the end of the war, the four libraries lacked a home, funding, and clearly defined owners. The negotiation of the return to Rome of the libraries was the work of the Unione preparatory committee, presided by Erik Sjöqvist.

The juridical ownership and future administration of the four libraries turned out to be a complicated political problem, one that, it was

---


754 See Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli," 222-223. See also Vian, ed., *Speculum Mundi*, 48. Official communications between Unione (and AIAC) members were written in Italian, in analogy with the ICA.

755 See Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 205.

perceived, could not be able to be determined before the advent of peace.\textsuperscript{757} An international group of scholars in Rome advocated the return of the German libraries to be placed under international custody; an Italian contingent wanted to view the libraries in terms of spoils of war and as compensation for the damages inflicted on Italian libraries and archives by German troops; whereas German scholars wanted to try to make sure the libraries would remain in German hands.\textsuperscript{758} In 1945, the US state department, office of war information as well as the ACC communicated with the US embassy in Rome regarding the issue of the German libraries. In a memorandum from the headquarters of the ACC regarding the 1920 concordat and the 1938 cultural agreement, it was stated that ‘in sum the strictly legalistic argument for the return of these libraries is open to question. The moral argument for their return is, on the other hand, undeniably strong. [...] On the other hand the Italian pre-war record of library administration leaves no doubt as to their fate if returned to purely Italian control; and it is quite certain that the Italian Government will not for many years have the means to keep them up unaided’.\textsuperscript{759}

\textsuperscript{758} Discussions regarding the location of the four German libraries after their return to Rome (with correspondence from De Gasperi, Bianchi Bandinelli et al.) can be found in ACS, PCM box 3474, 1944-1947, file 7-2, n. 50058, subfile 3-30. The Italian scholar Paolino Mingazzini wrote to Sjöqvist in June 1946 (regarding the rumour that the Florentine art historical library might be transferred to Munich) that ‘I would not be surprised if the Germans got their institute and library back in a few years time; but now it is impossible’. Mingazzini to Sjöqvist, June 3, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4. See also press cuttings (1949-1951) in the Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence, file ‘Presse’.
\textsuperscript{759} Admiral E.W. Stone (Headquarters Allied Commission), quoted in Arnold Esch, ‘Die deutschen Institutsbibliotheken nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs und die Rolle der Unione degli Istituti: Internationalisierung, Italianisierung – oder Rückgabe an Deutschland?’ in Deutsche Forschungs- und

DOI: 10.2870/64251
In a similar vein, John Walker (chief curator of the National gallery of Art in Washington), recommended the eventual Italian control of the libraries, with initial international aid as an ‘excuse’ for Allied involvement, standing by in case the Italian administration should slip. Walker however felt that ‘if Italy, after some years, shows neither the means nor the inclination to maintain the standards for these libraries established while they were under German direction, then consideration should be given to dividing all the books and photographs between the American Academy in Rome, the British School in Rome and the École Farnese [sic].’

Notwithstanding such radical expressions, the Allies on the whole felt that the libraries were no longer to be considered German property. The fact that the libraries had been taken from Italy broke the post-First World War (1920) agreement as well as going against Hertziana founder Henriette Hertz’ will. The power to determine this issue was vested in the Allied Control Commission (ACC, through Brigadier General G.R. Upjohn) after the unconditional German surrender.

The Italian government expressed no expressed claims to the libraries other than their administration; their ‘use’ by the Unione for research was...

---


not opposed (a limitation not intended by the Unione), as long as the libraries remained in Italy. In a letter from Carlo Ragghianti (editor for the review *Critica d’Arte* and temporary secretary of state in the Ministero dell’Istruzione Pubblica, 1945) to Charles Rufus Morey (July 1945), Ragghianti argued in favour of the ‘Italian solution’, stressing ‘moral claims’ to the libraries. Ragghianti was supported in this by Lionello Venturi (1885-1961), professor of art history and outspoken anti-fascist; by Vincenzo Arangio-Ruiz (1884-1964), jurist, Roman law scholar, minister of justice and minister of education; by the senator and philosopher Benedetto Croce (as well as by Count Gaetani dell’Aquila d’Aragona). Ragghianti proposed that his own new organisation ‘Studio italiano dell’arte’ in Florence would be the best caretakers of the art historical library, and claimed to have the promise of financial backup from the Florentine *Camerata di Commercio* for this purpose.

The ACC used a ‘postponing strategy’ in dealing with Ragghianti and the Italian claims, confronting the ‘moral claims’ by highlighting the predicament of the diverse legal positions of the libraries (for example referring to the different juridical status of the DAIR and Hertziana.

---

762 Quello che importa al Governo italiano oggi, non è tanto la proprietà e la destinazione in uso di dette biblioteche a questo o a quell’Istituzione, quanto la considerazione che esse continuino a rimanere nella città di Roma, che è una sede perfettamente degna e opportune per studi di archeologia, di storia, e di storia dell’arte. Il R. Governo sarà pertanto lieto, come ha già comunicato il Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, di farsi consegnatario delle biblioteche stesse assicurando la custodia e fornendo i locali adatti. In attesa che lo statuto giuridico di dette biblioteche venga definitivamente regolato, preferibilmente con una apposita convenzione, il Governo italiano nella sua qualità di consegnatario non avrebbe difficoltà a che le biblioteche stesse venissero utilizzate dall’Unione Internazionale per le ricerche in archeologia, storia e storia dell’arte’. Quoted in Arnold Esch, “Die deutschen Institutsbibliotheken nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs und die Rolle der Unione degli Istituti: Internationalisierung, Italianisierung – oder Rückgabe an Deutschland?” in *Deutsche Forschungs- und Kulturinstitute in Rom in der Nachkriegszeit*, ed. Michael Matheus (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2007), 78-79.

libraries): ‘As the Minister of Public Instruction and yourself are already aware, the Allied Commission in Italy is taking such measures as are at present possible to secure the eventual return of the German libraries [...]. The decision does not of course lie with the Allied Commission’.764

Erland Billig did not think that Ragghianti was a ‘redoubtable intriguer’, writing to Erik Sjöqvist in 1948: ‘He reveals too many cards at the beginning of the game’.765 Ragghianti was in this regard trumped by Bianchi Bandinelli, the ‘excellent Direttore Generale delle Arti’, in the words of Sjöqvist.766

Within a month of the German capitulation on May 17, 1945, an Italian delegation independent from any association with AIAC seized the

765 Billig to Sjöqvist, March 11, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1: ‘Skräckningagande som intrigör verkar han [Ragghianti] inte. Han lägger upp alla de för många kort vid spelets början.’ Ragghianti was also found to be associated with the allegedly notorious art dealer ‘Count’ Contini.
766 Cf. Sjöqvist to Boëthius, December 17, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2. Bianchi Bandinelli on the other hand expressed the opposite power dynamic: ‘contrariamente a quanto Lei crede, egli [Ragghianti] non è soltanto il mio superiore “politico”, ma è soprattutto quello tecnico, e quindi la decisione spetta a lui. [l'affresco scoperto in S. Agostino di Siena]’. Bianchi Bandinelli to Berenson, August 15, 1945. Cf. Berenson to Bianchi Bandinelli, April 3, 1946: ‘Ragghianti seems to be very active & has his fingers in every [pick?]’. See also Berenson to Frederick Hartt, March 23, 1946: ‘Here Ragghianti is begging like a hornet, frantically eager to control [...] & dominate. [...] Meanwhile Ranuccio [Bianchi Bandinelli] goes on saying Ragghianti has nothing to do with the case. He forgets that Rag. is a political personage’; as well as Berenson to Hartt, April 28, 1946 (with reference to Ragghianti): ‘Italians are quite capable of helping themselves’; and unidentified author, copies to Wolfgang Lotz and Lehmann-Brockhaus, n.d. of letter to Walter Paatz (from St. Louis), January 10, 1949, in which Ragghianti and Siviero were accused of ‘machiavellistische Politik machen’. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence. Ragghianti himself seemed to feel obliged to ‘lend a hand to political activities’ when his country called: ‘[...] questa una condizione di spirito che condivido con molti studiosi della mia generazione, che si sono trovati – come già nel Risorgimento – a dover lasciare le proprie occupazioni predilette per dar mano all’attività politica. È una condizione, mi creda, che ha le sue amarezze e le sue nostalgie’. Ragghianti to Berenson, December 30, 1945. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
potentially opportune moment and went to Frankfurt in order to present their demands to the American military government there regarding the return of the four German libraries to Rome and Florence. The delegation consisted of representatives from the Italian Foreign Ministry and the cultural section of the Italian Ministry of Education. Their agenda was far from subtle, and in effect undermined the work carried out during the spring by Sjöqvist’s provisional committee paving the way for AIAC: the delegation wanted the four libraries to return to Italy as Italian state property.

Drawn-out negotiations followed during the summer and autumn of 1945. As far as the Allies were concerned, the libraries were to be regarded as one entity and should not be treated separately – part of the question was whether the libraries should remain in Germany or return to Italy. The demand that the libraries were to be regarded as Italian state property was rejected by the Allied administration. The libraries were furthermore located in the American occupation zone at the end of the war.⁷⁶⁷

The American embassy in Rome entered the discussion as a lobbyist source of information for the Allied government in Frankfurt through Charles Rufus Morey as head of cultural affairs at the embassy. This line of communication was not (officially) disclosed to the Italian authorities, and provided the Allied government with frank opinions from Rome, such as that ‘the Italian pre-war record of library administration leaves no doubt as to their fate if returned to purely Italian control; and it is quite

⁷⁶⁷ See Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli," 224.
certain that the Italian Government will not for many years have the means to keep them up unaided”.  

Morey (a specialist of late antique and proto-Christian art at Princeton University) thus exercised a considerable influence regarding the issue of the German libraries. As in Sjöqvist’s case, the issue would in effect provide Morey with a way of increasing his own importance in the scholarly community in Rome through the work of the Unione. Despite Sjöqvist being the chairman of the provisional committee of the Unione, Morey had the advantage of direct knowledge of (and a probable influence on) the outcome of the Frankfurt discussions. Morey had been given an informal (American) guarantee that the Unione was to be considered a permanent long-term institution.

It is likely that Morey was referring to plans for the establishment of the Unione and the ‘internationalisation’ of the German libraries when he wrote to Bernard Berenson in November 1945, regarding ‘a somewhat

---

grandiose scheme for the future which it doesn’t harm to dream about, and which might come off.\textsuperscript{770}

The nascence of the Unione again emphasises the importance of contacts and the role of scholarly networks. Morey could vouch for Sjöqvist (and by extension the Unione) in the Frankfurt negotiations. Morey and Ernest De Wald were colleagues at Princeton; Morey followed De Wald’s recommendation of Sjöqvist based on their acquaintance through their collaboration in the subcommission.\textsuperscript{771}

Sjöqvist seemed pleased that Morey had taken an interest in AIAC, as he saw Morey at that time as ‘the American government envoy for cultural issues with a far-reaching mandate’. Morey had told Sjöqvist that ‘it was his governments belief that [the German libraries] should be returned to Rome and be placed under international control’. It seemed reasonable to Morey at the time that AIAC would be awarded that responsibility.

\textsuperscript{770} Morey to Berenson, November 26, 1945: ‘We are “sweating out” the transition of OWI [the Office of War Information] into the State Department. So far it has been marked by a steady cutting of the funds of USIS (OWI in Europe), though I must say they have been merciful to that part of USIS which is especially allotted to me. But the planning of future operations seems to me to be so completely out of line with Italian conditions that I have been demanding (in vain so far) to be recalled for consultation. Apparently a master plan for all of Europe is being evolved into which Italy is going to be made to fit willy nilly, and the thinking is still in the old OWI grooves. I am trying to work out some way of applying your recommendation about inserting some teaching of American law in the Italian universities. [...] On the whole, we are getting somewhere, slowly. I have a somewhat grandiose scheme for the future which it doesn’t harm to dream about, and which might come off. I’ll tell you about it when finally we meet. Best wishes, and hopes for a letter with good counsel’. In 1947, Berenson referred to Morey as ‘cherubim [and] angelic’. See Berenson to Morey, May 20, 1947. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

\textsuperscript{771} Cf. Billig and Billig, “The Billig Manuscript,” 206-207. For De Wald, see also his correspondence with Bernard Berenson (1944-1947), the Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
Morey was however evasive when Sjöqvist suggested German ‘administrative aid’.\textsuperscript{772}

The return of the four German libraries was therefore discussed as at least early as the late spring of 1945. For the second time in one year, Sjöqvist became the chairman of a committee whose task was to sketch statutes for a large-scale international institution in Rome (the Unione; Sjöqvist had also been instrumental in the establishment of AIAC in early 1945 – cf. section 4.7). Sjöqvist achieved this mainly together with Ward-Perkins and Morey, who had in effect ‘replaced’ Ernest De Wald (who had left Rome in the autumn of 1945) in the second subcommission triumvirate.\textsuperscript{773}

The available sources shed little light on the details of the negotiation process or conditions regarding the decision made as early as the summer of 1945 by the ACC to send the DAIR library back to Rome; nor do they allow for a detailed assessment of Sjöqvist’s input in the preparations for the Unione. Given that the ACC treated all four libraries as a whole, AIAC was unable to cater for them, following the statutes and its limitation to classical archaeology, hence the necessity of an organisation such as the Unione with a more comprehensive scope. Regarding the DAIR library, Sjöqvist recounted that:

\textsuperscript{772} Sjöqvist to Boëthius, May 6, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2: ‘Vad jag särskilt värdesätter är att Rufus Morey starkt intresserat sig för företaget. Han är här som amerikanska regeringens speciella ombud i kulturfrågor och har vida fullmakter. Vid ett förtroligt samtal häromdagen bragte han den känsliga frågan om de tyska institutsbiblioteken på tal, och sade mig att det var hans regerings uppfattning att de skulle återföra till Rom och ställas under internationell kontroll samt att det förefölle honom rimligt, att den nya sammanslutningen finge dem sig anförtrodda. Jag pläderade för tyskt administrativt bistånd, men därvidlag var han evasiv.’

\textsuperscript{773} Cf. Billig, ”Habent sua fata libelli,” 225.
The last time I saw Prof. von Gerkan he was deeply pessimistic regarding the future of his Institute. He expressed little hope that the library would ever return to Rome as a German library and pointed out at the same time that he could not imagine a German Institute in Rome without its library. Even if the Germans should win the war, he did not believe in the return as so many German university libraries had been destroyed that the want for books at home would induce the authorities not to send it out of the country anymore. He considered, therefore, the last chapter written in the glorious history of the more than 100 years old Institute, and again assured me that he had done what had been within his powers to prevent this tragic event.\footnote{\textit{Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential}. Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5 (appendix 1).}

Ward-Perkins kept BSR honorary general secretary Evelyn Shaw continually informed about the issue of the return of the German libraries; Shaw did however not reply (at least not in writing) regarding the issue.\footnote{In November 1945, Ward-Perkins for example referred to unidentified ‘documents on restitution’ regarding the German libraries. See Ward-Perkins to Evelyn Shaw, November 17, 1945. BSR, box 64: ‘I have written a line to Sjöqvist as promised. I will send you the documents on Restitution and on the German Libraries by registered mail early next week, so that you can pass them on to Lord Macmillan. Would it perhaps be possible for you to arrange for me to meet him in December, as you suggested on a previous occasion?’ Cf. Ward-Perkins to Shaw, November 25, 1945: ‘I enclose the copy of our recommendations as to the German Libraries for you to pass to Macmillan. You will note it represents the recommendations of the Allied Commission, after consultation with British, American & French Embassies, for formal submission to the Embassies’.}

Albert Grenier similarly updated Pierre Auger, \textit{Directeur de l’Enseignement Supérieure} and French representative of UNESCO, with information regarding the Unione, hoping that UNESCO might lobby for the immediate return of the two libraries still in ex-German territory (the DHI and Florentine libraries) with the UN and with the American military authorities. Grenier was particularly anxious to ensure that the German demands of the Florentine library being installed in Munich...
rather than being returned to Rome were rebuffed, and that UNESCO would ‘command the return of the libraries to their original locations, Rome and Florence’. The German wartime breach of treaties and promises served as an excuse to deflate the German claims to the libraries.\textsuperscript{776} The Unione was at the same time presented by Grenier as ‘a rarely realised international amity’.\textsuperscript{777} Were Grenier’s views regarding the more or less unprecedented international collaboration manifested in the board of the Unione fairly grounded, and did they correspond with pragmatic possibilities?

In early January 1946, Bianchi Bandinelli wrote to Bernard Berenson regarding the ‘urgent organisational problems’ that were facing him as newly appointed director of the Italian fine arts and antiquities ministry, namely ‘the organisation of soprintendenze, of art schools, of institutes and schools of archaeology and art history’, assisted by Morey and Doro

\textsuperscript{776} For such German (post-war) claims to the libraries, cf. the Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence. The archival material preserved in the Unione and AIAC files in the archives of the EFR (in Rome), would enable a more detailed study of director Grenier and his role (as well as that of Jean Bayet) in the development of policies and the gestation of the Unione than this study allows.

\textsuperscript{777} Grenier to ‘M. Auger, Directeur de l’Enseignement Supérieur’, June 27, [1946]: ‘C’est au représentant de la France près de l’UNESCO qu’s’adresse cette lettre […] L’objet essentiel de cette Union est de récupérer d’abord, puis d’administrer, les quatre Bibliothèques allemandes que les Allemands en 1943 ont enlevées d’Italie, en dépit de tous les traités et promesses […]. Les autorités américaines seraient disposées paraît-il à la rendre aux Allemandes pour être installé à Munich qui deviendraient ainsi un centre important d’histoire de l’Art. Les Allemands obtiendraient de cette façon le résultat qu’ils avaient voulu […] L’Union insiste auprès de l’UNESCO pour qu’elle ordonne le retour de ces bibliothèques à leurs lieux d’origine, Rome et Florence et que l’administration lui est soit confiée et non pas, même en partie, à l’Autriche. […] Je tiens à vous signaler l’envoi de ce rapport et à le recommander à votre attention et à votre appui […] pour que les demander de l’Union reçoivent un accueil. Ce rapport a été approuvé à l’unanimité et tous les membres de l’Union sont parfaitement d’accord entre [eux]. Nous [somes] l’exemple d’une entente internationale rarement réalisée’. Cf. draft letter (Grenier to Auget), February 23, 1946. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union/Association, textes de base, liaisons internationales’.
Levi.\textsuperscript{778} Levi, together with art historian Frederick Hartt, was instrumental in organising the return of the German libraries to Rome. This was reported by Ludwig Heydenreich (former director of the Kunsthistorisches Institut), who confirmed that ‘the Germans themselves have to my knowledge not been consulted in any way, directly or indirectly’.\textsuperscript{779}

\textsuperscript{778} Bianchi Bandinelli to Berenson, January 6, 1946. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College: ‘Ho speranza che ciò potrà avvenire alla fine dell’anno corrente e [in?] quest’anno potrei dare un assetto ad alcuni dei più urgenti problemi organizzativi: ordinamento delle soprintendenze, ordinamento delle scuole d’arte, istituto e scuole di archeologia e storia dell’arte. Con l’aiuto del Prof. Morey e di Doro Levi, che lavora con me e mi è molto utile, spero che riusciremo a organizzare qui a Roma gli istituti di archeologia in modo da avere qui uno strumento di lavoro veramente utile’.

Close to midnight on February 1, 1946, a freight train consisting of 16 carriages containing the libraries of the DAIR and the Kunsthistorisches Institut reached Stazione Tiburtina in Rome. After the transport, which had been ensured by the Allied authorities Office of Military Government, United States (OMGUS), administered by general Lucius D. Clay (1897-1978), and the Allied Control Commission (ACC), the collections were transported to provisional storage in the Galleria Nazionale d'Arte Moderna in Valle Giulia, where the nearly 2000 crates of books were destined to remain during the winter months. The sequences of events here remain blurred, but it is noteworthy that the Unione reached official constituency after the arrival of the libraries in Rome. This hints at laborious preparatory procedures, with potentially conflicting interests.

The Unione was finally formally established on February 6, 1946, in a meeting at the SIR presided by Sjöqvist. Its executive body consisted of the triumvirate discussed above, which in its first setup consisted of

---

Niemeyer Verlag, 2007), 79. Siviero was the 'capo Missione Italiana per il Recupero delle Opere d'Arte in Germania'. Cf. Lutz Klinkhammer, "Die Abteilung "Kunstschutz" der deutschen Militärverwaltung in Italien 1943-1945," Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken. Deutsches Historisches Institut Rom 72 (1992), 483-549.

780 For OMGUS, see for example Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 208. Cf. a letter regarding the two German art historical institutes in Italy (the Hertziana and the Kunsthistorisches Institut), by the 'Verband Deutscher Kunsthistoriker E.V. München Kunsthistorisches Seminar des Universität' to General Lucius Clay, 'Militärgouverneur der US-Zone von Deutschland', January 7, 1949. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.

78 Cf. memorandum by Luigi De Gregori: 'Il ritorno a Roma della biblioteca archeologica germanica e della Hertziana', February 8, 1946, in Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli," 232-233. It is possible that Sjöqvist helped organise the storage location (as a result of contacts developing from his work with the Valle Giulia libraries). The 1947 AIAC circular letter stated the number of cases as 'nearly 1300'. See circular letter from AIAC to its members, December 15, 1947, EFR, box 'AIAC 1945-1959' (Appendix 4).

Morey as the first official chairman; Ward-Perkins as treasurer (soon to become director of the BSR, however not present at the first Unione meeting); and Sjöqvist as secretary-general (cf. fig. 24). The main issue at hand, the return and custody of the ‘German libraries’, corresponded with the wider sphere of interest of the Unione (comprising history as well as the history of art) in relation to that of AIAC, which was to retain both its original tasks as member of the Unione equal to the independent institutes: that of managing the DAIR library as well as the publication of the archaeological bibliographies in the annual Fasti.\footnote{\textsuperscript{783} Cf. Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript," 204. See also Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli," 225.}

Four days after the formal establishment of the Unione, Bianchi Bandinelli gave Bernard Berenson a report regarding the ‘success, to a large extent due to the collaboration of Doro Levi’ of the return to Rome of the Hertziana and DAIR libraries, and the pending return to Florence of the library of the Kunsthistorisches Institut.\footnote{\textsuperscript{784} One box of Hertziana books allegedly disappeared to Verona (where some of the books appeared on the market) – probably during the transport back to Italy in 1946. The transport had been arranged by the scholar Dino Adamesteanu (and Schriebmüller at the Hertziana).} Bianchi Bandinelli’s letter to Berenson furthermore illuminated his contacts with the Allied subcommission (cf. section 4.3).\footnote{\textsuperscript{785} Bianchi Bandinelli to Berenson, February 10, 1946. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College: ‘[...]

… come la sistemazione interna dell’Istituto di Storia dell’Arte (Pal. Venezia) e della Scuola di Archeologia, che finora non funzionavano. Anche il fatto che le Biblioteche Hertziana e dell’Ist.Arch.Germ. sono tornate a Roma e date mi consegna al governo italiano è stato un successo, dovuto in massima parte alla collaborazione di Doro Levi. Presto verrà riconsegna anche la Biblioteca dell’Istituto tedesco di Firenze e ne saremo depositari noi italiani, in attesa di decisioni. […]. Ho ricevuto la lista dei [gradi?] portati dalla Germania in America, e La ringrazio del pensiero di comunicarmela. Ma io l’avevo già, anzi era stato io a comunicarla alla Subcommission MFAA. Perciò, pensando che possa essere utile a qualche altra persona, gliela rimando’.}

Doro Levi intriguingly spoke of ‘the enterprise we have been discussing
the last few days’, without specifying which enterprise he was referring to, although it was quite likely connected with the issue of the return of the German libraries.786

The board of the Unione, 1946:

Charles Rufus Morey (1877-1955), president, acting director of the AAR
Albert Grenier (1878-1961), vice-president, director of the EFR
Pietro Toesca (1877-1962), vice-president, president of the Istituto di Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte
Erik Sjöqvist (1903-1975), secretary-general, director of the SIR
Godefridus Johannes Hoogewerff (1884-1963), board member, director of the KNIR
Bartolomeo Nogara (1868-1954), board member, vice-president of the Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, director of the Vatican museums
Quinto Tosatti (1890-1960), board member, ‘commissioner’ of the Istituto di Studi Romani
Scarlat Lambrino (1891-1964), board member, director of the Roumanian Academy
Fernand de Visscher (1885-1964), board member, director of the Belgian Academy
John Bryan Ward-Perkins (1912-1981), board member, director of the BSR

The ‘executive committee’ of the Unione consisted of the ten individuals above together with the following:

Count Józef Michałowski (1870-1956), director of the Biblioteca di Roma dell’Academia Polacca in Krakow
Lucien de Bruyne (1902-1978), rector of the Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana 1946-1961
Federico Pfister (1898-1975), secretary-general of AIAC

786 Doro Levi to Berenson, March 17, 1946. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College: ‘I brought your warm messages to Ranuccio, Morey, Lavagnino, and so on: everybody was very grateful, and they all remember you with great affection. [...] Grenier was very touched of your remembering the episode of your first meeting. Zanotti will be in Florence tomorrow, and I hope he finds the time to see you. I will keep you informed about the developments of the enterprises we have been discussing the last few days’.
The individuals present at the first board meeting of the Unione represented the following nations: USA (Charles Rufus Morey), Italy (Pietro Toesca, Bartolomeo Nogara and Quinto Tosatti), France (Albert Grenier), the Netherlands (Godefridus Johannes Hoogewerff), Roumania (Scarlat Lambrino), Belgium (Fernand de Visscher) and Sweden (Erik Sjöqvist).

In a printed ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’, the ‘executive committee’ of the Unione was listed in its entirety. The Unione memorandum reported that the Italian government had, together with the Allied Commission for Italy, consigned the temporary custody of the Unione of the libraries of...

---

787 The members had one vote each. The proceedings of the first board meeting of the Unione were witnessed by advocate Staderini and notary Graziadei. See "Verbali Unione," 3.
the DAIR and the Hertziana. The rest of the memorandum was dedicated to arguing why the other two libraries should also return to Italy in the custody of the Unione.\footnote{The executive committee consisted of thirteen individuals, namely Morey (as acting director of the AAR), Fernand de Visscher (director of the Belgian Academy), Grenier (of the EFR), Ward-Perkins (of the BSR), Hoogewerff (of the KNIR), Pietro Toesca (president of the Istituto di Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte), Quinto Tosatti (commissioner of the Istituto di Studi Romani), Count Joseph Michalowsky (director of the Biblioteca di Roma dell’Accademia Polacca in Krakow), Lambrino (of the Roumanian Academy), Nogara (as vice-president of the Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia (not as director of the Vatican museums), Lucien de Bruyne (rector of the Pontificia Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana), Sjöqvist (of the SIR) and Federico Pfister (as secretary-general of AIAC). Among the purposes of the Union, the memorandum emphasised ‘the formation of a Union Catalogue of the libraries of the academies and institutes for archaeology, history and art history in Rome’. ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’, 3-4. For Quinto Tosatti, see for example Francesco Malgeri, La stagione del centrismo. Politica e società nell’Italia del secondo dopoguerra (1945-1960) (Soveria Mannelli (CZ): Rubbettino Editore, 2002), 121-123.\footnote{Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’, 11. The memorandum was signed by Morey, Grenier, Toesca and Sjöqvist. Grenier and Toesca were both vice presidents of the Unione at the time.}}

The memorandum proposed three main objectives in relation to the UN and UNESCO: (i) the rehabilitation and reopening of the DAIR and the Hertziana libraries ‘to the scholars of all nations under the control of an international body designated by UNO and UNESCO’. It was of course hoped that that body would be the Unione. (2) ‘That a subvention of $50,000 for 5 years be allocated from the funds at the disposition of UNESCO for the maintenance of these two libraries until the resources of international scholarship can be mobilized to the end of their permanent endowment’. (3) That the UN and UNESCO ‘take the proper steps’ for the return of the DHI and the Kunsthistorisches libraries to Italy.\footnote{Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’, 11. The memorandum was signed by Morey, Grenier, Toesca and Sjöqvist. Grenier and Toesca were both vice presidents of the Unione at the time.} Was the Unione asking for too much in terms of resources and mandate in their ‘five-year plan’? Did the Unione express an exaggerated faith in the
newly established UNESCO? The lack of clarity (and mandate) from UNESCO at this stage in the proceedings was doubtlessly influential in creating the ‘quagmire’ of years of discussion and debate regarding the fate of the four libraries (cf. sections 6.4-6.5).

It is of interest to this discussion to note the selection of ten appendices provided by the Unione for the 1946 memorandum.790 These ten appendices consisted of (1) agreement of 1920 – the Unione could not access the actual Croce agreement, as ‘the archives of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs [were] displaced during the war. [...] Its essential content is given in Croce’s article published by Risorgimento Liberale in its issue of June 16, 1945’, with ‘the formal demand for return for all four libraries removed from Italy by the German Army [which] was made by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in the following letter to the Chargé d’Affaires ad interim of the American Embassy in Rome (Morey), dated September 29, 1945’. The same principles as were applied in the 1920 agreement (restitution to German control) should according to the letter now be applied ‘a favore dell’Italia’.

(2) ‘Extract from article by Benedetto Croce in Risorgimento Liberale, June 16, 1945’.791 The 1920 convention actually only regarded the DAIR

790 ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’. These appendices that were to be reproduced in the printed 1947 Unione memorandum to the UN (cf. below).

791 Croce wrote that ‘nel corso dei negoziati [...] il funzionario direttore dell’Istituto Germanico, l’ottimo [Walter] Amelung, mi offerse di preporre, accanto al direttore Tedesco, un direttore italiano: idea che io scartai ridendo, col dire che mai più mi sarei caricato dello scrupolo d’impiantare in quell’Istituto un dualismo che sarebbe probabilmente diventato un litigio, specie conoscendo per esperienza e considerando gli spiriti singolarmente ascendibili ed irascibili degli archeologici. [...] Poiché l’Italia, nonostante la buona volontà che ci avevano
library – the 1938 concordat and Croce’s 1945 article referred to all four libraries. (3) ‘Letter from German Embassy to the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs’. Von Hassel to the minister, August 24, 1920: ‘[...] il sottoscritto, in nome della Direzione Generale dell’Istituto Archeologico, si dichiara pronto ad impegnarsi: Che la Biblioteca dell’Istituto Archeologico non potrà mai essere rimossa da Roma’. These guarantees thus only formally applied to the DAIR library, not actually to the institution itself. (4) ‘Extract of the official Italian copy of the will, dated 18 Sept. 1912, of the late Miss Henriette Hertz’: ‘[...] la Biblioteca Herziana non si può trasferire, senza ragioni impellenti, dai locali in cui essa si trova presentemente’.

(5) ‘Letter from Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the Swiss Legation’, August 21, 1918, regarding the proposed sequestration of Palazzo Zuccari – the letter stressed the will which connected the Hertziana to the property, ‘d’ou, par volonté de la testatrice, ne pourra jamais être enlevée. Par conséquent le Gouvernement Royal est venu dans la détermination de ne pas assujettir la maison à la mesure proposée’. (6) ‘Agreement of 1938 between the nazi and fascist governements [sic]’ (the 1938 concordat) regarding the five German ‘scientific insstitutes’ in Italy: the DAIR, the DHI, the Hertziana (‘L’Istituto della “Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft” per la storia dell’Arte e per la Storia della Cultura, a Roma’), the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence, and ‘L’Accademia Tedesca, in Roma (Villa Massimo)’. The concordat declared that ‘Il Governo Italiano

messo i nazisti, non è diventata “terra bruciata” per l’arte e per la Storia, e poiché incontestabile è il nostro diritto che quelle biblioteche, formate in Italia ed al paese d’Italia organicamente congiunte, tornino nei loghi donde, conforme agli impegni assunti, non dovevano essere mai rimosse, raccomandiamo al nostro Ministero degli Esteri di annotare e curare Insieme con le altre, anche questa restituzione’. 
abolisce le limitazioni di uso alle quali attualmente sottostanno le Biblioteche dell’Istituto Archeologico di Roma e dell’Istituto di Storia dell’Arte di Firenze. Il Governo Tedesco non intende allontanare tali Biblioteche dall’Italia, né precluderne l’uso ai lettori italiani’. The concordat thus actually only explicitly concerned the libraries of the DAIR and the Kunsthistorisches Institut.\textsuperscript{792}

(7) ‘Letter of the Italian Minister of Education to the Attaché for Cultural Relations, U.S. Embassy, Rome’. The Minister (Molè) to Morey, January 7, 1946, regarding the establishment of the Unione. ‘La creazione di tale Istituzione appare tanto più opportune e meritoria, in quanto che, oltre all’importanza scientifica che essa è destinata ad assumere quale centro di tutti gli studi umanistici riguardanti Roma, essa viene a rivestire immediatamente la qualità di Ente morale, al quale le Autorità Militari Alleate possono rivolgersi per tutti i problemi concernenti gli Istituti culturali già esistenti in Roma e di interesse internazionale’.\textsuperscript{793}

(8) ‘Letter from Vice-President, Civil Affairs Section, Allied Commission to Chairman, Provisional Committee, International Union of

\textsuperscript{792} The 1938 concordat furthermore stated that ‘Il Governo Italiano ha facoltà di conservare in efficienza l’Istituto già esistente a Vienna e di fondare nuovi Istituti a Berlino ed a Monaco’ for ‘scholarly research in the diverse fields of German culture and history’, as well as for the benefit of the ‘development of scholarly collaboration between the two peoples’

\textsuperscript{793} The minister continued with the offer of the Italian government of premises adapted for the conservation and safeguarding of the libraries upon their return to Italy: ‘[...] qualora le Autorità Militari Alleate siano disposte a consegnare all’Unione Internazionale le biblioteche di detti Istituti Germanici, asportate da Roma durante l’evacuazione Germanica, il Governo Italiano è pronto a farsi il consegnatario delle biblioteche stesse e dei loro archivi, offrendo i locali adatti per la loro conservazione e la garanzia per la loro salvaguardia. L’offerta del Governo Italiano non intende in nessun modo portare alcuna pregiudiziale allo stato giuridico attuale, né alla futura destinazione delle biblioteche in parola. […] Prego la S.V. di farsi interprete presso le Autorità Alleate di questa offerta del Governo Italiano. L’offerta si estende, fuori della città di Roma, pure alla biblioteca dell’ex Istituto Germanico di Storia dell’Arte di Firenze per cui sarebbero trovati locali adatti in Firenze’.
Institutes for Archaeology, History and Art-History. Headquarters Allied Commission, APO 394, Civil Affairs Section. 20909/20/D/MFAA, Brigadier M. Carr to Erik Sjöqvist, February 18, 1946 (as a reply to a letter from Sjöqvist do the ACC, February 15, 1946): ‘This Commission has no objection to custody of the German Libraries being temporarily vested in the International Union of the Institutes for Archaeology, History and Art History in Rome. It is pointed out that this arrangement should be regarded as provisional only, pending a definitive decision by the U.S., British and other Governments concerned as to the future custody of the Libraries’.

(9) ‘Resolution of the Executive Committee of the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome relative to the libraries of the former German Historical Institute in Rome and of the former German Art-Historical Institute in Florence’. That is to say, a Unione resolution regarding the libraries of the DHI and the Kunsthistorisches Institut. The Unione was in this context described as a body ‘composed of representatives of all institutions engaged in research in the above mentioned fields and situated in Rome, and it may reasonably be regarded as a body representative of scholarship of all countries specially concerned in such studies. [...] it cannot be too strongly stressed that these libraries are not mere aggregations of books, to be transferred, partitioned, dispersed, or put to other uses, without great loss to themselves and to the science for which they were created to be the instrument. Each is a unique and living organism, which has grown up through the devotion of past scholars to meet a special and unique need. There is a clear and overriding obligation that they be returned intact to
Rome and to Florence, the centres of Italian studies to which they uniquely belong, and where alone they have their full and proper significance.

Regarding post-war Austrian claims to the DHI, ‘the only reasonable solution whereby any claim of the Austrian Government may be reconciled with the overriding responsibility to restore this great library intact to the world scholarship, is that it be brought back to Rome, where it belongs, and put under International Control’. The ‘amalgamation’ with Austria was thus used by the Unione as an excuse for advocating the ‘internationalisation’ of the DHI library. Concerning the Kunsthistorisches Institut, ‘it may be further remarked that, among the long record of German savagery against the libraries and cultural records of Italy, Florence occupies a special place for the unexampled thoroughness of the demolitions which destroyed the heart of the ancient city, including therein the annihilation of the unique Colombaria library’. Why was that last section added? Seemingly in order to expand the text regarding the Florentine institute, which information-wise was otherwise essentially identical to that regarding the DHI.794

(10) Communications of Gaetano De Sanctis, Commissioner of the Central Giunta for Historical Studies, and of professor Bertolini, librarian of the Italian Institute of Mediaeval History’ (extract from a letter from

De Sanctis to Bartolomeo Nogara, dated June 20, 1946; with a ‘Memorandum of Professor Bertolini, Librarian of the Italian Institute of Mediaeval History’, which ‘attributed an essential value for the progress of Roman studies to the maintenance and accessibility of the library of the German historical institute in Rome’. 

The 1946 Unione memorandum to UNESCO was followed by a considerably shorter version the next year, with the identical ten appendices as in the 1946 memorandum discussed above. The 1947 memorandum consisted of a four-page letter by Morey. It is of interest to trace the developments in January 1947 – roughly a year after the first memorandum for the Unione in its quest to procure funding for the ‘internalisation’ of the four German libraries. The Unione, Morey informed, had ‘been charged with the temporary administration of the four German libraries which the Germans, in contravention of solemn


796 Bertolini referred to the importance of the publication of the Regesta Chartarum Italiae (of the papacy until 1198, published 1903-1914), by Paolo Kehr (director of the DHI). ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’, appendix 10: ‘L’Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo attribuisce quindi un valore essenziale per i progressi degli studi romani al mantenimento ed all’accessibilità in Roma della Biblioteca dell’Istituto Storico Germanico’. It was perhaps no coincidence that the DHI library was stored at the Vatican after its return to Rome (until 1953), considering its intimate identification with the history of Rome and the papacy.

797 Morey’s letter was printed in at least two different versions – one with his signature, one without. The letter was signed by Morey, in his capacity as president of the Unione, dated January 17, 1947.
international agreement, removed from Italy during the war. [...] The legal status of the libraries, their removal from Rome and Florence, and their subsequent return, are set out in the appendix to this communication, containing copies of the relative documents'.

Morey reported that ‘the Italian Government has put at the disposal of the Union a large palace in Rome, the Palazzo Vidoni, for the installation and eventual reopening of the libraries of the German Historical Institute and of the German Archaeological Institute, both of them being now without permanent premises of their own. The Union is beginning to prepare the Palazzo Vidoni for its new purpose; and it has applied to UNESCO for funds to reinstall and maintain the four libraries, basing its application upon a detailed annual budget’ (cf. section 6.2). The Unione requested that the UN clarify its intentions regarding the future of the libraries, considering ‘the heavy expenses involved in the re-arrangements of Palazzo Vidoni [and] the temporary character of the mandate held by the Union’. The ‘legal future of the libraries’ would not be ‘prejudiced until established in the forth-coming peace-treaty’.

798 Morey proceeded to report the steps taken by the Unione after the return of the libraries. The Via Sardegna building was no longer available for the DAIR, the premises of the ‘Austrian Academy’ were occupied by the Austrian Diplomatic Mission in Rome, Palazzo Zuccari was occupied by the Italian Section of the International Red Cross – in all cases the books remained in storage. The library of the Kunsthistorisches Institut had ‘been stored in its old premises, the Palazzo Guadagni in Florence, awaiting re-installation’. ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1947). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, file ‘Union 1950’.

799 ‘It seems evident that if UNO contemplates the restoration of the libraries to an exclusively German administration, the Union will not be able to meet the heavy expenses involved in a restoration of the Palazzo Vidoni without an assurance that the expenses will be reimbursed in due course. If, on the other hand, UNO intends to make definitive the present temporary international administration of the libraries securing the cooperation of all the nations concerned with their future, the Union would be in a position to undertake its task with greater confidence’. ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations
Morey concluded that ‘the Union will appreciate the decision of UNO on the above important problem, and suggests that the several states interested together with UNESCO, be invited to concern themselves not only with the future administration of the libraries, but also with the possible direct control thereof by UNESCO itself.\textsuperscript{800}

Bartolomeo Nogara (1868-1954) more accurately primarily represented the Vatican rather than Italy in the Unione, as an archaeologist specialising in Etruscan studies and director of the Vatican museums (1920-1954). Nogara's influence on the Unione was however probably more as a 'museum man' than as a representative of the Vatican, which serves as an illustration of the recurring problem of scale and representational influence. The foreign scholars in Rome who made up the Unione regarded Nogara as one of the most important cultural representatives of the Vatican, not least because of his important and wide-ranging web of connections within the Vatican itself (his brother Bernardino was for example treasurer of the Vatican),\textsuperscript{801} but also with domestic Italian scholars as well as an international contact network (Bartolomeo Nogara Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome' (1947). EFR, box 'Union 1950-1955', file 'Union 1950'. Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome' (1947). EFR, box 'Union 1950-1955', file 'Union 1950'.\textsuperscript{800} Bartolomeo Nogara did not officially represent the Vatican museums in the executive committee of the Union, but the Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia (as its vice-president). Bernardino Nogara (treasurer of the Vatican and vice-president of the Banca Commerciale Italiana) worked clandestinely with meetings with the resistance during the German occupation of Rome. For an assessment of his legacy, see John F. Pollard, Money and the Rise of the Modern Papacy. Financing the Vatican, 1850-1950 (Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005). Cf. also Renzo De Felice, “La Santa Sede e il conflitto italo-ethiopiano nel diario di Bernardino Nogara,” Storia Contemporanea 8 (1977), 823-834.

\textsuperscript{800} Morey’s letter ended with a ‘List of members of the Union’ (13 institutions).

was for example elected a member of the DAIR in 1905, and of the Austrian archaeological institute in Vienna (established in 1898) in 1914.802

All of the non-Italian members of the board of the Unione were directors of their respective foreign academies in Rome. This nucleus was to vary only slightly over the coming years (with the significant addition of Ward-Perkins representing the BSR); the structure of the governing body of the Unione was clear from the outset.803 Sjöqvist’s almanacs from February and March 1946 for example illustrate Sjöqvist’s close and regular contacts with Morey, Ward-Perkins, Hoogewerff, Toesca and Lambrino.804

The first Unione meeting concluded with the election of a Franco-American-Italian-Swedish management committee, consisting of Grenier, Morey, Toesca and Sjöqvist as interim representatives of the Unione. The Italian representatives were not part of the operational leading triumvirate of the Unione during the early years of its existence (until 1950). The position as president of the Unione in 1946 came down to a choice between Morey and Sjöqvist, who himself proposed Morey as president, with references to him as the ‘Spiritus Rector’ of the Unione, a proposal that was unanimously acclaimed. Morey was both grateful and

802 Interview with Antonio Nogara, Rome, Italy, December 13, 2009.
803 European countries not represented in the Unione (considering the academies already established in Rome at the time) were for obvious reasons most notably Germany, but also less obviously for example Austria and Spain (in the Austrian case, the Austrian Historical Institute had been appropriated by the DHI after the German Anschluss in 1938). The exclusion of certain Eastern European countries (such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia) as members of the Unione is poignant. Scarlat Lambrino had, as director of the Roumanian Academy, established good contacts with the initiators of the Unione, particularly with Sjöqvist.
804 Cf. the following extract from Sjöqvist’s almanac: ‘13/2 Dinner with Morey and Ward-Perkins, 14/2 Meeting at the Roumanian Academy, 17/2 Hoogewerff, 23/2 – Ward-Perkins 7/3 Meeting with Toesca and Lambrino, 8/3 – Ward-Perkins’, etc. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, VI:3.
modest; he stated that his work at the American embassy claimed too much of his time. Morey instead himself proposed Sjöqvist for the presidency, as the latter had already presided the provisional management committee.

It is possible that Morey had discussed the presidency of the Unione with the military command in Frankfurt in December 1945 or January 1946. Then again, Morey was Sjöqvist's and Ward-Perkins’ senior by some 25 years; from that perspective it was therefore no surprise that he would be seen as the more likely candidate. When Morey assumed the presidency of the Unione he was still temporary director of the AAR, although he in effect devoted most of his time to the US embassy. The Unione assembly urged Morey to ask for exemption from his obligations as cultural attaché. Grenier and Toesca were elected vice-presidents; the position of secretary-general was offered to Sjöqvist as ‘compensation’. The executive assembly was thus not confined solely to Morey, Ward-Perkins and Sjöqvist. Grenier, the director of the EFR, for example reflected a ‘no compromises’ French policy, unsympathetic to the changing Franco-German relations initiated by chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Robert Schuman.

The newly elected secretary-general Sjöqvist had exercised considerable diplomatic effort regarding the return of the German libraries to Rome through establishing personal contacts with an

---

impressive list of agencies: the Italian Minister of Public Instruction; the president of the International Red Cross committee in Rome; Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, Italian general director of fine arts; fine arts delegate Doro Levi; Luigi de Gregori, general inspector of Italian libraries; as well as with Ward-Perkins in his faculty as the director of the subcommission.807

The Unione was granted official legitimacy through a statement from the ACC headquarters on February 18, 1946. The attention of the Unione was from the outset focused on the issue of the return to Rome of the four German libraries. The Italian government had the intention, Sjöqvist affirmed, of making a building available adapted to accommodating not only the DAIR library but also that of the DHI in the near future (the Palazzo Vidoni – cf. section 6.2). Sjöqvist also referred to a report by Luigi de Gregori, the Italian general inspector of libraries, which stated that the books of the Biblioteca Hertziana were in serious need of conservation as well as of rapid systematisation.808 Sjöqvist’s preparatory investigations stirred a discussion that was in effect to continue for seven years until the four libraries were officially returned to their respective institution in 1953.809

808 Cf. Ernest De Wald’s statement a few months earlier that ‘there may be some losses as far as the Hertziana is concerned because of bad handling’. De Wald to Sjöqvist, November 11, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4.
Sjöqvist had paved the way for the future actions of the Unione regarding the issue of the return of the four libraries. The reluctance on the part of the Unione to act on his proposal of acting forthwith regarding the administration and maintenance of the libraries (although it did receive some support) must have been disappointing to him at the time. Sjöqvist was simultaneously negotiating his possible future library career in Sweden (cf. chapter 6). In applying for a position as second librarian at the university library at Uppsala, Sjöqvist had to try to utilise his connections with de Gregori, the Italian inspector of libraries up to that point, as well as his diplomatic efforts regarding the German libraries to his own advantage.810

At the same time Einar Gjerstad – in concert with the Crown Prince and the board of the SIR – were stalling Sjöqvist’s prospects for the presidency of the Unione. In March 1946, Sjöqvist wrote to Gjerstad regarding his own ‘international prospects’ (he had already been approached by Princeton University), and reported that ‘there may be possibilities regarding the administration of the German libraries’; these potential ‘possibilities’ were however ‘dependent on the peace treaty’.811

Sjöqvist was simultaneously receiving queries regarding the future of the German libraries from some of his pre-war and wartime colleagues at the DAIR (notably Kübbner and von Gerkan), who were also in contact

810 Cf. a letter from Sjöqvist to Gjerstad in which Sjöqvist felt that he was ‘now forced to deal with the German libraries’, but that this might be useful in the light of his application for the Swedish library position. The exigencies of his potential library career in Sweden might in fact well have acted as an incentive to Sjöqvist’s vivacious engagement with this issue in the framework of AIAC and the Unione. Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, March 1, 1946. Samling Gjerstad, Einar, Lund University Library, Sweden.

811 Sjöqvist to Gjerstad, March 1, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
with Nogara (as well as with Albert Van Buren at the AAR).\textsuperscript{812} Italian library inspector De Gregori had repeatedly argued that the present storage of the libraries of the DAIR and the Hertziana at the \textit{Galleria d’Arte Moderna} was unsatisfactory. In the light of confidential communications by Grenier and Adrien Bruhl of the EFR it is clear that the Unione was unable to act as rapidly and forcefully as seemed necessary at the time. It is noteworthy that Grenier and Adrien Bruhl (both representing the EFR) opposed the repatriation of the German libraries – which influenced the stalling of the process.\textsuperscript{813} Sjöqvist’s ‘pragmatic’ position and belief in a rapid solution was possibly somewhat naïve. Did Grenier feel ‘left out’ of the preliminary discussions?

Correspondence from von Gerkan and Leo Bruhns (ex-director of the Hertziana) to Sjöqvist in 1945-1946 reveals different approaches to German ‘intervention’ in the fate of the libraries. Von Gerkan felt it necessary not to interfere with the ‘honest and sincere efforts being made for the return of the libraries to Rome.\textsuperscript{814} Leo Bruhns did not share von Gerkan’s ‘insight’; he lamented the return of the libraries as ‘spoils of war’, and foresaw that the issue of the legal ownership would be a crucial factor upon their return.\textsuperscript{815}

Bruhns returned to Rome in the late summer of 1945 to lobby for the ‘moral rights’ of the German scholars to the four libraries. Bruhns soon


\textsuperscript{813} Cf. ”Verbali Unione,” 13-14.

\textsuperscript{814} Von Gerkan to Sjöqvist, November 18, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4: ‘Immerhin besteht von meiner Seite das starke Gefühl der Verbundenheit mit meiner 80-jährigen Arbeitsstätte, aber auch die Einsicht von der Notwendigkeit einer gebotenen Zurückhaltung, um die offenbar ehrlichen und aufrichtigen Bemühungen nicht zu stören’.

\textsuperscript{815} Bruhns to Sjöqvist, June 28, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4.
realised that Morey was in favour of a permanent ‘international’ administration of the libraries and discussed the matter with professor Antoni of the Italian foreign ministry, as well as with a certain Marquis Giustiniani and Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli.816 Part of Bruhns’ agenda was to try to retrieve his position as director of the Hertziana; his diplomatic demarches did not reap any notable success in this regard, however.817

The 1946 Unione memorandum addressed to the UN expressed that the ‘ultimate disposition’ of the German libraries ‘is a part of the liquidation of the war and a responsibility of the UN [UNO]. It may be assumed also that a matter of this kind would come within the jurisdiction of UNESCO, and the present memorandum is therefore directed also to UNESCO, by virtue of its purpose as defined in section 2 c of Article I of the Final Act of the United Nations Conference for the Establishment of an Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization’818

The memorandum listed two main questions that needed to be resolved by the UN and UNESCO regarding the return of the German

libraries: (1) should the DHI and the Kunsthistorisches library be returned to Italy?, and (2) what steps should be taken to restore the DAIR and the Hertziana libraries ‘to their former useful function’? The Unione, not surprisingly, advocated the immediate return of the two remaining libraries to Rome and to Florence, for which centers of research they were organized and are peculiarly adapted, and where they will be of most use to international scholarship’. Regarding the proposed steps for the two libraries already in Rome, the Unione presented an ‘account of its custody of these libraries to date, and its recommendations for the future’.

The Hertziana was deemed ‘so indispensable to international scholarship in its field, that the Union is confident of ultimately mobilizing international financial support for its operation’.\footnote{The annual budget for the Hertziana in 1939 was approximately $40,000. After the elimination of salaries, and the income of ceiling rents in the tax-exempted Palazzo Zuccari, the Unione estimated that 50% of the 1939 figure ($20,000) would be sufficient for the operation of the library. ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome’ (1946). EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’, files ‘Union 1950’ and ‘Union 1955’, 7-8.} Regarding the DAIR, the memorandum stated that ‘this library, and the Institute it served were founded in 1829. The Institute was of purely international character [...] and was supported by contributions from several nationalities. In 1874 it was taken over by the German government and housed on the Capitol in the Palazzo Caffarelli. After the first world war its premises and the Institute were confiscated, but restored to German ownership in 1920’.\footnote{By cutting back expenditures on salaries, scholarships and publications (which can be taken care of otherwise, i.e. through AIAC and the planned Fasti), the Unione estimated that the DAIR library could be restored to adequate functioning ‘on a budget of $30,000’, that is to say more than a 50% cut in relation to the last available DAIR budget of approximately $65,000 (from 1936). ‘Memorandum addressed to the United Nations Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in
This account of the DAIR vis-à-vis the ICA in part goes against the rhetoric of a return to the ICA and the ‘spirit of collaboration’ after the Second World War. This was very likely a conscious move, however. Support for the cause of the Unione (the internationalisation of the German libraries) might be facilitated by maximising the antiquity of the institution: ‘The Institute and its library have been for over 100 years the chief center of archaeological research, not only on the part of German scholars but those of other countries as well. It is hardly to be supposed that international scholarship will allow this valuable instrument to disappear, and international support can certainly be procured in time.’

In August 1946, Ward-Perkins remained optimistic regarding the possibility of a rapid internationalisation of the German libraries. His correspondence with Sjöqvist illustrates Sjöqvist’s focal role in the scholarly network in Rome: ‘As to the libraries I can only so far report good will. One Foreign Office UNESCO delegate was away in Paris (do I gather Morey went?), but is said to be anxious to see me, and I shall fix an appointment next trip to London’. Ward-Perkins continued: ‘an American officer [...] may be coming down to Italy about the libraries. The arrangement will, I suppose, come through AC [the ACC], but if by any chance Morey should be away it would be essential that he should be put in touch with you.’

In September 1946 Ward-Perkins made an unusually detailed assessment of the situation of the foreign (and domestic) academies in Rome in a letter to BSR honorary general secretary Sir Evelyn Shaw, stressing that the restitution of the German libraries was truly important; but also that their absence had initiated collaboration regarding issues that had previously relied on the existence of the German book collections – now making more systematic use of the respective ‘national’ academy library collections (which was later (in 1992) to result in URBS (*Unione Romana Biblioteche Scientifiche*), a common library catalogue and database for the academies of Rome): 823

[...] Apart from the damage to the Basilica of S. Lorenzo, the monuments and institutions of Rome suffered very little from the war. A very serious loss however has been the removal, contrary to solemn international agreements, of the three German libraries, the Bibliotheca Herziana [*sic*] and the libraries of the Archaeological and Historical Institutes, all of them fundamental to research in their respective fields. The two first-named are back in Rome; but their future is still uncertain, and the condition of the books gives cause for alarm. The affair has however had one happy result, in that it has been the occasion of drawing into close collaboration the Schools and Academies in Rome, both Italian and foreign, by the formal constitution of a Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History, and History of Art in Rome. Apart from the immediate problems of the German libraries, of which it has been constituted temporary custodian, the body aims at a closer cooperation between the constituent institutions, particularly in respect to their libraries, so as to increase efficiency and limit individual expenditure. A second cooperative venture, arising from similar circumstances, has been the foundation of an International Association for Classical Archaeology, the immediate purpose of which is to fill the gaps left by the withdrawal of the publications of the German Archaeological Institute [...]. At the time of writing the needed financial backing is assured, subject only

to certain difficulties of transferring currency, which there is every reason to hope will be
surmounted. Not least of the indirect advantages of these two ventures have proved to be
the close and cordial relations with all our colleagues in the other schools and Institutes
in Rome, which have arisen from tackling common problems together.\textsuperscript{824}

Ward-Perkins' assessment of these allegedly ‘close and cordial relations’ of
the foreign academies in Rome was possibly overly optimistic. The Unione
was hoping to benefit from possible financial aid from UNESCO as the
expenses of running the DAIR needed to be accounted for: ‘If these tasks
are not carried out through international cooperation, they will not be
carried out at all’.\textsuperscript{825} This ‘international cooperation’ was to be
administered by the Unione, it was argued, as it would be perceived as a
great international setback if ‘these activities’ (essentially international
scholarly research based in Rome) were to diminish.

\textsuperscript{824} Ward-Perkins to Evelyn Shaw, September 30, 1946. BSR, Box 64. Cf. BSR
annual report 1945-1946: ‘The wrongful withdrawal to Germany in 1943, on the
orders of the German High Command, of the Biblioteca Herziana [sic], of the
libraries of the German Archaeological and Historical Institutes in Rome, and of
the German Art-historical Institute in Florence, removed four of the key
instruments of scholarship in Italy. To meet this alarming situation there was
formed in January 1946 a Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History and
History of Art in Rome, a loose but clearly defined organization representing all
institutions in Rome, both Italian and foreign, which are concerned with the
study of these subjects. To this body, of which the School [the BSR] is a founding
member, has since been consigned, with the concurrence of the Allied authorities
and of the Italian Government, and subsequently of Unesco, the provisional
custody of the four libraries, all of which are now once more back on Italian soil.
Their future is yet to be decided by the competent authorities, but at least it can
be reported that the books are safe and have not been dispersed’. In September
1946, Sjöqvist wrote to Grenier regarding the German libraries that ‘si potrebbe
concretizzare come segue : (i) la questione giuridica, (2) la conservazione dei libri,
(3) il controllo e l’aggiornamento delle biblioteche, (4) la sede delle biblioteche.
[...] è ovvio che si correrebbe il rischio di perdere quest’unico occasione, se l’UNESCO seguisse il principio “wait and see”’. Sjöqvist to Grenier, September
26, 1946. Cf. ‘Confidentiel. L’Union International des Instituts d’Archéologie,
d’Histoire et d’histoire de l’art et l’UNESCO’ (Grenier, 1946): ‘Il s’agit, en ce
moment, de décider si nous pouvons, grâce à l’Unesco, réaliser vraiment une

Organization by the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History,
1950’ and ‘Union 1955’.
The only preceding expense accounts available at that moment were for the DAIR that of 1936 (excluding rent), for the Hertziana that of 1939, and for the DHI one ‘for an undetermined year’. The total maintenance cost of running the three libraries (for one year) was estimated to be (at least) 31,880 Lire. With the added costs of running the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence, the total bill would be amount to at least 40,000 Lire a year, at the time the equivalent of approximately 200,000 US Dollars. These costs would have had to be faced by any international organisation proposing to take over the German institutes of archaeology and art history in Italy after the war.  

Morey confidently (and somewhat naively) believed that ‘following their statutes, UNESCO would not be able to avoid [financial] responsibility of the German libraries’. Morey and the Unione seemed to have felt that the new UNESCO-organisation would be more or less morally obliged to support the cause of the Unione. UNESCO was established in November 1946 as a specialised agency of the UN. Its first general conference was held in Paris on November 19, 1946. The constitution of UNESCO was signed on November 16, 1945, and came into force on November 4, 1946.  

826 Ibid., 16-17.
827 ‘[…] l’Unesco secondo i suoi statuti non abbia la possibilità di sottrarsi alla responsabilità delle Biblioteche tedesche’. Ibid., 21.
Its forerunners can be said to have been the post-First World War International Research Council (IRC, 1919-1931) – which was transformed into the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU, the present-day International Council for Science) in 1931 – and the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation (ICIC), established in Paris in 1922 with funding aid from the French government in order to implement its plans and policies.\textsuperscript{829} These interwar period councils and committees were in turn preceded by organisations such as the Alliance Scientifique Universelle, established in Paris in 1876, and the International Association of Academies (IAA, 1899-1914), established in Wiesbaden in 1899.\textsuperscript{830}

Morey’s confidence in UNESCO was shared by Bartolomeo Nogara, who in November 1946 expressed hope that ‘with the imminent return of the [German] libraries [...] one of the principal objectives of the Unione

\textsuperscript{829} For the UNESCO archives, cf. \url{http://www.unesco.org/archives/} (visited May 13, 2010). Large-scale post-war conferences in Paris were in a sense indicative of French universalism and the assumption of post-war ‘moral’ control of European consciousness, with the French taking the role as ‘stage managers’ of ideas. This was reflected also in Gaullism in relation to the Vichy regime, the moral control and consciousness in line with Charles De Gaulle’s attempts to claim that the (Fourth) Republic was still intact. A defining characteristic of de Gaulle’s vision for France was the preoccupation with returning France to a major world power within the international hierarchy of nations. Cf. Anthony Hartley, \textit{Gaullism: The Rise and Fall of a Political Movement} (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), Jean Touchard, \textit{Le gaullisme, 1940-1969} (Paris: Le Seuil, 1978), Robert O. Paxton, \textit{Vichy France: Old Guard and New Order, 1940-1944} (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), and Julian Jackson, \textit{Charles de Gaulle} (London: Haus Publishing, 2003).

would be attained’. Nogara’s belief in the realisation of the short-term aim of the Unione would turn out to be premature wishful thinking; this objective was still a long way from being reached.

Ward-Perkins underlined the fundamental importance of presenting a concrete work plan to UNESCO, and strongly recommended all personal contacts and personal efforts in approaching its secretary. He declared that he had spoken to the British representative of UNESCO, who had been most favourable towards the ‘aspirations of the Unione’ regarding financial aid. The British representative however thought that it would be opportune to wait for the completion of the Italian peace treaty. Grenier had been in contact with the French UNESCO representative, whose benevolence vis-à-vis the Unione seemed ‘passionate’. Ward-Perkins was hopeful that all the juridical issues would be resolved with the coming peace treaty (in 1947).  

Sjöqvist reported to Erland Billig in October 1946 that ‘the preparatory committee of UNESCO has swallowed our application for an annual contribution of $30,000 for the DAIR library’. The issue did not seem to have made it beyond the preparatory committee, however. Sjöqvist also mentioned that the library of the Kunsthistorisches Institut was to be returned to Florence, but ‘in the worst case, I might have to go up to Germany and get it’.  

---

832 Ibid., 20-23.
833 Sjöqvist to Billig, October 29, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:i: ‘UNESCO:s föreberedande kommitté har svalt våra äskande på 30,000 dollars årligen till tyska arkeologiska biblioteket så länge vår förvaltning varar. Äntligen tycks vi ha kommit igenom portgången, men det har varit ett släp. [...] Florentinarna få igen det konsthistoriska institutets bibliotek under Unionens
Billig replied in November, congratulating Sjöqvist on his work for the ‘archaeological libraries’, which was he felt going to be ‘a feather in the cap both for yourself, the SIR and Swedish archaeology.’ This was not necessarily the case, however, as the board of the SIR did not share Sjöqvist’s level of enthusiasm for the project, partly as the discussion was simultaneous with domestic Swedish debates regarding adherence to the UN, although the board believed in the general principle of the international venture. The Crown Prince had for example discussed the possibility of contributing funds for the AIAC *Fasti*-publications and for the Unione with Axel Boëthius, although little came of this during the immediate post-war period.

Morey went to Paris in November 1946 in the capacity of counselor to the American delegation at the first general conference of UNESCO, to support the appeal from the Unione for financial support for the libraries, an appeal that was ultimately not very successful. Morey did not in other words go to Paris primarily in the function of president of the Unione, but the combination of two official positions served multiple purposes. The Unione fundraising pleas to UNESCO (for $50,000 annually) resulted in contributions of $6,000 for 1947 and the possibility of the same amount

---


836 See “Verbali Unione,” 44.
for 1948. The pleas were based upon pre-war assessments of expenses for the DAIR and the Hertziana libraries.

Adding to the financial plight of the maintenance of the libraries was the problem of accession and the libraries losing touch with contemporary research. The funding of the (AIAC) publication of the Fasti (not intended to be covered by the hoped for UNESCO contributions) was also suffering. At the end of the year (1946), Bianchi Bandinelli updated Bernard Berenson regarding the present state of the library affair, following an inquiry from Berenson regarding the state of affairs of the Kunsthistorisches Institut library: ‘I have heard from Doro [Levi] a little while ago that the library of the Germ. Inst. [that was here] is returning. Have you any idea what is to become of it? [You] know that although my name appears on committees, I am not consulted nor even informed about anything [...]’. Bianchi Bandinelli informed Berenson that nothing had yet been decided regarding the libraries, apart from that their restitution had been made to the Unione, with financial contributions from UNESCO, rather than to the Italian government, ‘which is fair’.

Bianchi Bandinelli to Berenson, December 30, 1946. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Albert Grenier however quoted the figure of the UNESCO contribution for 1946 as $5,000 (and $3,000 in 1947-1948) being directed primarily at the reinstalation of the Hertziana. According to a list of Unione expenses for the four libraries (January 1-June 30, 1948), the DAIR library was by far the most ‘expensive’ of the three active libraries to run; the Florentine library was by far the cheapest (the DHI remained in storage in the Vatican – cf. undated list of expenses (1952)): DAIR and Hertziana 500,000 both Lire per month, the ‘Biblioteca Fiorentina’ 315,000, the DHI 100,000. Memorandum on the state of the four libraries, Grenier (1948). EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union 1946-1949’.

Berenson to Bianchi Bandinelli, December 9, 1946. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Bianchi Bandinelli to Berenson, December 30, 1946. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College: ‘Per le biblioteche degli istituti germanici, tra le quali quella di Firenze, che è ritornata a Pza S. Spirito, ancora nulla è deciso. Solo che la restituzione è stata fatta non al governo...’

837 Albert Grenier however quoted the figure of the UNESCO contribution for 1946 as $5,000 (and $3,000 in 1947-1948) being directed primarily at the reinstalation of the Hertziana. According to a list of Unione expenses for the four libraries (January 1-June 30, 1948), the DAIR library was by far the most ‘expensive’ of the three active libraries to run; the Florentine library was by far the cheapest (the DHI remained in storage in the Vatican – cf. undated list of expenses (1952)): DAIR and Hertziana 500,000 both Lire per month, the ‘Biblioteca Fiorentina’ 315,000, the DHI 100,000. Memorandum on the state of the four libraries, Grenier (1948). EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union 1946-1949’.


839 Bianchi Bandinelli to Berenson, December 30, 1946. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College: ‘Per le biblioteche degli istituti germanici, tra le quali quella di Firenze, che è ritornata a Pza S. Spirito, ancora nulla è deciso. Solo che la restituzione è stata fatta non al governo...’

837 838 839
The work of the Unione did not end with plans of the reestablishment of the German libraries in Rome and in Florence under ‘international’ control. The ambition was to create a permanent group of libraries for scholars of the humanities in Rome, funded and led by the Unione. The German libraries dominated the work of the Unione from 1946 until 1948 (when the libraries had finally physically returned to Rome and to Florence). The Italian scholar Paolino Mingazzini wrote to Sjöqvist in January 1947 regarding the rumour that it was ‘absolutely excluded that the [DAIR] library could return to Via Sardegna, as the Allied war archives were to be installed there’. Mingazzini hoped not, as ‘the archives could well be installed in any building, while the shelving [for the DAIR library] was ready [for use] in Via Sardegna’.

The DAIR and Hertziana libraries had reached Rome on February 2, 1946; the Florentine library was returned directly to its original location (in Palazzo Guadagni, Florence) upon its return to Italy in 1946. The DAIR library returned to its original location in Via Sardegna on July 7, 1947. In November 1947 Sjöqvist reported that ‘we have now got the German School [the DAIR] going under international administration’.

---

italiano, che è solo il consegnatario (come è giusto), ma alla associazione fra gli istituti stranieri di storia dell’arte, per conto dell’ONESCU [sic], che poi provvederà alla gestione con un organismo non ancora formato'.

The occupants of Palazzo Zuccari (the Italian Red Cross) strongly opposed having to move out and initiated a press campaign against the Unione. Ward-Perkins threatened to leave his position in the Unione unless the Hertziana library was rapidly reinstalled: ‘As one of those who, even before the formation of the Union, took the initiative in securing the return of the libraries to Rome, I feel that the position with regard to one of these, namely the Hertziana, is rapidly approaching the position where, unless we are able corporately to secure some tangible results, I shall have no alternative but to dissociate myself personally from further responsibility in the matter’.\textsuperscript{843}

In the 1946-1947 BSR annual report, Ward-Perkins stressed the laborious nature of the issue of the return and administration of the four libraries: ‘The problems occasioned by the withdrawal of the former German learned Institutes, and by the restoration to Italy, under provisional international control, of their libraries, continued to involve much hard work. The Union of Institutes has been engaged chiefly in negotiations to secure the adequate housing of the four libraries and in efforts to raise funds for their immediate maintenance. The International Association for Classical Archaeology has been directly concerned with the library of the former German Archaeological Institute, of which it has temporary custody, and in the launching of an annual news-bulletin and bibliography for classical archaeology. Both activities have paid a valuable dividend in terms of mutual understanding and co-operation between the foreign schools and the Italian institutions concerned’.\textsuperscript{844}

\textsuperscript{843} Ward-Perkins to Morey, June 6, 1947 (quoted in Billig, cf. Erland Billig’s papers).
\textsuperscript{844} BSR annual report 1946-1947.
The Hertziana library had not yet been relocated to Palazzo Zuccari in December 1947, when Sjöqvist reported a strike thwarting an effort to do so, complete with ‘workers, trucks and government representatives’. The library was eventually returned to Palazzo Zuccari in early 1948. In his 1947-1948 annual report, Ward-Perkins felt the need to justify his extra-curricular ‘international engagements’ to the executive committee of the BSR (similarly to Sjöqvist’s relations with the board of the SIR):

The Union of Institutes and the International Association for Classical Archaeology, the two bodies called into being by the withdrawal of the Germans, continued to occupy much of the Director’s time, as he became Secretary-General of the former in April and was on the editorial committee of the latter, but the close practical collaboration with the other learned institutions in Rome, both foreign and Italian, is of great value to the School.

The first post-war German representational activity in relation to the four libraries was a visit by Christine Teusch (1888-1968), Rheinland-Westfalen minister of culture 1947-1954, to Rome in March 1948. The Zentraldirektion of the DAI in Berlin was simultaneously investigating the issue of ‘the libraries in Italy’. Scholars such as F.W. Deichmann of the DAIR – associate with the Zentraldirektion until 1944, Ludwig Heydenreich – ex-director of the Kunsthistorisches Institut, and Leo

---

Bruhns – the exiled director of the Hertziana – could keep Berlin informed.

In 1948, Albert Grenier reported that the DHI remained temporarily stored in the Vatican.\(^{848}\) Grenier emphasised that the money and organisation was still lacking for the repatriation of the German libraries, although this in a sense provided a way for Grenier of contributing to the stalling of the potential restoration of the libraries to German control.

For the domestic and foreign academies that together constituted the Unione, the level of national representation of the respective academy directors had to step down in favour of ‘institutional’ representation in an attempted, and not wholly successful, supranational collaboration in dealing with UNESCO as well as with Allied and Italian authorities. The composition and structure of the Unione was intended to guarantee that the development of scholarly collaboration would be dictated by demands placed by research rather than by specific interests of individual nations. This was probably the aim of a commission that the Unione asked Sjöqvist to lead in 1949. If so, the removal of Sjöqvist from his position as director of the SIR then caused more ‘damage’ to international scholarly collaboration in Rome than has hitherto been acknowledged. The issue of

\(^{848}\) Grenier had been in contact with the French Ministry of National Education, Direction des Bibliothèques de France, Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques regarding the issue of the German libraries, expressing little hope of a rapid solution regarding the accommodation of the libraries: ‘Nous avons à faire […] en effet au loyer du local de la Via Sardegna et de la bibliothèque de Florence, faute du local promis par le Ministère italien. Nous avons l'intention de demander ses loyers au gouvernement italien, mais sans grand espoir de voir nos demandes accueillir (2 millions de livres)’. Memorandum on the state of the four libraries, Grenier (1948). EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union 1946-1949’.
determining the actors involved in determining what those research demands would be was however not addressed at the time.

6.2 ‘IN THE INTEREST OF THE NATION’: THE UNIONE AND THE PALAZZO VIDONI AFFAIR

The Unione relied on financial assistance from UNESCO in order to carry out the organisation and administration of the German libraries after their return to Rome; it also relied on the Italian government to provide a suitable logistical framework for this purpose. Where would the libraries be accommodated, and where would the Unione reside? This issue soon became one of many matters of prestige in the post-war race during the first government of the new Italian Republic to claim vacated offices and buildings in historical palazzi in Rome. The issue of the organisation of suitable facilities for the Unione was intimately connected with national funding structures and the defense of scholarship and ‘universal values’.

In a ‘Pro Memoria concerning the German libraries’ (August 1945), Sjöqvist reacted to a ‘series of decrees promulgated by the Prefect of Rome, concerning sequestration of various German property [sic]’. These decrees gave ‘the impression of being improvised and arbitrarily issued’. Sjöqvist reacted to the arbitrary application of international law, as the Italian sequestration did not apply to ‘all German property under the jurisdiction of the Prefect, but only a few selected objects’ (such as the Villa Amelung, for example). The ‘real estate and movables’ of the DAIR in Via Sardegna had been sequestered, ‘although the Institute in question

849 The decrees were published in the Gazzetta Ufficiale del Regno d’Italia, Parte II:a, Anno 86 N.o 56, July 14, 1945.
does not possess the locality where it is housed’. Sjöqvist also similarly discussed the ‘ambiguous legal position’ of the Bibliotheca Hertziana.\textsuperscript{850} The classical archaeologist Doro Levi (later director of the Italian School of Archaeology in Athens, 1947-1976), who functioned as liaison between the Unione and the Italian government regarding the issue of the return of the German libraries, supported the possible opportunity of obtaining Palazzo Vidoni, located on Corso Vittorio Emmanuele II in Rome, for the accommodation of the DAIR and DHI libraries. Palazzo Vidoni had been the administrative seat of the Fascist party until 1944 (referred to as \textit{Palazzo del littorio}), after which it had been occupied by the French military command.\textsuperscript{851} A lot of the practical work (correspondence and personal visits) was left to secretary-general Sjöqvist, who had several (six) years of experience of Italian bureaucracy as director of the SIR. In early January 1946 Sjöqvist was optimistic regarding the possibility of the German libraries returning to Rome ‘in a few months, maybe even earlier’, but ‘as the International Red Cross have requisitioned both [Palazzo Zuccari and the DAIR building on Via Sardegna] it will be difficult to find storage facilities, but the Italians – that is Bianchi Bandinelli and the repatriated Doro Levy [sic] – claim to have a solution’\textsuperscript{852}.

\textsuperscript{850} See ‘Pro Memoria concerning the German libraries, etc.’, August 1, 1945 (Sjöqvist). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
\textsuperscript{851} Levi was also connected with the AAR (as ‘subsistence fellow’), and worked closely with Morey in Rome. Cf. Roberts to Morey, July 28, 1946; and Morey to Roberts, August 9, 1946: ‘His [Levi’s] position as “subsistence fellow” is irregular, but he is of vast assistance to the Academy and me, and I am glad to have your approval of his status’. AAR, reel 5798.
\textsuperscript{852} Sjöqvist to Boëthius, January 2, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.
In February 1946, Sjöqvist had the impression that the Italian government had indeed decided to concede Palazzo Vidoni ('the old seat of the Fascist party') to the Unione. The building was furthermore intended to house living quarters for library staff as well as the administration of both AIAC and the Unione.853

The Unione spent a substantial part of its first year of activities (1946) lobbying for a favourable outcome of that solution (supported by Levi). If the Unione were to manage to obtain the prestigious Palazzo Vidoni, the status and legitimacy of the new organisation would be boosted significantly. The logistics of power in the old palazzi of Rome was about to be rearranged, and the Unione did not want to miss out on any potential benefits.

Albert Grenier wrote to Pierre Auger (French UNESCO representative), regarding the issue of the Unione possibly obtaining Palazzo Vidoni. Grenier emphasised a policy of reciprocity. As Italy was not yet a member of the United Nations (Italy did not join the UN until December 14, 1955),854 it was not obliged to heed any pressure from UNESCO. On the other hand, Grenier felt that it would be ‘impossible’

for the Unione to disregard Italian (national or pontifical) ‘scientific institutions’.

The Unione consequently requested that the Italian government would provide suitable accommodation for the installation of the four German libraries. According to Grenier, the Italian minister of public instruction had promised the concession of Palazzo Vidoni (‘close to Palazzo Farnese’) for this purpose, and was hoping that UNESCO would apply all possible diplomatic pressure to ensure a positive outcome of the matter. Grenier’s letter displayed an optimistic (and exaggerated) faith in the power of the recently established UNESCO, symptomatic of the perception of UNESCO by the Unione.

The headquarters of UNESCO itself were for some time planned to be located in Rome. As the result of a compromise the United Nations decided to place the FAO (the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN) in Rome instead. UNESCO in other words had other things than...

---


856 Interview with Antonio Nogara, Rome, December 13, 2009. The International Institute of Agriculture (1908-1946) was placed in Rome, and was replaced by FAO. Cf. Luciano Tosi, *Alle Origini della FAO. Le relazioni tra l’Istituto*...
potential long-term funding commitments to the Unione on the agenda; the absence of a ratified ‘four powers treaty’ in 1949 regarding the international (Allied) administration of the four German libraries (cf. section 6.4), possibly also played its part in contributing to a certain reluctance regarding long-term commitments to the Unione on the part of UNESCO.

The Unione found its way to Italian prime minister Alcide De Gasperi in 1946 through the diplomatic efforts of Morey (and his connections through the US embassy).857 Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, director of the Direzione Generale delle Belle Arti, had assured Morey that Palazzo Vidoni would ‘almost certainly’ be assigned to the Unione as soon as the French military authorities had abandoned the building (in spite of this not yet having received any official confirmation).858 The ‘administrative and politically opportune formula’ in operation was ‘all German books together in Palazzo Vidoni’.859

---

857 After three successive governments from June 1944 to November 1945 (led by Ivanoe Bonomi and Ferruccio Parri), Alcide De Gasperi (1881-1954), leader of the Christian Democrats, became the head of a government representing the ‘Committee of National Liberation’ (six anti-Fascist parties). He was to remain prime minister until July 1953, with a predominantly Christian Democratic government after 1946. The Christian Democrat hegemony would last for three decades: ‘The De Gasperi era also witnessed the adoption of a republican and democratic constitution that was largely inspired by the ideology of Christian Democracy. The implementation of the constitution was accompanied by economic recovery and identification with the West, as Italy accepted Marshall Plan funds, joined NATO, and became a member of the European Coal and Steel Community’. Coppa, ed., Dictionary of Modern Italian History, xxv. For De Gasperi, cf. http://www.degasperi.net/index.php (visited July 11, 2010).

858 Another communication from Bianchi Bandinelli declared that part of the building would immediately be put to the Unione’s disposal for the purpose of the disposal of the DAIR Library. "Verbali Unione," 25-26.

The concession to allow the use of Palazzo Vidoni for the reorganisation of the German libraries had to be agreed to by the Italian ministry of finance as well as the ministry of public instruction. The ministry of finance (in writings dated January 10 and February 4, 1947) was far from enthusiastic regarding the idea.\textsuperscript{860} The concession of Palazzo Vidoni to the Unione and the administration of the libraries clashed with the interests and motives of the Italian undersecretary of state (Cappa) and the Ministry of Public Instruction to secure buildings such as Palazzo Vidoni for state use when they were likely to be restituted the following year (1947), pending the arrival of the new Italian constitution.

The Unione thus considered its activities sufficiently important to claim Palazzo Vidoni. The undersecretary of state intervened, however, overriding an agreement between Morey and prime minister De Gasperi. The undersecretary of state wanted to use of the building for his own offices.\textsuperscript{861} In June 1946, Sjöqvist informed the members of the Unione that Palazzo Vidoni had been handed over to the Prefettura di Roma and the city prefect (Borelli); the Unione had received the news of this \textit{ex post facto}. The future headquarters of the Unione therefore had to be reconsidered.\textsuperscript{862} Cappa, the undersecretary of state, had contacted the Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding the International Institute of Deutschland?" in \textit{Deutsche Forschungs- und Kulturinstitute in Rom in der Nachkriegszeit}, ed. Michael Matheus (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2007), 81.\textsuperscript{860} ACS, PCM, Box 3474, file 7-2, n. 50058, subfile 3-30, 1944-1947. The material in the ACS pertaining to the Unione and Palazzo Vidoni is one of several examples in this study of archival resources hitherto rarely or never utilised in historical research.\textsuperscript{861} Undersecretary of state Cappa to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, November 21, 1946. ACS, PCM, Box 3474, file 7-2, n. 50058, subfile 3-30, 1944-1947. ACS, PCM, Box 3474, file 7-2, n. 50058, subfile 3-30, 1944-1947.\textsuperscript{862} "Verbali Unione," 34-35.
Agriculture, inquiring whether it might be possible to accommodate ‘other bodies of international character, especially of a cultural nature’ (i.e. the Unione) in the premises of the Agricultural Institute (instead of in Palazzo Vidoni).\footnote{ACS, PCM, Box 3474, file 7-2, n. 50058, subfile 3-30, 1944-1947. The International Institute of Agriculture (was located in Villa Borghese, in the ‘Villa Lubin’ (Via di Villa Ruffo), named after its founder David Lubin (1849-1919).}

At the same time, professor Luciano Laurenzi (of the Segreteria Particolare of the Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri) had exchanged a series of letters with the city prefect Borelli (who was in charge of Palazzo Vidoni at the time), lobbying on behalf of Morey and the Unione. Laurenzi had informed city prefect Borelli regarding De Gasperi’s promised concession of Palazzo Vidoni to the Unione after the evacuation of the French military command, and had included a copy of a letter from De Gasperi to Morey (dated October 29, 1946). Laurenzi had furthermore referred to a memorandum that he had prepared for Borelli’s colleague, chief prefect Miraglia. Borelli replied that neither he nor Miraglia had seen such a memorandum.\footnote{Laurenzi to Borelli, November 2, 1946. ACS, PCM, Box 3474, file 7-2, n. 50058, subfile 3-30, 1944-1947.}

De Gasperi’s letter led the board of the Unione to believe that the matter had been more or less settled. Sjöqvist reported the same day (October 29) to Erland Billig that ‘the question of the premises is still floating, but the Palazzo Vidoni-solution appears to be increasingly certain’.\footnote{Lokalfrågan svävar ännu, men det tycks luta allt bestämdare åt Palazzo Vidoni-hållet’. Sjöqvist to Billig, October 29, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1.} Almost five years later, in February 1951. the Committee on German Assets in Italy referred to ‘the willingness of the Italian Government to place suitable premises at the disposal of the Union for
housing the [DAIR and DHI] libraries [by] the President of the Italian Council of Ministers, by letter to the Union of the 29th October 1946.\textsuperscript{866}

City prefect Borelli was clearly against the use of Palazzo Vidoni by the Unione. Borelli considered Laurenzi to be a typical functionary of the Segreteria Particolare, ‘profiting from his position, presenting the signature of the prime minister’. Borelli with unmistakable irony urged Laurenzi to contact Cappa, the undersecretary of state, ‘since I see that you are more capable’ (Borelli however contacted Cappa himself).\textsuperscript{867}

Laurenzi had asked De Gasperi’s opinion regarding the use of Palazzo Vidoni for the Unione, and informed Borelli that ‘with this I did not at all think of entering in competition with you, but I fulfill my duty in presenting and illustrating a problem of high national interest to the leader of the government, the solution of which, exactly because of its importance, had to be remitted to the authority of the government’.

Laurenzi downplayed his own agency and influence on De Gasperi: ‘The decision of the prime minister [...] was made following a full examination of the argument and in the interest of the nation’. Laurenzi felt that this would end the discussion and settle the matter; to be on the safe side, he however added that De Gasperi had, in the presence of both the minister of foreign commerce and of Miraglia, confirmed the decision of the government of temporarily conceding the use of Palazzo Vidoni to the ‘International institutes of archaeology and history’, on the condition

\textsuperscript{866}Draft protocol between the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America and the Government of Italy relating to the disposition of the German libraries in Italy’, February 1951. EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’. File ‘Union 1950’.

\textsuperscript{867}Borelli to Laurenzi, November 3, 1946. ACS, PCM, Box 3474, file 7-2, n. 50058, subfile 3-30, 1944-1947.
that the building had to be used for the organisation of the German libraries. Laurenzi also revealed that the concession of Palazzo Vidoni had been requested ‘by interests superior to the state’ (i.e. the Allied authorities; possibly through Charles Rufus Morey via the ACC in Frankfurt).

Laurenzi urged Borelli to drop the issue, appealing to his authority: ‘It was obvious that […] a matter regarding archaeology would be reserved for my examination and not that of another functionary of the Prime Minister’s secretary’. Borelli did not give up; his reply was immediate. He also played the authority card; he was surprised at Laurenzi’s ‘blunder’, in that the ‘segretari particolari’ (of the prime minister) were trumped by the cabinet of the Presidenza del Consiglio, to whom undersecretary of state Cappa answered. According to Borelli, Laurenzi had intended to favour ‘his friend’ the general director of fine arts (Bianchi Bandinelli). Palazzo Vidoni had in Borelli’s view ‘always’ been spoken of as the new headquarter for the prefecture of Rome.

Borelli concluded that ‘fortunately everything is changeable’ and that ‘Palazzo Vidoni will only be released [to the Unione] against my will and my untiring tenacity’. De Gasperi, ‘with his tact, balance and patriotism will not find it difficult to offer prof. Morey a solution much better than that which you too hurriedly had wanted to mortgage’. To Borelli the

869 Borelli to Laurenzi, November 6, 1946. ACS, PCM, Box 3474, file 7-2, n. 50058, subfile 330, 1944-1947. Borelli ended the letter by clarifying that he did not answer to the Segreteria Particolare, but was invested by official and trusted mandate of the cabinet of the Presidenza del Consiglio of October 20, 1945–
Unione constituted an unwelcome (foreign) presence, and was not considered suitable for the use of Palazzo Vidoni.

Borelli drew the longest straw in the end and ultimately succeeded in withholding Palazzo Vidoni, despite the ‘national interest’ of facilitating the Unione agenda. Palazzo Vidoni was restituted to the Italian state in 1947 and was to house offices for the ministry of public instruction from 1948 until 1953. From 1951 the first floor had indeed been reserved for the undersecretary of state for the organisation of bureaucratic reform; and the entire building was dedicated to this function from 1953 until 1979, when it was taken over by the department of public function (the Dipartimento della funzione pubblica), the present inhabitants of the building.\(^{870}\)

The activities and outcomes of decisions reached during the first year of activities of the Unione were summarised in the December 1947 AIAC circular letter (in English, French and Italian), which implied that the use of the old DAIR building on Via Sardegna was only to be considered temporary until Palazzo Vidoni was fully available; at that time the Unione evidently still hoped it would be possible to gain access to Palazzo Vidoni. In December 1947 AIAC thus believed, or pretended to believe, that Palazzo Vidoni would be made available as ‘a suitable new seat’ for the DAIR library, awaiting ‘repairs and [necessary] alterations’.\(^{871}\)

\(^{870}\) ‘never revoked or modified’ – this in order to emphasise his position in relation to that of Laurenzi (they both seemed to have felt strongly for the matter).


\(^{872}\) Circular letter from AIAC to its members, December 15, 1947, EFR, box ‘AIAC 1945-1959’ (appendix 4): ‘Pending the definition of the future legal and financial status of the library by the competent Allied or other authorities, the
When it was clear that Palazzo Vidoni would not be conceded to the Unione, the books from the four libraries were taken out of their cases to avoid them being ruined through rot. Three years later Grenier reported that the committee for the liquidation of German assets in Italy had contributed with 500,000 lire for the management of the four libraries since the end of 1949; but lamented that despite the Unione’s work for the benefit of Rome and Italy, the Unione ‘had so far not benefited from any favour from the Italian government’.872

Had Palazzo Vidoni been conceded to the Unione, the restitution of the libraries to German control might well have been delayed or impeded in favour of ‘international’ control, administered through the Unione. Such

---
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restitution would have been made nigh impossible, had the 1949 ‘four powers treaty’ been signed (cf. section 6.4). The Unione would then have administered the four libraries in perpetuity; the libraries officially becoming Italian state property after 99 years (in 2048).

6.3 ‘MANUS E REBUS POLITICIS ABSTINE’: ERIK SJÖQVIST AND THE UNIONE (1946–1948)

With the advent of peace the issue of the German libraries was no longer a matter of scholarly expertise; it had become a political issue of some magnitude. Erik Sjöqvist felt that the Unione would be able to in effect ‘balance’ protests from Greek archaeologists in removing the most Rome-specific elements from the activities of AIAC (cf. section 4.7). In Sjöqvist’s view, then, the Unione evolved out of AIAC, the original gestation of which was both too encompassing and too specific at the same time (an international organisation, focusing specifically on classical archaeology). From this perspective there was in other words no outspoken perceived need of an organisation such as the Unione when AIAC was established, although that need soon became apparent.

Sjöqvist received a telegram from Axel Boëthius stating that he would be free to accept the presidency of the Unione from the perspective of the board of the SIR, as long as he did not do so in his function as director of the SIR (as doing so was perceived as potentially compromising the

---

independence of the institute).\textsuperscript{874} Sjöqvist did not consider that message sufficiently clear, and reported back that ‘the Italians, English, French and Americans insist I become ‘presidente’ [of the Unione]. What shall I do? [...] I will try to postpone the decisions until I know what you and the board think. In a way I do not feel like being involved in too many chairmanships, but it is of course in a sense pleasing from a Swedish perspective’.\textsuperscript{875}

Boëthius agreed; he thought that Sjöqvist should accept: ‘there are difficulties, but the honour and significance seem clearly greater to me’. Boëthius however emphasised that the outcome of the issue would ultimately be decided by the Crown Prince.\textsuperscript{876} The Crown Prince replied in a telegram on December 30, communicating his negative response (without specified motives), which settled the matter. The Crown Prince in this sense represented the final instance of authority regarding the SIR, not only in his role as chairman of the board, but also due to his person and his accumulation of representational influence and impact. The scepticism and careful attitude of the Crown Prince was a result of the private origins of the institution, which in this way ‘shackled’ its further

\textsuperscript{874} See telegram (in English), Boëthius to Sjöqvist, November 30, 1945: ‘After consultation Stockholm positiv[e] advice accept presidency being honour regarding you personally not institution[e]’. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:2.


\textsuperscript{876} Boëthius to Sjöqvist, December 23, 1945: ‘Så äro vi framme vid Ditt ordförandeskap i Morey’s Union. Det glädjer mig i aldra högsta grad och mitt råd är obetingadt ja. Där finns svårigheter, men hedern och betydelsen synas mig absolut större. Jag meddelade omedelbart vår Hederspresident [Kronprinsen], och före detta bref när Dig, har Du säkert ett telegram i saken. Hur det nu blir, har Du här min spontana och bestämda första reaktion’.
development. It is likely that different spaces for manoeuvre would have been available had the SIR been an official state institution.

At the New Year (1946) Boëthius however still believed that the opinion was that Sjöqvist should accept, as long as the presidency only applied to him personally and not to ‘the director of the SIR, regardless of who holds this position’. It was perceived that the matter could not rest, as Sjöqvist replied just after the New Year that the Unione was likely to be legally constituted ‘within a few days’.877

It is possible that the connections with Frankfurt and the Allied military government influenced the board of the SIR and the Crown Prince in their negative stance towards Sjöqvist’s active involvement with such ‘politically charged’ matters (a misinterpretation of essentially scholarly rather than political collaboration); the fact that these events were taking place so soon after the end of the war quite likely also had a certain influence on the negative outcome of the decision.

Similarly to the restrictions placed on Sjöqvist regarding his participation in the Swedish ‘cultural council’ in 1942 (cf. section 5.1), the Crown Prince chose what he most likely felt to be the ‘safe’ option, even though Sjöqvist had declared already in 1942 that ‘nothing can bring me to stray from my regula prima: Manus e rebus politicis abstine! I know what this means for the institute, for myself and for our entire operation’.878

---

Had Sjöqvist been in a position to accept the presidency of the Unione, with full backup from the board of the SIR, he would quite likely have been elected instead of Morey.

Sjöqvist’s ‘official’ account to the board of the SIR regarding the presidency of the Unione was that he had asked not to be considered a candidate after the work of the preparatory committee had ended, the main reason being that ‘the funding of the Unione is likely to be dependent on [UNESCO], and that the Unione therefore ought to be represented by an individual whose country already belonged to their circle’. To the board, Sjöqvist’s reasoning was thus based on the fact that Sweden had not yet joined the UN at the time (Sweden became a member of the UN on November 19, 1946), and that the funding of the Unione seemed wholly dependent on contributions from that source at the time.

The incident illustrates the deep-rooted and active involvement of the Crown Prince in the SIR as in many ways both ‘a blessing and a curse’—the Royal interest and support was a key factor in the establishment and maintenance of the institute in the first place, its consequence was on the other hand that the identity of the SIR was closely entangled with

---


political reservations, with Swedish neutrality as part of its identity, further complicated by a degree of royal ‘neutrality’ within the context of Swedish neutrality, as the Crown Prince cannot really be understood as a political actor in this context, but rather as an actor with accumulated representational influence.\textsuperscript{881}

Above all Axel Boëthius was kept regularly informed by Sjöqvist regarding early AIAC and Unione developments. Boëthius gave an account in November 1946 of Sjöqvist’s association with ‘international’ executive committees and provisional boards, in which he reported that Sjöqvist had ‘recently been called by the Allied government in Berlin to go to Germany for three weeks in order to arrange for the return of the German [DAIR] library. Through all this Sjöqvist has obtained a central position in scholarly collaboration in Rome and has proved to be a high-ranking force in the international scholarly sphere’.\textsuperscript{882}

Sjöqvist was characteristically modest (or alternatively had no real choice) regarding his own agency and importance in his work with the Unione, much in the same way as he was regarding the provisional committee of AIAC in 1945. Sjöqvist reported the early activities of the Unione to the board of the SIR, even though it is clear that the board was well aware of both its scope and its activities; this is evident in the correspondence

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{881} The Crown Prince was gradually won over by the idea of UNESCO. Cf. Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf to Bernard Berenson, May 14, 1950. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

\textsuperscript{882} Boëthius to unidentified recipient, November 12, 1946. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, II.B.1: ‘Genom allt detta har Sjöqvist erhållit en central ställning i det vetenskapliga samarbetet i Rom och dokumenterat sig som en arbetskraft på det internationella vetenskapliga området av hög rang’.
\end{footnotesize}
between Sjöqvist and Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf, Einar Gjerstad, Axel Boëthius and Martin P. Nilsson.\textsuperscript{883}

Sjöqvist’s report on issues of cultural collaboration of the SIR 1945-1946 stated that ‘the traditional cordial relations between Italian authorities and colleagues in relation to the Swedish Institute is confirmed by the important contributions these colleagues have made to this year’s teaching, as well as by the good will directed at Swedish research by the Italian Ministry of Education and by the highest authorities for the protection of antiquities, which have given Swedes the publication right to one of the finest of Italian historical monuments, the triumphal arch at Benevento’.\textsuperscript{884}

The Unione had, according to Sjöqvist, been established ‘in order to carry out the interim administration of the German scientific institutions in Rome in cooperation with […] UNESCO, the Italian government and the Allied Control Commission in Italy [ACC]; as well as to generally stimulate the collaboration between the humanist research institutes in Rome. The results of this first year of activities are highly significant’.\textsuperscript{885} Sjöqvist did not specify or exemplify this significance, however. The fact that such collaboration had reached an institutional level through the establishment of the Unione was presumably significant enough in itself.

Sjöqvist’s activities in connection with AIAC and the Unione were met with scepticism and opposition from parts of the board of the SIR. Crown


\textsuperscript{884} SIR annual report 1945-1946, 12-13.

\textsuperscript{885} SIR annual report 1945-1946, 13.
Prince Gustaf Adolf was particularly reluctant to support Erik Sjöqvist’s international undertakings in relation to the establishment of AIAC and the Unione in 1945-1946. What were the reasons for this sceptic stance to active Swedish international participation? One factor was the (royal) Swedish reluctance to forsake the perceived benefits of the neutral position of the SIR and its independence by extension.

Another was bad timing. The establishment of AIAC and the Unione took place simultaneously with a domestic debate in Sweden regarding possible membership in the UN and UNESCO. The argument against ‘outspoken’ international participation in that debate can be summed up with the belief that Sweden would be ‘consumed’ by such large-scale supranational organisations and would thus have to sacrifice its hard-won independence (an argument similar to the debates prior to Sweden joining the European Union in 1995). The SIR library might suffer from involvement with UNESCO (although this was never specified or clarified); SIR funds were limited, and fears of the Unione draining them further prevailed.

The common argument against international collaboration, that of losing independence and control over decision-making processes, was reiterated in the SIR discussion of the Unione. In practice this entailed control of excavation permits and the perceived risk of interference with Swedish scholarly activities. The financing of the Unione via liquidated German assets furthermore echoed problems experienced with German capital in Sweden after the end of the war.

Einar Gjerstad considered the Unione too focused on Rome, and for a while entertained the somewhat peculiar notion that it should instead be
based in Berne in Switzerland in order to be ‘neutral’ in the perceived scholarly ‘competition’ between Rome and Athens. Reacting to the September 1945 protest of the board of the SIR that AIAC did not actively include Greece, Sjöqvist discussed an (unofficial) lobbying ‘committee’ in Athens, similar to the ones he had organised himself in Rome for AIAC and the Unione. The Athens group was to be headed by illustrious archaeologist Carl Blegen (of the ASCSA), who in analogy with Charles Rufus Morey in Rome also served the double function of cultural attaché (at the American legation in Athens).  

The ‘what if’-arguments of the SIR board had little relation to the actual task of the Unione, that of administrating the four German libraries. The task at hand was not commented on by the board of the SIR, which did not seem to (or want to) fully grasp that Sjöqvist’s efforts were arguably working wonders for the perception of the SIR within scholarly circles in Rome. This clash of interests boils down to a lack of perception and imagination on the part of the board of the SIR regarding the potential long-term benefits in reaping the fruits of Sjöqvist’s labours, to the extent that those fruits were desired at all.

Sjöqvist might have himself been partly to blame for the distorted perspective of the board regarding the Unione. He was, after all, their most reliable source. Sjöqvist’s reports were focused on the potentially positive future of the organisation, rather than on the daily work at hand with the German libraries in Rome, or his reconciliatory stance in

---

886 Carl Blegen was to be assisted in this planned committee by Robert Demangel (director of the EFA) and professor T. Whitemore. Cf. Sjöqvist to the board of the SIR, n.d. (After February 16, 1946; before April 23, 1946). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.
mediating between Charles Rufus Morey and Albert Grenier, for example.\textsuperscript{887} Parts of the SIR board furthermore seem to have been suspicious of the possibility that Sjöqvist was planning to use his position in the board to justify prolonged tenure as director of the SIR.\textsuperscript{888}

The opposition to Sjöqvist’s commitments with AIAC and the Unione (the two organisations often appear to have been treated as one and the same by the board of the SIR, which is another indication of a deficit in information and insight) was particularly strong at Lund University, where the matter was mixed up partly with Einar Gjerstad’s disappointment with Sjöqvist’s ‘failure’ to devote himself to ‘his share’ of the Cyprus material during the war years; and partly with Gjerstad’s keen promotion of his protégé Arvid Andrén for the position as Sjöqvist’s successor as director of the SIR. Andrén had defended his doctoral thesis in Lund in 1940; it was in the interests of Gjerstad – and by extension the university – to transfer Andrén’s post-war temporary grant-subsidised lectureship to the directorship of the SIR. The relative success of the AIAC and Unione-enterprises might thus have entailed a prolonged appointment for Sjöqvist, which was not desirable from the Lund perspective. The question of Sjöqvist’s tenure and his successor as director of the SIR was discussed in Lund (by Nilsson and Gjerstad) at least as early as 1944.\textsuperscript{889}


\textsuperscript{889} Cf. Nilsson to Boëthius, December 2, 1944. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:B:1.
The close yet not institutionalised and undefined connection between the position as director of the SIR and Swedish university posts in effect stifled long-term structural development and profiling of the SIR, as its directorship was in some quarters viewed as a way of rotating classical archaeology and ancient history positions in the Swedish universities, not taken on its own merits, with potential benefits for the SIR as the main priority. Gjerstad was acting in his own interest in promoting Andrén as his protégé-candidate of choice. Such a client-patron situation worked in Gjerstad’s favour as he needed direct access to scholarly networks in Rome in order to successfully carry out his own research.  

Gjerstad’s was not the sole opposition to Sjöqvist’s ventures. Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf was in this sense also equipped with ‘blinders’, in the sense that he emphasised the ‘non-diplomatic’ status of the SIR since its foundation – the institute should never officially represent Sweden in Italy (not even in terms of cultural representation), a function reserved exclusively for the foreign office (UD) and the Swedish diplomatic mission. The Crown Prince feared that Sjöqvist was about to break this golden rule:

[...] We also approve of the planned closer cooperation between the institutes in Rome. [...] this new organisation [the Unione] should prove to be valuable; depending on how it develops and is handled it might even prove to be very important. I have noted with satisfaction that it will in no way hinder or interfere with the independence and initiatives of the separate institutes. This is a sensible and invaluable precondition for its

\[^{890}\text{ Cf. correspondence from Gjerstad to Boëthius (LUB, Samling Gjerstad), in which his dismay at the prospect of appointing Åke Åkerström as Sjöqvist’s successor without taking Arvid Andrén into account is clearly expressed.}\]
successful outcome. It would of course be very important if the new organisation could contribute to a diminished role of nationalism in the field of archaeology. International collaboration, naturally with a priority for Italian interests, would be most reasonable in a field of study as important as that of classics in Italy. Wide-ranging perspectives on loyal scholarly collaboration open up here that might prove to be of great importance. Generally speaking, our institute should naturally promote all such endeavours that pertain to international understanding and cooperation in scientific research – all, of course, observing tact and discrimination.  

Such fears increased when Sjöqvist was appointed secretary-general of the Unione. Sjöqvist sent the by-laws and regulations of AIAC to the Crown Prince, with seemingly little effect. The Crown Prince repeatedly emphasised the risks involved in the SIR venturing out of its depth (‘att sy en för stor kostym åt institutet’), not necessarily solely in political terms.  

It remains unclear what the Crown Prince really meant when he spoke of ‘loyal scholarly collaboration’? Loyal to what, exactly? At the time of writing (in January 1945), the war had still not ended, although Rome had been liberated six months previously. The loyalty discussed here was one of academic diplomacy and networks between individuals, loyalty to the cause of diminishing the role of nationalism in scholarly circles; also one of a belief in scholarly neutrality, a specifically Swedish legacy. The suggested recommended strategy was to observe ‘tact and discrimination’, and to furthermore prioritise ‘Italian interests’.

Scholarly neutrality and recourse to an argument of a division between research and foreign affairs is only part of an explanation of the

---

892 Cf. Ibid., 194.
scepticism of the board of the SIR in this regard. Sjöqvist’s involvement in matters ranging further than his own research and the traditional archaeological course in the spring term of each academic year were essentially considered incongruous with the objectives and statutes of the SIR. Such extra-curricular activities would include ‘cultural propaganda’ – such as the conscious decision not to associate the SIR with the Swedish Institute for International Cultural Exchange (Svenska Institutet för kulturellt utbyte med utlandet).

The problem here was – at least on the surface – one of communication and lack of transparency that was not limited to the war years. An institution such as the SIR had to, as it still has to, be aware of both its self-perception and ‘image’ in terms of public relations. The strategy for legitimacy at the foreign academies in Rome (exemplified by the SIR) was to develop research profiles with a maximum of scholarly credibility, communicating this through networks and the local scholarly community. The balance between publications and public relations, as practiced by Axel Boëthius, the first director of the SIR, to a certain degree indicated the standard by which the board later judged the role of the director and SIR academic diplomacy.

It would be fair to say that the SIR in this specific sense profited from the war and from Sjöqvist’s capabilities of using Swedish neutrality to his

893 Sjöqvist furthermore wrote to Erland Billig in 1948, asking for advice regarding possible travel contributions for traveling to Princeton from Billig’s employer the Swedish Institute (Svenska Institutet), or SI; not to be confused with the SIR, invoking ‘possible efforts for Swedish cultural propaganda during my eight years in Italy’ (ev. insatser för svensk kulturpropaganda under mina åtta Italien-år). Sjöqvist to Billig, March 8, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:1.

own as well as to the institute’s advantage. The differences of opinion and emphasis between the board of the SIR and Sjöqvist regarding AIAC and the Unione had little or no real impact on Sjöqvist’s day-to-day work for the two organisations (with the exception of the issue of whether or not Sjöqvist should accept the presidency of the Unione).

Sjöqvist’s final session with AIAC before leaving the directorship of the SIR took place on February 12, 1948. In his final appearance in the Unione on May 7, 1948, Sjöqvist focused on the topic of the *Annales Institutorum*, which had remained unresolved for two years; in other words the desire to create a common regular publication for domestic as well as foreign academies in Rome, including addresses, lists of staff, library hours and other such practicalities. The failure to produce such a publication had until that point mainly been due to a lack of sufficient funds. It was to be realised a decade later with the publication of the first Unione *Annuario* (in 1958-1959).

---


Negotiations for a treaty that would give the Unione greater financial security commenced were initiated in the summer of 1947. The treaty was based on the liquidation of German assets in Italy seized during the war, and was to be agreed on by the USA, Great Britain, France and Italy. The interests of a fund consisting of one billion lire were to be allotted for the four German libraries, which were to be considered Italian property, but to be handed over to the Unione for a period of 99 years, in essence in perpetuity. The funds were to be placed in Italian government securities. In September 1947, Morey gave Ward-Perkins the following update:

A recent development has clarified considerably the future of the libraries. German assets in Italy are to be liquidated by a Committee of four representing Britain, France, Italy and the United States, with full power of disposal. This Committee will be constituted at once. I have seen [Paul] Bonner, who will be the American member and he has agreed to propose the sale of the four German libraries to the Unione (for a nominal consideration) [...] This note is to ask if you could take the trouble to get to the Foreign Office and prepare it to consider favourably through the British representative on the Committee of Four, the proposed solution to the problem. This is Bonner’s suggestion and I am writing the same request to Grenier. 897

Morey and Ward-Perkins favoured the ‘internationalisation’ of the four libraries. After having discussed the matter with the latter, temporary SIR director Åke Åkerström reported in October 1948 that ‘the Italians could not be completely excluded’ from the administration and use of the libraries, and that ‘the Germans can come, but as private individual [scholars].’

Two months later Åkerström reported the contents of the planned ‘four powers treaty’ as a done deal: ‘I asked Morey if he was not afraid that the Italians would intervene to their own advantage at some weak point. He replied that there must not be any weak points.’ The planned inclusion of an (unnamed) UNESCO representative in the board of the Unione underlined the international dimension of the undertaking, ‘regardless of how unclear the future of UNESCO might appear’.


898 Åkerström to Boëthius, October 15, 1948. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III.B.1. Ward-Perkins reported that he had ‘attended the Third General Conference of Unesco at Florence’ to the BSR executive committee. BSR annual report, 1949-1950.

In 1945 the scholar Paul Frankl (then at Princeton University) wrote to Charles Rufus Morey recommending one of his pupils, Fritz Haessler, for the directorship of the Bibliotheca Hertziana after its return to Rome: ‘Politically he would be the right man to be backed by those Germans who will have to govern Germany some day when the Americans leave’.\(^\text{900}\) Such individual lobbying initiatives for the restoration of the German institutions to German control through specific individual merits were numerous after the war, and Morey was receiving several suggestions regarding the future staff of the four libraries.\(^\text{901}\) Morey certainly seems to have felt at the end of 1948 that the four powers treaty would materialise:

B.B.’s [Bernard Berenson’s] answer to Dr. Degenhardt was quite right, except that the property right in the Libraries, which will be granted the Italian government, is quite real and complete. It is granted on condition that a lease in perpetuity be granted the Union of Institutes, which furthermore is explicitly protected, in its administration of the Libraries, from any interference by the Italian Government “or any other government”. The Libraries will be administered by a carefully protected international administration, representing all countries, including Italy, which are represented in the

\(^{900}\) Paul Frankl to Morey, December 31, 1945. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5. DAIR associate F.W. Deichmann had also been Frankl’s pupil, and was recommended by Frankl to become Haessler’s future assistant at the Hertziana.

\(^{901}\) Cf. Morey to Nicky Meriano, November 24, 1948 (part of the letter is missing): ‘I am glad to have the opportunity to read Dr. Hahnloser’s letters, but I think he has a mistaken idea of the situation. [The DAIR?] Library, which accounts for Pfister’s prominence in the present situation. But this situation is tutt’altro che permanente. As for the Florence library, the eventual personnel for that and all the others is still unsettled, and can’t be settled until we (the Union) are officially in charge. But Hahnloser is a very good person, and I'll keep his name in our “possible” file’. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
Union, and will have an endowment adequate to the purpose. There will be no discrimination whatever in this administration for or against any nationality. \footnote{Morey to Nicky Meriano, December 24, 1948. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Cf. (unidentified) report (1948?), the Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence: ‘The property right in the libraries, which will be granted the Italian Government, is quite real and complete. It is granted on condition that a lease in perpetuity be granted the Union of Institutes, which furthermore is explicitly protected, in its administration of the Libraries, from any interference by the Italian Government or any other Government. The Libraries will be administered by a carefully protected international administration, representing all countries, including Italy, which are represented in the Unione, and will have an endowment adequate to the purpose. There will be no discrimination what ever in this administration for or against any nationality’. For Bernhard Degenhart, cf. correspondence with Bernard Berenson, the Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.}

Morey politely, but somewhat condescendingly, dismissed German demarches against the four powers treaty, as well as an unspecified ‘offer’, in the summer of 1948: ‘I am declining for the Union the offer which was made and hope that your friends will understand the situation which makes it necessary for the Union to adhere to its previous decision to close the libraries until they are fully financed, which has been communicated to the Committee on German Assets in Italy.’ \footnote{Morey to Heydenreich, July 20, 1948. Cf. Heydenreich to Morey (from Rome), July 15, 1949. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.}

UNESCO representative E.J. Carter was present at the December 10, 1948 Unione meeting, and subsequently recorded that

I reported on the 3rd General Conference decision to make a grant of $5,000 with, if required, a loan of a further sum not exceeding $8,000, should funds not be forthcoming from the investment of ex-German assets in Italy in sufficient time to meet 1949 obligations. [...] The Committee expressed the hope that Unesco should have some formal and permanent association with the Union. It was agreed that something less than formal trusteeship would be desirable; Unesco had interest in the Union’s work extending...
beyond the conduct of the libraries, so that it might be mutually advantageous for the Union to offer Unesco a seat on its council, which could be filled by the most suitable representative from the Cultural Department in respect to the actual business at any meeting on certain occasions this might be a representative of the Libraries Division, on others a representative of Humanistic Studies. [...] The Union is completely independent politically, both from the Italian Government and the governments of participating institutions, and is determined to preserve its independence.\footnote{Memorandum of meeting with the council of the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History and History of Art, Rome on 10.12.48: E.J. Carter (UNESCO), January 4, 1949 (appendix 6). The memorandum included a letter (1949) from J.J. Mayoux (Director of Ideological and Humanistic Projects, Philosophy and Humanistic Studies Division), UNESCO to Prof. Ulrich Middeldorf (Chicago, later director of the Kunsthistorisches Institut): ‘You will realize that there is indeed a difficulty. [...] German intellectuals, in so far as they could show that they had remained pure of heart throughout this tragic period of German history, ought to be allowed to do intellectual work on top level, if such was their capacity, in the international as well as the national field. [...] the main obstacle to that is the “National prejudice” encountered in the country [Italy] where the work would have to be done. [...] It is a very delicate question indeed, in which possibly an American intervention with Dr. Morey might do something. My personal viewpoint, which I am not called to act upon, would be that if one of the three posts of directors were given to a “good German”, that would be the ideal solution. Failing that one or more of the librarians’ posts might be so given. In any case, as a gesture, it would be good in my opinion that a German scholar should receive a post of some importance in one of the libraries in question’. Cf. Robert Boehringer to Heydenreich, January 17, 1949 (regarding the Unione meeting in December 1948): ‘Darin hat Morey berichtet, man könne nun mit dem Abschluss des Vertrages bis zum 15. Januar rechnen; für die Mitarbeit auf italienischer Seite habe man besonders Prof. Toesca zu danken. Die Unesco könne nicht mehr als 5000 $ jährlich als Zuschuss leisten, dies aber regelmässig. Jedes Institut werde einen italienischen Beobachter erhalten. Die Direktoren sollten weder deutsch noch italienisch sein, das technische Personal aber deutsch. Dafür sei Prof. Grenier eingetreten. Die Tätigkeit der Institute solle sich hauptsächlich auf die Aufrechterhaltung der Bibliotheken beschränken. Das florentinische Institut solle vom Palazzo Guadagni in den Palazzo Pitti überführt und der Accademia Pittiana unterstellt werden. Das florentinische Institut sei nicht an den Geldern der Unesco beteiligt. Die Einrichtung des Institutes in Florenz werde wahrscheinlich Dr. Siviero übertragen. Gegen diese Florentiner-Regelung hätten sich Prof. Hoogewerff und Mr. Roberts gewendet. Perkins soll geäussert haben, es werde nicht so schnell gehen, wie Morey hoffe, man müsse zufrieden sein, wenn diese Regelung bis zum April durchgeführt sei’. See also ‘Die deutschen wissenschaftliche Institute und der Plan ihrer Internationalisierung’ (Deichmann and von Gerkan), with an account of the Unione meeting in December 1948, L. Schudt, January 18, 1949; as well as Deichmann to Lotz, December 12, 1948, regarding the Unione meeting as well as the possibility of moving the Kunsthistorisches Institut to Palazzo Pitti (Florence). The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.}
In a 1948 memorandum, Albert Grenier lamented the ‘deplorable’ solution of having to close the libraries after having already reopened them to some degree, as well as the pressing exigencies of surveillance and maintenance. Grenier advocated asking for a funding supplement from UNESCO of $5,000 for 1948 which would be sufficient for the continued maintenance of the libraries for 1948, to be ‘allocated as quickly as possible’ He also wished to see a hasty solution to the work of the ‘Commission des Quatres’ regarding the liquidation of the ‘ex-German libraries’, through the allocation of the sum of one billion lire to the Unione.  

A certain lack of German coordination in the lobbying efforts by archaeologists, art historians and historians was discussed in January 1949 in a letter with an unidentified author:

Ich bin nicht wenig betrübt darüber, dass die Archäologen doch wieder für sich gehandelt haben, ohne mit den Kunsthistorikern und Historikern auch nur Fühlung zu nehmen; dasselbe haben sie auch 1943 bei der Bergung getan. [Otto] Brendel hat anlässlich einer hiesigen Archäologen Tagung eine langes Gespräch mit Frank Brown, director of

---

Archaeological Research of the American Academy at Rome, gehabt, der wie Br. Schreibt “actively interested and well informed” war. Brendel führt dann fort: “I mentioned that I had heard, as a rumour, that the libraries would be handed over to the Italian Government as owner, but given to under a ninety-nine year contract to UNESCO as active trustees, Brown’s reaction was that he had never heard of this plan and that he was convinced the rumour was wrong. He assured me that nobody at the Academy would seriously contemplate a solution on this basis, or as he put it to me “We are just as eager as you are to keep this thing on a truly international basis”. He said that the question was practically decided, that neither the Italian Government nor the International Archaeological Association would receive any of the four libraries. The two libraries in Rome, the Archaeological and the Hertziana, will be internationalised; that is to say, the owner will be an international body, the “International Union of Academies in Rome”. He thinks this deal is virtually completed. The Italian Government has a representation in the administration of the “UNION”, which means one vote. He does not think that the Italians will claim or exercise any further influence on this question. [...] Dass das Florentiner Institut nun doch in den Pitti kommen soll, erregt mich natürlich tief. Es war dies der immer wieder von den Florenz-Italienern [vorgetragene?] Wunsch, den Morey, Perkins and Shöquist [sic] ständig zurückgewiesen haben. Alle drei haben mir persönlich gesagt, dass sie gerade diese Verlegung in den Pitti auf keinen Fall gestatten wollten – eben wegen in diesem Vorschlag enthaltenen Gefahren italienischer Übergriffe’.  

In February 1949, the same Otto Brendel (at Indiana University) wrote to Ludwig Heydenreich regarding the libraries that

I should like to tell you that I had a letter from Krautheimer who seems to know nothing about the plan to return the libraries to the Italian government. I expected that you had meanwhile seen him. He, of course, has full confidence in Morey. The College Art

906 It is however unclear whether or not Brown had been informed by Morey regarding the four powers treaty. Unidentified author, copies to Wolfgang Lotz and Lehmann-Brockhaus, n.d. of letter to Walter Paatz (from St. Louis), January 10, 1949. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.
Association 'have committed themselves to the solution of a strict internationalization. [Morey] is undoubtedly the key man in this matter.\textsuperscript{907}

After two years of drawn-out negotiations, the four powers treaty was to be signed in the summer of 1949. On August 3, 1949 the US state department backed out of the agreement in the last minute, however. The other parties involved tried to influence the state department through diplomatic efforts, but to no avail. Why did the US delegate (Paul Bonner) and the state department change course in the matter? The evidence indicates that interventions by art historian Bernard Berenson in 1948 were influential. In a letter to Bonner in February 1948, Berenson clearly favoured and advocated the restitution of the libraries to Germany over the international administration drafted in the four powers treaty (quoted in full in appendix 2): ‘My ideal would be to restore these institutions to German scholarship, subject to supervision by a committee selected from the archaeologists and art historians from the United Nations’.\textsuperscript{908} This implied supervision of research does however not rhyme well with the widespread admiration for German scholarship (cf. section 5.8).

\textsuperscript{907} Brendel to Heydenreich, February 16, 1949. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.

\textsuperscript{908} Berenson to ‘Paul Bonner Esq. American Embassy, Rome’, February 17, 1948 (appendix 2). Paul Bonner was furthermore in close contact with Morey (they were both at the US Embassy), as this excerpt from a letter to Berenson indicates: ‘I miss your presence here as there are so many matters arising on which I should like to benefit of your wisdom. One minor matter, for example, is the composition of the foundation to be set up under the Fulbright Bill for our American students and scholars in Italy. Whom would you suggest? Rufus Morey has suggested Matteoli, whereas I favor Baron Zerilli’. Bonner to Berenson, February 19, 1948. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Bonner also wrote to Berenson regarding the application of the Marshall Plan in Italy (for example on April 1 and May 5, 1948). For Paul Bonner, see also the Paul Hyde Bonner Papers, 1931-1975, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
On the other hand, it is likely that Berenson’s influence in this matter has been somewhat exaggerated (for example by Erland Billig),\textsuperscript{909} taking Bonner’s prompt reply to Berenson into consideration:

Many thanks for your letter concerning the German libraries. I am taking the liberty of having it copied and sent to the British and French Embassies, as well as to Dr. Morey, Ward Perkins and Professor Grenier. The whole matter seems to be moving along with the utmost agreement amongst all concerned. The Italian Foreign Office informed me yesterday that they were entirely in accord with our formula, which is, as I believe I told you, to give the libraries to Italy on the condition that they be leased for 99 years to the Union of Institutes. In addition, our plan is to give the Union an endowment of one billion lire to be invested in Italian Government bonds. The whole plan is now being forwarded to Washington, London and Paris for consideration by the three Governments. Once the Union have possession, they should take heed of your advice to use those German scholars who have done so much to develop the libraries and whose presence would be of such infinite use to scholars.\textsuperscript{910}

This implies that Berenson’s letter was not that decisive after all, and that the US Embassy in Rome (Bonner and Morey) in fact supported the ‘internationalisation’ of the libraries and the Unione approach (which was to a large extent Morey’s brainchild). It is thus reasonable to assume that the impetus for the US objection emanated from elsewhere, possibly from

\textsuperscript{909} Cf. Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli."

\textsuperscript{910} Bonner to Berenson, February 20, 1948. Bonner was also a novelist, and wrote to Berenson in 1951 regarding his novel \textit{Belles Lettres}, set at the American Embassy ‘during the Spring & Summer of 1948’ and featuring a secretary ‘who gets himself far too involved in good old Roman intrigues’. Bonner to Berenson, May 17, 1951. In 1958, Bonner added: ‘Let no one ever say that the Romans are not friendly, hospitable and sincere. They may be politicians, they may be snobs, they may be gossips (even at times malicious gossips) but when they give you their friendship it is a true friendship not conditioned by favor or rank’. Bonner to Berenson, November 20, 1958. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
the state department itself, although intense lobbying efforts by Italian and German scholars had a certain influence on the proceedings (cf. section 6.9). Ward-Perkins also wrote to Berenson, thanking him for the ‘summary of [his] views about this difficult problem’.

After the breakdown of the four powers treaty, the Unione continued to define the four libraries as ‘international’. In his 1949-1950 EFR report, Grenier reported that funds had been raised by way of ‘a monthly allocation, consented to by the committee for the liquidation of German assets. Grenier maintained that ‘the situation remained uncertain. The only favourable fact is the perfect agreement among the members of the

---


912 Ward-Perkins to Berenson, March 6, 1948. The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College: ‘Dear Berenson, Thank you very much for the copy of your letter to Mr. Bonner about the German libraries. It is most useful to have this summary of your views about this difficult problem. After I left you I saw Jahier twice, and I must confess that, however troublesome he may be in other matters, I found him very pleasant and right-minded over the library [of the Kunsthistorisches Institut]. You will perhaps have heard that the Chamber of Commerce, at the instance of Professor De Voto, has voted 500,000 lire towards this year’s expenses. Provided we can be sure that there are no strings attached to the offer, we shall accept with gratitude.’

Unione regardless of their nationality’. Grenier believed that the Italian government were mainly interested in designating the libraries (its libraries, referring to the Unione) as international, and that the Unione on the contrary strived for a true and thorough internationalisation of the libraries.915

The general incertitude regarding the future of the libraries made it difficult for the Unione to hire the necessary competence for their administration. Appeals to the ‘committee of four’ were in vain, and the Unione was forced to keep pursuing the management of the libraries despite the silence, although making the committee responsible for ‘the insufficiency that has quite justifiably moved the Italian opinion’. The Unione was waiting for a response to a new appeal in 1950, however

914 EFR annual report 1949-1950: ‘La situation demeure donc incertaine. Le seul fait favorable est la parfait entente qui règne entre les membres de l’Union quelle que soit leur nationalité. D’accord avec les Américains, les Anglais et les Italiens, l’École française s’attache à maintenir cette bonne harmonie. […] L’Union doit se borner à la conservation, au jour le jour, des collections existantes. Elle a, du reste, fait savoir au Comité des quatre qu’elle n’était pas disposée à accepter la charge des Bibliothèques à n’importe quelles conditions et si on ne lui donnait pas les moyens de les administrer comme il convient et en toute indépendance’.

'without much hope, as the issue of the ex-German libraries has after a year unfortunately become a question of politics'.

It had however been thus ever since the libraries were removed in early 1944. In a meeting in London in May 1950, the American delegate had suggested ‘simply returning the libraries to the Germans’. The French and British delegates were, not surprisingly, opposed to this, and the decision was postponed for the peace treaty with Germany, anticipated also by the German scholars advocating the restoration of the German institutions in Italy. Grenier blamed the Americans for the failed policy reported that the American delegate was to discuss the matter with the US government: ‘He most probably did, but the government did not respond. It is a veto through silence. The entire responsibility regarding the insufficiency in the management of the libraries lies with the [US] state department. It appears that it is the effect of deliberate politics, consisting in demonstrating that the Unione is not a valid administrator of the libraries’. Grenier asked rhetorically ‘why initiate the formation, why preach the Unione to the peoples of Europe and then insist on destroying it when it has come into existence?’


Following the consequences of the treaty of Versailles, no treaty was in fact signed with Germany after the end of Second World War. The 1957 EEC treaties of Rome in essence replaced its function. For the German anticipation of the peace treaty, see the Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.
Grenier informed the French ambassador (Jacques Fouques-Duparc) that 'by reason of the Franco-British reaction, the American government is abandoning the idea of not placing the billion lire at the disposal of [the Unione]. But the American authorities are raising a new issue, namely that of the non-liquidation of the German cultural assets. They wish to introduce into the [project] an arrangement formulating a principle [...] of prior consultations with the German government on the subject of putting [the project] into operation'.

From Grenier's perspective the Unione had done all in its power to acquire the necessary funds for upkeep of the libraries since the failed 1949 treaty, but was stalled by the US government, which displays a lack of transnational (in this case also transatlantic) communication and trust. If the discussion – and political will – had taken place on the level of Berenson's influential expressed faith in German scholarship in 1948, the settlement of the matter might have been considerably facilitated.

1952-1953'; and box 'Union 1950-1955'. File 'Union 1950': ‘Le délégué américain a proposé de rendre [...] simplement les bibliothèques aux Allemands. ‘Devant l'opposition des délégués anglais et français il a été décidé de renvoyer la question au futur traité de paix avec l'Allemagne. [...] Le délégué américain ne dit pas non – mais il a besoin de consulter son gouvernement. [...] C'est le veto par la silence. [...] Pourquoi en avoir suscité la formation, pourquoi prêcher l'Union aux peuples de l'Europe, se l'on s'acharne à la détruire lorsqu'elle existe?’.

919 Grenier to Jacques Fouques-Duparc (French Ambassador to Italy), March 23, 1951: 'En raison de la réaction franco-britannique, le gouvernement américain abandonne l'idée de ne pas mettre le milliard de lires à la disposition de l'Union internationale des instituts d'archéologie. Mais les autorités américaines soulèvent une nouvelle question qui est celle de la non liquidation des avoirs culturels allemands. Elles désirent introduire dans le projet de protocole une disposition formulant un tel principe [...] des consultations préalables avec le Gouvernement allemand au sujet de la mise en vigueur du projet de protocole'. Cf. Morey to the Commission on German assets in Italy, March 20, 1950; the Italian Ministero degli Affari Esteri to the French embassy, Rome, October 31, 1950; and Fouques-Duparc to the French minister of foreign affairs, December 20, 1950 EFR, box 'Union 1950-1955'. Files 'Union 1950-1951' and 'Union 1951-1952'.

Similar criticism of American attitudes regarding the German libraries was expressed in a joint letter to the editor of the (American) *College Art Journal* (1951-1952) by Morey and Sjöqvist: ‘*Suumum ius, summa iniuria.*’ Whatever be the right or wrong of the decision of the state department, it is certainly one to which the welfare of the [German] libraries has been subordinated.920

Erik Sjöqvist’s name does not appear once in Grenier’s many and lengthy memoranda regarding the four libraries, mainly as Sjöqvist had left the scene in 1948, before the breakdown of the ‘four powers treaty’. After the initial organisation of the logistics of the libraries in early 1948, the Unione would very likely have employed Sjöqvist as ‘coordinator’ or director of the libraries had the issue of funding been settled at that time. Morey and Sjöqvist made a plan for the administration, personnel and funding of the four libraries during the spring of 1948, when it looked like the four powers treaty would be ratified. According to the Morey-Sjöqvist plan, each library was to form an independent unit under the auspices of a head librarian. The overall control of the libraries was to be vested in a general director.

During his year as visiting professor at Princeton, Sjöqvist learned in June 1949 that the Unione was indeed offering him the position as general director of the new library organisation. Sjöqvist probably considered the offer seriously during the summer, until August 3, 1949, when the USA announced that they stood firm in their decision not to ratify the treaty...

---

(despite British and French diplomatic interventions). On October 24, 1949, Sjöqvist informed Morey that he no longer wished to be considered for the position offered to him by the Unione. After the breakdown of the treaty and the solution he had been working towards for four years, Morey reportedly had an argument and fell out with US ambassador James Clement Dunn (1890-1979, ambassador to Italy 1947-1952).921

Writing to Federico Pfister in 1951, regarding Pfister’s remuneration for his (and AIAC’s) efforts as commissario of the DAIR library (cf. section 6.5), Morey spoke of ‘bad conscience on the part of the [US] state department’ regarding the German libraries: ‘I have no very clear idea of what we can expect for the Union and the Fasti, in any financial settlement. It would seem however that a bad conscience on the part of the state department, and the continued support of the British and French, should have the effect of trying to compensate the Association, the Union, and especially you, for all the work and trouble of more than four years. I hope especially that the result will include a quasi-financing of the Fasti’.922

921 Cf. Erland Billig’s papers.
The abandonment of the ‘four powers treaty-solution’, and the subsequent discussions between Italy and Germany to return the four libraries to their previous owners, in effect entailed a partial return to the pre-war state of affairs – ‘status quo ante bellum’, in the words of Erland Billig – with unresolved issues of agency and mandate concerning the scholarly actors, or ‘academic diplomats’, representing the Allied powers.

6.5 The ‘Post-War Dream’: AIA, the Unione and UNESCO (1948–1953)

The question of the return of the four libraries to German control became a matter of the highest diplomacy. This section illustrates Italian, German and Allied perspectives regarding the issue, and the twists and turns from the ‘internationalising’ four powers-treaty via ‘italianising’ attempts to eventual restitution of the libraries to German control in 1953.925

Discussions between the Bundesregierung and the governments in Washington, London and Paris were initiated in the late autumn of 1950. The future legal status of the German institutes was discussed in negotiations between Bundeskanzler Adenauer and prime minister De

924 For the Bibliotheca Hertziana this was dealt with above all by the ‘Prälat’ Georg Schreiber. Cf. Thoenes, "Geschichte des Instituts," 26.
The original clause that the library could never leave Rome was corroborated, and both Italian and German were to have equal linguistic status within the institute. The restitution treaty was finally signed by the three Allied powers, by Italy and Germany on June 18, 1953. In 1950, the DAIR, Hertziana and Florentine Kunsthistorisches libraries had been opened to researchers presenting ‘sufficient guarantees’. Did the role of the network of directors remain after the war and after the initial years of the Unione? Was the ‘spirit of international collaboration’ a tenable persuasion? The Unione fund-raising appeals and discussions with UNESCO have to be considered a failure, and were generally speaking unilateral, based on one-way communication and information form the Unione to UNESCO. In general terms, the same applies for attempts to establish official Italian legitimacy and support for the Unione.

In 1953, Ward-Perkins acknowledged the main problem of the Unione vis-à-vis UNESCO – namely a ‘lack of contacts’ with UNESCO.

---


930 Cf. for example Morey’s failed attempt at elevating the Unione to the status of Ente Morale in 1949 (as president of the Unione). See Morey to the Italian minister of public instruction, June 17, 1949; as well as a memorandum (Morey) regarding the ‘ex-German libraries’. EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955. File ‘Union 1951-1952’.
representatives. Ward-Perkins, Bayet and Unione president Giuseppe Lugli felt that the question of the ‘international position’ of the Unione in relation to UNESCO once and for all had to be clearly affirmed on a pragmatic administrative level.\footnote{See Unione session, March 30, 1953. President Giuseppe Lugli communicated that ‘[…] non vi è nulla di nuovo nelle relazioni dell’Unione, nè con l’Unesco, nè con il Conseil International des Sciences Humaines. Ward-Perkins precisa che l’Unesco ha tutta via riconosciuto che l’unica ragione per cui l’Unione è stata esclusa dall’elenco delle istituzioni non governative aventi relazioni consultive con l’Unesco è stata la mancanza di contatti; questo apre quindi la possibilità all’Unione di rientrare a farvi parte in futuro’. Cf. Unione session, January 23, 1953, in which it was reported that the Unione had been cancelled from the ‘elenco di consultazioni con l’Unesco’, according to Ward-Perkins due to a document sent in July 1952 regarding information regarding the structure, aims and activity of the Unione that had not reached UNESCO because of a ‘deplorable’ mistake regarding an address. Cf. the Ministero del Tesoro to Giuseppe Lugli, March 16, 1950. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949. File ‘Historique. L’UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953’. \footnote{Jean Thomas (UNESCO) to Jean Bayet, February 6, 1953. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949. File ‘Historique. L’UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953’. ‘Grâce à vous, nous disposons pour la première fois d’un document clair et précis. Si j’en avais reçu de semblables dans la passé,}

Contacts with UNESCO had, since 1946, taken place on an individual rather than an institutional level. In part for that very reason, the Unione had consistently overestimated the agency and diplomatic powers of UNESCO from the outset. These individual lobbying contributions were clearly counterproductive and confusing at times. In 1953, French UNESCO representative Jean Thomas expressed his gratitude for an historical assessment and description of AIAC and Unione activities by Jean Bayet (in a memorandum by Bayet dated January 25, 1953): ‘Thanks to you, we have a clear and precise document for the first time [regarding the Unione and the issue of the German libraries]. If I had received similar documents in the past, many misunderstandings could have been avoided’.\footnote{Jean Thomas (UNESCO) to Jean Bayet, February 6, 1953. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949. File ‘Historique. L’UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953’. ‘Grâce à vous, nous disposons pour la première fois d’un document clair et précis. Si j’en avais reçu de semblables dans la passé,
How come the Unione had not managed to produce a document of sufficient clarity over the past seven years? Thomas’ satisfaction with Bayet’s information was at the same time covert criticism of Grenier’s preceding lobbying efforts. The lack of real definition of the structure and aims of the Unione beyond the restitution of the German libraries, in conjunction with the lack of a realistic time plan, can in part explain the previous deficiency in the presented information; did the system of national UNESCO delegates did not facilitate the matter either. It is furthermore clear that the sometimes somewhat aggressive rhetoric advocating ‘internationalisation’ at the expense of Germany did not always sit very comfortably with the UNESCO representatives.

So what was Bayet saying in his lauded document? In essence his memorandum made the effort of motivating why UNESCO should be potentially interested in either AIAC or the Unione in the first place, contrary to for example Grenier’s faith in presuming that UNESCO would be interested in the cause of the Unione more or less by default, in order to ‘better define their responsibilities and different positions’ in relation to UNESCO.933 Bayet’s report stressed the aim of the Unione and AIAC beyond the fate of the four German libraries, in clarifying what may otherwise have come across to UNESCO as a ‘competition’ or a conflict of...

---

interests between the two organisations. The value of the German libraries was ‘common knowledge’ in scholarly circles in Rome; their exigency was essentially not communicated clearly enough to funding agencies such as UNESCO, however, and often stranded on the level of discussing German scholarship and Italian attitudes towards the Unione project. The two organisations (AIAC and the Unione) had in essence neutralised and cancelled each other out; conflicting presentations had confused the matter for UNESCO, and quite likely contributed to an impression of the Unione as a temporary organisation solely preoccupied with the issue of attempting to ‘internationalise’ the four German libraries.

How were Bayet’s clarifying remarks then received by the Unione itself? One potentially constructive outcome was the argument that the work of the Unione had to be of ‘real universal interest’, and not merely as a facilitation of locally contained scholarly work in Rome.934 This amounted to a more ‘active’ (but at the same time more abstract) ‘definition’ of the aims and the purpose of the Unione, embracing the symbolic allure of Rome, ancient and mediaeval archaeological and philological source material, indeed the nucleus of the force of the classical tradition itself, and of the gestation of ‘universal values’ in post-war Rome.

As is the case for domestic Italian voices regarding the foreign academies in Rome, AIAC and the Unione, German perspectives regarding the issue of the restitution of the German scholarly institutions in Italy after the war are elusive and often absent in the sources. Archival material at the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence (not previously studied) however provides several significant exceptions.

In a sense, German scholars were beaten with both ends of the stick after the war, they not only almost lost their research institutes to the ‘international’ administration of the Unione; the administration and upkeep of the institutes were furthermore to be funded by liquidated German assets (through the Unione).

A German Kommission für die deutsche wissenschaftliche Arbeit im Ausland was established at the same time as Morey left his position at the US Embassy and the presidency of the Unione in 1950. The four powers treaty was referred to by the German commission as the ‘Morey-Plan’; certain correspondence hints at lobbying efforts by various German art historians being the main reason for the state department to abandon the treaty and the vision of Morey and the US Embassy.\textsuperscript{935} From the German perspective it was imperative to act rapidly:

Ich hoffe, dass auch Sie der Ansicht sind, dass wir die bedingungslose Kapitulation der Union nicht abwarten sollten, denn es könnte durch das Eingreifen des State Department auch anders kommen. Die Gelder dürften natürlich nur für die Institute, nicht aber für

die Parasiten ausgegeben werden. Die Bezeichnung librarian, statt Direktor dürfte wohl keinen vernünftigen Kollegen stören.936

The German commission also had to deal with the issue of the German art academy (Villa Massimo – the former ‘Preussische Akademie der Künste’), as this did not fall under the jurisdiction of the Unione, but was controlled by the Italian foreign ministry.937 Plans for a ‘station’ for German research at Villa Massimo were for example entertained for some time.938


938 Cf. Baethgen, ‘An die Mitglieder der Kommission für die deutsche wissenschaftliche Arbeit im Ausland’, München, December 13, 1949. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence: ‘Auf jeden Fall halte ich es für unbedingt notwendig, den Plan der Station mit allen Kräften weiter zu verfolgen, da die Regelung der Frage der alten Institute sicher noch geraume Zeit erfordern wird und ein Widerauftreten deutscher Wissenschaftler auf dem römischen Boden unbedingt sobald als irgendmöglich erfolgen sollte’. Ludwig Heydenreich was proposed as the first director of the station at Villa Massimo. See also the
In November 1949, Ludwig Heydenreich received the following report regarding the breakdown of the four powers treaty a few months earlier, by William George Constable (1887-1976), curator of painting at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts 1938-1957:

It is the best of news that the Commission for German Scientific Work Abroad has been established, and that there is a prospect, not only of your getting quarters in Villa Massimo, but that there is a likelihood of securing money to maintain the Center and to transfer this money to Italy’. [The Center is] not planned to act as an institute. [...] Meanwhile the establishment of the Center will secure the end for which we have all been striving – to find a way for German participation in control and administration of the former German Institutes, so that these could be truly international in scope and idea. [...] As you may know, I went to Italy this summer and while in Rome and Florence had a good many interviews and made a number of investigations into the problem of the Institutes on behalf of United States Military Government. I wrote the report on the matter which was sent to various officials in Germany. As you know, various obstacles to realizing the plan agreed upon for international control had arisen. Some of these had come from Germany, some from Italy. As a result, in my report, I urged Military Government to put all the weight it could behind realization of the plan as drawn up by the International Union and in addition to urge the early association of Germans with the control and administration of the Institutes and to do everything that could be done to facilitate the export of money. I pointed out that the establishment of some serious

---

Italian Atti Parlamentari (Camera dei Deputati, 37700 – Legislatura II – Discussioni), November 12, 1957, regarding the ’esatto stato di applicazione ed esecuzione dell’accordo De Gasperi-Adenauer del 24 febbraio 1953, concernente la parte italiana la restituzione di quattro istituti culturali e da parte germanica la restituzione delle opere d’arte e materiale culturale asportati dall’Italia durante l’occupazione nazista. [...] Per conoscere altresì se la villa Massimo, recentemente restituita alle autorità germaniche, rientra fra gli istituti la cui restituzione era prevista dall’accordo sopracitato’. Also questions regarding the continuation of l’insistito e umiliante sistema di sfratto degli artisti, che nella villa Massimo avevano i loro studi’. See also for example Arnold Esch, ’Die deutschen Institutsbibliotheken nach dem Ende des Zweiten Weltkriegs und die Rolle der Unione degli Istituti: Internationalisierung, Italianisierung – oder Rückgabe an Deutschland?" in Deutsche Forschungs- und Kulturinstitute in Rom in der Nachkriegszeit, ed. Michael Matheus (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2007), 87.
equivalent of a new German Institute in Italy was essential and suggested that Military
Government should favor this project as a step towards German association with the
larger project.939

Constable’s report indicated a different conceptualisation of
‘internationalisation’ than that of the Unione. For Constable, the libraries
could not be considered truly ‘international’ without German involvement.
It is possible that the Unione would have been more successful in applying
for UNESCO funding with such an approach.940

The commission for German scientific work abroad was led by Friedrich
Baethgen (President of the ‘Monumenta’).941 It consisted of Hans Jantzen
(professor of art history, Munich and president of the “Verband
Deutscher Kunsthistoriker”), Theodor Klauser (principal of the university
of Bonn, ‘representing the Historical Institute of the Görres-Gesellschaft
at Rome’), Dieter Sattler (Staatssekretär – connected with the Villa
Massimo), Carl Weickert (President of the DAI, represented by professor

939 W.G. Constable to Heydenreich, November 8, 1949. The Kunsthistorisches
Institut archives, Florence.
940 Constable’s ideas were on the other hand not very well received: ‘Waehrend
Mr. Birley von Ihnen gar nicht genug am 10 Juni hofiert werden kann, war die
Stimmung gegen Constable sehr schlecht. [...] Ausserdem glaubt Herr Klauser,
sicher zu sein, dass ein Gutteil der mission des Herrn Constable in Deutschland
darin besteund, den gefallenen Plan der Unione nachtraeglich doch noch
durchzudruecken. Herr Klauser hat Constable als einen direkten Sendboten von
C.R. Morey bezeichnet. [...] Derr Hemmschuh sind und bleiben die
Archaeologen. Vielleicht muss Herr Weickert so unendlich vorsichtig operieren,
weil seine Zentraldirektion ganz offensichtlich nicht hinter ihm steht. Die
ungeheure Tradition des Instituts mache es schwer, irgend welche Rechte an die
Beiden Nach ardisziplinen zu delegieren.’ Unidentified author
(Kunstgeschichtliches Institut, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität), to
Wolfgang Lotz (Zentralinstitut fuer Kunstgeschichte, Munich), June 1, 1949. The
Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.
941 Cf. Baethgen, ‘An die Mitglieder der Kommission für die deutsche
wissenschaftliche Arbeit im Ausland”, München, December 18, 1950; and
Weickert to Baethgen, October 10, 1950 (regarding the DAIR). The
Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.
Bittel (professor of archaeology at the University of Tübingen). The Hertziana representative had not yet been named.\(^{942}\)

Constable wrote to Heydenreich in the summer of 1949 that he ‘wanted again to discuss with you the question of the former German Institutes in Italy. I have become deeply interested in this question and I am very anxious that some proper solution should be achieved. Alas I am no longer in any way connected with Military Government, I can therefore write to you as a private person. In that capacity my advice would be that you ask Dr. von Herwarth, who is much interested in the subject, to write to Dr. Ralph Burns, head of the Cultural Branch of OMGUS at Bad Nauheim, putting very briefly indeed the main points at issue, and ask whether Military Government would be willing to take steps to explore the matter’.\(^{943}\)

In November 1949, Heydenreich declared that he had been made an ‘extraordinary member’ of the commission, ‘because I am supposed to become the first director of the below mentioned GERMAN CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND ARTS in Rome’. On Morey’s suggestion the commission had sent an ‘Application for Release of Villa Massimo, Rome, to establish a German Station for Science and Arts’ to the US state department. Heydenreich related to Constable that the planned Center at Villa Massimo was planned to play a (neutral) part in the lobbying

943 Constable to Heydenreich, June 20, 1949. Cf. ‘Bericht von F.W. Deichmann über die Lage des Archaeologischen Instituts’; as well as ‘Promemoria über die Lage der deutschen Institute in Italien erstattet von Prof. Werner Heisenberg (Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Deutscher Forschungsrat) und Prof. Theodor Klauser (Zentraldirektion des Archäologischen Instituts. Görres-Gesellschaft. Kuratorium der Notgemeinschaft)’. (1949?). This promemoria does not mention the removal of the libraries from Italy in 1944. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.
enterprise concerning the four remaining German institutes: ‘You see that this project of the planned “Center of Study” is a completely independent institution and has nothing to do with the former German Institutes. But it is the idea of Dr. Morey that the director of this “Center” should join the International Unione, so that Germany would be represented with one seat and one vote in the administration of her former Institutes. I think that this is to be a wonderful project. It gives us a good chance of cooperating in future with the Union on the common interest to re-establish the activity of our former Institutes. Quod felix faustumque sit!’

In March 1950, Friedrich Baethgen formulated a proposal to unite all previous German research institutions in Rome (the DAIR, the DHI, the Hertziana and the Görres-Gesellschaft, based at the Vatican) in one new institute, in analogy with ‘all other nations’. This proposal would most

944 Heydenreich to Constable, November 2, 1949. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.
945 The Görres-Gesellschaft was at that time not a member of the Unione, ‘being a ecclesiastical one and located in the Vatican, has not been confiscated, and for that reason it is not under the control of the International Union’. Heydenreich to Constable, November 2, 1949. See also Baethgen to Staatsssekretär Dr. Wende, Bundesministerium des Innern, Bonn, March 21, 1950. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence: ‘[…] in den Bundeshaushalt schon jetzt die vollen Mittel für eine Widerübernahme der römischen Institute einzusetzen. Zu nächst ist nach meiner Kenntnis der Dinge nicht der leiseste Anhaltspunkt dafür gegeben, dass mit einer Rückgabe der Institute in irgendwie absehbarer Zeit zu rechnen ist. […] Man wird danach noch weniger als schon bisher sagen können, dass der sogenannte Morey-Plan erledigt sei; vielmehr werden wir von der Tatsache ausgehen müssen, dass wir vorerst keinerlei Verfügungsrecht über die römischen und das Florentiner Institut besitzen. […] Ich bin daher in Übereinstimmung mit verschiedenen anderen Kommissions-mitgliedern der Meinung, dass die Frage, ob wir wirklich das Ziel anstreiben sollten, wiederum in Rom drei völlig selbständige Institute und mit dem der Görresgesellschaft sogar vier, zu unterhalten, einer ernsthaften Prüfung bedürfte, und dass sorgfältig zu überlegen sei, ob es nicht angesichts der Tatsache, dass die sämtlichen anderen Nationen in Rom jeweils nur ein institut haben, auch für uns angebracht wäre, eine stärker Zusammenfassung der Institute anzustreben’.

European University Institute
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likely have stranded if attempted, if nothing else due to the legal complications of combining the different statuses of the institutions. The notion of a new German institute in Rome had also been discussed by Constable in the autumn of 1949: ‘I think it is a chose jugée that they [the German institutes] will pass under international control; though that is not yet finally settled. The major problem is (if such events come to pass) to secure proper representation of Germany in the governing body and in the administration of the libraries. This at present is not difficult, owing to Germany being unable to export funds; and I am much exercised as to how the necessary steps, such as founding a new German Institute in Rome, can be accomplished’.  

German politicians and scholars increased their lobbying activities regarding the German institutes in Italy in 1950, partly spurred on the petition by 109 Italian scholars represented by Gaetano De Sanctis (cf. section 5.8).  

A similar petition – or ‘a call (not a ‘protest’) to the entire


\footnote{447} See for example Bundeskanzler Adenauer to John McCloy, ‘dem Geschäftsführenden Vorsitzenden der Alliierten Hohen Kommission’, November 14, 1950 (with an attached ‘Memorandum über die deutschen Institute in Italien’). Cf. an article regarding the DAIR by Paolino Mingazzini (Università di Genova) in \textit{Il Mondo}, October 7, 1950: ‘[…] allorché venni a sapere che, per ordine degli Alleati, tramite una Union Académique Internationale di novella formazione, costituita dai direttori degli Istituti straniere di archeologia e storia d’arte esistenti a Roma [...] aveva affidato la Gestione della biblioteca dell’Istituto Germanico ad una certa Associazione Archeologica Internazionale […] di recentissima formazione e per di più un ente privato, pensai che fosse cosa transitoria, in attesa del trattato di pace, che certamente avrebbe ridato ai tedeschi una proprietà chi era loro non soltanto per ragioni giuridiche (la proprietà intellettuale non può essere trasferita da nessuna clausola legale), ma anche per ragioni pratiche […] in questo caso le persone direttamente interessate non sono né i diplomatici, né i direttori delle scuole straniere a Roma, ma solo coloro che sanno per esperienza quale insostituibile mezzo di lavoro sia la biblioteca, che i tedeschi misero su in più di cento anni di fatica assidua ed intelligente’. See also \textit{Il Messaggero} (di Roma), September 19, 1950 (‘Una
scholarly world’ by German scholars of the humanities, against the four powers treaty-solution – was discussed in late 1948 (by F.W. Deichmann of the DAIR).\textsuperscript{948}

In a 1950 memorandum regarding the ‘former German institutes in Italy, the office of the US high commissioner for Germany posed the following questions: (a) Did the Vatican protest against the confiscation of the German libraries in Italy? When? To whom? On what grounds? (Such a protest has been reported, but no record is available in Washington). (b) Would the Bonn government provide a single budget for the four institutes, or does it favor revival of one institute more than of another and therefore propose a varying scale of support?\textsuperscript{949}

\begin{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{949} Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany – ‘Office Memorandum, September 23, 1950 – from Professor Baethgen and Professor Heydenreich to Mr. Heinrich – Subject: Former German Institutes in Italy’. Cf. (unidentified) report, Geneva, April 25, 1950: ‘There are 4 German Institutes in Rome […]. Hitherto the financial means given to the Unione by the UNESCO were hardly sufficient for paying the salaries of a few officials. This is a very serious question, for a library that is not permanently supplied by new publications is soon antiquated.
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Salat (of the Bundeskanzleramt) wrote to Italian minister Babuscio Rizzo regarding the restitution of the institutions, and went to Rome in 1951 to assist Bundeskanzler Adenauer in discussing the restitution with De Gasperi and Sforza:

Die Italiener waren über den Plan der drei Allierten auf das Äusserste verstimmt, zumal sie nicht vorher informiert werden waren. Sie sprachen sich gegen die Anerkennung der Union als “Entente morale” aus und haben sich in den Tagen des Besuches des Bundeskanzlers zu einem neuen Vorschlag durchgerungen. Dieser sieht eine Stellung der Institute unter italienisches Sequester bis zum Friedensvortrag vor, wobei aber die volle Verwaltung Deutschland werden soll.

Grenier did not give up after the breakdown of the ‘four powers treaty’ in 1949, and the ‘Morey-Plan’ was followed by a Frank Brown-plan in 1950 (advocating the return of the DAIR to German control), and a ‘Grenier-

The German circles interested in Archaeology, History and Art are ready to the best of their ability to undergo the financial burdens connected with these Institutes and their libraries. Therefore it should be considered whether Germany could not be authorized by the Allies to help in the Administration of the libraries and their financial support.

The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.

Cf. Heydenreich to Deichmann, December 21, 1950. Salat was furthermore wary of correspondence regarding the German institutions ‘getting into the wrong hands’. This caution was specifically expressed vis-à-vis UNESCO. See Salat to Heydenreich, March 30, 1951. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence: ‘Ich habe es vorgezogen, in dem Brief nicht näher auf die UNESCO-Sitzung über die Institute einzugehen, da man nie weiß, in welche Hände die Korrespondenz fallen kann’.


Cf. Staatssekretär Wende (Bundesministerium des Innern) to Klauser, April 21, 1950. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence: ‘In der Begründung, die der Herr Finanzminister zunächst nur in grossen Zügen weitergegeben hat, ist davon die Rede, dass in Rom anstelle des Morey-Plans ein Plan von Professor Brown, des Direktors der amerikanischen Schule in Rom, in Vordergrund stehen, und dass nach diesem Plan Deutschland die Verwaltung des Archäologischen
Plan’ in 1951 – a more lenient version, with the Unione in control of the libraries for 25 years, rather than 99, the funding of the operation still conceived to be through the ‘biens allemands’, or confiscated German assets.\textsuperscript{953} Salat reported in June 1951 that the Allies were still negotiating the future of the libraries, and that Germany had to do its utmost through demarches in ‘the three Allied capitals’:

\begin{quote}
[...] bereits einen Vertrag auf 25 Jahre internationalisiert werden sollen; die Verwaltung solle der uns wohlbekannten „International Union“ überlassen werden [...] Der Vertragsentwurf fasse aber nicht, wie ursprünglich angenommen, eine Internationalisierung auf 25 Jahre, sondern nur eine Internationalisierung für die Zeit bis zum Friedensvertrag ins Auge. [...] Herr Mameli teilte auf Anfrage des Herrn Salat bei dieser Gelegenheit mit, dass der Brief, den der generaldirektor der UNESCO in der Institutsfrage an die italienische Regierung gerichtet habe, nicht beantwortet worden sei; die UNESCO sei nicht befugt, sich um die Institute zu kümmern. [...] Der Abschluss des Internationalisierungsvertrages ist am Widerstand Italiens zunächst gescheitert; die allierten Regierungen müssen erneut verhandeln; Deutschland muss versuchen, sich in diese Verhandlungen durch entsprechende Schritte in den drei allierten Hauptstädten irgendwie einzuschalten; eine Entscheidung, die dem deutschen Standpunkt Rechnung
\end{quote}


In general terms, the German scholars active in the issue of the restitution of the German institutions in Italy were waiting for the peace treaty with Germany (which never came), believing that no stable solution could be found before the advent of such a treaty: ‘it is here a matter of a political question, which can only be resolved with the peace treaty.’\footnote{W. Heisenberg to Klauser, May 31, 1949: ‘[…] dort an Herrn Morey angelangen, und an Einwande scheitern, es handele sich hier um eine politische Frage, die erst im Friedensvertrag geklärt werden könnte’. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence. The Treaty on the Final Settlement With Respect to Germany was eventually signed in 1990, reunifying Germany and officially ending the Second World War.}

In June 1951, Benedetto Croce had published an open letter sceptical of restitution of the libraries to German control, which sparked discussions among the German scholars involved in the lobbying efforts regarding the German institutions.\footnote{Cf. Il Giornale d’Italia, July 18, 1951 (‘Scambio di lettere tra l’ambasciatore Tedesco e Croce’) and La Nazione, Firenze, June 24, 1951 (‘Biblioteche e Istituti tedeschi in Italia – Una lettera di Benedetto Croce per una infondata richiesta di Adenauer’). See also La Nazione Italiana, August 18, 1951 (‘Una complicata vicenda da risolvere – Le biblioteche germaniche in Italia’). Croce’s letter was also publicised in German media, for example in the Neue Zeitung, June 27, 1951 and July 4, 1951 (‘Der misverstandene Croce’). Cf. Heydenreich to Salat, June 29, 1951: ‘[…] Croce wiederum ein opfer eines Missverständnis geworden ist, den er scheint doch offensichtlich von der Meinung auszugeben, dass Adenauer die Schutzklause für das Verbleiben der Institute in Italien angefochten habe. […] von Seiten des Auswärtigen Amtes eine Berichtigung herausgeben und in der Presse veröffentlicht wird; […] durchaus versöhnlichen Tones sein und gleichsam “mit schmerzlichen Bedauern” […]. Aber irgendwie Ausserung von Seiten des Auswärtiges Amtes müsste unserer Meinung nach erfolgen’. See also Kommission für die deutsche Wissenschaftliche Arbeit im Ausland – ‘Bericht über die neuerliche Entwicklung der Institutsfrage’ (Klauser), July 27, 1951: ‘Einige italienische Zeitungen hatten die Erklärung des Bundeskanzlers auf der Pressekonferenz so wiedergegeben, dass der falsche Eindruck entstehen konnte, als habe der Kanzler die Überführung der Institute nach Deutschland verlangt. Diese Nachricht veranlasste Benedetto Croce, in einem Schreiben and den Direktor des Giornale d’Italia an die 1921 von der deutschen Regierung }

One of the German contacts in the
In 1952, the Unione consisted of four Italian member-institutions – the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, the Giunta Centrale per gli Studi Storici, the Istituto Nazionale di Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte, and the Istituto di Studi Romani – and eleven ‘non-Italian’ member-institutions (AIAC and the foreign academies). AIAC pursued its original tasks as member of the Unione; i.e. the custody of the DAIR library as well as the regular publication of archaeological bibliographies in the *Fasti*. These two activities merged to some extent; Grenier for example complained that funds allocated for the maintenance of the DAIR library were instead being consumed by the *Fasti*. The necessity of subventions from the...
Unione itself illustrates an aspect of the interdependence and interplay between AIAC and the Unione.

The DAIR library needed a librarian, and Grenier discussed the matter with Luigi de Gregori. The necessary sum for updating the library with publications (dating from 1940 onwards) was estimated at 30,000,000 lire, which can be contrasted with the total monthly maintenance cost, estimated at 200,000 lire. The publication of the *Fasti* had been temporarily secured by a donation by a certain Dr. Mattioli, but depended on further subventions.

The financial situation of the Unione remained problematic. The lack of stable funding meant that the Unione had to rely on regular short-term

---

960 See promemoria regarding AIAC. Grenier to Morey (in the latter's function as president of the Unione), March 6, 1950. 'Union 1946-1949. File 'Historique. L'UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953': 'Quest' spesa mensile modestissima garantirebbe un funzionamento quasi normale della Biblioteca. [...] sarebbe molto opportuno se [...] il Comitato dei Quattro concedesse almeno per la pubblicazioni più importanti e particolarmente per quelle che incominciano a diventare rari, una somma sufficiente per iniziare le ordinazioni (3 o 4 milioni)'. Cf. 'Situation de l'Association d'Archéologie Classique au 31 mars 1950. Rapport du Président' (Grenier), April 11, 1950. EFR, box 'Union 1946-1949'. File 'Historique. L'UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953': 'À partir du Ier Avril [1950], l'Union doit nous verser 150,000 lire par mois. C'est sur cette somme qu'il nous faut établir notre budget [...]. A ces dépenses il faut nécessairement ajouter celle d'un bibliothécaire tenant à jour la bibliographie et surveillant l'ensemble. À cet effet nous nous sommes assuré le concours de M. [Luigi] de Gregori, bibliothécaire de profession qui, étant employé au Ministère, pourra néanmoins nous donner ses après-midi et à qui nous attribuerons la rétribution très modeste de 20,000 lire par mois. [...] M. [Federico] Pfister est généralement à la Bibliothèque le matin; M. de Gregori y sera l'après midi. La Bibliothèque accueillera les membres de l'Association et les travailleurs présentés par eux'. See also Grenier to Morey, June 10, 1950 ('[... before offering the libraries to the Germans'), Morey to Grenier, June 19, 1950, and Grenier to Morey, June 21, 1950. EFR, box 'Union 1950-1955'. File 'Union 1950'.

961 Promemoria regarding AIAC. Grenier to Morey (as President of the Unione), March 6, 1950. EFR, box 'Union 1946-1949. File 'Historique. L'UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953': 'Da parte dell'UNESCO credo che si possa contare su di un contributo annuo di circa 1500 dollari'.
fundraising.\textsuperscript{962} The Bibliotheca Hertziana and the DAIR library had both returned to their original pre-war locations by early 1948 (in Palazzo Zuccari and Via Sardegna, respectively). The buildings had been confiscated at the end of the war, and the repatriation of the libraries in their original locations and the bureaucratic and judicial endeavours involved in their return proved to be time-consuming, laborious and murky. Palazzo Zuccari was for example still occupied by the Red Cross in March 1950, despite instructions from Geneva that the Rome office should be closed, as its pressing post-war exigencies were fading.\textsuperscript{963} In 1953, Ward-Perkins informed EFR director Jean Bayet about the situation regarding the German libraries and the lack of information on the part of the Unione:

I received the impression in our conversation the other day that you felt you had been “left in the dark” about the course of negotiations for the restitution of the libraries. [...] As you well know, [Laurance] Roberts and M. Grenier and I (and now yourself) have been placed in a very difficult position these last few years. The last official communication that the Union received about the course of negotiations was (I believe) in 1949! Since that date, we have, as individuals, been kept informed by our respective Embassies of the progress of negotiations, but we have not been in a position to discuss them officially with our colleagues. Any advice that the three of us might give was necessarily given in

\textsuperscript{962} In March 1949, Axel Boëthius for example complained to SIR director Arvid Andrén that he had not received the Fasti Archeologici, despite ‘with great difficulty having procured 500 dollars for them’. Andrén replied that although he was part of the board of the Unione ‘as Sjöqvist’s successor’, he had little to do with the distribution of the Fasti. Andrén to Boëthius, March 9, 1949. SIR, Korrespondens 1939-. Andrén was absent from several Unione meetings without sending a substitute representative (‘non rappresentato’), which illustrates a difference in commitment compared to that of Sjöqvist. Cf. Unione session, April 4, 1952. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union/Association, textes de base, liaisons internationales’.

\textsuperscript{963} See promemoria regarding AIAC. Grenier to Morey (as President of the Unione), March 6, 1950. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Historique. L’UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953’.
our capacities as Directors of the French, American and British Schools, not as official
representatives of the Union – a fact which we stressed on every possible occasion. [...] To the best of my belief, every important step that has been taken by any one of us has been taken with the full knowledge and approval of his two colleagues. Recently the position has been radically changed by the inclusion of the Italians in the negotiations, which are thus no longer a confidential matter between the three Allied governments. The Union has not yet received formal notification of the libraries; but it has received an unofficial notification, through its President, that the date prepared is the 30th April, and it has been asked to do everything possible to facilitate the transfer. [...] At the same time the Union has received an official letter from the Chairman of the Committee for the disposal of German assets announcing the gift to the Union of 125 million lire. [...] In all of this, I have to admit that I assumed that both Roberts and yourself had been kept informed of these decisions by the American and French members on the Allied Committee. It now appears that you at any rate were not informed [...] ⁹⁶⁴

Ward-Perkins testimony highlights multiple belongings and shortcomings in communication between the academy directors, as well as the limitations as a result of the restricted available channels of information. Information regarding the restitution negotiations was disseminated to the directors through the mediation of diplomatic bodies. The multiple belongings of the

The Unione was faced with the problem of dealing with a strong Italian opinion (mainly in Rome and in Florence) opposed to the very existence of the Unione and the principles of international collaboration that it clearly manifested. These opinions served domestic national interests and requirements and advocated the treatment of the German libraries as Italian state property, to be disposed of as the Italian

authorities saw fit. There was no clear compromise or ‘third way’ in sight, at least not until Germany might eventually be able to lay claims to the administration of the libraries for itself.

The DHI library had been deposited in the Vatican since its return to Italy after the war; the art historical library in Florence functioned to some extent thanks to a contribution from the local Florentine Chamber of Commerce in the early 1950s. The society of the Kunsthistorisches Institut reconstituted itself in 1951, moving its headquarters to Munich. The former director of the institute, Ludwig Heydenreich, became chairman of the society. Heydenreich now held the post of director of the Central Institute of Art History in Munich. Practical issues regarding the three remaining libraries had been placed in the hands of three commissari: Federico Pfister for the DAIR library, Hoogewerff for the Hertziana, and Enrico Jahier for the Florentine library. The issue of Federico Pfister's


967 The library of the Kunsthistorisches Institut had been transferred to the Central Collecting Point in Offenbach in 1945. The library was made accessible from August 14, 1947 under the provisional directorship of Enrico Jahier, as the ‘Biblioteca Internazionale d’Arte’. Cf. ‘Promemoria for conclusion of transfer of libraries’ (Ward-Perkins), May 15, 1953: ‘[…] financial agreement between Union and Germans. […] Inform Mr. Campbell of signature, and he will notify other Embassies and Committee for German Assets. Prepare letters of instruction to AIAC (Boëthius), [Enrico] Jahier and Hoogewerff. On receipts of instructions from Embassies and Committee, send instructions to three Libraries to complete the transfer. […] The Germans will give a cheque for the whole sum stated in the Annex to the Union […]. The Union will pay Jahier and Hoogewerff directly’. See also Unione session, April 30, 1953 – the maximum financial compensation for the commissari was 3 million lire for Pfister, 2 million for Hoogewerff, 1.5 million for Jahier for ‘indennità legale e liquidazione degli obblighi morali’; and Unione session, May 11, 1953: ‘Approvazione della minuta del testo della Convenzione Finanziaria fra l'Unione e i Tedeschi’ (Ward-Perkins, president). Enrico Jahier
remuneration for his work as the DAIR *commissario* became a matter of controversy – he received letters of support from Morey, Sjöqvist and Grenier.968 Axel Boëthius (representing both the SIR and AIAC), reported that the Germans would be financially responsible for the four libraries, but that the Unione would have to cover the cost of the administrative staff (possibly also retrospectively).969

After the breakdown of the ‘four powers treaty’ in August 1949 (cf. section 6.4), the four German libraries were, until their restitution to German control in 1953, collectively denominated ‘international libraries of archaeology, history and history of art’, and individually referred to as the ‘international library of classical archaeology, Rome’ (DAIR), the ‘international historical library, Rome’ (DHI), the ‘international Hertziana

---

968 See for example Morey to Pfister, July 30, 1951: ‘I was very glad to be of any use at all in trying to get you the reimbursement you certainly are entitled to, for all your devoted service to the Archaeological Library and the Union’; Pfister (AIAC) to the Unione, before the March 30, 1953 session, with the request that the three ‘commissari’ were to be exempt from all future responsibilities regarding the libraries. Cf. Unione session, April 27, 1953: ‘Boëthius [‘representing’ Pfister] riferisce su uno scambio di corrispondenza con Pfister, nel quale è messo in chiaro che Pfister non avanza alcuna pretesa di rimunerazione per l’opera prestata come Segretario dell’AIAC durante gli anni dal 1946 fino all’Aprile 1953’. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Historique. L’UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953’. Hoogewerff was appointed ‘direttore onorario’ (as *commissario*) of the Hertziana before its restitution to German control in 1953.

library, Rome’, and the ‘international art historical library, Florence’.970

One cannot help wondering what impact this would have had on the
Roman (and Florentine) scholarly community and the internal dynamic
between the foreign academies in Rome, had this situation been
maintained rather than the libraries being restituted to German
administration in 1953. This ‘international’ position (the return of the four
libraries to German control viewed as a ‘debasement’) was most clearly
taken by the EFR (by director Grenier and his successor Bayet), but was
also advocated from the outset by Morey, for example.

The EFR devoted substantial time and energy lobbying for the
‘international’ solution of the management of the German libraries
through the control of the Unione. The EFR above all blamed the
Americans for the breakdown of negotiations after 1949. In May 1950,
Adrien Bruhl (EFR general secretary) established that ‘after ten months,
negotiations in fact remain blocked as the US state department has left its
delegate in Rome without any instruction relative to the libraries, does not
give any answer to questions and does not define its attitude’. The
situation would undoubtedly have ‘deplorable consequences’ and lead to
further interallied discord if it was to continue.971

970 Cf. Unione statutes (registered October 29, 1949, signed November 8, 1949),
§12-14. EFR, box ‘Union 1946-1949’. File ‘Union/Association, textes de base,
fiaisons internationales’: ‘Le biblioteche amministrate dall’Unione sono
collettivamente denominate “Biblioteche Internazionali di Archeologia, Storia e
Storia dell’Arte” ed individualmente come: — Biblioteca Internazionale di
Archeologia Classica, Roma. — Biblioteca Internazionale Storica, Roma. —
Biblioteca Internazionale Hertziana, Roma. — Biblioteca Internazionale di Storia
dell’Arte, Firenze’.

971 Adrien Bruhl (EFR general secretary), May 10, 1950. ‘Note pour Monsieur
Vieillefond’ (cultural counsellor at the French Embassy in Rome). EFR, box EFR,
négociations restent bloquées parce que le Département d’État américain laisse
son délégué à Rome sans aucune instruction relativement aux Bibliothèques, ne
donne aucune réponse aux questions qui lui sont posées et ne définit pas son
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Ward-Perkins urged the directors of the foreign academies in Rome to follow his example of lobbying for the continued control of the Unione vis-à-vis the German libraries. Morey stressed the necessity of securing stable funding for the libraries, in preparation for his representation of the Unione at the fifth session of the UNESCO preparatory commission in London in 1950. Morey listed the nine delegates of the ‘commission for reference’; he was himself listed as one of five potential ‘substitutes’ for the American delegate, Dr. Esther Brunauer.

In February 1953, the French ambassador to Italy related that ‘the French, United States and United Kingdom Governments have recently [...]
reached agreement amongst themselves to release [the German] Libraries from their custody and to return them to their former German owners'.

The libraries were finally returned to German control during spring 1953. The allied mandate of the AIAC custody of the DAIR library

---

974 Jacques Fouques-Duparc (French Ambassador to Italy) to Georges Bidault at the French foreign ministry, February 6, 1953. EFR, box 'Union 1946-1949'. File 'Historique. L'UNION et les Bibliotheques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953'.

975 See restitution treaty (the four libraries, Palazzo Zuccari and the Villino Amelung were returned to the German Federal Republic); as well as Unione session, April 20, 1953: 'Trasferimento delle Biblioteche ai Tedeschi'. Cf. 'Promemoria for conclusion of transfer of libraries' (Ward-Perkins), May 15, 1953. EFR, box '1946-1949'. File 'Historique. L'UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953'. The DAIR library was 'transferred' on May 26, 1953. See also Anselmo M. Albareda (Prefect, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana) to Jean Bayet, May 29, 1953, regarding the restitution of the DHI library ('in essa depositati con i protocolli del 25 agosto 1947'). Cf. receipt for payments to the Unione from the German Embassy (more than 11 million Lire), June 13, 1953. EFR, box 'Union 1946-1949'. File 'Historique. L'UNION et les Bibliothèques ex-Allemandes, textes et Documents 1952-1953'. The Hertziana reopened on October 1, 1953 with the new name 'Bibliotheca Hertziana (Max-Planck-Institut)' under the direction of Franz Graf Wolff Metternich (1893-1973). Count Metternich had experienced several conflicts with the Nazis during the war as leader of the Deutscher Militärer Kunstschutz (German Military Art Protection Front). His actions won him the respect and sympathy of above all his French fellow art historians. As an employee of the German foreign office after the war, Count Metternich also took part in the discussions and negotiations regarding the German foreign institutes. Cf. Thoenes, "Geschichte des Instituts," 26. Ludwig Heydenreich, director of the Florentine Kunsthistorisches Institut, became a voluntary member of the Kunstschutz, and was instrumental in the marking of historic buildings in Florence, Siena and Pisa with warning signs, intended to obstruct and prevent military use or occupancy. The German federal government pledged to maintain the Florentine institute, which was returned to the control of the executive board of the society of the institute on April 30, 1953. Enrico Jahier was awarded the Federal Cross of Merit for his services as interim director. The Kunsthistorisches Institut was formally reopened in 1953, with a commemoration of Friedrich Kriegbaum. Ulrich Middeldorf (1901-1983) was appointed the new director of the institute. The Max-Planck Society (MPG) took over the funding of the Institute on June 3, 2002, after an appeal from the German federal ministry of research and education in 2000. Cf. http://www.khi.fi.it/en/institut/geschichte/index.html (visited May 21, 2010). For the reopening of the institute, cf. 'Zur Wiedereroeffnung des Institutes' (Bundeskanzler Adenauer, February 27, 1953, agreement with the Italian government), as well as 'Ansprache des 1. Vorsitzenden des Vereins zur Erhaltung des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz, Herrn Generaldirektor Prof. Dr. E. Hanfstaengl anlaesslich der Rueckgabe des Institutes in deutsche Verwaltung am 9.6.1953. [...] Signori! Il giorno, nel quale l'Istituto di Storia dell'Arte viene restituito alla Germania e torno sotto la nostra amministrazione è per noi – e questo è facilmente immaginabile – un momento importante e solenne allo stesso tempo. È significativo perché così è venuta l'ora in cui possono essere riprese le
largely maintained through the efforts of ‘commissario’ Federico Pfister) expired on April 30, 1953, when the diplomatic arrangements with Germany had finally been completed satisfactorily. The library was officially returned to the DAIR in a ceremony on May 1 at the SIR, when the library was handed over by Federico Pfister to the first post-war director of the DAIR, Guido von Kaschnitz-Weinberg. The DAIR was symbolically (and typically, for a discipline wholly identified with and resting on tradition – the classical tradition as well as the scholarly traditions of classical archaeology and ancient history themselves) re-opened on Winckelmann’s birthday (December 9) 1953. The choice of location was symbolic, as the SIR was the site both of the preservation of the DAIR catalogue during the war, as well as of the AIAC provisional committee meetings in 1945 and the constituting meeting of the Unione in 1946. The ‘occupation’ of the DAIR building on Via Sardenga, 79 by AIAC until 1953 was also symbolic.976

Commenting on an article in Le Monde regarding the restitution of the German libraries (‘the specialists of the numerous foreign academies in Rome, notably those of Palazzo Farnese and the Vatican, hide their

relazioni culturali e spirituali tra l’Italia e il nostro paese. Il caso da parte italiana], ci è stato provato non solo negli ultimi giorni, ma durante tutto il lungo periodo delle trattative di riconsegna, e in un modo tale, che ha fatto la più profonda impressione a me e ai miei collaboratori e ci ha riempito [veramente] di grande gioia. [...] Questa nostra gratitudine la dobbiamo [...] soprattutto al Professore Jahier, il quale [...] ha svolto la sua opera come direttore dell’Istituto ed ha messo per molti anni le sue forze a disposizione dei nostri comuni interessi, e precisamente del mantenimento di questa Biblioteca’. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence.

disappointment badly’), EFR director Bayet challenged the claim that the restitution of the German libraries had ‘awoken old petulance and rivalries that an international organism might have eliminated’. Bayet contextualised the issue, emphasising that the ICA had been ‘captured by the German Empire’ in 1871, and that, after the restitution, ‘all will not have been lost of ‘the post-war dream’ [...] which was fine indeed.977

Upon the full entry of the German institutes in the Unione in 1953, following a treaty between the USA, Britain, France and Italy, the first phase of the Unione had come to an end.978 Ward-Perkins was president of the Unione when the German libraries were officially returned to German control (1953-1954). The president of the Italian Republic (Luigi Einaudi, replaced by Giovanni Gronchi in 1955) elevated the Unione to Italian Ente Morale-status in 1955. The same year Gino Filipetto (librarian and secretary of the SIR) assumed Sjöqvist’s former position as secretary-general of the Unione.979


With the restitution of the German libraries, and their installation in their pre-war locations, the immediate task of the Unione had thus come to a conclusion. Problems relating to the funding and maintenance of the libraries remained, however. Above all Sjöqvist and Ward-Perkins had spent a considerable amount of time and energy on fundraising to cover the necessary expenses such as rent, electricity and heating, as secretary-general and treasurer of the Unione. A commission was nominated for investigating the possible future activities of the Unione (after the restitution of the libraries) in 1952.⁹⁸⁰

It was considered essential that necessary funds in order for the Unione to function after the restitution of the German libraries would be guaranteed before or simultaneously with the libraries being handed over, as the issue had so far constituted the main raison d’être of the Unione; this was considered a ‘précaution indispensable’ by Jean Bayet.⁹⁸¹ The

---


⁹⁸¹ See Bayet to M. Vieillefond, cultural counsellor at the French Embassy in Rome. Cf. a communication from the French foreign ministry to Grenier (1951) expressing that faced with the impossibility of avoiding the restitution of the German libraries you may imagine that [...] we would be dreaming of defending a solid position: that of the Unione. This would partly be achieved through the Italian recognition of the Unione as Ente Morale: J. Augley (French Ministry of Foreign Affairs) to Grenier, November 20, 1951: ‘Vous ne doutez pas en effet que, devant l’éventualité devenue impossible à éviter de la restitution aux Allemands de leurs anciennes Bibliothèques, nous n’avons songé à défendre une position solide: celle de l’Union. [...] Le Ministère de Finance nous a en effet donné son accord sur ce point [elevating the Unione to Ente Morale status]. Nous n’avons pas encore de nouvelles de la démarche qui ont du être faite à Washington et de
Union wanted to avoid 'the danger lest, in the event of the restitution of the former German libraries to German control, all the good work should be undone, for lack of the funds necessary to ensure the Union’s continued existence as an active and effective body.'

In their joint memorandum on the future of the Unione (1952), Ward-Perkins and AAR director Laurance Roberts discussed 'the corporate part that can be played by the Union, as distinct from its constituent members’, and the agency of the Unione in terms of its efficiency. They felt that 'the discontinuation of the ‘Fasti’ at this moment would be a heavy blow, not only to the spirit of international cooperation, but also to the good name of the institutions most closely concerned in founding and producing it' Ward-Perkins and Roberts concluded that

The Union's strength as an international body lies in the fact that, from the outset, it has had to face concrete, practical problems, and that the funds available to it, however inadequate at times, have been just enough to ensure a continuity of action: it has had no time to degenerate into a debating society. If the libraries were now to be handed back,

---


without any immediate provision from the Union’s future, the laboriously accumulated fund of practical good will would be dissipated. [The Union] has been kept in ignorance of the detailed course of negotiations ever since 1949. The best, indeed the only, way to avoid feelings of frustration and bitterness, and to ensure an atmosphere in which the re-established German institutes will be welcome, is to provide the Union with the means to turn its energies, without interruption, to the constructive projects for which it was founded, and from which it has been so long distracted.984

Grenier wrote to French ambassador Jacques Fouques-Duparc in July 1951 commenting on the memorandum by Ward-Perkins and Roberts. Grenier considered the restitution of the four libraries to Germany, ‘seized in Germany as spoils of war by the Allied armies’, to be ‘an Allied defeat vis-à-vis the Germans. This defeat will be particularly noted and exploited by Italian opinion, which is only too keen to applaud revenge gained by their former ally’. Grenier’s account was sprinkled with military rhetoric, and considered the ‘triumphant return’ of the Germans (to their libraries) detrimental to Allied, ‘in particular French’, intellectual life.985 According to Grenier, Italian opinion had ‘always opposed’ the Unione, although he admitted that this opinion had been divided from the outset. Grenier essentially lamented the possible ‘dissolution’ of the Unione, which

‘marked the complete failure of the Allied effort in favour of international collaboration in the face of chauvinistic nationalism re-emerging in Italy as in Germany’.\textsuperscript{986} In other words, in Grenier’s view both the old axis powers were to be blamed and were essentially not to be trusted; unquestionably a difficult attitude regarding the negotiation of German libraries on Italian soil.

Grenier presented the French ambassador with misinformation regarding the funding of the BSR and ‘all the other foreign institutes in Rome’, claiming they were all funded privately in analogy with the AAR, and that the Unione thus could expect no governmental subventions. Grenier therefore argued that the only solution lay with the liquidation of German assets, and the committee of the four Allied powers would not carry sufficient diplomatic weight – the Allied governments had to act (‘capital producing an annual interest of five million would be sufficient’), or ‘the death of the Unione is inevitable’ – the maintenance of the Unione would be the only way of providing the Allies with the means to ‘save face’.\textsuperscript{987}


The comparison between three draft protocols (1949) predating the four powers treaty (an ‘original’ version, a US version and a French version), the French not surprisingly added that ‘in the event of passage of title to the German government by the Peace Treaty or otherwise that government should conclude an agreement with the Union for the continued administration of the Libraries by the Union on the terms of the interim lease or contract existing at that time’.\(^{988}\)

Italian claims to the German libraries were based on the ‘historical, moral and scientific rights of Italy’, which had for many years been illuminated by the presence and activities of the foreign academies in Rome (cf. appendix 5).\(^{989}\) The necessity of securing the future of the Unione was expressed by the French ambassador as well as French UNESCO representative Julius Lain, who assured Grenier that the French delegation had made the issue of entrusting the Unione with the care of the German libraries its main priority. In this context, Lain spoke of a

---

\(^{988}\) ‘Draft protocol between the Governments of France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America and the Government of Italy relating to the disposition of the German libraries in Italy’, February 1951, §7. Comparison between ‘Original Version’, ‘United States Version’ regarding the freedom of the German government to ‘reach an agreement with the Union for the continued administration of the Libraries by the Union’. The US Version: ‘[...] in the event of title to the Libraries not being transferred by the Peace Treaty, or otherwise, the owners will be free to reach an agreement [cf. formulation above] on the terms of the interim lease or contract existing at the time, and in the event of such agreement being reached the endowment would remain with the Union for the period of the agreement’. The French Version added that ‘if the German government and the Union cannot reach an agreement the three Allied Governments will arbitrate’. §9: ‘The Government of Italy shall conclude an agreement with the Union for the purpose of implementing the above arrangements. The agreement shall be concluded in consultation with the Committee on German Assets in Italy’. EFR, box ‘Union 1950-1955’. File ‘Union 1950’.
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great rage from the Italians, who had not dared oppose themselves to this.'

Grenier insisted on the solution of the Unione maintaining control of the German libraries after the breakdown of the four powers treaty: ‘the Unione is ready to yield to the pressure from the Americans. The position adopted by the French Embassy, close to that of Ward-Perkins and Roberts, is that the libraries must be handed over to the Allies and not to the Italians’. The Unione needed governmental assistance in order to carry out the maintenance of the libraries and to clarify German and Italian responsibilities; the Unione thus required an endowment from the ‘committee of four (or of three)’. In the face of Italian ‘bad will’ (mauvaise volonté), the Allies ‘appeared to have decided to act without them [the Italians] and to present them with a fait accompli’. Grenier based his criticism on communications with French UNESCO delegate Jean Thomas, and seemed convinced that governmental pressure was only ‘possible in Paris – but the French government is already convinced. UNESCO lack the means to act upon foreign governments’. Grenier was in contact with UNESCO representative Carter, who was in turn in touch with Jean Thomas and Julius Lain. Grenier emphasised that the Unione had been given the responsibility of the control of the libraries by
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the Allied governments. According to Grenier, UNESCO representative Carter had also 'observed the Italian and German [unjustified] hostility regarding the Unione'.

Italian scholars were, despite their lobbying efforts and participation in the board of the Unione, essentially not involved in the core of the decision-making process regarding the fate of the German institutions; it would thus be difficult to speak of a clear 'Italian way' in this regard. The Unione wanted clear directives from UNESCO regarding the patronage as well as the future control of the libraries. Grenier suspected that 'UNESCO wants to dissolve the Unione in order to reconstitute it as an emanation of [itself], in order to satisfy the Germans and the Italians. It may be difficult to sell the control of the libraries to UNESCO if they become German once more'. Jean Thomas and Julius Lain had proposed that the Unione write officially to UNESCO regarding the patronage of the libraries; Grenier replied that only the president (Toesca) had the mandate to write such a letter, but that he needed to seek the counsel of the board 'which cannot take place at the moment' (during the summer of 1951).

---


AIAC eventually developed its juridical configuration with official recognition by the Italian state through *Ente Morale* status in a decree signed by Italian president Giovanni Gronchi on September 4, 1957 (which coincided with the adoption of new statutes of the association). These new statutes – contemporary with the (European Economic Community) treaties of Rome – coincided with an expansion of the academic activities of AIAC in terms of publications ranging further than the *Fasti Archeologici* (for example an extensive critical edition of the excavations of the *Hallstatt* necropolis published in 1959). The *Fasti* had (as previously discussed) functioned as a replacement of the annual archaeological compiled bibliography as a supplement to the *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (the *Athenische and Römische Mitteilungen*, or AM and RM) published by the DAIR) – as well as the AIAC *Annuaires* (published in 1954, 1956, 1958 and 1967).

The scholarship produced during the period of interest in this study is not systematically taken into account here, suffice to say that the absence of the AM and RM was clearly felt in the world of classical archaeology during and after the war; the *Fasti* was in other words primarily produced to fill the vacuum left by the German publications.

The assignation of AIAC as a permanent organising committee for recurring conferences every five years was proposed in 1958. This was acknowledged by the *Fédération Internationale des Associations d’Études Classiques*, in turn subordinate to the *Conseil International de la philosophie et des sciences humaines* of UNESCO, of which AIAC was a member. This

---

opened up other initiatives to which AIAC contributed, such as the inscription publications *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (SEG) and the *Corpus Signorum Imperii Romani* (CSIR).

AIAC depended financially on limited annual contributions from its members, from the Unione as well as on funding from the Italian state (the ministry of foreign affairs and eventually also the ministry of *Beni Culturali e Ambientali*), as well as from other (international) institutions. In accordance with the statutes of AIAC, its president has traditionally been the director of one of the domestic or foreign academies, a tradition initiated by the selection of Erik Sjöqvist as the first president of AIAC (1946-1948), followed by (among others) Albert Grenier (EFR, 1948-1953), Jean Bayet (EFR, 1953-1954 & 1958-1960), Pietro Romanelli (1954-1958 & 1964-1974), Axel Boëthius (SIR, 1960-1964) and John B. Ward-Perkins (BSR, 1974-1978).

Sjöqvist’s successors as director of the SIR also contributed to the expanding sphere of the circle of international archaeology in Rome, although none during the remainder of the twentieth century (with the exception of Carl Nylander, director 1979-1997) took an explicit interest in actively participating in developing the paradigm of scholarly collaboration through AIAC and the Unione, an undertaking to be associated specifically with the legacy of Erik Sjöqvist.

995 The fact that Grenier and Bayet succeeded Sjöqvist explains the rich source material related to AIAC (and the Unione) in the EFR archives.
997 In his letter of resignation as secretary-general of the Unione dated March 6, 1963, SIR librarian and secretary Gino Filipetto expressed his gratitude in having been associated with the ‘broad and generous vision of the ideals of concrete and constructive international collaboration, which the Unione has identified itself with for more than a decade, the same as those of the Swedish Institute at Rome’. Unione secretary-general Gino Filipetto to president Per Krarup, March 6, 1963.
7 CONCLUSION

Up till now everything had been quiet and reasonable – just the usual round of diplomatic-social engagements among colleagues. Now this beastly fellow started the ball rolling with a public lecture [...]. Culture spreads like mumps, you know, like measles. A thing like this could get everyone acting unnaturally in no time. All culture corrupts, old boy, but French culture corrupts absolutely. [...] Culture was spreading like wildfire. (Lawrence Durrell, ‘La Valise’)

7.1 CONCLUSIONS

Lawrence Durrell’s satirical narration quoted above (with its nod to Oscar Wilde), of Durrell’s own foreign office experiences of cultural exchange within national frameworks through the diplomatic corps of the imaginary Communist country ‘Vulgaria’, gives a humorous account of the expectations of the ‘official’ world of cultural reciprocity and representation.

This study has attempted to identify and illustrate the phenomenon of academic diplomacy through the ambassadorial quality inherent in the directorship of a foreign academy in Rome, as well as through the dynamic of national and international interests at these academies before, during and after the Second World War. It has focused on interaction and degrees of exchange between five foreign academies (the Swedish Institute in Rome, the British School at Rome, the American Academy in Rome, the Institute for Advanced Study, and the Villa Medici), and their relationship to national and international cultural politics. The period covered is from 1935 to 1953, during which time the Swedish Institute operated in Rome under the directorship of Filipetto Sjöqvist.

Filipetto’s debt and gratitude to Sjöqvist can be read between the lines. That debt indeed extended to the scholarly community in Rome in its entirety.

6, 1963, Prot. 405/63: ‘[...] una larga e generosa visione degli ideali di concreta e costruttiva collaborazione internazionale, che la sede dell’Unione si identificasse, per ben un decennio, con quella medesima dell’Istituto Svedese a Roma’. Filipetto’s debt and gratitude to Sjöqvist can be read between the lines. That debt indeed extended to the scholarly community in Rome in its entirety.
the École française de Rome and the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom), with a special interest in the gestation, micromanagement and consequences of the neutral role of the Swedish Institute in Rome (SIR). The focus of analysis has been the dynamic between the pragmatics of individual (and national) opportunism and international collaboration, with the foreign academies as the projection of ‘national’ frameworks. The study has further illustrated how the SIR, BSR, AAR and EFR – through their directors, boards and trustees – relate to the DAIR and perceptions of German scholarship before, during and after the Second World War.

The study has explained the genesis of the foreign academies in Rome through the context of the conglomerate of savants and scholars forming the Institute of archaeological correspondence (ICA) in Rome in 1829, evolving out of the gradual professionalisation of classical archaeology; of the milieu of the literary salons in Rome of the nineteenth century; of artist’s studios during the Grand Tour; of a local (Roman) tradition of academies (e.g. the Académie de France); as well as of nineteenth century foreign (predominantly German) cultural diplomacy, primarily at the Vatican.

The young Italian nation shaped the legacy of ancient Rome as a national Italian (or local Roman) heritage. This was intensified with the Fascist appropriation of ancient Rome and the regime’s embrace of the manifold conceptualisations and expressions of the invented identity of romanità. The move towards ‘internationalism’ after the Second World War did entail collaborative efforts, and the archaeological opening of Italy in this way contributed to ‘internationalising’ ancient Rome.
This study has illustrated move from horizontal collaboration (through the ICA), via the vertical development of national paradigms, back to a conscious shift towards horizontal international collaboration in the immediate post-war period in the context of the foreign academies in Rome. Scholarly communities are however seldom truly horizontal in international terms, as national scholarship and national prestige have often overshadowed real collaborative possibilities. This in turn illustrates an unfulfilled potential, not only in terms of funding but also in terms of transnational interdisciplinary work. The issue of the return of the four German libraries to Rome after the war relates to individual and national perceptions of ‘international heritage’ and Rome as a centre for scholarship and ‘universal culture’, illustrating the local scale and spatiality of Rome itself, as an arena for competition and collaboration between the foreign academies as ‘figureheads’ of their respective national scholarly traditions.

The underlying current, thrust and sentiment of the immediate post-war period in Western Europe can be characterised as striving towards at least nominal political and cultural international collaboration – in Italy and elsewhere. Individual initiatives, research traditions and funding structures however remained within the realm of national paradigms.

Narratives of the years immediately following the Second World War in Italian history have often focused on Italy’s relations with the United
States (and the Marshall Plan). Post-war Italian European connections and diplomatic relations do not really come into play until 1947-1948, when Italy could once more to some extent act as an independent political unit within Europe. The Italian constitution was enacted on December 22, 1947 (it came into force on January 1, 1948); the Paris peace treaties were signed on February 10, 1947. The Treaty of Peace with Italy followed on the Paris peace conference (from July 29 to October 15, 1946), which was in turn followed by the UNESCO general conference attended by Charles Rufus Morey in November 1946. This historiographical gap, or ‘raw nerve’, of the post-war period in Italy has been addressed in this study from the perspective of scholarly interaction and national representation in post-war Rome.

This study has furthermore illustrated how scholarly representatives of the Allied victors in Rome made necessary changes and adjustments in procedures and networks after the Second World War in order to maintain, justify and expand the established research framework of the study of ancient Rome, ‘purging’ it from its associations with Fascist Italy. Changes had to be made in order for nothing to change. The rhetoric of international collaboration, not collaboration per se, was a prerequisite for the national academies in order to continue their pre-war activities in a post-war guise.

The desire for increased collaboration between the foreign academies after the war was simultaneous with the opening of Italy for large-scale (national) foreign excavations. This study suggests that this double-edged post-war paradigm of collaboration and competition continues to leave its mark on the operational structures of the foreign academies in Rome.

This post-war paradigmatic shift can tentatively be considered in terms of a new legitimacy through scholarship and research; as a change from paths and internal traditions pursued explicitly by each national institution before the outbreak of war to an outspoken policy of collaboration after the war, manifested in the establishment of the two Rome-based organisations AIAC and the Unione of institutes in Rome in 1945-1946.

The genesis of the Unione emphasised the influence of individuals, as well as the importance of contacts and the role of scholarly networks. The scholars and countries involved in the establishment of the two post-war organisations AIAC and the Unione (through the directors of the respective academies – predominantly Britain, France, the USA, Italy and Sweden – were faced with the question of how to deal with the important legacy of the German scholarly presence in Rome, fundamental in the sense of representing the foundation of institutionalised foreign academic activity in Rome. The debate regarding the ‘internationalisation’ or the restitution of the German libraries in Rome and Florence, restoring them to German control after the war, was influenced by a widespread respect for German scholarship.

The four libraries (of the DAIR, the DHI, the Hertziana and the Florentine Kunsthistorisches Institut) depended on their catalogues – the
fact that the DAIR catalogue remained in Rome (at the SIR, thanks to its
director Erik Sjöqvist) facilitated the post-war lobbying process regarding
its return. This was indeed the case: when the DAIR catalogues were
checked for reference during the post-war reinstallation of the library,
less than ten volumes were missing from the library holdings. The
seeds were thus sown for Erik Sjöqvist’s later commitment regarding the
return of the German libraries in the context of AIAC and the Unione.

The theme of libraries as spoils of war is one which has permeated this
study, along with an abundance of ‘military’ metaphor. Research libraries
represent scholarly ‘hardware’; in the Roman foreign academy context
often more or less isolated and dependent on national frameworks and
national funding. There was then a multitude of reasons for the Unione
to stress the return to Italy (under its control) of the four important
German libraries after the war – the scholarly activities of its member
institutions, but also of the Unione itself, depended on it. It is thus
possible to speak of national as well as international prestige in the
context of this study.

When the board members of the Unione spoke of
‘internationalisation’, they meant ‘Western European’ or transatlantic,
reinforcing pre-war scholarly structures and Western hegemony through

---

1000 Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
1001 The Unione can in this sense be said to have been the ‘precursor’ of URBS
(Union Romana Biblioteche Scientifiche), the online network of the foreign
academy libraries. Today, such a (national or otherwise) overarching institution
might be set up without the ‘hardware’ of extensive libraries; skilled librarians
and access to online databases could then suffice. Another example of a migrant
library is that of the Warburg library, removed from Hamburg to London,
becoming the foundation for the Warburg Institute of the University of London.
the foundation narrative of Greek and Roman antiquity as the bedrock of (Western) European civilisation.

The strengths and weaknesses of the individual libraries, their histories and the monetary as well as symbolic value of the buildings in which they had been housed or were to be accommodated in the future, came into play during the Unione negotiations with UNESCO beginning in 1946: the four German libraries were in fact treated individually, in pairs or in any combination during these negotiations and discussions, depending on the argument in question or the intended desired result.

The success of the Unione in maintaining control of the libraries depended to a large extent on the flexibility of its individual board members (the driving force of ‘academic diplomacy’) in varying unofficial and ‘official’ degrees on boards and committees, as well as on the wide range covered in terms of separate simultaneous positions.

A choice arguably needed to be made between the organisation of the Unione in the shape of either (1) a truly international union in the establishment of new, autonomous, institutions; or (2) with an overarching ‘umbrella’-like structure of organisational agreements between already existing institutions. A version of the latter solution was opted for, with its presidency in a prominent position, although this choice was neither framed nor explicitly made, with the Unione suffering from a lack of mandate, focus and clarity as a result of this compromise. Issues of representation and the reconciliation of diverging (national) viewpoints within the organisations were not satisfactorily resolved, with implications for the present-day situation.
The risk an actual union runs is of ending up in situations in which diverging opinions and viewpoints in particular issues need to be conciliated and modified, with a lack of mandate and decision-making power as a result. The Unione arguably did not satisfactorily address the issue of representational mandate, and found itself in a position in which its board members to a large extent acted as individuals vis-à-vis UNESCO and Allied as well as Italian authorities.

The failure of the Unione to successfully influence the negotiations of the 1949 ‘four powers treaty’ regarding the potential ‘internationalisation’ of the four German libraries, can be attributed to (1) a combination of a lack of representational mandate – in general, Unione contacts with UNESCO tended to take place on an individual rather than an institutional level – (2) insufficiently elaborated funding structures – as well as (3) opposed views within the Unione itself and its academies regarding perceptions of German scholarship. It is possible that the Unione would have been more successful in applying for UNESCO funding with an inclusive policy vis-à-vis Germany and German scholars (certainly on the level of scholarship), rather than the essentially exclusive approach advocated by a number of the Unione board members, confusing – or choosing to equate – German scholarship with German nationalism. It is also possible that the reliance on UNESCO for its funding was a mistake, or a miscalculation, on the part of the Unione; although the Unione perceived UNESCO as an instrument of potential legitimacy in the immediate post-war period.

The board of the Unione expressed an optimistic, exaggerated faith in the power and diplomatic force of the recently established UNESCO.
(partly as Italy did not become a member of the UN until December 14, 1955), leading to recurring frustration with the shortcomings of the Unione itself. This study has accordingly illustrated how science rarely can be protected from political influence and funding structures.

The foreign academies in Rome continued to operate primarily in the sphere of national representation and scholarship in the post-war period, with the academies as figureheads of national paradigms and traditions. The national academies had come to stay, with national prestige as an integral element in the alleged new international order in the ‘post-war world’.

This discussion remains important and actualised, as the closure of for example the Austrian Historical Institute (Valle Giulia) in Rome as well as the Italian Archaeological Institute in Athens – which recently celebrated its centenary (in 2009) – is presently being discussed (2010). This is happening for two main reasons: (1) problems related to lack of funding, as well as (2) lack of imaginative ways of informing both the authorities and the general public of the importance of researching the ancient Mediterranean and the classical tradition. The Italian Institute in Athens has recently celebrated its centenary (in 2009). This is, then, a study in failure of ideals, but also of success, since the German scholarly libraries were de facto returned to Italy and reopened; the foreign academies moreover continue to operate in a spirit of enhanced cooperation.
7.2 ERIK SJÖQVIST AND THE SWEDISH INSTITUTE IN ROME

For Erik Sjöqvist and the Swedish Institute in Rome (SIR), active involvement in the Unione was complicated by the issue of Swedish neutrality, partly as a result of the legacy of the private nature of the institute since its establishment and the wide-ranging involvement of Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf, 'the great benefactor of archaeology',\textsuperscript{1002} in the interests of the SIR. The careful attitude of the Crown Prince was connected with the private origins of the institution: other avenues would most likely have opened had the SIR been an official state institution.

This work is in part inspired by that of Swedish scholars Erland and Ragnhild Billig in the 1980s and early 1990s,\textsuperscript{1003} but encompasses a far wider range of archival material and a more diverse scope of questions in painting a picture of the historical context and intellectual legacy of the foreign academies in Rome (the Billig couple focused specifically on the SIR and the issue of the return of the German libraries). They did however lead the way in focusing attention on the period and on SIR archival material in the national archives in Stockholm (RA).

The selection of Sjöqvist as SIR director in 1940 was seen as a temporary solution by the board from the outset (cf. Sjöqvist’s leave of absence from the Royal Library (KB) in Stockholm for one three-year period only in 1940). This hindered the board from seeing his potential in developing the position and profile of the SIR after the war. The possibility of Sjöqvist being appointed president of the new Unione in

\textsuperscript{1002} Cf. SIR annual report 2003, 58: ‘[...] HKH Gustav VI Adolf, arkeologins store mecenat’.
\textsuperscript{1003} See Billig, "Habent sua fata libelli." and Billig and Billig, "The Billig Manuscript."
1946 was for example perceived as a potential threat to the independence and core activities of the SIR. It is reasonable to assume that Sjöqvist would have wanted to stay as director for another three-year period, beginning in 1946 (until at least 1949), had he been asked. Sjöqvist can from several perspectives be considered as both the Crown Prince’s, Einar Gjerstad’s and Axel Boëthius’ ‘man in Rome’ (cf. section 3.4), and on several occasions got caught in the crossfire of conflicting individual interests, although SIR board discussions and disagreements often emanated from ‘structural’ tensions (for example concerning the direction and future of the institution), and did not (or at least very seldom) solely boil down to personal issues.

The role of the SIR in the internationalisation of the resources of Rome-based research in the humanities contributed to an increased importance of the SIR in the post-war Roman scholarly community. This development was however neither fully recognised nor truly appreciated by the board in of the SIR, displaying a lack of perception and imagination regarding the potential long-term benefits in reaping the fruits of Sjöqvist’s achievements in Rome. It is however not certain that the development of such benefits was actually desirable to the board of the SIR in 1945-1946.

The close connection between the directorship of the SIR and Swedish university positions in effect stifled long-term ‘structural’ development and profiling of the SIR, as its directorship was connected with (the limited) positions in the Swedish universities; not taken on its own merits with potential benefits for the SIR as the main priority.
It was arguably counterproductive of the board of the SIR to the interests of the institute to ‘waste’ the post-war opportunity of making more of a difference in the international academic community in failing to fully realise and explore Sjöqvist’s potential. Sjöqvist’s own reluctance to actively promote himself or his actions however contributed to the underestimation by the board of his influence. Sjöqvist was seldom tempted to write about his experiences at the SIR during the war later in life (in part as he became the private secretary of King Gustaf VI Adolf after leaving Rome), as he did not see himself as primarily an administrator but as a scholar and an archaeologist.\(^{1004}\)

Sjöqvist can to a considerable degree be said to have expressed a Swedish (Scandinavian) ‘tradition’ of mediatory neutrality and diplomacy vis-à-vis mainland Europe and the Mediterranean. The projection of individual interests on Sjöqvist (mainly by the Crown Prince, Einar Gjerstad and Axel Boëthius) outweighed his own intermediatory agency in this regard, however. The SIR board had no reason not to ‘trust’ Sjöqvist or to be displeased with his directorship.

The Crown Prince ruled supreme in the board of the SIR, and it is possible that the presence of further state representatives in the board might have facilitated the accommodation and encouragement of Sjöqvist’s academic, or cultural, diplomacy. The Crown Prince may have been wary of how state authorities would react if he practised a form of foreign policy through the SIR, and reined Sjöqvist in for that reason.

\(^{1004}\) Cf. interview with Ross Holloway, professor emeritus, Brown University, USA, December 2008.
After August 3, 1949, when the United States opted out of the ‘four powers treaty’ with Britain, France and Italy regarding the liquidation of German assets confiscated in Italy during the War, the future of the Unione seemed more insecure than ever before. It is not unlikely that Sjöqvist, who did not want to exclude German scholars from the reorganisation of the four libraries and was acclaimed for having stalled the possible ‘Italianisation’ of the libraries after the war,1005 would have accepted the position as director of the former libraries of the DAIR and the DHI had the treaty been ratified.

Sjöqvist pushed the boundaries and the parameters of international collaboration in the context of scholarly interaction in Rome, due to (a) historical contingency – he was ‘stuck’ in Rome because of the war by force of circumstance – and (b) personal motives – as a way of promoting his chances of a fortuitous next career move. Scholarly Rome in this sense ‘used’ Sjöqvist, who returned the favour.

The SIR was set up in the framework of an established tradition of foreign academies and research institutes in Rome (most notably exemplified by the DAIR and the EFR). The DAIR was from many perspectives the ‘authority’ in the field (not least as it published annual archaeological reports in the *Römische Mitteilungen*), the BSR and the AAR were however considered the ‘natural’ SIR alliances before the Second World War, with little contact between the SIR and the EFR, for example.

---

1005 Cf. interview with Malcolm Bell, professor, University of Virginia. October 7, 2010.
During the war, the SIR assumed a more important position than it had previously attained. This changing dynamic (particularly pronounced after 1943), was not fully grasped by the board of the SIR in Stockholm, partly due to the breakdown in the available channels of communication. Swedish (post-war) scepticism regarding international engagements was not unique to the board of the SIR; the board (particularly its chairman, Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf) however essentially seemed content with the SIR remaining a relatively minor institution in the immediate post-war period. That attitude gradually changed after Einar Gjerstad’s excavations on the Roman Forum in 1949, and was to lead to the establishment of the Swedish ‘big dig’ of the 1950s (at the Etruscan site of San Giovenale).  

The outcome of a combination of cultural and political perspectives (and lack of transparency in internal communication) ultimately stifled potential possibilities for both Sjöqvist and the SIR itself. The policy of the Crown Prince can be summed up thus: ‘We [in the SIR] should not commit ourselves any further or deeper than can be achieved without hazarding conflicts, especially with the archaeological authorities’.

The SIR (together with most other foreign academies in Rome) was thus directed more towards Italy and Rome rather than to Italy and Rome in wider international context.

1006 For San Giovenale, see for example Boëthius, ed., San Giovenale. Etruskerna, landet och folket. Svensk forskning i Etrurien.
7.3 Academic Diplomacy and the Accumulation of Representational Influence

‘One must disabuse oneself’, wrote the Prussian diplomat Bielfeld in 1760, ‘of the speculative ideas held by ordinary men about justice, equity, moderation, candour, and the other virtues of nations and their rulers. In the end everything depends on power.’

The observation above by Jakob Friedrich von Bielfeld (1717–1770) arguably rings as true for the present and the twentieth century as it did for the eighteenth. This study has aimed at an evaluation and appreciation of academic diplomacy. It is suggested here that the maintenance of structures (both in terms of traditions, organisations and diplomatic relations) is to a large extent dependent on the active influence of individuals. Power is linked with connectedness; tradition is linked with power and control. This was displayed in the juggling of national interests of ‘pivot powers’ regarding the issue of the return to Rome of the four German libraries after the Second World War.

The Second World War entailed changes in diplomacy – academic as well as traditional (political) – the link between the two can arguably be found in representation, as individual networking was challenged in both cases by different kinds of ‘institutional networking’ and more asymmetrical diplomacy. The rules of ‘the game’ were changing.

This study has been placed in the dynamic between ‘structure’ and ‘paradigm’ on the one hand, and ‘agency’ and ‘actor’ on the other. The drama has been played out between directors in relation to boards and

---

trustees, with the academies in this sense metaphorical ‘one-man-bands’. The foreign academy directors had no official ‘mandate’ in terms of national representation, their academic diplomatic representation took place on the institutional local or regional level, at times employing aspects of the façade of official diplomacy. The directors were both administrators and scholars; the ambiguous aspect of this has been integral to the conceptualisation of academic diplomacy in this study.

Structures are filtered through individual collaborative efforts (and vice versa) within the framework of institutions and organisations, which thus depend on individual interpretations and expectations of such structures and traditions. This is in turn to some extent conditional and contingent on tradition itself and the ‘corporate’ culture of scholarly disciplines and traditions. The paradox of conservatism in this context lies in the maintenance of tradition requiring recurring change and reinterpretation in order for it to survive.

The Unione’s communications with UNESCO were mostly unilateral, and took place on an individual rather than an institutional level. A cornerstone in the conception here of academic diplomacy is the combination of two official positions serving multiple purposes, creating an increased level of influence (such as Charles Rufus Morey’s double function as president of the Unione and US cultural delegate at the UNESCO meeting in Paris, November 1946). Academic diplomacy in that sense represents further ranging complex layers of interconnectedness, beyond mere formal courtesies.
The relations between the foreign academies in Rome during and after the Second World War can better be described as intrapersonal, rather than as primarily ‘institutional’. ‘Academic diplomacy’ is thus characterised by a combination of focus on individual flexibility and interaction within networks – an important factor for individual progression in and of academe. This applied for the foreign academies in Rome acting in concert regarding the issue of the return of the German libraries during the immediate post-war years, clearly illustrated through the lobbying campaigns by a number of German scholars and politicians (such as Heydenreich, Salat, Sattler, Weickert, Baethgen and Klauser – cf. section 6.5).

The use of the term ‘networks’ in this sense refers to a combination of professional relations and personal friendships in the accumulation of representational influence. This study does not suggest that there is by necessity a direct link between classical scholarship and the employment of academic diplomacy. It is however not surprising that the dynamic of academic diplomacy has been prominently emphasised in a discipline so strongly veered towards and identified with tradition.

The notion of ‘academic diplomacy’ is not exclusive to the post-war Roman scholarly context studied here – it has however sprung from analysis of this specific scholarly context as a way of relating the transition from the war years and the post-war period through Erik Sjöqvist's directorship of the SIR. Sjöqvist, as a ‘civis academicus’, both channeled and represented the national traits of the SIR. He was not a specific ‘cultural diplomat’ such as for example Valentine Chirol – British
journalist and diplomat (1852-1930), ‘devoted to his country, loyal to his friends and his principles, and utterly determined to do his best by all three’.\footnote{1009 Sjöqvist’s principles arguably served him better than did his country.}

The risk of overemphasising the role of the individual is doubtlessly inherent to this discussion regarding individual (academic) diplomacy in mediating opinions and interests. The balance between the internal tradition and voices of an institution (a combination of flexibility in decision-making, funding structures, and scholarly legacies) and the input and role of individual academy directors sometimes presents a conundrum in sliding scales and focuses of analysis. Different spaces of potential flexibility open up depending on different local, national and transnational contexts, with transnational perspectives enabling the entangling of ideas and mythologies.

Academic diplomacy is, this study suggests, a positive phenomenon from several perspectives, grounded in aiming for conceptions of humanism and humanist values. Through applied intermediate agency scholars are thus encouraged down and out of the revolving doors of the ivory tower(s) of academia, which implies a mutual gain through a two-way learning process, ultimately based on respect, openness and curiosity.

This study has illustrated how the ends and means of academic diplomacy, or the \textit{milieu} of the foreign academies in Rome in relation to
each other and to Italian as well as primarily German scholarship, was constructed around notions of individual, national as well as international prestige.

Academic diplomacy at the foreign academies in Rome during and after the Second World War simultaneously incorporated elements of both collaboration and competition, springing from perceived understandings of the importance of prestige – international as well as national; as such it serves as a potent illustration of the relations between the foreign academies in Rome in the immediate post-war period, with agendas of promoting national institutions and research simultaneously juxtaposed and symbiotic with ideals and principles of international collaboration. The practice of academic diplomacy in the context of the foreign academies in Rome during and after the Second World War thus incorporated elements of the common ground of the ‘internationale’ of scholarship together with aspects of national identities and national traditions.
7.4 NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INTERESTS

[...] if Europe’s past is to continue to furnish Europe’s present with admonitory meaning and moral purpose – then it will have to be taught afresh with each passing generation. ‘European Union’ may be a response to history, but it can never be a substitute.1010

The post-war shift towards official mutual recognition, international collaboration, arbitration and compromise among the foreign academies in Rome signified a ‘break with the past’, although at the same time relying on the past (bearing a certain resemblance with the intellectual rationale of the Renaissance). The foundation narrative of collaboration of the foreign academies after the war was based on a glorified ‘memory’, or perception, of what the 1829 Institute for archaeological correspondence (ICA) had been, what it represented and the mindset from which it had originated.

National rivalry in the context of the academies of Rome was to a certain extent to be expected as an expression of nation-building, and encompassed domestic (Italian) scholarship. The question of Italian perceptions of Roman antiquity as ‘national’ heritage is connected with the tendency of preserving archaeological sites of prime ‘national interest’ for Italian archaeologists and to leave ‘lesser sites’ for the foreign

1010 Judt, Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945, 831. Richard Bosworth has pointed out that Judt’s admonition may be equally applicable to Italy, a member of NATO and the liberal capitalist world since the fall of its Fascist dictatorship, but also a country that might well be fruitfully viewed as a sort of Western Yugoslavia, a border state of its bloc, never fully orthodox in its behaviour. Regarding being ‘led astray’ by the Resistance myth, Italy, according to Bosworth, ‘just like the countries that had endured Soviet control since 1945, was rooted in historiographical error. Communism has a black history. But so does anti-communism which was a major part of the mixture that took Europe to ruin between 1939 and 1945’. R.J.B. Bosworth, “A Country Split in Two? Contemporary Italy and Its Usable and Unusable Pasts,” History Compass 4/6 (2006): 1089-1098.
academies. At the same time, the foreign academies contributed to an accumulated (national) scholarly prestige in taking an active interest in the ‘Italian’ ancient past.

The benefits of scholarly collaboration in the field of classical archaeology were also related to issues of funding. The absence of the Römische and Athenische Mitteilungen (RM and AM) was noticeable for the foreign (and domestic) scholarly community in Rome – they were sorely missed; an attempt to fill the gap on a corresponding scale was achieved through the joint venture of the annual publication of the Fasti Archeologici. It was this pragmatic issue that – together with that of the exigencies of the return of the four German libraries – provided the main impetus for the establishment of AIAC and the Unione.

The understanding of the ‘spirit of internationalism’ present in scholarly circles in Rome in 1945-1946 sprung in part from wishful thinking, as well as misapprehension and lack of historical contextualisation of perceived lost cultural values and alleged international mindsets. Post-war emphasis was placed on commonalities and the object of research rather than differences and national research paradigms. Most importantly the issue of funding of the two organisations AIAC and the Unione was not satisfactorily addressed (which had incidentally also been one of the inherent ‘structural’ problems of the nineteenth century ICA). The study suggests that the rhetoric of collaboration to a considerable extent amounted to window-dressing, with national structures and paradigms continuing to dominate relations among the foreign academies in Rome after the Second World War, with varying pragmatic self-serving agendas in essence encompassed in conceptualisations of prestige and
dignity. Behind the smokescreen of rhetoric idealising international collaboration lies a complex web of interests related to individuals, organisations and nations.

International collaboration in the aftermath of the Second World War can be discussed in terms of inclusion and exclusion, and as a matter of stabilising and maintaining power relations. The establishment of AIAC and the Unione in 1945-1946 reinforced a Western European (and North American) narrative of implicit exclusion (of Eastern Europe and indeed of the rest of the world) as well as explicit inclusion. AIAC could for example have been framed as a ‘European’ or ‘transatlantic’ association; ‘international’ however seemed more rhetorically convincing. Evidence of real collaborative work can be found almost exclusive on an individual level, and the lack of institutional collaboration might be expressed in analogy with sociologist Edward C. Banfield’s remarks on ‘amoral familism’, or reluctance to act together for the ‘common good’ (in studying nuclear families in Southern Italy, 1958).

The issue of the potential concession of Palazzo Vidoni in Rome to the Unione in 1946-1947 was discussed within Italian government circles as one being ‘in the interest of the nation’. Palazzo Vidoni was in the end not conceded to the Unione but retained by the Italian government, which illustrates aspects of the importance of such Italian national interest in the immediate post-war period.

Erik Sjöqvist referred to the maintenance of the role, or the ‘favourable position’ of the SIR, in the fraternity of foreign scholarly institutions in
Rome. This ‘fraternity’ was creatively flexible, as the foreign academies were essentially competing with each other in the same field of scholarship, and collaborated when it was in the common interest to do so.

The SIR was able to pursue its activities during the war largely due to increasingly stable finances – to annual state contributions from 1938 and to currency exchange profits. In combination with the drawn-out discussion of the liquidation of German assets in Italy after the war, this illustrates the weight of funding as a prerequisite to institutional scholarly collaboration – national as well as international.

Funding is in turn connected with issues of prestige – national as well as international. This was clearly the case for the academies of Rome in the immediate post-war period. This study suggests that these two obstacles to genuine collaboration and mutual understanding (insufficient funding and prestige) often go hand in hand, and indeed still set the general tone for scholarly collaboration in Rome and elsewhere. As long as both funding and prestige are conceived of in national terms, it would seem that collaboration and research will struggle to be either international or interdisciplinary.

The dynamic of national prestige in relation to international collaboration analysed in this study has illustrated a reluctance to relinquish national authority and independence, on a minor scale predating similar tendencies within the EC/EU by at least a decade (with the signing of the treaties of Rome, 1957).
The foreign academies in Rome can essentially be understood as an expression and consequence of the (Western) narrative of the elevated status of the classical past and common ‘roots’, and as a legacy of nineteenth century European nation-building. By acknowledging the pursuit of perceptions and values of a ‘common’ heritage and by focusing on commonalities, the foreign academies in Rome (and similarly in for example Athens) have the potential of transcending the level of national funding through collaborative projects.

Historicising self-reflection, focusing on ‘positive values’ and the foreign academies as a truly ‘European legacy’ might facilitate future funding for such collaborative projects from for example the European Union (the European Research Council) and from (national) universities and funding bodies. As was the case after the Second World War, change is likely to be necessary in order for nothing to change in confronting and making sense of the counterproductive force of national prestige. International (in this context mainly Western European) collaboration – political, cultural or educational – arguably cannot successfully transcend national paradigms unless curiosity prevails over defensiveness, respect over fear and enlightenment over the darkness of disregard.

The leap from national frameworks to ‘superstructures’ such as the Unione can sometimes seem almost insurmountable and structurally most complicated, which provides another case for why commonalities rather than specific national scholarly traditions and Sonderweg-related specificities need to be stressed. The future of AIAC, the Unione and the foreign academies in Rome partly depends on an increasing flexibility in
terms of collaborative projects and courses focusing on common themes through organisational frameworks such as the Unione, but also between the individual academies themselves.

This study has illustrated the difficulties inherent in attempting to protect ‘science’ and scholarship from political influence, or the impossibility of separating science from politics. This can in part be explained by strong national traditions and characteristics of scholarly institutions. Such political influence is however the almost inevitable outcome of combining a cultural and a political perspective. National as well as international politics permeate actors and networks; thus also, by extension, scholarly institutions and research paradigms. Universities, academies and research institutes are not objective and untouchable ivory towers, cut off from society – on the contrary they form an unmistakable part of society in both political and cultural terms.

This study however only constitutes a beginning. The present moment can be understood as a turning point, witnessing a change in self-reflective perspectives and an increased interest in entangled, transnational and interdisciplinary work. This recent development or ‘trend’ can be illustrated with for example recent publications such as the Accademie svelate. Tradizione e attualità delle Accademie straniere nel Lazio (2010), manifestations in the context of the centenary of the international exhibition and the establishment of foreign academies in Valle Giulia in 2011, and a planned conference on the intellectual legacy of the foreign academies in Rome organised by the Unione in 2012.
Without reading too much into the position and importance of the foreign academies in Rome, it is safe to say that their potential as keys for understanding both national frameworks and scholarly structures is just beginning to unfold. This work may hopefully contribute to arousing such interest and to illuminating potential avenues for future research.
SUMMARY

National hegemony and nation-building constituted the predominant discourse in the context of the establishment of the foreign academies in Rome, synchronized with the history of the young Italian nation until the fall of the Fascist regime. The foreign academies were established in the name of their respective countries as figureheads and instruments for the proliferation of national scholarship, spurred on by the spirit of national rivalry, creating an inherent tension in regard to the empirical subject matter and identity of the academies – the ‘common legacy’ of antiquity manifested in the classical tradition. The frameworks of national funding of the foreign academies in Rome persisted during the internationally oriented immediate post-war years.

The foreign academies in Rome can thus be analysed from local, national, and international or transnational perspectives, all of which have been taken into account in this study in varying degrees. It is suggested here that national and institutional scholarly prestige often go hand in hand. The classical tradition has on the one hand been shaped by national paradigms. On the other hand, the classical tradition and the ‘universal values’ often associated with the symbol of Rome have enjoyed a dynamic existence long before nineteenth- and twentieth-century nineteenth- and twentieth century nation-building. The national roots of classical scholarship require further attention, for the classical tradition, the study of classics and the foreign academies in Rome to find and adapt to new fluctuating roles and positions in the twenty-first century.

The use of the term ‘international’ in the context of AIAC and the Unione in 1945-1946 was largely synonymous with Western Europe and
the North America. Collaboration in the aftermath of the Second World War can be framed in terms of inclusion and exclusion, as well as a matter of stabilising and maintaining power relations in order to maintain control over the perception and understanding of the generic understanding of the roots of Western civilisation (through the professionalisation of ancient history and classical archaeology). By advocating a joint official ‘program’ of international collaboration (manifest in the creation of AIAC and the Unione in 1945-1946), sufficient changes – or necessary measures, depending on the perspective – were introduced, in order to enable and ensure that the structure of the discipline and the identity of the foreign academies would be able to remain more or less intact.

The importance and influence of individual action and the role of intermediaries in scholarly networks has been a recurring theme in this study. The scholars constituting the board of the post-war Unione of foreign (and domestic) academies in Rome served as an influential and significant lobby through the practice of academic diplomacy, whilst at the same time promoting their own careers, striving towards common aims and causes for the good of the (national) academies they represented. The identity and agency of the Unione can in this way be defined as the sum of its individual components.

Problems relating to financial structures and decision-making power remain in the two organisations AIAC and the Unione today; the ‘spirit of international collaboration’ at best only seems to transcend the level of rhetoric and mental national scholarly boundaries. The two organisations
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(AIAC and the Unione), and the ‘spirit of collaboration’, however represent and incorporate a legacy truly worth preserving as the prerequisite for informed and self-reflective research in the humanities.

This study has discussed several examples of national interests and perspectives on collaboration and interaction in the post-war Roman scholarly community, balancing the common rhetoric of a post-war paradigmatic shift towards international collaboration. National funding structures continue to dominate the activities of the foreign academies in Rome. The potential benefits and mediating potential of consciously addressing academic diplomacy and the intellectual legacy and traditions of the foreign academies themselves might prove to be a benign factor in the continued challenge of approaching the Gordian knot of ‘universal values’ attached to scholarship in and of the eternal city.
8 **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

**I. PRIMARY SOURCES**

(1) Unpublished material

1.1 Italy. The Swedish Institute in Rome archives, Rome (SIR). The SIR archival material is divided between the SIR archives in Rome and the Swedish National Archives (*Riksarkivet*) in Stockholm (see 1.10 below). A substantial part of the SIR archival material in Rome is not yet systematically categorised. Part of the material consists of material collected by SIR librarian and intendent Gino Filipetto; this material was donated to the SIR after his death in 1977 by Filipetto’s widow Margit Filipetto. The extensive amount of material from Gino Filipetto’s private collection is preserved in files.

The SIR has also preserved a rich photographic material, consisting of photographs dispersed throughout the archives as well as in three albums, covering the periods 1926-1931, 1931-1939 and 1941-1942 – cf. figs. 12, 14, 15, 16 and 20 (from the three albums), as well as fig. 23 (from the SIR archives). SIR Box *Korr. 1939-1967* in general terms consists of correspondence by SIR directors with the board (predominantly through its secretary Axel Boëthius), regarding issues such as accommodation at the institute, the acquisition of literature, and so forth. The same applies for boxes *Korrespondens 1939-1948* and *Korr. 1948-1950*. Sjöqvist’s correspondence with Gino Filipetto is preserved in Filipetto’s private file *Korr. G. Filipetto – E. Sjöqvist 1947-1959* (the material mainly concerns the period 1947-1953, the majority of the material is related to Sjöqvist’s first years as professor at Princeton University). The first letter from Filipetto as SIR secretary dates from November 27, 1945; most of the SIR correspondence predating that during Sjöqvist’s directorship of the SIR (from 1940) was by Sjöqvist himself, at times assisted by Arvid Andrén.

Of particular interest to this study is a collection of archival documents selected by Erland Billig, referred to here as ‘Billig box 1’ and ‘Billig box 2, *Korr. ink. o. utg. 1939-1947*’. These boxes also contain correspondence from the war years

---

1011 The annual reports of the foreign academies covered by this study are located in unpublished volumes in the offices and libraries of the respective academies in Rome. For the AAR, the annual reports for the period in question here are located in two bound volumes: (1) for 1934-1940, and (2) for 1943-1964.
from Gino Filipetto’s wife, Margit Winbergh, to her sister in Sweden. Some of the material in the two Billig boxes has been removed, possibly by Erland Billig himself – most of which was in turn used as source material for Billig’s unpublished manuscript (cf. 1.13 below).

1.2 Italy. The British School at Rome archives, Rome (BSR). The archive of the BSR (in Rome) contains correspondence (numerically ordered), in two general categories, pertaining to the BSR Faculty of Fine Art (FFA) and the Faculty of Archaeology, History and Letters (FAHL). Document box 9 contains correspondence with the British foreign office, 1937-1951. The material in document box relates to the Italian Institute (London, after 1950), UNESCO (1949-1954) and the British-Italian Society (1950-1955).

The main BSR archival material relevant to this study can be found in the ‘director boxes’ (in Rome) containing correspondence – in particular Box 63: ‘BSR Director Mr. C.A.R. Radford. Correspondence 1938-1946’ (mainly consisting of communications between C.A. Ralegh Radford, BSR director 1936-1945) and the honorary secretary of the BSR in London, Sir Evelyn Shaw; and Box 64: ‘BSR Director J.B. Ward Perkins. Correspondence 1945-1949’. Additional archival material is located in the National Archives, London, and includes BSR-related records created by the foreign office, the treasury and the government communications headquarters. The absence of ‘official’ correspondence from Sjöqvist in the BSR archives (BSR, box 64) can be explained by the amount of private correspondence between Sjöqvist and Ward-Perkins. Cf. RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:3.

The material in document box 63 – correspondence to and from BSR director Ralegh Radford (1939-1946) is organised in two files covering the periods July 1938-June 1939 and 1939-1946. The material in document box 64 consists of correspondence to and from director Ward-Perkins (1945-1949). This material is arranged chronologically in five separate files. Document box 312 contains ‘Reports of the Executive Committee and Faculties, December 1935’ and ‘Reports of the Executive Committee and Faculties, February 1937’. Archival material pertaining to the Allied subcommission relevant to this study (cf. section 4.3) can be found in MFAA document box D (4 files), which contains some correspondence regarding the issue of the return of the German libraries, as well as war department pamphlets (1944) and correspondence from Erik Sjöqvist to Ward-Perkins (1945).
1.3 Italy. The American Academy in Rome archives, Rome (AAR). The AAR archival documentation was donated to the Smithsonian Archives of American Art in Washington, D.C. in 1982, as well as in another separate donation in 1990. Prior to receiving these donations, the Smithsonian microfilmed printed matter of the academy in 1965 (microfilm reels ITRO 2-3 and ITRO 11-13) – material as a rule not corresponding to that donated in 1981. The AAR archives are preserved in the Smithsonian Archives of American Art, but also exist on microfilm (stack 176.9) at the AAR in Rome. The collection as a whole can be found on AAR microfilm reels 5749-5800.1012

The bulk of the AAR archival records date from 1894 to 1946 (the archive as a whole contains material from 1855 to ca. 1981: ‘Items predating the 1894 founding of the American School of Architecture in Rome are personal papers and memorabilia of individuals associated with the institution; materials postdating 1946 are official institutional records, but are very sparse and quite incomplete.’1013 Series 3 and 4 (out of a total of four) are relevant to this investigation. Series 3 (New York Office Records) consists of records of staff, rosters, printed matter, photographs, personal papers and miscellaneous records, including Charles Rufus Morey’s correspondence from his period as acting director of the AAR (1945-1947). Series 4 (Rome Office Records) consists of records of staff and personal papers, as well as fairly complete records of AAR directors J.B. Carter, G.P. Stevens, J.M. Hewlett and C. H. Aldrich; significant portions are missing from those of directors Charles Rufus Morey and Laurance Roberts.

Reels 5750 (1946) and 5758 contain correspondence to and from the board of trustees. Reel 5772 contains president John Russell Pope’s and James Kellum Smith’s correspondence with the board of trustees and directors Chester Holmes Aldrich and James Monroe Hewlett. Reel 5779 comprises material relating to the Classical Society of the American Academy in Rome 1938-1948, as well as William B. Dinsmoor’s correspondence, 1944, as well as correspondence to and from Charles Rufus Morey 1945-1946. Reel 5798 contains correspondence relating to AAR directors Stevens (pre-war), Morey (wartime acting director) and Roberts (post-war); reel 5799 contains correspondence of director Roberts with AAR president J.K. Smith and with executive secretary Meriweather Stuart, 1946-1947 (as well as material relating to the so-called ‘Classical Society of the


American Academy in Rome, 1938-1948). The MFAA Commission Archives (Monuments, Fine Arts and Archives) of the Allied subcommission (2 boxes) at the AAR duplicate a substantial amount of similar material in the BSR archives (cf. section 1.2). It is possible that copies of MFAA documents also exist in the ACS.


1.5 Italy. Deutsches Archäologisches Institut Rom archives, Rome (DAIR). The statues and early correspondence of the Hyperboreisch-Römische Gesellschaft (1823-1828) and of the Istituto di corrispondenza archeologica (ICA, 1829) are located in several files in a DAIR document box dedicated to the ICA. General DAIR correspondence is alphabetically ordered in numbered document boxes (Allgemeine korrespondenz, or ‘Allg. Korr.’). The DAIR annual reports (Berichte Rom) are chronologically organised, along with additional quarterly reports (Vierteljahresberichte).

Correspondence to and from other academies and libraries (since the early nineteenth century) can be found in the document boxes entitled Akademien, Institute, Bibliotheken & Kongresse. An unnamed file contains documents dating from August 1939 to August 1941. Other archival boxes of fragmentary interest to this investigation are Adunanze, Botschaften, Italienische behörden, the file containing ‘Germanische Hinterlassenschaft in Italien’, as well as correspondence with the ZD (Zentraldirektion) of the DAI in Berlin, 1926-1943. The DAIR archive also contains material categories such as Mitglieder, Nachlässe (bequests), and Gelehrtenbriefe. SIR director Erik Sjöqvist’s correspondence from the Second World War with DAIR director Armin von Gerkan is preserved in RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5.
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1.6 Italy. The archives of the Associazione di archeologia classica (Palazzo Venezia), Rome (AIAC). Documents relating to the foundation of AIAC and the issue of the post-war return of the DAIR library can be found in document box ‘Statuto’, the box ‘Documenti Istitutivi e Costitutivi’, as well as the two boxes ‘Biblioteca Archeologica Germanica 1 & 2’. The majority of these documents date from 1950 onwards (including the documents related to the DAIR). The document box ‘Documenti Istitutivi e Costitutivi’ contains minutes from early meetings held at the SIR in December 1944. The document box ‘Biblioteca Archeologica Germanica 1’ contains a file dedicated to AIAC correspondence with the Unione concerning the DAIR library (mainly involving Federico Pfister, dating from 1949). The AIAC archive also contains bound volumes of the minutes of AIAC board meetings (Verbali assemblee) from 1945 onwards.


PCM (Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri) box 3474, 1944-1947, file 72, n. 50058, subfile 3-30, contains discussions in 1946 regarding the location of the headquarters of the four German libraries after their return to Rome; PCM box 4450, 1951-1954, file 51, n. 77210 contains an invitation from the newly reopened DAIR for its 125th anniversary (on April 21, 1954 – essentially the 125th anniversary of the ICA). PCM files 1948-1950, 3.3.7/27135.17 and 1955-1958, 9.3/18251 are indexed but have notably most likely never actually been deposited in the ACS.

The ACS archival holdings most relevant to this study are in other words those of the Ministero di Pubblica Istruzione (Min. Pubbl. Istr.), particularly the Direzione Generale di Antichità e Belle Arti (Dir. Gen. AA.BB.AA.); the
Ministero di Cultura Popolare (Min. Cul. Pop.) – mainly dealing with foreign cultural relations) – as well as a limited number of documents from the Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri (PCM).

1.8 Italy. The archives of the Kunsthistorisches Institut, Florence. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives contains correspondence and press clippings pertaining to the issue of the post-war restitution of the German institutes in Italy (1945-1953) by a large number of German scholars (cf. sections 6.4 and 6.5).


1.10 Archivio Storico del Ministero degli Affari Esteri (ASMAE), ‘Archivio Storico Diplomatico’, Rome. ASMAE archival material pertaining to this study comprises D.G.R.C. (Direzione Generale per le Relazioni Culturali, Ufficio III), Pratiche UNESCO, file IV/49 (regarding the Biblioteca di Storia dell’Arte at Piazza Venezia); AP (Affari politici) 1932-1945, Svezia, box 13 (file 7 ‘Rapporti culturali’ is missing); Segr. Gen. e Gab. Min. (Segreteria Generale e Gabinetto del Ministero) 1923-1943, box 1442 (files concerning the civil war in Spain and Swedish connections, in the file ‘Svezia’, 1936-1939); AP 1946-1950, Svezia, box 1 (reports

1014 The genesis of the Ministero di Cultura Popolare is narrated by Alan Cassels, who has highlighted ‘the idiosyncrasies of Fascist policy [which] compelled some modification in the internal structure of the Foreign Ministry. [...] The ufficio stampa had long been a fixture in the Foreign Ministry, although something of a neglected backwater as the aristocrats of the old diplomacy looked askance at the cultivation of press and public opinion. However, it mattered to the Fascist regime, which specialised in the fabrication of mass images at home and abroad. In 1935 the press office was taken out of the Foreign Ministry and integrated into a new Ministry of Propaganda. The Foreign Ministry did not lose all touch with the press for diplomats were regularly seconded to the propaganda ministry or, as it was more famously rechristened in 1937, the Ministry of Popular Culture. Yet, the episode was a setback for the Foreign Ministry and a sign of its growing susceptibility at this time to political pressure’. Cassels, ed., Italian Foreign Policy 1918-1945. A Guide to Research and Research Materials, 8-9.
by Bellardi Ricci regarding the ‘Situazione Politica della Svezia’, Stockholm, December 15, 1945; on Sweden joining the UN, October 12, 1946; regarding ‘Corrispondenza dall’Italia dello “Svenska Dagbladet”’, December 27, 1945; and regarding ‘Adesione Svezia O.N.U.’ Archivio di Gabinetto, 1944-47, box 106, file 49 (‘Enti Culturali all’Estero – Istituto Nazionale per le Relazioni Culturali con l’Estero (Irce)’) contains a memorandum regarding the foreign ‘cultural institutes’ in Rome; other relevant material can be found in files 37 (‘Istituto Nazionale dei Cambi con l’Estero’) and 39 (‘Istituto Italiano di Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte – Roma – Prof. Paribeni’). The Archivio Personale, Serie I (II Vers.), ‘box 8’ (actually box 192) should contain a file on Bellardi Ricci (the post-war Italian minister in Stockholm); this file is however missing.

1.11 Italy. The Keats and Shelley House archives, Rome. The Keats and Shelley House archive contains files relating to meetings and correspondence of the association in charge of the removal and return of the library and artefacts of the Keats and Shelley House in Rome during and after the Second World War, of which Erik Sjöqvist was an executive board member. Relevant categories of minutes are: 1.1 UK minutes 1911-1967, 1.2 UK Minutes 1947-1954 and 1.4 Rome minutes 1933-1974. Relevant archive boxes are for example boxes 31A and B, box 33 and box 35.

1.12 Italy. Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Archeologia, Storia e Storia dell’arte in Roma. The Unione board meeting minutes (Verbali assemblee, February 6, 1946-June 27, 1958) have been made accessible courtesy of Prof. Paolo Vian, Rome, as the Unione archives are as yet neither organised nor open to the public. Material pertaining to the Unione can be found in the archives of above all the EFR and AIAC.

1.13 Italy. Erland Billig and Ragnhild Billig. The ‘Billig Manuscript’ (Erland Billig and Ragnhild Billig: The Swedish Institute in Rome, 1925-1948, unpublished manuscript, incomplete). This unpublished historical account of the SIR (1925-1948, 213 pages) is preserved at the SIR together with related archival material, selected by Erland Billig (Billig boxes 1 and 2 – see 1.1 above; cf. chapters 1 and 2.2).

1.14 Sweden. Erland Billig’s papers. This collection of loose documents refers to correspondence from Erland Billig to Carl Nylander pertaining to Billig’s article Habent Sua Fata Libelli. Swedish Notes on the Problem of the German Scientific Libraries
in Italy 1943-1948 (1990), as well as draft versions of chapters in Billig's unpublished manuscript (cf. 1.13).

1.15 Sweden. Riksarkivet (the National Archives), Stockholm, Sweden (RA). Categories of archival material at RA relevant to this study are series ‘I’ (board minutes), ‘III’ (correspondence) and ‘VI’ (the archives of Erik Sjöqvist; 4 volumes). Category ‘III:A’ contains directors’ correspondence (mainly to and from Sjöqvist), ‘III:B’ contains correspondence to and from the secretary of the SIR (to and from Axel Boëthius, beginning in the 1940s),¹⁰¹⁵ ‘III:F:1’ contains documents relating to the establishment of the SIR and correspondence with Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf.

1.16 Sweden. Lund University Library Manuscripts Collection, Samling Gjerstad, Lund, Sweden (LUB). The collection of correspondence to and from professor Einar Gjerstad covers domestic as well as foreign contacts. Of particular interest to this investigation is Gjerstad’s correspondence to and from Sjöqvist, Boëthius, Alfred Westholm (Gjerstad's colleague and close friend), as well as Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf (only drafts of letters to the Crown Prince from Gjerstad are available, as the Royal (Bernadotte) archives in Stockholm are presently inaccessible for this period).

1.17 Sweden. Lund University Library Manuscripts Collection, Samling Nilsson, Lund, Sweden (LUB). The Nilsson collection contains correspondence to and from Martin P. Nilsson, professor of ancient history and classical archaeology at Lund University 1909-1939, SIR board member and secretary, as well as principal of Lund University 1936-1939. The collection includes more than 500 letters from Axel Boëthius. This material is not used in this study, with the exception of Nilsson’s correspondence with Sjöqvist.

1.18 Sweden. Gothenburg University Library Manuscripts Collection, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, Gothenburg, Sweden (GUB). The three capsules entitled ‘Svenska Institutet i Rom’ in Axel Boëthius' papers (GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80:238–240) contains protocols, financial reports, certificates, press clippings (also in Boëthius' diaries) and

¹⁰¹⁵ The material in series III:B:2 (1945-1949) consists of duplicates of correspondence in Lund University Library Manuscripts Collection, Samling Gjerstad and Samling Nilsson, Lund, Sweden (LUB) to a certain extent – cf. categories 1.16 and 1.17.
correspondence. Axel Boëthius’ diaries from the early years of the SIR are also preserved in Gothenburg (GUB, Handskriftssamlingen, A. Boëthius’ papper, H 80: 241-243, Svenska Institutet i Rom, dagböcker 1925-1932). Johan Bergman’s correspondence with Vilhelm Lundström is located in GUB, handskriftssamlingen, brev till Karl Johan Vilhelm Lundström från Johan Bergman.


1.20 Great Britain. The National Archives (Public Record Office), Kew, London (NA). The NA holds BSR-related government records created by (1) the foreign office – reports on the upkeep of the School during the war, expansion plans, reports on the auditing of its administration as well as correspondence – NA, FO 170/1160, FO 366/1357, FO 366/1257 and FO 371/23827; (2) the treasury – documents related to British cultural relations in the Mediterranean, as well as government grants for the upkeep of the BSR (NA, T 161/1090, T161/779 and T1/11347); (3) the government communications headquarters – reports on the Italian ‘internal situation’ (June 1943) and on the German invasion of Rome (September 1943), as well as Vatican protests against Allied military use during the liberation of Rome (June 1944) – NA, HW1/3003/7, HW 1/1721 and HW 1/2036.

1.21 United States of America. Princeton University archives, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey; as well as Princeton University Archives, Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton, New Jersey. The two main categories of archival material at Princeton University are separated into (1) archival material in the Department of Rare Books and Special Collections of Princeton University Library (Boxes 1, 2, 4 and 9), as well as faculty files (Erik Sjöqvist, Charles Rufus Morey, Ernest De Wald, Richard Stillwell and Allan Johnson); and (2) archival material in the archives of the Department of Art and Archaeology, containing photographs from the Princeton Morgantina excavations (2 albums: 1955-1961 & 1961-), as well as the following files: ‘Correspondence, Sjöqvist, Erik 1953-1958’, ‘Correspondence, Sjöqvist, Erik 1959-1968’, ‘Correspondence 1955-59 (General)’
(containing letters from Richard Stillwell and Sjöqvist relating to the Morgantina excavations) and ‘Correspondence, Stillwell, Richard (Dick)’ (cf. section 2.3).

1.22 France. Archives Nationales, Paris (AN). The EFR is subordinate to the French Ministry of Public Instruction; archival material pertaining to the EFR at the AN in Paris is located in the archival holdings of this ministry (subseries F 17). This material in turn mainly contains director’s reports (1896-1929), publication of the works of the École, as well as discussions regarding the nomination of its membres from the first sixty years of EFR activities; the majority of this material is related to its first three decades of existence. Examples of this are F/17/4024-4273: ‘Grandes écoles spéciales et Instituts français à l’étranger’; F/17/4129-4141: ‘École française de Rome. 1876-1898’; F/17/13596-13618: ‘Grandes écoles spéciales’; F/17/13600-13601: ‘École française de Rome. 1872-1934’; as well as ‘Attributions administratives du directeur de l’École française de Rome’. F/17/13359: ‘Relations culturels avec l’étranger’, covers the period 1940-1958. Box F/17/14585 contains the files ‘École française et Institut d’Études françaises d’Athènes. École française de Rome. Institut de Caire, de Barcelone, de Florence, de Londres, de Madrid. 1917-1948.’


1.24 Germany. Bundesarchiv, Berlin (BA). Archival holdings pertaining to the DAIR can be found in the following main categories: the Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung und Volksbildung (R/4901); the Reichskanzlei (R/43), the Reichsfinanzministerium (R/2 – category 5.3 – ‘Wissenschaft’); the Auswärtiges Amt (R/901); the Reichsministerium des Innern (R/1501); the Persönlichen Stab Reichsführer SS (NS/19 – category C.13 – ‘Wissenschaft, Presse und Propaganda’); as well as ‘Das Ahnenerbe’ (NS/21 – category B.52 – ‘Lehr- und Forschungstätte für Klassische Altertumswissenschaft’). Of these, the material in category R/4901 (the ministry for research and education) is by far the most relevant to this study, particularly file R/4901/14064 (‘Bericht über die Lage der deutschen Kulturinstitute in Italien’, November 1943; and ‘Errichtung des Amtes eines Generalbevollmächtigen für die deutschen Kulturinstitute in Italien’,
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February 1943). Other relevant DAIR-related material may be found in the DAIR Archive, Berlin (ADAIZ – Archiv des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts).

(2) Published material

AA.VV., "La Svezia: Pubblicazione dell'Associazione generale degli esportatori svedesi," (Stockholm, 1924).

Bastianini, Giuseppe, Gli Italiani all'estero (Milano: Mondadori, 1939).

Boëthius, Axel, Svenska brigaden: en skildring från Finlands frihetsstrid på Föreningen Finlands vänners uppdrag (Helsinki, 1920).
———, Bland svenska minnen i Rom (Göteborg, 1946).

1016 Published material by the protagonists of this study, or contemporary with the period in question (1935-1953).
——, "Die Ursprungsgeschichte der römischen Kaiserfora," Opuscula archaeologica 3 (1944), 40-72.
——, Italien efter fascismen, Världspolitikens dagsfrågor (Stockholm: Kooperativa förbundets bokförlag, 1953).
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APPENDIX I

‘Pro Memoria recording the events preceding the transportation of the German scientific libraries from Rome to Germany – Confidential’. Erik Sjöqvist, n.d. (between June 1944 and May 1945, possibly October 25, 1944). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:5:

“The events of the 25th of July 1943 [the German occupation of Rome] created a pronounced state of allarm [sic] in all German circles in Rome with very traceable repercussions, also in the intellectual quarters. The nervousness was apparent and already at that time the responsible directors of the two scientific institutions with which I was in contact, Prof. Dr. Armin von Gerkan of the Deutsche Archäologische Institut and Prof. Dr. Leo Bruhns of the Kaiser Wilhelms Institut für Kunstwissenschaft (Bibliotheca Herziana) were preoccupied for the future of their respective institutes.

One of the first days in August [1943] I received a visit of Prof. Bruhns who under strongly confidential conditions – any expressed doubt on the possibility of the German authorities to master the new situation would be considered as high treason – very outspokenly let me know his worriedness as regarded the future of his institute, asking me if I were willing in the event of a separate peace between Italy and the Allies and by a joint occupation of Rome, to exert the moral authority I might possess to hinder the violation of the library and its eventual confiscation by the Italians. On my reply that the best moral authority available of course was the Holy See, Prof. Bruhns pointed out that any approach to the Vatican had to be made through the German diplomatic representatives of the Power, and that under present conditions they were not allowed to take any step which might reveal distrust in the final victory. He would however try to approach privately the Cardinal Librarian Giovanni Mercati and the Prefect of the Vatican Library, Father Albareda. I declared myself willing to do what I could to protect the library [and] the real estate if necessary to prevent [the?] sequestration and dispersal during the [foreseen] Allied occupation of Rome, and in that matter to cooperate with the Vatican if that was considered useful. No written act of this our agreement was put up, nor were the assistants of the institution [the Hertziana] informed, owing to the very confidential character of the affair and of Prof. Bruhn’s pronounced fear of being considered a “défaitiste”. During our conversation the eventual transport of the library to Germany was never mentioned and I am quite sure that it had never entered into the mind of Prof. Bruhns.
Shortly after I had a similar visit of Prof. von Gerkan who, however, made much clearer proposals in the matter than had Prof. Bruhns. Although well aware of the personal risks he might run by applying for foreign protection of his Institute – these risks were especially high, as he was personally on very bad terms with the German Embassy at the Quirinal in general and especially with the Ambassador Herr von Mackensen – he did not hesitate after our preliminary conversation to send me an [officially?] registered letter dated Aug. 17th asking me to take care of the interests of the Institute [the DAIR] in the event of the Germans having to leave Rome, which he foresaw would happen very soon. I remember especially his expression during a subsequent conversation of ours, that he felt it his duty to do anything in his power to safeguard the library especially against the event that the “high poppies” (“gli alti papaveri”) [implying that they conversed in Italian] of the party or the embassy, whom he characterized as extremely stupid and unknowing, might get it into their heads to take the library from Rome. He did not feel inclined to cooperate with the Vatican, if he could prevent it, this in view of his strongly anti-Italian instincts. His assistants, Dr. J.W. Crous, Librarian, Dr. F.W. Deichmann, deputy for Christian archaeology and Dr. H. Fuhrmann, deputy for the photographic archives, were officially informed of my position as curator ad interim in case of emergency, and declared their willingness to follow any directions given by me for the safeguard of the library, [following] the general lines laid down by von Gerkan.

At the day of the armistice, the 8th of Sept., the German Embassy at the Quirinal, headed by Herr von Rahn, had succeeded Herr von Mackensen after July 25th, fled hastily northwards after having given strict orders to the directors of the two institutes and to Messrs Deichmann and Crous to follow in a special train at 4 o’clock in the morning together with other prominent members of the German colony. Bruhns and von Gerkan followed the orders given but Deichmann and Crous neglected them, and both came the same day to me to report what had happened. Neither of them being members of the Nazi party and both having acted against orders, they were naturally somewhat anxious about the personal positions, also much the more so as the assistant director of the Archaeological Institute, Dr. Siegfried Fuchs, an SS man and “Vorsitzender der N.S.D.A.P. Landesgruppe Italien” with special not clearly defined qualifications in the “Sicherheits Dienst”, was present in Rome at that time. It should however, be stated that the principle preoccupation of these two brave gentlemen concerned their institute and its library; they asked me to allow them to deposit in the store rooms of the Swedish Institute the most valuable
catalogue of the library (the shelf index) and the archives of the Institute from 1829 and onwards, a thing which I granted them with pleasure. The deposit was brought in Sept. 9th.

On my advice they avoided any contact with the resident German consul in Rome – at this time I think it was Reisinger or Möllhausen – both I was told fanatically [sic] Nazi-men, but tried to establish contact with the German Embassy at the Holy See, where they found an efficient supporter in the Councillor [sic], Baron von Kessel, whom Prof. Bruhns had pointed out to me as “a very reasonable gentleman”, an expression which in the mouth [sic] of a German intellectual at that time would be synonymous to non-Nazi. He and the Ambassador, Baron von Weiszäcker, gave them their full moral support and von Kessel took immediately steps to legalise their presence in Rome. This was achieved with great skill, and after a short time their positions were cleared also with the resident German consul, who characterised them as the only ones who had not lost their heads in a critical moment. When the tempo of the Allied offensive at Salerno slowed down, the panic in official German circles dwindled, and the directors of the institutes were allowed to come back on short visits to Rome. The library of the Archaeological Institute was kept open for selected visitors during the whole of October and November. Baron von Kessel, supported by Messrs von Gerkan and Bruhns, when at Rome, brought about a stable contact with the Vatican, which declared itself ready to take over the moral protection of the Institutes [and] to house the libraries inside the Vatican City if necessary, to realise this intention however, a formal application for such protection was wanted, and this the German Government considered [...] incompatible with the Reich’s dignity. Even the Pope [Pius XII] personally was interested in the matter, and directed a letter in his own hand writing to the German Ambassador offering his bona officia.

Sept. 28th the librarian of the Bibliotheca Herziana, Dr. L. [Schudt], asked me to house the most valuable catalogues of his library too, at the Swedish Institute. They were brought over the same day. Before the middle of November there were no visible or otherwise traceable signs that the removal of any of the libraries were considered, but at that time the first rumours came to my ears that something of that sort was planned. They coincided approximately with the return from Berlin of Prof. W. Hoppenstedt, director of the German propaganda institute, Kaiser Wilhelms Institut für Kulturwissenschaft, a man with very high Nazi acquaintances and an old friend of Hitler. It is, however, doubtful whether he can be considered responsible for having first brought about the idea or not. Dr. Deichmann, who generally was very well informed about what was going on
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behind the scenes, did not seem to know anything with certainty in the matter, and was together with Crous towards the end of November still fairly optimistic. He could however, state that the assistant director, Fuchs (president of the Nazi group in Italy), the portion of the Archaeological Institute, Mannz [?], (secretary of the same institution) and the intendent [sic] of the Archaeological Institute Kübbner (treasurer of the same institution), all ardently Nazi and highly influential, had spoken threateningly of the necessity of saving the libraries from the “ungrateful Italians”.

It was certainly a very unhappy circumstance that these three men, all holding key positions in the German Nazi group in Italy, belonged to the personelle [sic] of the Archaeological Institute, and that they were decidedly hostile against Messrs Deichmann and Crous and hardly tolerated their director, von Gerkan. Von Kessel of the Embassy to the Holy See and Drs. Deichmann and Crous, to a certain extent seconded by Dr. Fuhrmann who was a man of much less influence, courage and ability, tried [in] different ways which I do not exactly know, to counterbalance the overwhelming influence of the Nazi trio who were undoubtedly supported by Hoppenstedt. It was however an uphill struggle and the result was in the beginning of December clearly traceable.

As to what happened at Fasano, the site of the German Embassy in Northern Italy, during this crucial week, there are two somewhat contradictory versions, one given me by Prof. Bruhns who was actually there, the other by Dr. Deichmann who assured me of the reliability of his sources. According to Bruhns, von Rahn had during the last week of November been summoned up to Hitler’s HQ to report on Italian affairs and included in his report the subject of the German Institutes. He told Bruhns that he had given the advice not to remove them from the viewpoint of German prestige in Italy, and it was decided to give the Boards of Trustees of the two institutions the chance of uttering their opinion[.] On one hand wanting to keep the libraries at Rome, on the other suspecting their master’s wish to bring them to Germany and not daring to utter an opinion in [contrast] with Hitler’s presumed will, they unhappily enough had based their dissuasion [sic] on what they termed the impossibility of arranging a safe transport owing to the bombardment of all the lines of communication. This [–] so von Rahn related to Bruhns – brought the Führer in a rage and he gave von Rahn the order to bring the libraries back to Germany forthwith. Arrived back in Italy he called Prof. Bruhns to Fasano and gave him the order to execute the Führer’s will (Beauftratragten des Führerbefehls). According to Deichmann’s sources which confirmed the earlier portions of this story von Rahn still intended to delay the execution of Hitler’s order until it would have been too late, but on
discussing the matter with Brühns in Fasano, the latter had put himself at
disposal and declared himself ready to execute the order immediately. Against
[his] von Rahm could no longer oppose.

On December 9th Brühns came back to Rome and presented himself with full
powers as executor of the Führer's orders to evacuate the libraries of the German
Historical Institute (ex-Austrian), the Art Historical Institute (Bibliotheca
Herziana) and Archaeological Institute. A possible explanation of this seemingly
contradictory attitude of Brühns may lie in the precarious position of himself and
of his family. He may very well have felt that his own failure in the past to take
[the] nazi ticket demanded some such expression of [unquestioning?] obedience.
A few days [after?] the packing of Bibliotheca Herziana began and the catalogue
deposited at the Swedish Institute was withdrawn by Miss Schreibmüller, the
Secretary of the Institute. At an informal conversation in my house soon after his
arrival Prof. Brühns deplored the necessity of his mission, but tried to make me
believe that the real reason for the evacuation was that the Allies had the
intention of bombarding Rome and that at least the German property had to be
saved. On my questioning how such an hypothesis could be reconciled with the
bringing to Rome of all the material from Montecassino, he remained slightly
embarrassed.

The historical and the art historical libraries were sent away in railway trucks
in the first half of January [1944] and arrived without incident at their
destination, a salt mine near Salzburg where suitable localities also were prepared
for the archaeological library. Messrs Deichmann and Crous succeeded in putting
off to the very last, any packing of the Archaeological Institute in the expressed
hope that it would finally be too late to carry it through[. Therefore the
Historical Institute was packed immediately after the Herziana, and [their] own
library was kept open until xmas [sic] 1943. In the early days of January Prof. von
Gerkan returned again to Rome, and on January 7th the packing finally began. Dr.
Deichmann told me that nothing more could be done to prevent the unhappy
decision from being carried through, especially as Dr. Fuchs had let him, Crous
and even Prof. von Gerkan understand that any further delay would be
interpreted as sabotage of the Führer's orders.

The packing was going on when on the 22nd of January the Anzio landing
took place. Everybody concerned believed now that the evacuation was rendered
impossible, and that the final result would be that the remaining library should be
deposited in the Vatican partly packed as it was in its cases. I am told that Baron
von Kessel again tried to make his influence felt in this direction, but again the
same phenomenon was repeated as that noticed after the Salerno landing. When
it got clear that the liberation of Rome was not immediately impending, the momentary panic of the Germans vanished, and was replaced by a doubled energy. At the beginning of February the two first railway trucks loaded with book cases and hooked on a soldiers’ leave train were sent northwards towards Brenner. At Terni the train was bombarded when on the bridge; the bridge was hit and some of the carriages plunged into the river. A part of the train including the two trucks with the book-cases were saved and parked close to the burning railway station. Miraculously enough they remained intact and could be sent on after some days delay.

The event produced a strong impression on the German archaeologists in Rome, but could not exert any change as regard the fulfilment of the Führer's orders. Some weeks later two further carriages were sent in the same way, in spite of Prof. Bruhn's attempt to arrange a lorry convoy which would have been able to travel on side roads at night and this run less risks. However, the second couple of carriages came through without any incident, and on February 21st the rest of the library forming a special train was sent off along the coast line. Dr. Deichmann remained in Rome until Febr. 28th; Dr. Crous followed the last train on Febr. 21st; Prof. Bruhns had left slightly earlier, and Prof. von Gerkan left Rome together with Kübber somewhat later. A considerable part of the deposit consisting of the Shelf-Catalogue, Catalogue of Bibliotheca Platneriana at the Swedish Institute remained on its place and is still in my hands. It is my personal belief that the failure to withdraw this material was not part of the official plan but was a deliberate oversight on the part of the librarian, Crous. For obvious reasons its existence must therefore be treated as a highly confidential matter to avoid any possibility of reprisals.

The last time I saw Prof. von Gerkan he was deeply pessimistic regarding the future of his Institute. He expressed little hope that the library would ever return to Rome as a German library and pointed out at the same time that he could not imagine a German Institute in Rome without its library. Even if the Germans should win the war, he did not believe in the return as so many German university libraries had been destroyed that the want for books at home would induce the authorities not to send it out of the country anymore. He considered, therefore, the last chapter written in the glorious history of the more than 100 years old Institute, and again assured me that he had done what had been within his powers to prevent this tragic event. As regards the place finally decided upon for the deposit in the Reich of the Archaeological Library – a salt mine not in Austria but in Bohemia – he pointed out that although it could be considered pretty safe against direct acts of war, it was politically just as unsafe as ex-Austria.
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Professor L. Curtius, the ex-director of the Institute [the DAIR], summed up his opinion in a conversation with me shortly after the departure: “They are all mad, and have no idea of the consequences of their acts”, and I am sure that his opinion is shared by all responsible German scholars concerned.

Summing up the evidence here presented I trust that it has been made clear that the evacuation of the German scientific libraries in Rome was favoured by Prof. Dr. W. Hoppenstedt, Director of the Kaiser Wilhelms Institut für Kulturwissenschaft, pronounced Nazi holding a party ticket with a very low number[,] Dr. S. Fuchs, Second Director of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, SS man, Vorsitzender der NSDAP Landesgruppe Italien and connected with the Sicherheits Dienst[,] Herr Mannz, portier [secretary] of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, convinced Nazi and Schriftleiter der NSDAP Landesgruppe Italien[,] Herr Kühber, intendent [sic] of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Nazi and Rechenschaftsführer der NSDAP Landesgruppe Italien. It is even probable that the idea of removing the libraries had its origin in this inner Nazi circle of Rome. Professor L. Bruhns, director of the Kaiser Wilhelms Institut für Kunstwissenschaft (Bibliotheca Herziana), one of the few – if not the only – German official personality of high rank who had never taken the Nazi ticket, worked strenuously to bring his institution under Vatican and Swedish [neutral] protection; was in his heart against the removal of his library, which was bound to Rome by the donator’s will; but yielded to the pressure exerted by the party men and finally ended as the actual executor of higher orders. Professor A. von Gerkan, director of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, member of the Nazi party pro forma, worked actively and openly against the evacuation project – his moral courage is well documented, e.g. in his intervention to the favour of Prof. A.W. Van Buren of the American Academy and his efficient protection of the Russian-Jewish scholar Mrs. T. Warscer – but had the considerable drawback of having as employees in his Institute the three most important Nazi men in Rome[,] to whom he had to obey as a simple party member.

Dr. F.W. Deichmann, deputy for Christian archaeology at the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, worked with the utmost courage and skill to prevent the removal and run gladly great personal risks for the benefit of the cause. Dr. J.W. Crous, librarian of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, a faithful companion to Deichmann and as he a convinced and plucky anti-Nazi, worked methodically and quietly to obstruct the realization of the plans, and showed the great and foreseeing presence of mind to let the shelf catalogue of the library be left behind in Rome, thus facilitating its eventual reconstruction. Dr. L. Schudt,
librarian of the Kaiser Wilhelms Institut für Kunstwissenschaft (Bibliotheca Herziana) and Dr. H. Fuhrmann, deputy for the photographic archive of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut played, as far as I know, fairly negligeable [sic] roles in the matter. None of them was member of the Nazi-party and both are earnestly working scholars with an all-absorbing interest for their respective scientific topics. Fuhrmann, being married to an Italian, managed to remain in Rome until the end of May, 1944. Dr. Homann-Wedekind [sic], attached without charge to the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, visited Rome on military leave from the Balkans in February 1944. He is an intimate friend of Deichmann, a non-Nazi and supported Deichmann and Crous in their work. Baron von Kessel, counsellor to the German Embassy at the Holy See, has played an honourable rôle [sic] as the official supporter of the good forces in the two institutions’.

Sjöqvist’s (handwritten) draft promemoria was edited and corrected by Ward-Perkins. Sjöqvist’s additional ‘chronological notes’ (in Swedish), attached to the promemoria, read as follows:

‘9 dec. Führerbefehl
omkr. Årsskiftet far Herziana [sic]
6 jan. börjar packningen på Via Sardegna
slutet av jan. (efter Anzio) de första två vagnarna
början på febr. ytterligare 2 vagnar
mitten på febr. resten jämte Crous
slutet på febr. far Deichmann
slutet på maj far Fuhrmann’.
The Berenson Archive, The Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa I Tatti, courtesy of the President and Fellows of Harvard College:

‘Dear Paul, forgive delay in writing what I have to say about the three German Institutions, the Archaeological one and the Hertziana in Rome, as well as the German Institute in Florence. All three were created by German scholarship and conducted in a way that did it honour. Every student was welcome, and until the Nazi madness, regardless of nationality, race or creed. Not only welcomed, but given every encouragement, every assistance to forward his task. The idea was the promotion of learning and understanding in the branch specialized in by each institut [sic]. Thus the Archaeological one in Greek and Roman Antiquity, the Hertziana in Roman Renaissance and Baroque, the Florentine Institut in Florentine and Tuscan Art from early Middle Ages to 19th century. I understand that the libraries of these institutions are henceforth to be conducted by Americans, British and French. This meets with my approval. I venture nevertheless to utter a warning against putting in inferior or indolent scholars of our nations into the posts of directors, librarians, etc. in any of these institutions. These must not afford board, lodging and society advantages to any of our fellow citizens who want to enjoy a year or two in sunny Italy. My ideal would be to restore these institutions to German scholarship, subject to supervision by a committee selected from the archaeologists and art-historians of the United Nations. I believe I have three good reasons for ventilating this ideal. In the first place it would remove the competition, petty politics and favoritism among ourselves, poor sinful creatures that we are. Than [sic] it would continue the contribution German have made – at least as great as made by any one of us – to archaeological and art-historical studies. Let me add that these remained almost unaffected by the Nazi regime, and that it would not be difficult to find German scholars of the best attainments to fill posts even of a subordinate rank. These libraries moreover being collected by Germans and in the first place for Germans, have inevitably as German a character as mine for similar reasons has an English-language one. Just as an American could find his way about and advice and direct others better than any Continental person, in my library, so the German institutions could be more inexpensively and more efficiently run by Germans then [sic] by Italians, French or ourselves. Finally these libraries should
be made accessible with the least delay. As I know from my own experience students, and not only Italians, are in sore need of them'.
Ernest De Wald to ‘Freddy’ (Alfred Van Buren, AAR), November 9, 1945 (sent from ‘HQ US Forces in Austria’ – copy). RA, Svenska Institutets i Rom arkiv, III:A:4:

‘We are really in the middle of our job here. The big move of things out of the Alt Aussee mine has been completed and many other smaller [deposits] are back or in our warehouse. Some still have to be attended to, such as the Library of the German Institute. The Herzhiana we have collected and have safe in Salzburg warehouse. There is one thing you might find out from Eric Sjöqvist. Among the cases of the German Institute books are presumably some from the Austrian Academy at Rome. The Austrians have been fussing about them. Although I had that information in writing from people at the mine I wasn’t quite certain about the truth of the situation because Eric and no one else in Rome ever mentioned that books had been removed from the Austrian Academy. I thought that maybe cases from the Austrian Academy might have been taken to ship books from the German one. So if Eric [sic – Sjöqvist] could check up on this for me and you could let me know I should be very happy and thankful. There was an Austrian by the name of [Gottfried Lang] who wanted to take over the Austrian Academy while I was still in Rome. He had come down from Milano, and according to John W-P [Ward-Perkins] has halitosis! He might know something about it too. [...] To day General Clark finally pinned the Legion of Merit on me which had actually been awarded some time ago. He always insists on doing it personally. [...] You mention hoping that I would return soon. Don’t I! I get very homesick for Rome. [...] You are very nice writing to me and keeping me informed about the situation in Rome. I appreciate it no end. I am sure that you and Rufus are doing the usual bang-up job. Wes shall miss seeing you and being with you at Thanksgiving and Xmas. We had such a wonderful time at Sjöquists [sic] during those holidays last year’.

European University Institute
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Circular letter from AIAC to its members, December 15, 1947, EFR, box ‘AIAC 1945-1959’:

‘Two years have passed since the group of members who founded the International Association for Classical Archaeology sent out their programme and invited scholars of Archaeology throughout the world to take part in the enterprise. The circle to which we have addressed ourselves has so far been very limited. This was primarily due to the difficulty of communication – a difficulty which largely still continues to exist –, and also to the fact that in 1945 we still did not know what had happened to many of our colleagues. [...] We have however not got in touch with our colleagues again during this period: we have neither written to those who already belong to our Association nor invited others to join it. The cause of this silence can well be understood when the difficulties of this post-war period are taken into consideration and when normal intercourse between nations is impeded on all sides. As we have stated in our first appeal, the proposed programme could not be considered workable immediately. Only patiently and gradually, counting solely on our very limited resources, were the first results attained which will form the basis for all future efforts; and only if this initial step proves to be solid and vital shall we be able to look confidently to the future. Yet the very delay caused by difficulties both economic and practical has enabled us to consolidate our internal organization and to prepare a work which we can now present to our members, old and new, as realising one of the principal aspirations of our programme, namely the world-wide collaboration between classical archaeologists. [the Fasti Archaeologici] We would however like to draw the attention of our members to the financial situation of the enterprise. Funds to meet the many expenses come to us from institutions and private individuals – and we would here thank all those who have contributed either directly or by means of their valuable collaboration, notably the American Academy, l’École Française d’Archéologie et d’Histoire [sic], the British School and the Swedish Institute in Rome, whose comprehensive and generous assistance has enabled us to realize our project. However in order to be able to face the future with confidence we are still obliged to rely upon the financial help our members are able to give us. [...] The Association has furthermore taken upon itself another task of no less importance and of vast international range, though of a more local character: that of organizing the library of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome. This library was confiscated by the Italian
Government after the first world war and restored to German ownership at the instance of Benedetto Croce, Minister of Education in 1920, with the conditional clause that it was not to be removed from Italy. In 1938 a concordat was signed between the Nazis and the Fascist governments in which, in return for the cancellation of the previous formal restrictions, the German government again solemnly stated that it would not remove the library from Italy. However in 1944 it was taken by the German Army to Austria and only returned to Rome in 1946 by action of the Austrian U.S. Army Command. Nearly 1300 Cases containing the books were stored in the Gallery of Modern Art in Rome.

The temporary custody of the library was, with the consent of the Italian government, entrusted by the Allied Commission for Italy to the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History and History of Art in Rome awaiting final directions from the Allied Authorities in cooperation with the UN and particularly its cultural section UNESCO. Pending the definition of the future legal and financial status of the library by the competent Allied or other authorities, the Union of Institutes applied to UNESCO for the funds necessary temporarily to operate the library. The Italian government placed the Palazzo Vidoni at the disposal of the Union as a suitable new seat for the library. The Union delegated the reorganization of the archaeological library to one of its members, that is to say our Association. The Association has taken over this task, fully aware of the responsibility and duties implied, and it will, while awaiting the repairs and alterations necessary to adapt the Palazzo Vidoni to its new purpose, make temporary use of the rooms of the old seat of the library at 79 Via Sardegna. The re-organization was carried out during the summer months and the library has just been re-opened; temporarily only to a limited number of scholars, since the necessary funds granted by UNESCO have not yet arrived, the expenses for the installation and for the temporary administration of the library have been and still are paid by the Association, which has been generously helped by institutions and private individuals in the carrying out of this task.

Difficulties of every kind have hampered our activity and still continue to do so; but we trust the news we are able to give our members will suffice to convince them that the time that has elapsed since our last circular has not been wasted. We should therefore be fully justified in requesting our members to pay their membership fees for 1946-47, were it not for technical difficulties owing to the present situation of foreign exchange which still prevents the normal payment of the fees. We intend to overcome these difficulties by creating other collecting centres: in London, Paris, New York and perhaps elsewhere. We therefore ask our members to send us their adherence only, postponing the payment of fees.
We are principally concerned in any case with the diffusion of our fundamental idea, which is international collaboration in the scientific field, and therefore with obtaining adherence wherever there are kindred archaeological interests. We say this in the first place to those scholars who are already members and whom we consider permanent members of the Association. New members whom we address for the first time are to consider this letter as an invitation to take part in this work of ours which is taking shape in such a manner as to permit us to look confidently to the increase of contacts and enlargement of activity which was envisaged in our program of 1945. This letter will be followed by a membership form and a copy of the Statute. [Signed] The provisional Council of the International Association of Classical Archaeology.
APPENDIX 5


‘I presentatori di questo promemoria si fanno interpreti delle preoccupazioni della maggior parte degli studiosi italiani di archeologia e storia dell’arte e cioè di tutti coloro che non hanno ritenuto opportuno firmare l’appello De Sanctis per la restituzione pura e semplice delle biblioteche alla Germania. Tale appello infatti, pur recando le firme di alcuni nomi illustri della scienza italiana, non è stato condiviso né per la sua sostanza né per la sua forma, dai più qualificati rappresentanti universitari ed extra universitari delle discipline archeologiche e storico-artistiche, come è facilmente controllabile dall’esame delle firme apposte all’appello medesimo e come è, del resto, ben noto agli organi competenti del Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione e a tutti i circoli scientifici italiani. Si ritiene che nella questione delle biblioteche ex-germaniche vi siano almeno tre punti di vista in contrasto, o almeno differenti l’uno dall’altro: e cioè il punto di vista germanico, ovviamente orientato alla richiesta di un ripristino integrale dello status anteriore all’ultima guerra; il punto di vista degli Alleati, che erano originariamente concordi per una internazionalizzazione delle biblioteche e a tal scopo crearono la Unione Internazionale degli Istituti di Storia, Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte in Rome, e che oggi appaiono piuttosto indirizzati verso una futura restituzione delle biblioteche alla Germania (particolarmente desiderata dagli Stati Uniti e avversata dalla Francia), ma con un periodo di gestione intermedia della suddetta Unione; il punto di vista italiano, che deve essere, in ogni caso quello della tutela degli interessi e dei diritti storici dell’Italia nei riguardi delle biblioteche in questione sia rispetto alle esigenze germaniche che a quelle alleate. Sarebbe assurdo che gli organi responsabili italiani, Ministero degli Affari Esteri e Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, si facessero interpreti e sostenitori piuttosto dei punti di vista dei Tedeschi e degli Alleati che di quelli italiani.

Nessuno vorrebbe, unilateralmente e faziosamente, misconoscere la importanza dei diritti germanici acquisiti in tanti anni di lavoro nelle biblioteche, né la necessità di una più vasta utilizzazione internazionale di questi centri di studio, per certi aspetti unici al mondo. Ma il primo nostro dovere è quello di esigere che siano rispettati i diritti storici, morali e scientifici dell’Italia, rappresentati da tanti anni di permanenza e di attività di queste istituzioni nel
nostro Paese, dove primamente sorsero (la Biblioteca dell’Istituto Archeologico Germanico di Roma fu anzi in origine e fino al 1871 la biblioteca di un istituto internazionale nel quale la lingua e l’attività italiana avevano una posizione preminente), e positivamente garantiti dall’accordo Croce, reso successivamente inoperante ed anzi tradito dai noti eventi dell’ultima guerra e della occupazione germanica. È necessario inoltre tener presente anche la opportunità di una conveniente salvaguardia da eccessive invadenze della scienza e dell’attività scientifica straniera nel nostro Paese, di cui, per quanto riguarda la Germania si ebbero purtroppo nel passato manifestazioni allarmanti nel senso di una esorbitante propaganda culturale e perfino politica, partita proprio dalle biblioteche in questione e sorretta da mezzi finanziari in cui l’Italia non poté mai disporre. Tute queste ragioni portano a suggerire una grande cautela, da parte delle nostre Amministrazioni responsabili, in eventuali prese di posizione a favore di una restituzione sic et simpliciter alla Germania o di una totale internazionalizzazione, specie se questo si voglia fare in vista esclusivamente di interessi politici, laddove il problema ha anche e prevalentemente un suo profilo culturale. In ogni caso si dovrebbe rispettare, in un eventuale accordo con la Germania, la posizione base dell’accordo Croce, nella sua pienezza, e cioè anche in quelle clausole che contemplate [sic] la presenza di italiani nella direzione delle biblioteche (condizione che allora fu offerta dai Tedeschi stessi e poi non applicata). Ma si riterrebbe assai più opportuna una soluzione generale di conciliazione dei vari punti di vista sopra enunciati, la quale contemplasse una partecipazione tedesca ed italiana alla gestione delle biblioteche, non escludendo la possibilità di interessare ad essa anche una commissione di formazione internazionale. Si richiede comunque dalle Amministrazioni responsabili uno studio assai mediato del problema, prima di prendere qualsiasi impegno con governi stranieri, e si ritiene opportuno che di questa volontà di esame, per la tutela degli interessi italiani, siano informati gli organi attualmente preposti alla gestione provvisoria delle biblioteche’.

European University Institute
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'Memorandum of meeting with the council of the International Union of Institutes of Archaeology, History and History of Art, Rome on 10.12.48. E.J. Carter (UNESCO), January 4, 1949. The Kunsthistorisches Institut archives, Florence:

'I reported on the 3rd General Conference decision to make a grant of $5,000 with, if required, a loan of a further sum not exceeding $8,000, should funds not be forthcoming from the investment of ex-German assets in Italy in sufficient time to meet 1949 obligations. A vote of thanks was passed to Unesco for its assistance. [...] I promised to press for the payment immediately the 1949 financial year started. [...] The Committee expressed the hope that Unesco should have some formal and permanent association with the Union. It was agreed that something less than formal trusteeship would be desirable; Unesco had interest in the Union's work extending beyond the conduct of the libraries, so that it might be mutually advantageous for the Union to offer Unesco a seat on its council, which could be filled by the most suitable representative from the Cultural Department in respect to the actual business at any meeting on certain occasions this might be a representative of the Libraries Division, on others a representative of Humanistic Studies. [...] The Union is completely independent politically, both from the Italian Government and the governments of participating institutions, and is determined to preserve its independence'.

Attached: a letter (1949) from J.J. Mayoux (Director of Ideological and Humanistic Projects, Philosophy and Humanistic Studies Division), UNESCO to Prof. Ulrich Middeldorf (Chicago): ‘You will realize that there is indeed a difficulty. If I remember rightly, your point of view is that German intellectuals, in so far as they could show that they had remained pure of heart throughout this tragic period of German history, ought to be allowed to do intellectual work on top level, if such was their capacity, in the international as well as the national field. [...] the main obstacle to that is the “National prejudice” [from Carter's paper] encountered in the country where the work would have to be done. [...] It is a very delicate question indeed, in which possibly an American intervention with Dr. Morey might do something. My personal viewpoint, which I am not called to act upon, would be that if one of the three posts of directors were given to a “good German”, that would be the ideal solution. Failing that one or more of the librarians' posts might be so given. In any case, as a gesture, it would be good in my opinion that a German scholar should receive a post of some importance in one of the libraries in question'.
The board of the SIR, 1925–1951, and the SIR executive committee, 1940–1951:

1925
· HRH Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf (1882-1973), chairman of the board of the SIR 1925-1950
· Carl Swartz (1858-1926), board member and Swedish university chancellor, 1917-1926. Right-wing politician, Swedish prime minister 1917
· Martin P. Nilsson (1874-1967), board member and professor of Greek, classical archaeology and ancient history at Lund University 1909-1939, principal of Lund University 1936-1939 – secretary of the SIR 1925-1936
· Axel Hallin (1877-1948), bank manager and chamberlain – SIR treasurer 1925-1948
· HRH Prince Eugen (1865-1947), board member, artist (painter), uncle of Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf
· Sigurd Curman (1879-1966), board member and director-general of the Swedish National Heritage Board (Riksantikvarie), 1923-1946
· Henrik Schück (1855-1947), board member and professor of literature at Lund University 1890-1898 and at Uppsala University 1898-1920. Principal of Uppsala University 1905-1918, member of the Swedish Academy 1913-1947
· Olof August Danielsson (1852-1933), board member and professor of Greek at Uppsala University
· Lennart Kjellberg (1857-1936), board member and professor of classical archaeology and ancient history at Uppsala University
· Ludvig Stavenow (1864-1950), board member and professor of history at Uppsala University, of which he was the principal 1918-1929
· Axel W. Persson (1888-1951), board member and professor of classical archaeology and ancient history at Uppsala University
· Ernst Nachmanson (1877-1943), board member and professor of Greek at Gothenburg University

1935
· HRH Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf (chairman)
· Ernst Trygger (1857-1943), right-wing politician, prime minister 1923-1924, foreign minister 1928-1930, university chancellor 1926-1937
· Martin P. Nilsson, SIR secretary
· Axel Hallin, SIR treasurer
HRH Prince Eugen
Sigurd Curman
Henrik Schück
Ludvig Stavenow
Lennart Kjellberg
Axel W. Persson
Einar Löfstedt
Ernst Nachmanson
Axel Boëthius (temporary secretary, see below)

1940
HRH Gustaf Adolf
Axel Boëthius (1889-1969), board member and professor of classical archaeology and ancient history at Gothenburg University 1934-1955 – secretary of the SIR 1936-1955
Axel Hallin, SIR treasurer
HRH Prince Eugen
Martin P. Nilsson
Gregor Paulsson (1889-1977), board member and professor of art history at Uppsala University 1934-1956
Axel W. Persson
Ivar Tengbom (1878-1968), board member, architect and professor at the Royal University College of Fine Arts, Stockholm (Kungl. Konsthögskolan) 1916-1920, general director of the Swedish state board of building (Byggnadsstyrelsen) 1924-1936
Sven Tunberg (1882-1954), board member and professor of history at Stockholm University 1919-1949, of which he was principal 1927-1949
Einar Löfstedt
Ernst Nachmanson
Henrik Schück
1945
- HRH Gustaf Adolf
- Thore Engström (1878-1957), board member and university chancellor (t.f. universitetskansler) 1945-1951, professor of law at Uppsala University, principal of Uppsala University 1933-1945
- Axel Boëthius, SIR secretary
- Axel Hallin, SIR treasurer
- HRH Prince Eugen
- Martin P. Nilsson
- Axel W. Persson
- Gregor Paulsson
- Gunnar Rudberg (1880-1954), board member and professor of Greek at Uppsala University
- Ivar Tengbom
- Einar Löfstedt
- Sven Tunberg

1950
- HRH Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf (‘Kronprinsen Regenten’), chairman
- Thore Engström, university chancellor
- Axel Boëthius, SIR secretary
- Admiral Erik Wetter (1889-1983), SIR treasurer, first marshal of the Swedish court 1952-1961 (also a politician, folkpartist)
- Martin P. Nilsson
- Gregor Paulsson
- Axel W. Persson
- Josef Svennung (1895-1985), professor of Latin at Uppsala University, 1955-1961
- Gösta Säflund (1903-2004), professor in classical archaeology and ancient history at Stockholm University
- Ivar Tengbom
· Georg Zacharias Topelius (1893-1985), deputy director, secretary at the university chancellor office (kanslråd, kanslerssekreterare vid universitetskanslersämbetet), later SIR secretary
· Sven Tunberg
· Einar Gjerstad
· Albert Wifstrand (1901-1964), professor of Greek at Lund University

1951
· HRH King Gustaf VI Adolf, honorary chairman
· Thore Engström, university chancellor, chairman
· Axel Boëthius, SIR secretary
· Erik Wetter, SIR treasurer
· Axel W. Persson, temporary chairman (April 2, 1951)
· Ingemar Dürring (1903-1984), professor at Gothenburg University
· Einar Gjerstad
· Gregor Paulsson
· Nils Gustav Rosén
· Josef Svennung
· Gösta Säflund
· Ivar Tengbom
· Georg Z. Topelius
· Sven Tunberg
The SIR executive committee (*Arbetsutskottet*), 1940–1951:

1940
- HRH Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf (chairman)
- University chancellor Östen Undén
- Treasurer Axel Hallin
- Secretary Axel Boëthius

1945
- HRH Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf (chairman)
- University chancellor Thore Engströmer
- Treasurer Axel Hallin
- Secretary Axel Boëthius

1950
- HRH Crown Prince Gustaf Adolf (chairman)
- University chancellor Thore Engströmer
- Treasurer (‘konteamiral’) Erik Wetter
- Secretary Axel Boëthius

1951 (December 15)
- HRH King Gustaf VI Adolf,
- University chancellor Thore Engströmer (chairman?)
- Treasurer Erik Wetter
- Secretary Axel Boëthius