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My thesis studies a wide-ranging spectrum of literary representations pertaining to
German-speaking immigrants and exiles in Argentina by examining these works in the
context of immigration and exilic theory. The theoretical framework of immigration and
exile is first applied to particular instances of German-speaking exiles and immigrants
associated with Argentina: the Volga Germans, the Jewish Germans and the National-
Socialist Germans. The reasons for which these groups were exiled to or immigrated to
Argentina in the context of these theories allows for a more complete understanding of
the literature that arose as a result of these phenomena. The German-language literature
by Stefan Zweig, Paul Zech, and gerontologists Andreas Kruse and Eric Schmitt,
pertaining to Jewish Germans Herr A. and Frau M, depict distinct mentalities concerning
the arrival to and habitation in Argentina. How these individuals conceptualize their
immigration and exilic experiences is directly linked to their ability of inability to
construct a new transatlantic home. The Spanish-language literature by José Alfredo
Schwarzc, Alberto Gerchunoff, Carlos Grünberg, and Samuel Eichelbaum form
representations specific to the Jewish-immigration experience in Argentina.
Representations by both Jews of German origin and non-German origin allow for an
examination of the concerns unique to the Jewish immigrant, and consequently, a look at
the paradoxical role of both religious national heritages in the formation of individual
identity. The distinct, examined literary works concerning these various immigrants and exiles form a powerful medium in which to represent their extraordinary experiences.
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INTRODUCTION:

Immigrants and exiles have produced some of the world’s finest works of art and literature, as well as some of the most memorable and significant contributions to their newfound homelands. Their unique experiences as human beings living cross-cultural existences give us insight into our species at large. These two groups live in situations than encompass a wide range of situations that human beings are capable of creating, from despicably nauseating atrocities to whole-hearted melting pots of diversity and harmony, and of course, the entire spectrum in between. Immigrants and exiles can experience situations in which they are marginalized and rejected by the dominant society, embraced by and assimilated into the dominant society, neither, or both. Furthermore, it is immigration and exile that change our world forever by bringing diverse groups of people and cultures together; sometimes for the better or sometimes for the worse. Through the theoretical framework of these two phenomena, we try to better grasp the meaning and behavior of our human species as a whole.

Theories of immigration and exile are important in my examination of various German-speakers arriving in Argentina from the 1870s through the 1940s. Through this theoretical framework, the mentalities of those in a new and foreign land are examined, along with both the reasons for and the consequences of the phenomena of immigration and exile. The reasons for and attitudes toward leaving their homeland help to explain these individuals’ capabilities in their new life: their ability or inability to assimilate, their influence on Argentine society, and the literary works that they were able to produce regarding their experience as an immigrant or exile. It is, therefore, through theories of
immigration and exile that I will be able to provide a framework in which to examine the Volga Germans, the Jewish Germans, and the National Socialist Germans who immigrated to or were exiled to Argentina. The Jewish-German Argentines will later be examined in greater depth in the context of these theories. The diverse literary representations of German-Jewish exilic and immigration experiences make this group particularly noteworthy. In order to establish the theoretical framework, I will first start with a discussion of the distinctions and similarities between immigration and exile. The terms often associated with these two phenomena will also be examined. The theories of immigration along with their interdisciplinary dimensions will be discussed, and I will then proceed to an examination of the theories of exile from various scholars. Finally, I will examine the concepts of nationalism and culture nationalism and their relationships with immigration and exile.

First of all, let us be clear on the distinctions and similarities of immigration and exile. According to the Meriam Webster dictionary, exile has two definitions: “the state or a period of forced absence from one's country or home” and “the state or a period of voluntary absence from one's country or home”. This same dictionary defines an immigrant as “a person who comes to a country to take up permanent residence”. Although a strict difference between immigration and exile can sometimes be blurred and overlapping, the main differences manifest themselves in the urgency in which the homeland must be left and the period of residence in which the person is to stay in the new country. Exile can be forced or not forced depending on the circumstances, whereas immigration is voluntary. Immigration is undergone with the intentions of establishing

1 Meriam Webster Online dictionary used for defining exile is available at http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/exile
permanent residence whereas exile may or may not be permanent. Hamid Nacify (3) writes that “Exile is inexorably tied to homeland and the possibility of return. However the elusiveness of return makes it magically potent.” Caren Kaplan also argues that this distinction between exile and immigration can be further expanded; the immigrants intend to assimilate whereas the exiles do not always, and additionally the immigrant (unlike the exile) is looking for financial gain or to improve their material circumstances.

But what separates the exile/expatriate from the immigrant in many contemporary discourses of displacement is that the immigrants intend to assimilate: they leave their homes without reluctance and they face a new situation with an eagerness to become as much a part of the nation of community as possible. In addition to this rather simplistic notion of intention to assimilate, I would argue that immigrants are associated with financial or material gain rather than aesthetic gain; in moving to improve their material circumstances, immigrants do not offer a romantic alternative to the exile, who may be seen to be displaced for spiritual, political, or aesthetic survival alone. (109-110)

The study of immigration, as a subset of the more wide-ranging discipline of migration, encompasses a large number of other social sciences. It is impossible to look at immigration holistically within one discipline, because any sort of migration is going to have implications for various other disciplines of study: anthropology, demography, economics, history, law, political science, sociology. Brettell and Hoffifield see the immigration theory taking on an interdisciplinary approach in the future, in which cross-discipline discussions will fuel the evolution of various theories and policies.
In countries of immigration, we foresee exciting collaboration on the question of citizenship between the political scientist and the political sociologists who frame the question in relation to the nation-state and the rights of a democratic society, and the anthropologists who frame the questions in relation to ethnicity and the construction of identity. (3)

Brettell and Hoffifield bring us to examine various research questions that directly relate to theories of immigration. From a sociological point of view, the question of what explains immigrant incorporation can be better understood. Through the discipline of history we can formulate an examination of how the immigrant experience is understood. Looking at anthropology, we can examine how immigration affects cultural change and affects ethnic identity. Brettel and Hoffifield study these phenomena and explain the implications of multidisciplinary and comparative approaches of theories of immigration.

The broader implications of multidisciplinary and comparative approaches for theory are exciting to contemplate, particularly if bridges can be built between casual explanations and interpretive understandings, between statistitical regularities and unique occurrences, and between the economic and structural forces that shape migrant behavior, and the individual agency that operates both harmoniously and disharmoniously in relation to those forces. (20)

These various disciplines have a great effect on how we can theorize immigration. Each discipline stresses a different form of classification, and consequently the study differs greatly depending on the other social science(s) that are providing the framework for examining this migration. In “Theorizing Migration in Anthropology” Brettel examines the effects of looking at migration from an anthropological perspective: “Migrants can be differentiated by sex, class, ethnicity, the nature of their labor force
participation, their reasons for migrating, the stage of the lifecycle at which they move, the form of the migration (internal, international, temporary, and so on), and the nature and impact of global economic and political policies that affect political policies that affect population movement…”(118,119). We see clearly the multifaceted factors that influence migration and the various social sciences that also find their way into the theoretical framework of migration.

To further conceptualize the meaning of exile, it is helpful to examine the root of the words often closely linked with exile and their historical context. An exile is legally referred to as a refugee, a word which originated from the Latin “refugiare” and means “to flee, run away, or escape.” The word diaspora, which has its etymology in the Greek word “diaspeirein” wherein “dia” means apart and “speirein” means “to sow or scatter” (McClennen 15), is often used with the refugee. Historically, diaspora was tied to the Jewish experience, and the term first appeared in a Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures in the third century B.C. In “Exile, Nomadism, and Diaspora”, Durham Peters examines the term diaspora as it relates to the Jewish experience.

The notion of the diaspora as the dispersed Jewish community outside of Judea was first developed in the Hellenistic era as well. The existence of a diaspora posed a theological dilemma, for residence outside the holy land was widely seen as a penalty for transgression. After the Roman destruction of the Second Temple in 70 A.D. and the dispersion of Jews outside of Palestine, the rabbis reinterpreted the biblical notion of 
\textit{galut} (used in the Hebrew Bible for captivity and deportation) to refer also to a more abstract sense of exile and alienation. Ever since, exile has been a leitmotif of Jewish thought, not only political but metaphysical. (23)
McClennen (15) gives a good contemporary definition of the term diaspora as it is used today in the theoretical framework of exile: “At present the term often describes the dispersion of an originally unified entity and is applied to cultural markers, like language and social practices, that were at one time geographically concentrated and are now deterritorialized.”

In “Framing Exile,” Hamid Naficy (3) develops the argument that there are three interlocking conceptual frames of exile: house, home and homeland. In order to avoid concepts being clearly defined and then subsequently dismissed, he feels that precise definitions should be avoided. Framing exile versus defining it clearly and succinctly is his alternative.

Many other theorists have taken similar approaches to this concept of framing instead of defining. Nonetheless, different theories produce different theoretical frames for each of these terms: house, home and homeland. Therefore, different theorists may use, for example, house and home interchangeably or synonymously (as does Morse) or sharply contrast the terms or, of course, accommodate a place anywhere in between these two theoretical frames. Eric Hobsbawm draws a clear distinction between Heim (home) and Heimat (homeland) and eloquently differentiates what he feels to be the distinguishing features between the two terms:

Home, in the literal sense Heim, chez moi, is essentially private. Home in the wider sense Heimat, is essentially public…Heim belongs to me and mine and nobody else…Heimat is by definition collective. It cannot belong to us as individuals. (qtd. in Morley 151)
In the past, debates regarding *Heim* and *Heimat* have largely been conducted in isolation from one another. In “Bound Realms: Household, Family, Community, and Nation,” Morley (152) takes an interdisciplinary approach to conceptualize these two concepts, which he feels have been artificially separated in analysis. To do this, he articulates different levels of abstraction in the debates surrounding *Heim* and *Heimat* and uses what he calls “grounded theory” to analyze the micro and macro structures. Morley focuses in on the processes of exclusion and identity construction at the micro and macro level, with microstructure being the home, the family and the domestic realm and the macrostructure being the nation, community, and cultural identities.

In “Home” Margret Morse (70) discusses the wide-range of meanings that the word “home” evokes and the idea that these meanings manifest themselves in a distinct way once a person is no longer in this place that she calls home: “It is when one leaves home that the imaginary as well as political contributions of the semantic range of home—homeland, native, nation, aboriginal, settler, pilgrim, colonist, pioneer, and so on—become clearer.”

What exactly constitutes “home” is clearly very different for different people. Vivian Sobchack, for example, sees “home” as something that humans feel rather that a specific geographical destination. For her “at home” is a feeling we have, not something that is either tangible or visible. In “Is any Body Home”, Sobchack (60) states that, “At home and regrounded in our bodies, we have dimension, gravity, and the enabling power to regain our sense of balance and to comport ourselves differently—first, perhaps, before our images, and then, one hopes, within them.” Raymond Williams (1975) came up with the label of “mobile privatization” (qtd. in Morse 70) to describe the phenomenon of ‘the
tie of house to a locality.’ He, like Sobchack, deemphasizes the tangible and material objects as the determination of home. The question of the person or persons who have not held the same residence for a significant amount of time comes to mind. Clearly, these people are not without house or home, but rather have a different set of images that constitute this home. In this context, home loses its value as a place, but rather comes to be viewed as the collection of memories and images that evoke this feeling of home and of belonging. With regard to “home” as a bond, Morse (1999) argues that this role is changing in contemporary society. “Politically, we are currently in a process of devolution and seem socially to lack a bond with and sense of responsibility for the nation as a whole.” For her, home is no longer “an institution providing refuge or rest for the destitute, the afflicted, the infirm, etc.” as defined in the Oxford English Dictionary, but rather a frayed concept. “Home” is more bits and pieces of images, recollections and memories that encompass a human’s experiences in both childhood and adulthood. Morse (1999) argues that “movies also evoke sense memories.” Since “home” is in this sense a collection of memories, a film produces a medium in which to reflect those collections, and it is, perhaps, for that reason that a large number of exiles have had been able to produce such meaningful works and have success in the film industry. Walter Benjamin expresses the exilic movement as one which “occupies the borderland between the domestication of human consciousness and the estrangement of the unconscious” (qtd. in Bhabha 1999), and it is through film that this Unheimlichkeit can be seen in moving pictures. In “The Intolerable Gift”, Teshome H. Gabriel (79) argues that “cinema should not simply be images printed on celluloid, but what those images refer to –to memories,
the lived experiences, the dreams, the unseen realm of myths and spirits that hovers beyond and between the images.”

In addition to the connection between the exile’s creation of film and the exile’s creation of home, this construction also allows the exilic filmmaker a unique opportunity to assimilate. Through their work, the exiles are then able to gain recognition in the society and find themselves operating within the media industries. In “Between Rocks and Hard Places”, Hamid Nacify examines this phenomenon.

Transnational exilic filmmakers inhabit the interstitial spaces of not only the host society but also the mainstream film industry. It would be inaccurate to characterize them as marginal, as scholars are prone to do, for they do not live and work on the borders, margins, or peripheries of society or the film and media industries. They are situated inside and work in the interstices of both society and media industries. (133)

Although we are discussing home and homeland in the theoretical framework of exile, these two concepts are also quite applicable to immigration theory. In relationship to the immigrant, the ideas of home and homeland take up multifaceted meanings. What exactly constitutes these two concepts can become complex, intertwined and often blurred, not only for the immigrants themselves, but also for the society at large. Thomas Elsaesser (113) examines the representation of this meaning through the German film immigrants in the US.

The story of the German film émigrés thus presumes a twofold estrangement: from their own home, and from the view that their U.S. hosts have of this homeland. The consequence is a kind of schizophrenia, which yields a double perspective also on American society, as admiration and a
The dilemma of the émigrés in this respect refigures the cultural attitude of the ‘pioneers’ who created Hollywood. Did they repress their ethnicity, or did it give them a sharper insight into what it meant to be American?

This phenomenon holds true in any other nation of immigrants. Although we clearly would not be dealing with Hollywood, the principle is the same. In movies, literature, and cinema, are the immigrants representing their culture or are they, by representing their culture, simply representing what it is like to be living in a country of immigrants?

In 1994 Nora Rathzel did an empirical study of attitudes about *Heimat* (homeland) and *Ausländer* (foreigner) in Germany (Morley 166). In her study she found that those who saw the ideal, harmonious *Heimat* as something that was static and unchanging were the most hostile to incoming foreigners. The two terms *Heimat* and *Ausländer* in this sense found themselves to be in opposition, and Rathzel describes the attitudes toward *Ausländer* among the *nicht Ausländer* in her study: “they make our taken-for-granted identities visible as specific identities and deprive them of their naturalness so that once we start thinking about them, becoming aware of them, we cannot feel ‘at home’ anymore” (qtd.in Morley 166). The very existence of newcomers becomes threatening for many of the original inhabitants. Here, both exiles and immigrants apply, because it is not necessarily the cause or duration of the *Ausländer* being there, but their mere existence in the new land that makes the original inhabitants apprehensive.

As we examined earlier, immigration studies have taken on an interdisciplinary approach in terms of study and theoretical framework. Sociology is needed to explain why some would see the newcomers as threatening, as Rathzel (1994) observed, while
others hold entirely different views with regard to the *Ausländer*—from indifference, to welcoming, to racist…etc.

As we see once again, the existence and experience of an exile in a new land and that of an immigrant in a new land are often times quite similar. In her book *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement*, Kaplan offers some insight into how these two concepts, immigration and exile, oppose one another by first examining the relationship between exile and cosmopolitan diaspora.

If we can identify a desire for a strict division between exile and cosmopolitan diaspora, what material relations might produce that desire itself? In worrying the exile/expatriation divide in this manner we can lose sight of a greater and more overarching binary configuration: the opposition between exile and immigration. That is, between the ostensible “real” and “false” exile, there are degrees of return that may or may not be possible; political regimes may change, financial limits may be overcome, or some other move may become possible. (109-110)

When dealing with exilic theory, it is useful to examine the historical underlying factors as well as the contemporary factors that have resulted in exile. Nationalism is, for many, undoubtedly tied to exile. It is this idea of a unified nation and a unified people that leads one to question what exactly constitutes unity. Does unity mean that people have to be alike? Should everyone share certain common traits? Who belongs? Who does not? The idea of the nation brings the concept of the citizens and “the others” to mind. Those who do not fit the desired notion of the nation then find themselves in a position to be exiled, to immigrate or live in diaspora. In *The Dialectics of Exile: Nation, Time,*
For the exile, a sense of both nationalism and national identity are necessary. Without the belief that there is a connection between an individual and a place, exile has no meaning. Yet, the exile’s nationalism is usually contrary to the versions of nationalism and national identity fostered within the nation’s borders. (21)

McClennen (21) states that “Cultural nationalism is a political position very closely linked to nationalism.” It is the argument that a nation has a common culture and that this culture has unique qualities that should be maintained.” Cultural nationalism fits into the framework of nationalism by arguing the position that these people with the ‘unique cultural qualities’ should be able to form their own autonomous nation. The Basque people, with their own unique language and culture and desires to be autonomous, are a contemporary example of cultural nationalism. Culture, under the idea of cultural nationalism is inherited and connected to geography and its people’s history. A historical example of cultural nationalism would have been the expulsion of the Jews and Muslims from the Iberian Peninsula during the Inquisition. Although many of them converted to Christianity, they were not “pure” Christians. The guidelines defining culture here in the 15th century are in accordance with cultural nationalism, in that it is inherited not learned. The Jews were exiled (forced to leave), whereas the Muslims were not formally banished. In the “The Key to the House”, Seed examines the underlying repercussions of cultural nationalism on the Muslims who, although not formally banished, found it necessary to leave.
Nonetheless many of the wealthy and learned Muslims from the city of Granada felt compelled to leave at the same time as the Jews. The exiling of the Jews in 1492, therefore, also constituted a portent (as indeed it was) of coming religious persecution of their faith, despite obvious indications to the contrary. (87)

Cultural nationalism, as we can see, has a profound affect on immigration and exile, and simultaneously is clearly not something which the individual can choose. Basically someone either has it or does not have it, and if an inhabitant does not have these “unique cultural qualities” but wishes to remain in the culture and the geographical area that encompasses it, there is a problem. The result is usually exile or immigration. McClennen argues the importance of cultural nationalism as a political position and the differing effects that it can have upon the nation. According to the government of the time, the ‘desired cultural makeup’ may differ.

Because cultural nationalism is a political position, those who are from a different class, race, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation may not always be part of what some consider as the nation’s cultural makeup. For example, the Basques and Catalanians were not part of Franco’s Spain, which tried to eradicate all regional cultures and impose Castilian culture. In addition, in Chile, the Mapuche Indians were disregarded under Pinochet, whereas under Allende they were treated as valuable contributors to national culture. (23)

Cultural nationalism evokes a reaction, provoking exiles to challenge these official versions of culture. McClennen argues that there are two important ways in which the exiles challenge official versions of national culture. The first method is to create an
alternative/ counterculture and simultaneously critique the very concept of national culture. The second is to expose repressive connections between the self and the state.

Exiles seek the means of liberating the bonds that are constricting their national culture, and they often conclude that the notion of national culture must be abolished for true cultural freedom to be established. (23)

In “Between Rocks and Hard Places” Nacify (143) supports this vision, arguing that “the politics of exilic filmmakers, who are usually against their home governments, often forces them into painful positions.”

When dealing with cultural nationalism, another point to consider is the national hero whose importance is twisted to represent the respective political ideology. Take, for example, McClennen’s analysis of the figure José Martí:

… José Martí […] who is integral to the argument for cultural nationalism for Castro’s Cuba as well as for Cuban exiles. Both groups see Martí, the Liberator of Cuba, as a national hero, yet each group has a different version of Martí’s dreams for Cuba and each group is exclusionary. Cultural products, like heroes, anthems, flags, as well as literature, media, and the arts, are the foundation for the development and maintenance of cultural nationalism. (23)

This is not a unique phenomenon. Take also, for example, the German National Socialists’ use of Nietzsche or Goethe. A cultural hero can easily be molded to fit the desired image the unifying nationalistic body or those in opposition wish to present.

There are various issues that complicate exiled nationalism. McClennen (23) argues that “The central issue revolves around the tension between describing the
connection between the self and the state as either fragmented or unified.” There is a significant difference in the way this unification manifested itself in modern and postmodern times. The Enlightenment favored a faith in the self’s unity, but modernism challenged this notion when rationality “seemed incapable of describing the conflicts between the self and industrialization. Hence, we note the anguish of the modern subject who is conscious of fragmentation and nostalgic for unification”.

With regard to nationalism, McClennen also argues the stress on unification between the self and its home was central to both pre-modern and modern political theory. Nonetheless she believes the realization of the concept of unification (with reference to both the self and nation) was not easily attained. Societies and individuals often rejected the cultural homogenization that monarchies (in pre-modern times) and modern nations sought to achieve. The concept of nationalism was a central factor in the formation of modern nations, because it created a bond between the person and the nation. McClennen (41) argues, though, that,” …while nationalism projected a unified national body as part of its ideological persuasion, such unification rarely, if ever, existed.” Nationalism, is therefore, a façade that, although many times more imaginary than real (in that it is based on mythical, indefinable or pseudoscientific principles), has played an extremely important role in exile and immigration from historical times up to the contemporary era.

In conclusion, theories of immigration and exile and their application to migration studies provide an invaluable framework in which to examine German exilic or immigration experience in Argentina. As can be observed from the various immigration and exilic theories, these phenomena are multifaceted concepts that incorporate various
disciplines, attitudes, and human emotion. It is through this diversity that one must wade in order to fully understand these two phenomena. The concepts of nationalism and cultural nationalism prove invaluable when examining the nation of Germany as a whole and consequently the groups which comprised the nation. It is nationalism that led to the unification of this land in 1871 and nationalism that also led to the horrific defeats of this the German nation. When examining the three main German-speaking groups that immigrated or were exiled to Argentina (the Volga Germans, the Jewish German, and the National-Socialist Germans), nationalism is a key factor that has shaped their own unique histories. Nationalism, in the sense of maintaining their own unique traditions without assimilating to Russian culture, is what allowed the Volga Germans to retain their language and culture for many years while living on foreign soil. It is precisely this concept of nationalism that forced the Jewish Germans out of their homeland and into another, and it is the failure of implementing this unified homogeneous concept of nationalism that resulted in many National Socialists fleeing Germany upon their defeat. The theoretical framework of immigration and exile will be the foundation of my study in examining the literary representations of German-speaking exiles and immigrants in Argentina.
CHAPTER ONE:

Theories of Immigration and Exile:

Volga Germans

Jewish Germans

National-Socialist Germans

The three major groups of German immigrants and exiles to Argentina discussed herein, the Volga Germans, the Jewish Germans and the National-Socialist Germans, encompass a time line of arrival in Argentina beginning in the 1870s and extending through the 1940s. The reasons why these groups of Germans left their homeland are distinct, as are the reasons for which Argentina was selected as the country of destination. The theories of immigration and exile examined in the previous chapter will be applied to these three groups that came to Argentina in order to better understand the multifaceted complexities of the exilic and immigrant experience. Without the knowledge of the historical, sociological, and political factors leading to the abandonment of the homeland, it is difficult to fully understand their ability or inability to assimilate, their influence on Argentine society, and consequently the literary works that they were able to produce to represent their immigrant or exilic experience. Therefore, I will discuss the various factors that influenced the arrival of the Volga Germans, the Jewish Germans, and the National-Socialist Germans to Argentina in the framework of the theories of immigration and exile. The concepts of nationalism and cultural nationalism will prove to be especially important in studying the exilic experience, and I will examine their
relationship to the aforementioned Jewish Germans and National-Socialist Germans who came to live in Argentina.

As discussed in the previous chapter, immigration is undergone with the intentions of establishing permanent residence, whereas exile may or may not be permanent. A decisive differentiation between immigration and exile is difficult to achieve, seeing as the boundaries separating the two terms are oftentimes overlapping. Nonetheless, the main distinctions lie in the urgency in which the homeland must be left, the intended time period of residence in the new country, and the intentions of increased financial gain or material circumstances. Under this framework, the Volga Germans can accurately be classified as immigrants. Examining their situation, we see that the Volga Germans left for South America voluntarily and intended to build a new life there. Additionally, they expected improved material circumstances in their newfound homeland. Historically speaking, the Volga Germans’ label of immigrants also holds true in that they first immigrated to Russia in the mid-eighteenth century and resided in the Volga region of Russia for a little over a century before immigrating once again overseas to Argentina. Both times their migration was voluntary (although somewhat encouraged by external factors), they intended to reside permanently, and they expected a better, more financially stable life in the country of destination.

For the somewhat nomadic Volga Germans, the concept of “home” is no longer tied definitively to a specific geographic location. As examined in the previous chapter, Vivian Sobchack (60) in “Is any Body Home?” sees “home” as something that humans feel rather that a specific geographical destination. In this sense “at home” is neither visible nor tangible, but rather a feeling that one possesses. Raymond Williams, like
Sobchack, deemphasizes the tangible and material objects as the determination of home. Williams (1975) coins the term “mobile privatization” (qtd. Morse 70) to describe the phenomenon of “the tie of house to a locality.” The lack of “mobile privatization” is here applicable to the situation of the Volga Germans, due to the fact that their “home” is not a specific geographic location, but rather a collection of non-tangibles: the retention of their traditions, language, customs, and way of life. This collection of non-material concepts was so important to the Volga Germans that they were willing to relocate across the ocean when their “home” became threatened by Czar Alexander II’s declaration of the implementation of obligatory military service. The Volga Germans’ “home” contrasts sharply with the Israeli home, for example, which defines a specific place as home, or that of the United States, which has historically fought adamantly to retain and keep control of its “geographical home”. The “home” of the Volga Germans is not tied to the idea of a nation-state, but rather to community and retention of certain traditions.

Although it could be argued that they possess a certain nationalism for their desire to retain their own unique cultural qualities, their situation is not like those groups implementing “cultural nationalism,” such as the Basques in Spain (as exemplified in the previous chapter). The Volga Germans differ in that they do not desire to form their own independent autonomous nation, and although the Volga Germans value the retention of their unique culture, they do not view culture as genetically determined, but rather learned through tradition. For the Volga Germans, “home” is a collection of memories and images that evoke this feeling of home and of belonging. The Volga Germans’ retention of their own culture could also be seen as a reaction to and challenge to the official version of culture, in that they create an alternative/ counterculture and
simultaneously critique the very concept of national culture. As discussed in the previous chapter, according to McClennen (23), this is one of the two important ways that the official versions of national culture can be challenged.

As examined by Brettell and Hoffifield (2000), discussed in the previous chapter, the factors that influence migration are multifaceted and various social sciences find their way into the theoretical framework of immigration. Due to the fact that immigration studies encompass a large number of other social sciences (anthropology, demography, economics, history, law, political science, sociology), the phenomenon of immigration is best studied through an interdisciplinary approach.

With regard to the Volga Germans who immigrated to Argentina, examining the historic, economic, anthropologic and sociologic factors influencing their immigration proves to offer the most holistic understanding of their situation. These various disciplines have a great effect on how we can theorize immigration. Therefore, I will examine the historical, economical, anthropological, and sociological factors that led to the Volga Germans leaving the Volga Plains of Russia and finding a new permanent residence in Argentina.

Through an anthropological examination, for example, we can study how immigration has affected the cultural change of the Volga Germans and has affected their ethnic identity. Interestingly enough, anthropology shows us that the Volga Germans retained their own culture and language in Russia, and also set up their own communities in Argentina. Unlike the Jews who arrived in Argentina, however, the Volga German immigrants did not produce a great number of literary works, so their auto-representation is less prolific.
The historic component of immigration is vital to comprehending other aspects of the immigration experience, and consequently how the immigrant experience is represented. Therefore the historical situation encompassing the Volga Germans’ immigrant experience merits an examination. The Volga Germans first arrived in Argentina in late 1877, after first living for over one hundred years in Russia and then residing briefly in Brazil in 1877. The reason for this group’s immigration to Argentina is multifaceted, but the origin of the Volga Germans can be traced back historically to 1762 when Catherine the Great inherited the throne in Russia. The Czarina wished to have the Volga region in Russia settled, and in order to encourage the settlement of this region, she published a manifesto on the 22nd of July of 1763 which gave all new immigrants (with the exception of the Jews) various special privileges including exemption from military service, freedom of worship, the right to speak their own language, and the right to have their own school (Koch 12-13). This is how the first German colonizers arrived in the Volga region in Russia. The Germans established their own communities in the Volga region and cultivated wheat in the area for many generations. In 1864, however, Czar Alexander II changed the original agreement that had been made with the immigrants in the Volga Region so that eligible Volga Germans would then be forced into military service, beginning in 1874 (Sarramone 104 -110). Due to their deep opposition to exercising military service, the Volga Germans began to look for new areas of settlement. Many of the Volga Germans immigrated to the United States, but a large number chose Argentina. Whereas the exile is banished, the immigrant leaves the homeland voluntarily. The Volga Germans clearly fit into the later category in that they left of their own free will in pursuit of a better life in a new land.
As mentioned above, the interdisciplinary approach to studying immigration is vital to achieve a better understanding of the immigrant experience as a whole. The powerful social phenomenon of religion was influential in the immigration to Argentina by a large group of Catholic Volga Germans, because Catholicism was the official religion in Brazil and Argentina. In South America, the ratio of Catholic Volga Germans to Protestant Volga Germans was 7:1. However, in the Volga Region in Russia, there were approximately twice as many Protestant Volga Germans as Catholic Volga Germans (Miller 2004). The religious component has always been a crucial factor in examining the reasons for and aftermath of immigration. In Los abuelos alemanes del Volga, Sarramone examines the influence of religion on immigration.

Economic factors also led the Volga Germans to Argentina. A very large group of Volga Germans immigrated first to Brazil and settled in the grasslands of the state of Paraná with the intention of planting wheat as they had done for generations in the Volga region. However, the grasslands of Paraná proved to be less fertile than the steppes of Volga, and they were, therefore, unsuccessful in cultivating wheat there. Argentina, which was still dependent on Chile and the United States for wheat, was the next chosen
destination. Sarramone (110) states in *Los abuelos alemanes del Volga*, “Recordamos que para 1870 Argentina dependía de las harinas de Chile y EE.UU., pues no éramos autosuficientes en trigo.” In August of 1877 four representatives of the Volga Germans traveled to Buenos Aires to start negotiations with the minister of the interior of Argentina at that time, Bernardo de Irigoyen. The Argentine government eventually guaranteed the immigration of 50,000 people and the conditions which the Volga Germans had previously held in Russia were granted to them: exemption from military service, freedom of worship, and the installment of German schools along with good farm lands. In 1878, 1100 Germans arrived in Argentina.

En ministro Bernardo de Irigoyen comunicaba al gobernador entrerriano la aceptación del ofrecimiento, indicando la necesidad de la mensura y subdivisión del terreno. Como ya existía la propuesta de la provincia de Buenos Aires en las tierras que habían sido de los indios pampas de los cacique Catriel, los volguenses tendrían la oportunidad de escoger el lugar de su radicación, textualmente ‘a la llegada de los buques que conduzcan a los inmigrantes Rusos, deje a éstos en libertad para dirigirse a terrenos de Olavaria o a los de Diamante, según ellos prefieran’.

(Sarramone 201)

For those who came to Argentina there were three alternatives. The first was the providence of Buenos Aires, where the immigrants would be given horses, oxen, cows, and material to build houses, along with land at a certain price. The second was in the providence of Santa Fé where the offer was more or less the same, but the price of land was higher. The third choice was Entre Ríos where the offer again was more or less the same, aside from the supply of wood (which was nonetheless in ample supply from the multitude of trees in that region) and the elevated price of land.
The number of Volga Germans that initially colonized Entre Ríos was greater than in the other providences. The priority for those Volga Germans who first chose to settle Entre Ríos was the quality of the land. The first Volga German settlers were eight families and three single men who first arrived in Buenos Aires proceeding from the state of Paraná, Brazil the 24th of December 1877, arriving by train in Azul the fifth of January of 1878 (Sarramone 122). In Entre Ríos, the Volga Germans established the agricultural colonies: Marienthal, Marienfeld, Köhler, Pfeifer. Although the overwhelming majority of Volga Germans in Argentina were Catholic, there was also a Protestant colony named Aldea Protestante.

Another group of Volga Germans went south in the province of Buenos Aires, where they settled close to Coronel Suárez and established the village of Hinojo. The fact that contemporary Argentina has become one of the most important producers of wheat in the world is due in large part to its citizens of Volga German ancestry.

The immigration of the Volga Germans to Argentina continued up until the First World War. Crespo (in Entre Ríos) and Coronel Suárez (in the province of Buenos Aires) became the hubs of colonization. Nowadays, however, those with Volga German ancestry are spread throughout practically all of Argentina. Their numerous children in early times led to continuous divisions of plots of lands that were increasingly smaller. Eventually, many of the Volga Germans then found it necessary to abandon the original settlements and dedicate themselves to other professions.

The German Jews are the second German-speaking group, being discussed, that found a new home in Argentina. This group was, by far, was the most prolific in producing a wide array of literary representations and will therefore be examined in
subsequent chapters in greater depth. The individuals belonging to this group have been labeled both as immigrants and as exiles. As examined in the previous chapter, the main distinctions between immigrant and exile lie in the urgency in which the homeland must be left, the intended period of residence in the new country, and the intention of increased financial gain or material circumstances. When the Jewish Germans left, their understanding of the situation encompassing then contemporary Germany, their intended period of stay in the new country, and their financial intentions determined whether they would be called immigrants or exiles.

In order to better understand circumstances encompassing the German Jews, it is best to first examine their situation within the framework of the theories of immigration and exile. In chapter one, we examined a historical example of cultural nationalism seen with the expulsion of the Jews and the Muslims from the Iberian Peninsula during the Inquisition. This same phenomenon of cultural nationalism that forced the Jews and some Muslims into exile in the 15th century finds itself reoccurring in the 20th century with the onset of German National Socialism. Although these two situations are certainly not identical (occurring five centuries apart and under distinct political regimes), their comparison merits examination. Cultural nationalism was the key factor in both in the expulsion of those not fitting the “desirous cultural norm”. In both cases culture is defined as something that is inherited connected to geography and its people’s history. Although many of the Jews and Muslim converted to Christianity, they were not “pure” Christians. Likewise, although the majority of the German Jews had fully assimilated to German culture, they were not “pure” Germans. During the Inquisition, the Jews were exiled (forced to leave), whereas the Muslims were not formally banished. The
underlying repercussions of cultural nationalism, as examined by Seed (87) in “The Key to the House”, resulted in many of the wealthy and learned Muslims feeling compelled to leave. Likewise, many educated Jews felt compelled to leave Germany, although they were not formally banished. This situation applies to those German Jews leaving of their own free will before the true gravity of National Socialism became known. It is therefore, feasible to define German Jews who came to Argentina as either immigrants or exiles depending on their own individual situation. Those who left Germany before 1933 and the start of the Third Reich would technically be immigrants to another country, because they left of their own free will. Although, there were anti-Semitic sentiments, they were not yet forced from their homeland. Nonetheless, the title of immigrant versus exile when referring to the pre-1933 German Jew leaving his/her homeland is not always clearly distinguishable.

As we examined earlier, immigration studies have taken on an interdisciplinary approach in terms of study and theoretical framework. Sociology is needed to explain why some would see the “other”, in this case the Jew, as threatening. The discrimination against the Jews is not a recent phenomenon, but rather reaches far back into pre-modern times. Historically, the Jews have been associated with the term diaspora, and their relationship to diaspora helps to contextualize their status in postmodern society. As discussed in the previous chapter, McClennen (15) gives a definition to diaspora as it is used today in the theoretical framework of exile. In her contemporary definition, diaspora describes the dispersion of once geographically unified cultural markers. With the exception of Israel (which did not yet exist during the time of German National Socialism), the Jewish people have been deterritorialized. In “Exile, Nomadism, and
Diaspora”, Durham Peters, as discussed in the previous chapter, examines the term diaspora as it relates to the Jewish experience.

The notion of the diaspora as the dispersed Jewish community outside of Judea was first developed in the Hellenistic era... […] Ever since, exile has been a leitmotif of Jewish thought, not only political but metaphysical. (23)

As examined in the previous chapter, nationalism is, for many, undoubtedly tied to exile. Questions of unity arise as a result of nationalism, and consequently create severe problems for those individuals who threaten unity. Those are the individuals who are forced into exile, diaspora or immigrate to other areas where their “non-unity” is no longer viewed as threatening. Nonetheless, the very concept of unity is subjective, so along with nationalism come many more questions. What exactly constitutes the word unity? The question of unity within nationalism and the question of belonging would prove detrimental to the Jewish Germans.

As examined in the previous chapter McClennen (21) states that “cultural nationalism is a political position very closely linked to nationalism.” Cultural nationalism declares that the nation as a whole has “unique cultural qualities” which need to be preserved, and cultural nationalism links itself to nationalism by asserting the right to form an autonomous nation of individuals possessing these “unique cultural qualities” so that they can be maintained.

Nazi Germany is the perfect example of cultural nationalism. The National Socialists strove to create a nation consisting of solely the “culturally pure German Volk” all of whom possessed these “unique cultural qualities”. In order to maintain their
“unique cultural qualities”, The National-Socialist Germans strove to rid their autonomous country of these “cultural impurities” or “non-Aryans”. Within this category the concept of race was also a key factor. From the desire to form the Nazi rhetoric “culturally pure” nation-state, the pseudo-scientific concept of race science would develop. As examined earlier, culture, under the idea of culture nationalism, is inherited rather than learned and is connected to geography and its people’s history. Jewish Germans, although naturally being just as “German” as any of the other Germans, came to be characterized as “cultural impurities” which would destroy the “unified German Nation”. The feelings of anti-Semitism that encompassed Europe during the twentieth century are well-known and well documented. Argentina proved to be a refuge for many European Jews, including German Jews, but their arrival to Argentina proved to be complex, seeing as Argentina too was confronted with anti-Semitism. In *Argentina and the Jews: A Jewish History of Immigration*, Avni (128) states that, “The economic problems and growing wave of Catholic-Hispanic nationalism in Argentina created a clear opposition to immigration.” The anti-Semitism facing the newly arrived Jews in Argentina was similar to the anti-Semitism that they felt previously in Germany, in that they were cast as the ‘other’ and a threat to the so called harmonious static and unchanging Heimat. Rathzel’s 1994 empirical study (discussed in the previous chapter) toward Ausländer by the nicht Ausländer proves to hold true in the context of the Jews in Argentina as well. Those who did see the ideal Heimat as static and unchanging were the most hostile to incoming foreigners. In her study, Rathzel states the following:
they make our taken-for-granted identities visible as specific identities and deprive them of their naturalness so that once we start things about them, becoming aware of them, we cannot feel ‘at home’ anymore. (qtd. in Morley 166)

The very existence of the Jews in Argentina becomes threatening for the previous inhabitants. Here, it is not important whether or not the Jews are exiles or immigrants, because it is not necessarily the cause or duration of the *Ausländer* being there that matters. It is mere existence of a distinct new group of *Ausländer* in Argentina that makes the original (or previously settled) inhabitants apprehensive. The German Jews were *Ausländer* in Argentina, they had a different religion and a different language, and therefore the Jews were seen as being able to alter the Argentine culture as it previously existed.

As previously examined, when dealing with nationalism, the stress on unification between the self and its home was central to both pre-modern and modern political theory (McClennen 41). Despite the fact that realization of the concept of unified (with reference to both the self and nation) was not easily attained, the concept was constantly tried. In German history (before the creation of the modern nation in 1871), the best way to begin the classification of the unifying forces between self and home seemed to be the classification of those not belonging to the national culture.

As examined in the previous chapter, Brettell and Hoffifield see the immigration theory taking on an interdisciplinary approach in the future, due to the fact that any sort of migration is directly correlated to various other disciplines of study: anthropology, demography, economics, history, law, political science, sociology. These other disciplines either directly influence immigration, are directly affected by immigration, or
both. The interdisciplinary approach to examining the situation pertaining to the German Jew is particularly useful, due to the gradual evolution of long standing sociological, political, economic and historical factors that eventually led to the extreme anti-Semitic attitudes and construction of National Socialist Germany. Examining the situation of the Jews from a historical perspective, we see that although the first forms of anti-Semitism had a theological basis, later forms of anti-Semitism took that form of cultural discrimination on the basis of “cultural differences”. Observances of these “cultural differences” between the Jews and the Germans date back many centuries.

The German Enlightenment or Aufklärung of the seventeenth and eighteenth century marked the emergence of some of the most famous names in German literature and philosophy (Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, Kant). These writers and philosophers would later form an integral part the exaltation of the Volksgeist. This romantic notion of the spirit of a nation instilled cultural pride in German heritage Volk by expressing the idea that each nation had its own special qualities that should be celebrated. Lessing, Goethe, Schiller, and Kant became emblematic of the extraordinary literary and philosophical capabilities of the German people, but simultaneously their literature works could be manipulated to express a discriminatory cultural agenda. The beginning of this surge in cultural pride and Volksgeist also marked the beginning of what would evolve into a new and distinct form of anti-Semitism, and it is this Volksgeist that marked the beginning of German cultural nationalism.

McClennen’s analysis of the figure José Martí (examined in the previous chapter) is directly related to the creation of cultural nationalism within the German society.
... José Martí […] who is integral to the argument for cultural nationalism for Castro’s Cuba as well as for Cuban exiles. Both groups see Martí, the Liberator of Cuba, as a national hero, yet each group has a different version of Martí’s dreams for Cuba and each group is exclusionary. ...Cultural products, like heros, anthems, flags, as well as literature, media, and the arts, are the foundation for the development and maintenance of cultural nationalism. (23)

The hero’s importance is twisted to represent the respective political ideology. In the case of the Germans, their heroes are their most prolific and successful writers. We see here that German cultural nationalism is not a phenomenon belonging solely to the 20th century, but rather can be traced back historically. The new pride in a subject that was distinctively German, due to the Volksgeist, also made it easy to cast the villain as a dishonest foreigner from a superficial or inferior culture. The work of an emblematic cultural hero could easily be manipulated to express a cultural nationalistic agenda. Such was the case in Lessing’s 1767 comedy Minna von Barnhelm (Robertson 157) in which a dishonest Frenchman became the subject of loathing. Fitche also goes on to create this distinction between Germans and the ‘outsiders’. Although he, like Lessing, spoke little of this contrast in terms of Germans and Jews, this subject symbolic of the superficial culture was then easily transferred to the Jews. In order to exalt their own culture, it was easier to have a reference point of what not to be, and the Jew became the easy scapegoat. Nonetheless, like the example of Martí, Lessing could also be used by the opposite side to portray a symbol of religious tolerance. This is the case with his work Nathan der Weise in which the Ringparabel bridges the gap between the three main monotheistic religions (Judaism, Christianity and Islam), by showing each to be equally valid. Additionally, Nathan der Weise relays the message that all people, regardless of their
religious beliefs, deserve the respect of their fellow human beings. Here we see that although Lessing could be manipulated to express a certain cultural nationalistic or anti-Semitic ideology, he could also be used to portray exactly the opposite. Such is the case with “hero” figures of cultural nationalism.

In accordance with the interdisciplinary approach of Brettel and Hoffifield, the sociological component most certainly plays a vital role in the formation of the National Socialist society, which resulted in the migration of millions of Jews. Sociology comes to play a role in the classification of the German versus “the other” via the use of pseudo-sciences. The idea of language as being a true test of the validity of a true culture came into play with Fichte’s account. Only an Ursprache or beginning language could make up a true culture, and German and Greek were defined as such, therefore being the only ones capable of giving rise to true philosophy and literature. Consequently to be a member of the true Volk, one had to have a mastery of the German language.

The powerful assertions relating cultural validity to linguistic elements would later support the idea of the “hidden language” of the Jews. In other words, this pseudo-sociolinguistic component would then be used to “scientifically” classify the Jews as “the other”. It was a widely spread notion that because of their “hidden language”, Jews could never fully master the German language, and despite a seemingly impeccable grasp of the language, error would inevitable arise and give way to the “true nature” of the Jew. The Jews’ true language, in accordance with their religious tradition, was Hebrew. Since Hebrew was not an Ursprache, they used German. Nonetheless, according to the widespread 19th century belief, their use of the language was only a parrot-like mimic, rather than a self formulated intelligent expression.
As examined in the previous chapter McClennen (41) argues that,” …while nationalism projected a unified national body as part of its ideological persuasion, such unification rarely, if ever, existed.” We see that nationalism is a façade that is many times more imaginary than real (in that it is based on mythical, indefinable or pseudoscientific principles). Nonetheless, these mythical, indefinable, and pseudoscientific principles that constitute nationalism have played an extremely important role in exile and immigration from historical times up to the contemporary era.

The pseudoscientific principles that aided the spread of German nationalistic thought were very much aided by Richard Wagner, who did much to spread his anti-Semitic beliefs. In accordance with his views, the “Jew’s manner of speaking is alien and unpleasant” (qtd. in Robertson 159). Wagner’s works also perpetuate the negative Jewish stereotype as exemplified in Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg and the villain Beckmesser, who incorporated a plethora of negative Jewish stereotypes into one easy to loathe character. With regard to Jews who no longer followed strict religious practices, many saw them as a threat. The Romantic novelist Achim von Arnim, for example, warned in 1811 against these hidden Jews who “no longer observe their own religious laws and thus infiltrate society all the more effectively” (qtd in Robertson 162).

The increasing popularity of the study of “race science” in the 19th century, worked effectively to further extend the anti-Semitic stereotypes and penetrate these ideas even more into the mainstream. The anti-Semitic ideas hid under the scientific blanket of “race science” that set out to scientifically show the genetic differences between various races and the genetic “differences and peculiarities” of the “Jewish race”.
The technique of exalting German culture by putting down another culture, most conveniently that of the Jews, was then applied to elevate the status of the “Germannen”. Chamberlain published a book in the first decade of the twentieth century that talked about the Aryan race which in accordance with his beliefs was “united not only by physical features but also by its racial soul, which is religious and mystical” (qtd. in Robertson 170). The Jews, contrastingly, had been portrayed for centuries as being both “materialistic and legalistic”.

The various subtitles of anti-Semitic thought accumulated power and support throughout the 18\textsuperscript{th}, 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The anti-Semitic beliefs were widespread and far reaching. It is important to track the history of such thought in order to try to fathom and even begin to comprehend the atrocities that were committed against the Jewish people in the Second World War.

As with the case of the Volga Germans, it is important to examine the history of how the German Jews came to be inhabitants of Argentina in order to fully appreciate their experience as immigrants/ exiles in a new land. In May of 1922 the independent organization know as Soprotimis (Sociedad de Proteccion a los Inmigrantes Isrealitas) was formed as a breakout organization of the Central Committee for the Relief of the War Victims. Their aim was to help European Jews immigrate to Argentina (Avni, 129). 1920 to 1930 was the time period in which the majority of European Jews who emigrated from their European homelands to other countries overseas were able to successfully settle in a new land. This is not to say that Jews did not leave after 1930, but after that time period departure to oversee destinations became increasingly difficult.
Of the 674,527 Jewish émigrés who settled in various countries between 1920 and 1930, according to HICEM, 11.2 percent (75,505) found a haven in Argentina. More Jews reached the shores of Buenos Aires than went to Canada and Brazil combined, and the flow was only a third less that that to Palestine. After the United States, which absorbed more immigrants during this decade than all other countries put together, Argentina ranked second. Thus it appears that in the ten years after World War I, the Jews took relatively good advantage of the opportunity afforded them by Argentina’s immigration laws and general receptivity to newcomers. (Avni 123)

Due to the political risk and great difficulty of placing Jewish refugees in urban occupations in Argentina, more Jewish refugees were placed in rural regions, where they would exercise cultivation and farming occupations. One of the major Jewish organizations in Argentina, the Jewish Colonization Association (JCA), which was founded by the French philanthropist Baron Maurice Hirsch, had played an active role in bringing Jewish farmers from Eastern Europe to its land holdings in Argentina and Brazil since the 1890s. The JCA had many resources and was an effective administrative organization. With regard to the holdings of the JCA in Argentina in the 1930s, these comprised 213,000 hectares in Entre Ríos, 154,000 in Buenos Aires Province, 148,000 in Santa Fé, 81,000 in La Pampa Territory, and 3,000 in Santiago del Estero (Newton 147). It is important to note that the world depression, worsened by the U.S. stock market crash of 1929, had caused the JCA to sell a large amount of property. The JCA brought a large number of European Jews to Argentina, and “by early 1939 about 35,000 Jewish colonists, most of them JCA dependants, were on Argentine land” (Newton 147). Nonetheless, out of all of the Jewish refugees, those from Nazi Germany comprised only a minority.
On March 29, 1933, the directors of Soprotimis received a telegram from HICEM that they should convene to discuss the actions that their organization would take in response to Hitler taking power in Germany. The telegram urged Soprotimis to do the following:

Seek approval, together with the JCA, for the admission of Jewish refugees from Germany….Provide assurances that they will not become a public burden. Emphasize that they are an outstanding element and a genuine contribution to the economic, intellectual, and moral development of the host country. (Avni 129)

Two days before, after the Jews of Argentina had heard the news the German government sponsored anti-Semitic attacks, they had held mass protests in Buenos Aires. Now realizing the seriousness of the situation, the directors of Soprotimis, quickly submitted a request to the Immigration Department at the time, asking for a special dispensation that would allow German Jews into Argentina. The Argentine authorities, however, quickly rejected Soprotimis’s request, giving the following reasons: the immigrants in question had no relatives in Argentina, they had no employment lined up in advance with Argentine employers, and they were not farmers. “Moreover, the term refugees, used in the application to emphasize the special nature of the request, was not even recognized by the Argentine authorities” (Avni 129-130).

Various factors hindered the success of the Jewish organizations to bring over more European Jews to a safe refugee in Argentina. For example, the stock market crash of 1929 in the United States affected the world economy and “drastically changed political conditions in Argentina and thereby, the possibilities for immigration” (Avni
The economy of Argentina worsened and the immigration policies which had previously allowed many Jews a refuge now became increasingly stricter. In addition, the JCA was forced to sell off a considerable share of its land, thus having less territory available for the Jewish refugees. For the 500,000 Jews living in Germany in March of 1933 when Adolf Hitler was elected to power (Avni 109), fleeing their native country would be their only means of survival, and at the same time the prospect of leaving became increasingly difficult.

This situation was also complicated by the fact that the most prominent Jewish leaders of the time were not willing to embrace trans-Atlantic immigration for their fellow Jews as the best solution. At that time, the majority of the European Jews did not realize the severity of the situation which confronted them.

In the course of 1933, it became apparent that Argentina was less important as a haven than anticipated. Of the thirty-seven thousand Jews that fled Germany that year, only one-fifth set sail for countries across the ocean. Moreover, after recovering from their initial shock, the Jewish leadership in Germany was almost totally opposed to immigration. The hard won political rights attained by the Jews in the nineteenth century seemed to retain a glimmer of hope, and exodus from Germany, which was right in step with the plans of the Nazis, was perceived as deserting the battlefield….In late October 1933, all the major international Jewish organizations including the Jewish Agency in Palestine, declared their opposition to the emigration of the German Jewish community. This influenced the work of the Palestine Office, the Hilfsverein der Deutschen Juden in Berlin and HICEM: Rather than promoting a swift, massive exodus, they dispensed carefully regulated aid to Jews leaving Germany at their own initiative. (Avni 132)
Another factor, that proved difficult for JCA, was the sensitivity at the federal level to the complaints of the anti-Semitic press. There were complaints that the Jews were “given” what it termed “the best land” (Newton 147,148). The JCA officials retorted, as was true, that the territories were not the “best” and had certainly not been “given” to the Jews. Nonetheless, conditions became stricter for the Jewish Organizations. These stricter conditions had disastrous effects for the German-speaking Jewish community in Europe.

In Germany and Austria, more than 200 Jewish families sold their property hastily and at great loss, paid the Nazi “flight tax”, and obtained their Argentine visas and steamer passage, but were nevertheless unable to clear a European port by the first of October. Their visas lapsed and they were left high and dry. (Newton 151)

Changes in Argentine society also played a role in deterring JCA efforts. As increasingly large numbers migrated to the city and Argentina became increasingly more industrialized, the value of small and medium sized farms (which in the nineteenth century had been the unit of development for immigrant families) decreased significantly. The remote frontier areas such as Entre Ríos and Santa Fé were especially affected. Although “as late as the 1930s, pioneer family farms were still common in newly opened peripheral zones in Misiones, Chaco, La Pampa, and Río Negro” (Newton 148), the increasing industrialization proved to be a barrier for finding rural occupations for Jewish-Germans in Argentina.
In the aftermath of Kristallnacht, on 21 November 1938, Ambassador Thermann asked the Argentine government to deny further entry to Jewish refugees—he feared, he said, for his personal safety. In mid 1939, the British embassy learned informally that the Argentines had ceased to issue visas to all Jewish applicants. Investigating, the British verified that such a ban indeed existed, but that the government refused to put its directive in writing for fear of the uproar it would provoke from the congressional and press opposition—instead, all sorts of “chicane” were to be employed. (Newton 151)

The outbreak of the Spanish Civil War in 1936 also was also a factor in tightening trans-Atlantic immigration regulations. The struggle of the Spanish Second Republic to defend their legitimately elected government had gained communist support, and this proved consequential to Argentina as they had signed a pact in 1935 declaring their anticommunist stance. Therefore, any immigrants headed for Argentina faced an even more intense screening process.

In consequence of the anticommunist pact they had signed the previous year, the foreign minister of Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil agreed to increase their vigilance over immigration, and to pay particular attention to refugees’ political antecedents. Already in September, 800 German Jews who had applied for visas at Argentine consulates, as well as Spaniards and other Europeans known to have supported the Popular Front, found themselves being scrutinized even more closely. (Newton 149)

The JCA leaders of the 1930s believed that the settlement of their lands was beneficial, not only for the obvious reason of helping the European Jews, but also because the Jewish community felt it would be more difficult for the Argentine
Government to seize control of and expropriate settled land, if economic conditions worsened in Argentina and agricultural reform became necessary.

The JCA was supported by the British, and they believed this would prove to be advantageous for the realization of the Association’s goals. However, despite the British support, settlement continued at a painstakingly slow rate in the 1930s. From Nazi Germany, the first Jewish refugees were placed in small communities in the vicinity of Villa Crespo, Entre Ríos Province. In December 1935 and between 1933 and 1941, the JCA placed 430 German-Jewish families on the land.

By mid 1936, JCA administrators had drafted plans to place 347 refugee families on the land by the end of 1938; the cost would be about U.S. $2 million. This effort fell behind schedule, however: in January 1939, Osmond Goldschmid, the Paris-based president of the JCA, informed the British Foreign Office that 205 families had been established during the past two years and the 48 more had sent “pioneers”. Altogether, Goldschid reported, 140 more families could be placed immediately in Argentina, and 50 in Brazil. (Newton 147)

The third group of Germans that I will discuss with reference to the immigration and exilic examined in the previous chapter is the National-Socialist Germans. This group left their homeland predominately after the German defeat in the World War II. Unlike the previous two groups, many of these Germans were war criminals looking to escape imprisonment or execution for their roles in the Second World War. In terms of classification, the Nazis clearly fit under the category of exiles. As examined in the previous chapter, an exile is legally referred to as a refugee, a word which originated from the Latin “refugiere” and means “to flee, run away, or escape.” To flee, run away, or escape is exactly what the Nazis that came to Argentina did. The primary distinctions
between the immigrant and the exile (the urgency in which the homeland must be left, the period of residence in which the person is to stay in the new country, and the intentions of financial gain) clearly classify the Nazi under exile status.

The documentation of their arrival in Argentina is therefore much scarcer, due to the fact that the National-Socialist Germans (Nazis) wanted to hide their true identities. Nonetheless, the National-Socialist ideologies were present in Argentina before many of the German Nazis fled there after the war.

The formation of the modern nation of Germany in 1871 was founded on the basis of nationalistic principles. Nonetheless, Germany is not unique; nationalism is a central factor in the formation of a modern nation, because it creates a bond between the nation and the individual. Nationalism is however, ironically, a façade that is oftentimes less real than imaginary; “…while nationalism projected a unified national body as part of its ideological persuasion, such unification rarely, if ever, existed” (McClennen 41). Nonetheless, its lack of objective basis does nothing to diminish the enormity of its influence on exile and immigration from historical times up to the contemporary.

Cultural nationalism played a significant role in the formation of the National-Socialistic Germany. As examined previously, a national hero can be easily molded or twisted to represent the desired image of the unifying nationalistic body or political ideology.

The Nazis were masters of altering the perception of historically significant figures in order to sway public support. Take, for example, the famous German philosopher Nietzsche. His philosophical expressions became twisted by those pushing German cultural nationalism in order to foment a Nazi spokesperson, even though his intentions were never that of supporting a National Socialist society. McClennen (23)
states that, “Cultural products, like heroes, anthems, flags, as well as literature, media, and the arts, are the foundation for the development and maintenance of cultural nationalism.” In accordance with this idea, the Nazis devoted great time and effort to the exaltation of their own culture, and film became an outlet in which to display their propaganda. The cinematic expression of Leni Riefenstahl’s 1935 *Triumph des Willens*, for example, portrays the German *Führer* (Adolph Hitler) as a god-like character descending from the heavens above. The “unique cultural superiority” possessed by the German Aryans is also exalted in Leni Riefenstahl’s 1938 *Olympia*. The popular German film *Jud Süß* (Sweet Jew) allowed the German public to see all of the negative stereotypes of the non-Aryan Jew compiled into one easy to loathe character. The arts that were not “German enough” were labeled degenerate. The Expressionist German art groups (the *Brücke* and *Der Blaue Reiter*) were the main sufferers of the degenerate art label due to not adequately portraying the “unique cultural qualities” of the German nation.

As far as cultural nationalism influencing those people already on Argentine soil, the degree in which the German National-Socialist ideologies played a role in Argentina is still debatable. Although National-Socialist ideas were taught in some Argentine schools during the Second World War and there were some Argentine National Socialist groups preceding the war and during the war, the ideas did not appear to be far reaching enough to gain the support of the general Argentine public. Nonetheless, the Argentine government (although officially neutral) did initially sympathize with the Axis Powers. In the article, “Peron’s Nazi Ties; How the European fascist sensibility found new roots and new life in the South Atlantic region”, Falcoff (19) states the following:
As late as 1944, the Argentine military thought the Nazis were going to win the war, and during the first months of 1945 tried to act as if they had. Having bet on the wrong horse, Peron and his associates--far from reproaching themselves for their bad judgment, or at least striving to correct it--closed ranks and came to the rescue of some of the most unsavory figures to escape Allied justice in liberated Europe.

After the clear defeat of the Axis Powers, however, Argentina did take steps to gain the support of the Allies. For example, “in September 1945, the Argentine government decreed the elimination of German and Japanese nationals from the administration and faculty of foreign-language schools (except for the few antifascist schools such as Cangallo and Pestalozzi)” (Newton 371).

Due to the great number of falsified passports and dubious agreements involved in assisting the National-Socialist Germans’ arrival to their new residence, the exact number of Nazis that took refuge in Argentina following the war can not be documented with exact precision. According to Newton (372), “until the 1980s the question of the postwar migration to South America of Europeans of dubious past remained unclarified and highly contentious.” During their Civil War, the Spanish Nationalists had been allied with Nazi Germany. Seeing as the Nazis had aided the Nationalists (led by Francisco Franco) in winning the war; it was no surprise that Nazis would flee there. Many Germans did escape across the Pyrenees and join an already large German establishment. Spain became a point of departure for the Nazis in their flight across the Atlantic, and “allied agents in Montevideo and Buenos Aires began to take note of the fit looking priests from Spain, many of whom had taken the vow of silence” (Newton 373).
After 1945, the Argentine consulate in Barcelona became a distribution point for false passports, which enabled literally hundreds if not thousands of Nazi functionaries to escape to Argentina, including the infamous Dr. Josef Mengele. Eventually Argentina provided safe haven for such sinister personalities as Belgian Nazi collaborator Pierre Daye; Reinhard Spitzy, the Austrian representative of Skoda in Spain; Charles Lescat, former Vichy functionary and onetime editor of the scurrilous magazine Je Suis Partout; SS functionary Ludwig Lienhardt; German industrialist Ludwig Freude; SS functionary (for a time) Klaus Barbie, "the Butcher of Lyons"; Eichmann; and Eichmann's adjutant Franz Stangl. (Falcoff 19)

A second route led across the Danish-German border, which the Nazis used after May of 1945 as an escape route. According to Newton’s research, Nazis also later sailed directly from Scandinavian ports to South America in seagoing yachts.

The most notorious ‘ratline; used by Eichmann, Barbie, and hundreds of others, was the “Vatican” route, a chain of cloisters running from Upper Bavaria via Austria and Bolzano or Merano to Genoa, Pme and Naples. …The Spanish diplomat Juan Pérez Gómez, who had organized the Abwehr courier service between Iberia and Argentina, was reported active in moving refugees southward from Bavaria. (Newton 374)

The preoccupation of the former Allies with European reconstruction and the threat of communism proved to be deciding factors in deferring interest from tracking down National Socialists fleeing Germany, and after 1947 much of the effort that had gone into tracking down the Nazis was redirected to the aforementioned causes. Although the exact number of World War II Nazis that fled to Argentina after the
German defeat is uncertain, Argentina was most certainly a haven for many of the German National-Socialists.

As examined in chapter one, cultural nationalism evokes a reaction, provoking those not belonging to the national culture to challenge these official versions of culture. McClennen’s argument (23) that there are two important ways to challenge the official versions of national culture can be applied to the distinct manners that German immigrants and exiles in Argentina dealt with the official version of national culture. As we examined earlier, the first method to challenge these official versions of culture is an alternative/ counterculture and thereby simultaneously critique the very concept of national culture, whereas the second is to expose repressive connections between the self and the state.

Although there are clearly individual exceptions, the groups as a whole provide an intriguing look at the ways in which exiles and immigrants deal with national culture. The Volga Germans initially created an alternative/ counterculture by not assimilating into mainstream Russian or Argentine society and retaining their own unique culture and language. The German Jews for the most part, however, successfully exposed repressive connections between the self and the state via literary representations. The National Socialist Germans, being themselves the creators of strong cultural nationalistic sentiments, did not in any way protest national culture but rather assimilated to avoid the repercussions of being discovered.

With regard to the various issues that complicate exiled nationalism, McClennen (23) argues, as discussed in the previous chapter, that “the central issue revolves around the tension between describing the connection between the self and the state as either
fragmented or unified.” The Volga Germans, The Jewish Germans, and the National Socialist Germans live(d) in the postmodern era, and there is a significant difference in the way this unification manifested itself in modern and postmodern times. Whereas, the Enlightenment favored a faith in the self’s unity, modernism challenged this notion with its emphasis on rationality. The modern subject is, therefore, conscious of fragmentation, but at the same time nostalgic for unification.

As examined in the previous chapter, Morse no longer views home as “an institution providing refuge or rest for the destitute, the afflicted, the infirm, etc.” as defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, but rather as a frayed concept. “Home” is more bits and pieces of images, recollections and memories that encompass a human’s experiences in both childhood and adulthood. As discussed previously, “home” is in this sense a collection of memories. Morse sees movies as “evoking sense memories,” because film produces a medium in which to reflect this collection of memories. Nonetheless, film is not the only medium which pieces together images, recollections and memories of the human experience. Literature is also a method of evoking sense memories, and in this sense, it is through exilic and immigration literature that a recreation and representation of “home” is enabled.

The multidisciplinary examination of these three distinct German groups, that found a new homeland in Argentina under the framework of immigration and exilic theory, paves the way to a more comprehensive understanding of the immigrant and exilic experience. An examination, in particular, of the Jewish Germans’ complex history with reference to these theories is vital to appreciating the literary work pertaining to the Jewish-German immigrants and exiles in Argentina.
Literary representation is a significant tool utilized to portray the immigrant and exile experience, and in the following chapters, I aim to examine various immigration and exilic literary representations. Due to their primary preoccupations as agrarian workers and their lower median of formal education, fewer immigration literary representations pertaining to the Volga Germans exist in comparison with those pertaining to the Jewish-Germans. The National-Socialist Germans did not produce a great deal of exilic literature. The Nazis’ status in Argentina as war criminals hindered published literature from being an outlet to express their personal experiences in their new homeland of Argentina. Therefore, in the subsequent chapters, the focus will be primarily on the literary representations encompassing the Jewish-German immigration and exilic experiences in Argentina.
CHAPTER TWO:
Representations of German Exiles and Immigrants in Argentina by German-Speaking Europeans

Literature is a powerful tool for piecing together the images, recollections and memories of the human experience. It is through exilic and immigration literature that a recreation and representation of “home” is enabled. Home in this sense not a physical place, but rather a compilation of memories and images encompassing an individual’s own life experiences. Examining the literary representations of German-speaking Europeans who embarked on a transatlantic journey to reside in Argentina allows for a unique insight into the phenomena of exile and immigration. Due to the multidimensional psychological effects that immigrants and exiles face, representations of specific experiences may differ from individual to individual, but nonetheless offer an exceptional view of the situation. It is the German-speaking Europeans themselves who offer a first-hand analysis of their own nations’ situation and the effects of nationalism and cultural nationalism that drove out prominent members of their societies. Simultaneously their representations exemplify a life caught between the two poles: the life left behind (that of the Heimat), and the new transatlantic life that their former compatriots are no longer able to personally identify with (their new Heim). In this chapter I will examine the European literature written by and about German-speaking immigrants and exiles in Argentina. The German-language writers Stefan Zweig and Paul Zech will first be
examined in their historical context and then for their literary contributions. I will then examine the accounts compiled by the German gerontologists Andreas Kruse and Eric Schmitt pertaining to “ordinary” German Jews, Herr A. and Frau M., who sought a new life in Argentina. In terms of representative techniques, Zweig and Zech use personal representation, whereas Kruse and Schmitt access reality via a mélange of impersonal and personal representation.

These works offer a broad view of the immigration and exilic experience. They portray not only the physicality of this journey, but also the internal journey and that these German-speaking Europeans underwent as a result of their displacement. Cross-cultural passing incorporates various different steps through which the immigrant/exile must pass. Consequently the experience, aside from the paradoxical internality and physicality of which it is composed, can also be broken down chronologically. The experience encompasses the process of arrival as well as the process of adapting once having arrived.

As previously discussed, McClennen (245) examines the binary oppositions that relate to the exilic experience: “Much cultural theory rests on a series of binary oppositions. (…) Exile literature tests the limits of these binaries”. The immigration and exilic experiences of Zweig, Zech, Herr A., and Frau M. encompasses a number of binary oppositions: assimilation versus dissimilation, identity politics versus multiculturalism, essentialism versus free will, essentialism versus malleability … etc. Additionally, they

\[\text{\footnotesize{2 In the framework of German literature I will also include works written by Austrian authors, seeing as the Anschluß of 1938 incorporated Austria as part of Germany up until 1945, when the Second World War ended. (Adolf Hitler was also Austrian born and attained his German citizenship only shortly before becoming elected chancellor of Germany in 1933.)}}\]
also test the usefulness of these oppositions. Zweig, Zech, Herr A., and Frau M. each experience these binary oppositions in different ways.

Cultural nationalism, examined in the previous chapters, is undoubtedly tied to the exilic/immigration experiences of Zech, Zweig, Frau M. and Herr A. Each, in accordance with cultural nationalistic ideology, left the homeland due to a lack of “unique cultural qualities.” The idea of essentialism would, consequently, play a prominent role in how each individual was able to internalize (and combat, accept, or accept in part) the idea of a predetermined identity. Cultural nationalism catered to the idea of essentialism and forced those individuals who were banished from their homeland to reexamine their own identity. The concepts of identity, *Heim* (home), and *Heimat* (homeland) are directly related. Consequently, how Zweig, Zech, Frau M., and Herr A. conceptualized their post-exilic/post-immigration identities is directly related to how they were able to redefine *Heim* and *Heimat* for themselves and assimilate to or dissimilate from their new cultural surroundings.

Prominent figures of society who conflicted with the “ideals” of the Aryans were the first at risk with the rise of German National Socialism. Stefan Zweig, born in Vienna in 1881 to a wealthy Austrian-Jewish family, did not possess the “predetermined cultural characteristics” desired by the Nazis. Therefore, he found himself at odds with the cultural nationalism of pre-World War II Germany and Austria and was forced into exile in Argentina, before moving once again to Brazil. In Brazil he committed suicide with his second wife. His travels through South America begin with a tone of optimism that, nonetheless, changes to pessimism as the war continues and the vision of a return to normalcy becomes increasingly foggy. The examples of Stefan Zweig’s writings and his
journey from optimism into pessimism and eventual suicide are a symbolic microcosm of the sentiments felt by many of the German-speakers during the post-World-War-One period. Zweig’s *Die Welt von Gestern* (The World of Yesterday, 1942) offers a nostalgic view of the world which Zweig feels will never be the same.

As previously discussed, the modernist view of the self’s unity differed from the Enlightenment’s notion of the self’s unity. In the postmodern era, “we note the anguish of the modern subject who is conscious of fragmentation and nostalgic for unification” (McClennen 23). As an author of the modern era, Zweig believes in the unity of self. Like other modernists, he also believes that there are methods by which individuals can be clearly analyzed (i.e. Karl Marx with *Unterbau* and Sigmund Freud with psychoanalysis). Zweig does not focus on the fragmentation of the self, because it contradicts what he believes to be humanly possible. In this respect, if a “fragmented self” cannot be analyzed it, consequently, cannot be pieced back together. Zweig’s suicide holds cultural implications. Zweig’s last work, *Schachnovelle*, represents how some emigrants saw the loss of middle-class Central European culture as synonymous with a loss of identity, and that settling somewhere else did not restore this identity.

*Schachnovelle* depicts an eerie parallel to the exilic experience that that numerous Germans were forced to undertake, by fleeing their homeland en route to a new safe haven in Argentina.

Mit der Durchsuchung seines Hauses auf dem Kapuzinerberg 1934 und den ständig wachsenden Gewalttätigkeiten gegen Juden wurde ihm deutlich, daß die Welt in die Hände der Barbarei gefallen war. Es gelang Zweig, die Darstellung dieser Barbarei, in seiner subtilsten Form in seinem letzten vollbrachten Werk, *Schachnovelle*, aufzugreifen. (Varkonyi 98)
Zweig’s *Schachnovelle* was first published in 1944, after his death. In terms of the chronology of the immigrant and exile experience, the work represents the process of travel to a foreign land. The work also symbolically depicts the internality of the immigrant and exile experience, in that the exilic experience is principally as much a part of the psyche as it is tied to a specific geographical location. Zweig’s own exile began, ironically within the borders of his own native Austria. Nonetheless, the geographic location did nothing to undermine the fact the Zweig was a victim of exile (internal exile versus geographical exile). He would later be a victim of geographical exile as well, but his exilic psyche was first experienced in Austria. The personal life of Zweig is particularly noteworthy when examining *Schachnovelle*.

The parallels between the desperation of the protagonist and the desperation of the author are striking. As Massimo Negrotto (qtd. in Brummet 6) observes, “representation plays a key role in relating the human mind to the world” and that “representations are mental constructs whose consistency with the world depends, according to different psychological or social circumstances, on the strength of our subjectivity, or cultural models, or the world.” Reality must be *accessed* through representation, and Zweig uses fictional representation (as opposed to a non-fictional, scientific representation) in *Schachnovelle* to present his own exilic experience.

Zweig’s novel is set aboard a passenger ship en route to Buenos Aires. The two central figures of *Schachnovelle*, Dr. B. and Mirko Czentovic, are distinct opposites of one another. Dr. B. is cultivated and intelligent while Mirko Czentovic is arrogant, privative, greedy, and avaricious. Dr. B., a member of the educated middle class, also
differs from his nemesis in that Czentovic comes from very humble beginnings. In spite
of being uneducated, Czentovic is extremely effective in his one specialty: chess. The
representation of these two very opposing characters immediately leaves the reader to
question their motives and personal histories.

The character of Dr. B. offers a multidimensional look at the plight of survival
under German National Socialism. Dr. B., a German on his way to exile in Argentina,
survived solitary confinement by the Nazis. His survival and ability to retain his sanity
are credited to his capacity to play chess entirely in his mind. The figure of Dr. B offers a
portrayal of the downfall of the middle-class intellectuals during the time of National
Socialism. Czentovic, being the nemesis of Dr. B., has been interpreted as the figure
embodying fascism. Nonetheless, Schachnovelle contains multiple underlying themes
aside from the microcosms of Czentovic and Dr. B. as fascism and the intellectual
German middle class respectively. The theme of the psyche and to what extent an
individual is able to overcome psychological torture is also dealt with.

In dieser Novelle bleibt nicht viel übrig von der Hoffnung auf die Überwindung des Kriegs durch
seelische Stärke.... Hier rückt mehr die psychische und seelische Beschädigung des Protagonisten
Dr. B. durch die psychologische Quälerei der Nazi-Soldaten in den Vordergrund. Was am
deutlichsten in der Schachnovelle zum Vorschein kommt, ist die geistige Zerstörung des Dr. B.,
die beim Schachspielen hervorgerufen wird. Dr. B. ist durch seine Gefangenschaft ein seelischer
Krüppel geworden. Das Schachspiel zwischen Dr. B. und dem Analphabeten Mirko Czentovic
funktioniert als Katalysator, indem dessen Monomanie Dr. B.s zerbrechlichem psychologischem
Zustand gegenübergestellt wird. Zweigs Dr. B. ist nicht mehr fähig Widerstand gegen Czentovics
monomanisches Benehmen zu leisten. Dr. B. schein am Anfang seiner Partien mit Czentovic
davon überzeugt, daß er die intellektuelle Fähigkeit besitzte, dem Weltmeister den Titel streitig zu
machen. Dr. B.s Sieg über diesen kann sich aber nicht verwirklichen. Trotzdem Dr. B. seine etwa hundertfünfzig auswendig gelernten Schachpartien zur Verfügungen stehen, glingt es ihm nicht, Czentovic zu besiegen. (Varkonyi 98-99)

Zweig’s *Schachnovelle* is told from the perspective of the *Ich-Erzähler* (first-person narrator) who is also a passenger on the ship to Buenos Aires. The *Ich-Erzähler* formulates his own opinion regarding each character, and consequently gives the reader insight to the psyche and backgrounds of the novella’s protagonists. Czentovic is portrayed in a negative light by the *Ich-Erzähler*, whereas Dr. B. is portrayed admirably. The story develops as the passengers challenge the at that time (fictional) world chess champion, Mirko Czentovic, to a chess match. The *Ich-Erzähler* also takes part in the chess match, and consequently is able to find out about the circumstances that have plagued Dr. B. and discover his identity. In the first game of chess, Czentovic wins, but in the second game, Dr. B. joins the rest of the passengers to play against the world champion, and the game ends in a draw. As a result of Dr. B.’s incredible showing of chess capabilities, a match between him and Czentovic is organized.

Before the chess game between Dr. B. and Czentovic is played, though, the history of how Dr. B. came to be a chess player is revealed through his conversation with the *Ich-Erzähler*. Dr. B. was held by the Gestapo in a hotel room 24 hours a day without anything with which to occupy his mind. However, he managed to steal a chess book from an officer’s jacket. In order to have some sort of mental stimulation while in solitary confinement, Dr. B. reenacted the chess matches, move by move, which were outlined in the book. Afterwards he began to replay the chess games blind, until he knew them all by memory and was unable to derive any sort of stimulus from the already
created chess matches. Dr. B then moved on to create new chess matches in his mind, but eventually, he suffered a mental breakdown. The mental breakdown led to his release from being held in confinement. Dr. B.’s mental breakdown is also symbolic of the internal exile felt by those forced to leave behind everything. Paval (1998) argues in *Exile as Romance and as Tragedy* that “taken metaphorically exile may stand for many things, in particular the pervasive feeling human beings often experience that they do not entirely belong in the sublunar world.” In this sense, Dr. B’s psychological battle can be viewed as not only exile from homeland, but also metaphorically as an exile from one’s own self.

Dr. B. wins the first game of chess against the world champion. During the second game, however, Dr. B. becomes more and more anxious the longer Czentovic takes to make his moves. Dr. B. knows all of the world championship chess matches by memory, and therefore knows in advance the move that Czentovic will make. Dr. B., however, becomes increasingly impatient, and this leads once again to another mental breakdown and to the termination of the match. The fact that Dr. B. is an intellectual is also significant. His figure is symbolic of the exorbitant number of its intellectuals that were eliminated by the cultural nationalism in Germany. Noakes (qtd. in Thomas 25) gives the shocking statistics of the number of great minds that fled Germany as a result of National Socialism.

The flight of intellectuals from Germany after 1933 …reached mass proportions. Between 1933 and 1938 a staggering total of 3,120 academics left Germany, including 41 percent of full professors in the social sciences and 36 percent of those in law.
Mirko Czentovic’s personal story is revealed through a flashback. He is the son of a poor Slavic boatman on the Danube. After the death of his father he was, as a twelve-year-old, be taken in and raised by a parish priest. He is portrayed as a dull, taciturn and uncommunicative child. In spite of all his efforts, he doesn’t succeed in getting an education. The language that Czentovic uses is simplistic and sharply contrasted with the eloquent speech of Dr. B., and it is language, in large part, that ties the character of the Czentovic to the symbol of fascism. McClennen (222) states that “fascist oriented authoritarian regimes often revert to pre-modern notions of time and existence.” Czentovic is representative of this pre-modern character, lacking in education, eloquence and any sort of refinement, but nonetheless very effective in the one limited area in which he focuses his attentions.

The pessimism of Zweig’s *Die Welt von Gestern* is also seen in *Schachnovelle*, in that the ability to overcome the psychological damage caused by German National Socialism is portrayed as too great for any one individual to overcome. Zweig’s essentialist belief in the human spirit and the humanistic intellectual contributes to his failing psyche.
Motives for Zweig’s suicide are presented in his literary work *Schachnovelle*. He felt that the loss of middle-class Central-European culture was synonymous with a loss of identity. Settling somewhere else did not restore this identity, and in this sense, Zweig supports the essentialist belief that his identity was, in a way, predetermined. *Schachnovelle* exemplifies the forced removal from one’s cultural identity and the lack of success in using intellectual structures (chess) to replace this identity. It also shows the victory of a primitive, non-humanistic force when confronted with the intellectual, humanistic power. *Schachnovelle*, in relation to the concepts set up in the first two chapters, exemplifies the cultural factors that construct identity, *Heim*, and *Heimat*. *Heimat*, as represented by Zweig, is the humanistic bourgeois culture of middle-class Central Europe. Without this culture, those formerly forming part of this culture felt themselves to be stripped of identity and stripped of their core as human beings.

Paul Zech, another prominent German figure of society who conflicted with the National Socialist “ideals” was born on February 19, 1881 in Briesen, West Prussia. He belonged to the literary group of the German Expressionists, an artistic style labeled by the Nazis as degenerate. It is the fascist intolerance of cultural creativity that put Zech in danger. As a result of his profession, Zech first went into exile in 1933, the same year which marked the rise of Hitler to power and the official implementation of the politics of National Socialism. Zech died in Buenos Aires in September of 1946.

Zech produced many works while in exile in Argentina and also wrote for the Argentinischen Tagenblatt and the Deutsche La Plata-Zeitung. Spitter claims that Zech was significant in that he was the first prominent German exiled writer to attempt to write about South America thematically.

Zech war der erste exilierte Schriftsteller von Bedeutung, der Südamerika thematisch zu erfassen suchte, und er hoffte deshalb verständlicherweise für seine neuen Werke ein interessiertes Lesepublikum zu finden- zuerst unter den Emigranten, später auch in Deutschland: Wie viele Exilanten war auch er in den ersten Jahren der Emigration von einem schnellen Zusammenbruch des nationalsozialistischen Regimes überzeugt. Um so herber war die Enttäuschung, als ein Verleger nach dem anderen seine Manuskripte ablehnte. (Spitter 66)

Zech mantains his identity (feeling German) and uses an outsider’s perspective to explore the new area where he took up residence. Although he and Zweig both retain their Central European identity, Zech is able to conceptualize his own identity in a way that is not detrimental. This approach differs from Zweig, who clings to an unmalleable, essentialist Central European identity that no longer exists. For Zweig, the retention of an identity that no longer exists is synonymous with the loss of identity, and consequently
results in suicide. Zech does not wholeheartedly embrace either essentialism or free will when assessing his new place in the world, but rather finds a neutral zone between these two binary oppositions. Through his literary representations, Zech is able to present the idea of personal identity as neither one hundred percent predetermined nor one hundred percent free will, but rather malleable. Zech, although clearly hostile due to the loss of his Heimat, is able to reconstruct a Heim in Argentina.

Zech’s literary representations show the distinct meanings of and implications of Heim and Heimat for different individuals and different cultures. His literary works Kinder von Parana and Menschen der Calle Tuyuti depict distinct concepts of what constitutes home for two different cultures: indigenous Argentina (the “other” from Zech’s perspective) meeting with German exiles (the “other” from indigenous Argentina’s perspective). The clash of these two cultures is representative of the identity conflict felt by the exile. The two cultures, each adhering to different traditions and customs (different concepts encompassing home), somehow forge a coexistence that lingers between harmonious and conflicting.

Zech also formulates literary reconstructions of his own Heimat via near-autobiographical representations of his own exilic situation. Michael M irrt durch Buenos Aires is one such representation that portrays many autobiographical elements. The name of the novel’s protagonist Michael M., for example, came from a pseudonym that Zech had previously taken on.

In dem Roman Micheal M. Irrt durch Buenos Aires sucht Zech das Erlebnis der Flucht und des Exils in Argentinien literarisch zu gestalten. Da Michel Michael (bzw. Michael M.) ein früher von
Zech benutztes Pseudonym ist, spielt bereits der Titel auf autobiographische Zusammenhänge an.

(Spitter 166)

Spitta writes of Thomas Mann, Alfred Neumann, Lion Feuchtwanger and Rudolf Olden’s critiques of Zech’s *Michael M. irrt durch Buenos Aires*. The novella is filled with “sehr viel persönliches Ressentiment, sehr viel Abstraktes und Weltanschauliches, fast durchwegs Monologisieren. [...] Ausserordentlich negativ in der Gesamteinstellung, bis zum Nihilistischen“ (Spitta 168). In this respect, Zech’s outlook resembles Zweig’s essentialist perspective. Nonetheless, Zech is able to evolve from this nialist extreme and see that, although own actions will never restore his *Heimat*, they do allow him to build a new *Heim* in Argentina.

Spitta (169) also critiques Zech’s *Kinder von Parana*. The structure of the novel represents societal relations. The novel portrays the relationship between an Indian youth and the daughter of a German couple. Spitta (175) describes Zech’s work *Menschen der Calle Tuyuti* as a critique of society. *Menschen der Calle Tuyuti* is also a representative example of Zech’s narrative art in that he incorporates almost all of the most important motifs of his exile work in this novel. There are scenes from the everyday poor quarter: the battle for existence, criminality, and promiscuity next to the search for ascending the social hierarchy and the luck of the lower middle class; clerical satires; Indian elements in Zech’s new surroundings in South America (myths, magical ceremonies, Indian legends) and exotic elements such as the effect of the *pampero* storms on the native population. Zech represents the new cultural phenomena in his new home of Argentina from his “outsider” perspective. Resultantly Zech neither assimilates to Argentina nor dissimilates from Argentine culture, but rather ligers between these two binary oppositions.
In *Wir haben uns als Deutsche gefühlt* Andreas Kruse and Eric Schmitt succeed in giving detailed portrayals of individual “ordinary” German Jews who left Germany and found a new home in Argentina during the time of German National Socialism. These texts provide an understanding of individuals’ experiences on various levels of the immigration and exile spectrum. They encompass the spheres of internality and physicality as well as the chronological representation of the immigration and exile experience. Kruse and Schmitt’s literature differs from that of both Zech and Zweig in that their work is not the result of their own personal exilic experiences. Their representations are impersonal in that they are not experienced first hand, but simultaneously personal in that they rely on the personal experiences of other exiles. Kruse and Schmitt represent the experiences of German exiles to Argentina by speaking directly with these exiles and relating these people’s experiences. Brummet (55) discusses the moral accountability of representing such realities.

When one speaks of representations in a world that contains reality, the technical changeability of representations is held in check by the moral accountability contained in the expectation that representations will re-present reality.

Kruse and Schmitt (in accordance with Brummet) trust the reliability of personal representations because of their authenticity and the moral expectation that people will tell the truth.

The German Jews whom I will be discussing are not named in Kruse and Schmitt’s work but rather anonymously represented as Herr A. and Frau M. respectively. Their personal stories are revealed through interviews and direct quotes from Herr A. and
Frau M. as well as biographical information written by Kruse and Schmitt. Although the intention was to protect their privacy, the concealing of their true identities is in a way symbolic of the situation. The individual lives of immigrants are rarely examined in depth from a non-autobiographical viewpoint, and this gives a personal representation to otherwise unnamed individuals victimized by National Socialism.

Herr A. was born on April 10, 1908 as the third child of a Jewish salesman in Rheinland-Pfalz where his grandparents were residents. Cultural nationalism is what forced Herr A. out of his Heimat. Being Jewish by “birth” denied him the desirable “unique cultural characteristics” that the National-Socialist Germans demanded of their citizens. Herr A.’s father died in 1910, so he was left as the only male of the household. After he finished his Abitur he spent a year in military service, during which he did an apprenticeship that utilized his foreign language skills; He interned as an interpreter for French and English in a department store with 150 employees. In 1927, at age 19, Herr A. switched to being an interpreter in the purchasing division the department store Société Française de Nouvelle Galerin in Paris. In 1929 he took over a lead position in the shopping center Leonard Tiez AG in Kohl (which is today Kaufhof). At the age of 23, he was promoted to assistant manager was put in charge of the construction and management of a central city office. Herr A.’s job required him to travel, and due to his business trips, he was already informed early on about the German National Socialism. The threats of National Socialism would have effects on Herr A. because, as National Socialism gained power, doing business with Jews became taboo in the eyes of the regime.
Damit änderte sich schlagartig das gesamte Bild für alle jüdischen Mitarbeiter, denn gegen das jüdische Warenhaus wurde ja ein Kampf von Seiten des Nationalsozialismus ausgeführt, der damals proklamierte: „Das jüdischen Warenhaus ist unser Unglück, Deutsche kauft nicht bei Juden“. (qtd in Kruse and Schmitt 51)

In spite of his high academic qualifications and outstanding knowledge of languages, Herr A. found it impossible to be employed. The cultural nationalism of National-Socialist Germany had begun its vicious attack against the “culturally void” Jews. In 1935 he left Germany together with his mother and two sisters. The original plan was to immigrate to France, which created a plethora of unforeseen problems, and then once in France it became clear that he was also not treated as a normal citizen. Argentina then became the new destination.

Upon arrival in Argentina, Herr A. sought to assimilate to Argentine culture by attaining the desired skills and language of the Argentine culture. Adapting important aspect of the new culture, he felt, would allow Argentina to become his new home. Herr A., therefore, initially worked in an agricultural colony and learned Spanish. Then Herr A. sought to take advantage of his previous identity and attempted to put the qualifications that he had earned in Germany to use in Buenos Aires. Nonetheless, work in the area of his original employment was not possible for him to attain, so Herr A. began work as a bookkeeper in a textile factory. He was able to rise quickly in the ranks, but at the expense of his health. Therefore, Herr A. was forced once again to switch careers.

The question of identity became a personal one for Herr A. Although it was the German nation that drove him away and treated him as an inferior human being, he still
continued to identify himself as German. “Herr A. hat sich immer als Deutscher gefühlt und mit Deutschland als dem Land identifiziert, in dem seine Familie über Generationen gelebt hat“ (Kruse and Schmitt 59). The Germany in which he and his family had resided for generations was his home even though such a Germany no longer existed. Nonetheless it was his ability to assimilate to the Argentine culture (through the acquisition of yet another language and job skills) that allowed him to make a second home in Argentina. For Herr A. Heimat is not tied exclusively to Central European identity. Whereas Zweig found himself without identity with the loss of the humanistic bourgeois culture of middle-class Central Europe, Herr A. is able to form a multicultural identity that retains positive aspects of his old cultural identity and adapts aspects of the new culture.

For Herr A. Germany is his fatherland, and Argentina is his second homeland. „Ich darf es vielleicht nicht so ausdrücken: Deutschland ist mein Vaterland, Argentinien ist meine zweite Heimat“ (qtd. in Kruse and Schmitt 61). Although Herr A. left Germany in his early twenties and lived the rest of his life in Argentina, it is still Germany that he considers his homeland. Nonetheless the idea of home becomes a complex duality in that Argentina is his second Heimat.

With regard to the question of collective guilt, Herr A. reacts with clear rejection and sums up the categorical dealings with fellow human beings.

Ich glaube in des Deutschen Brust liegen zwei Seelen: Die eine Seele ist die des sogenannten guten Deutschen, des Deutschen von Schiller un von Goethe und unserer großen Musiker, unserer Schriftsteller und so weiter, das ist der eine Deutsche. Die andere Seele ist der Teil, der erwacht, wenn da draußen Uniformen erscheinen und die Marschmusik erklingt, dann geht der andere
Deutsche hoch, und dann ist der erste Deutsche, den ich vorhin benannte, der ist dann in den Hintergrund getreten. (qtd in Kruse and Schmitt 61-62)

For Herr A. the German National Socialists belong in a different category, far removed from what he knows as his Vaterland. For him, the Germany of National Socialism was the so-called other part of the German psyche that served only to repress that which was truly German. Cultural nationalism was the cause of Herr A.’s exile, but he nonetheless does not totally rule out the essentialist component of identity. Although quite obviously on a different level, Herr A. still acknowledges unique qualities of German identities. It is only that for Herr A., the National Socialists are the ones lacking in these cultural qualities of “good Germans”; the Germans like Schiller and Goethe and the great musicians and writers. Herr A., like Zech, is able to conceptualize an identity somewhere between essentialist and free willed. Both seem to represent identity as, in part, predetermined but also malleable.

Frau M., born in 1921, came from the “typical” family of the educated middleclass. Up until 1933, her Jewish family was well integrated in German culture, in Germany and with the German Volk. Nonetheless the Machtergreifung of German National Socialism in 1933 changed this very quickly. Cultural nationalism, like in the case of Herr. A., drove her out of her Heimat. In 1938 Frau M. emigrated out of Germany, and her family stayed behind. Her family’s situation exemplifies the plight of many of the educated middle class German Jews who tried to leave later, only to find they could no longer emigrate.
Frau M. reflects back on the perceived impossibility of an advanced culture, such as that of Germany, to implementing the seemingly pre-modern practices of National Socialism for an extended period of time.

Das ist unmöglich, das deutsche Volk, das eine so hohe Kulture erreicht hat, kann sich nicht auf dieses mittelalterliche oder vomittelalterliche Niveau herunterbegeben. Das kann nicht von langer Dauer sein. (qtd. in Kruse and Schmitt 65)

Frau M.’s reflections highlight the technique by which fascist authorities implement their power. The central figure of Czentovic in Zweig’s Schachnovelle comes to mind here as the primitive force who is able to achieve dominance in a limited area, in spite of his shortcomings in education and eloquence. McClennen’s previously discussed views of how fascist oriented regimes implement power is applicable not only to Zweig’s work, but also to Frau M’s reflections.

Since fascist oriented authoritarian regimes often revert to pre-modern notions of time and existence, describing their control of the country as a return to normal course of history, exile writers respond to the authoritarian use of myth by providing counter-myths. (McClennen 222)

Gino Gemani (qtd. in McClennen 82) describes the importance of authoritarianism: “What is essential in modern authoritarianism…is that the aim of this planned socialization and re-socialization is the transformation of the population into ideological ‘militant’, active participants.” What happened in Germany during the time of National Socialism was a regression to a pre-modern authoritarianism. It was
nonetheless brought about by a specific chain of historical events, according to Geno Germani (qtd. in McClennen 82):

The legitimacy of the rulers need not be formally approved by the subjects. Insofar as the nation becomes the prescriptive nucleus on which social integration rests, and the active presence of all members of the national community is functionally necessary,…some form of active political participation will also be required, even if to some extent it remains purely formal and symbolic. Here we find one of the most paradoxical aspects of the totalitarian system.

The situation regarding the emigration of her parents was also difficult because there were various handicaps. Frau M.’s mother had her own father to worry about, who at the time of Frau M.’s emigration was 85 years old. Frauen M., though, was able to go to Argentina through the Riegner-Gruppe, a group dedicated to the immigration project of helping Jewish-German youth escape from the danger of the National Socialists and establish a new life in Argentina. She belonged to the German-Jewish Youth Organization that came out of the Riegner Gruppe, and it is this group to which she credits her life.

In der ersten Zeit war das wichtige Thema, Arbeit suchen, denn wir standen vor dem Nichts. Hitler erlaubte uns, zehn Reichsmark mitzunehmen, und das war’s. Punkt. Ich hatte ja absolut niemanden, keine Freunde, keine Verwandten, nichts und niemanden. Die Gruppe war ein gewisser moralischer Halt, aber wir hatten uns auch verpflichtet, alles, was wir verdienen, zuerst mal dort einzuzahlen, in die Kasse. (qtd. in Kruse and Schmitt 20)
Solidarity and the willingness of the Argentine people to help facilitated Frau M.’s initial period in Argentina. It was through their efforts that Frau M. was able to initially assimilate somewhat to Argentine society. Frau M. held strong ties to her *Heimat* culture, but unlike Zweig, she did not see the bourgeois Central European culture as her sole identity. She would nonetheless need a transitional period before being able to take on a multicultural identity, and she describes the initial feeling of the loss of homeland as characteristic for the Jewish emigrant.

Frau M. never lost her attachment to the German language and culture, and although she doesn’t characterize herself as feeling “Argentine,” she had in the time of her immigration to Argentina numerous experiences that shaped her in a certain way and connected her with the Argentine *Volk*. Like many Jewish emigrants, Frau M. also followed the unstable political situation in Argentina, and political events that she suffered alongside with fellow Argentines are what made her feel most Argentine. Frau M.’s daughter disappeared in 1978 at the age of 28. Above all else it is the characterization of her daughter as one of the *desaparecidos* that establishes her own feeling of “Argentine identity.”

Frau M. has made her peace with Germany and declared that the contemporary post-war Germany can simply not be compared with the National Socialist Germany. Identity for her is a blurred image in which she feels neither German nor Argentine as a whole. For her, identity seems to be fragments of recollection and experiences rather than tied to a specific geographical location or nation. It is a multicultural identity that, unlike the static identity of Zweig, is evolutionary. She, like Zech and Herr A., is able to find a middle ground between the binary extremes of cultural existence and come to grips
with an identity that is neither essentialist nor totally of one’s own accord. For them identity is malleable and evolutionary.

In conclusion, the terms cultural nationalism, *Heimat*, and *Heim*, along with the binary oppositions of cultural theory (assimilation versus dissimilation, identity politics versus multiculturalism, essentialism versus free will, essentialism versus malleability), help to illuminate the exilic and immigration representations of Zweig, Zech, Kruse, and Schmitt. Zweig, Zech, Herr A., and Frau M were all forced out of their *Heimat* due to cultural nationalism and all realize, as a result of this phenomenon, that free will under all circumstances is an unreality. Nonetheless, all find very different existences in their transatlantic destination due to the ways in which they conceptualize the binary oppositions of cultural theory. Whereas Zweig finds himself stripped of free will and identity (as represented via his character Dr. B.), Zech, Herr A. and Frau M. are able to retain their *Heimat* identity, but simultaneously explore the multicultural possibilities of an evolutionary identity in a new society.
CHAPTER THREE:
Representations of German-Jewish Immigrants and Exiles in Argentina

As we examined in the previous chapter, literature is a vital tool for representing the exilic and immigration experience. Literature is the means which enables immigrant and exilic binary oppositions to be presented, and consequently facilitates a more comprehensive understanding of the exilic/immigration experience. In this chapter I will examine the literary work done by and pertaining to the Jewish-German and Jewish-Russian immigrants and exiles who embarked on a transatlantic journey to Argentina where they found permanent residence. In doing so, the representation of various central issues surrounding the Jewish immigrant and exilic experience will be examined: assimilation versus dissimilation, Argentine cultural identity versus Heimat identity, identity politics versus multiculturalism, essentialism versus free will and second-and third-generational identity. When examining the binary opposition of assimilation versus dissimilation, influential societal factors contributing to the assimilation or dissimilation, in particular discrimination, will be taken into account. The representations by both Russian-Jewish immigrants and Jewish Germans offer insight into whether nationality or religious affiliation was a more likely contributor to the “outsider” status and discrimination.

In addition to the examination of the aforementioned issues surrounding the Jewish immigrant and exilic experience, how immigrants and exiles conceptualize Heimat and Heim will also be examined, because differing conceptions of these terms affect literary representations. I will discuss the literary work of José Alfredo Schwarcz,
who offers a unique perspective on various Jewish-German exiles in Argentina, who did not fully assimilate to Argentine culture, but rather fully retained their own language and customs, living in relative isolation from the rest of Argentine society. Contrasting, I will examine the works of second-and third-generation Jewish Germans and Jewish Russians in Argentina who fully assimilated to Argentine culture and published their artistic works in Spanish: Alberto Gerchunoff, Samuel Eichelbaum, and Carlos Grünberg. The various Jewish Argentines offer contrasting perspectives on their immigration experiences: from optimistic and hopeful, to critical, to pessimistic and bitter. Each representation is unique and offers a distinct view of what it is like to be a Jew living in Argentina.

In his text, *Y a pesar de todo...los judíos de habla alemana en la Argentina*, gerontologist José Alfredo Schwarcz represents the Jewish German experience in Argentina through a series of personal interviews. Like Kruse and Schmitt with their work on Herr A. and Frau M, Schwarcz assesses the Germans’ personal representations through scientific methodology. Schwarcz, himself of German ancestry, offers a multifaceted view of the process of adapting to a new life in Argentina after being forced out of the homeland as a result of German cultural nationalism.

The concepts of “home,” discussed previously, are directly applicable to the situation encompassing the subjects of Schwarz’s study. For these Jewish Germans, “home” as they had once known it was no longer accessible. The ability to deal with the concept of “home” not being tied exclusively to a specific geographical location, is directly connected to the success or lack of success in building a new life in Argentina. “Home” for the first generation German-Jewish exiles is based on the familiar and the
comforting, and in order to feel “at home” in Argentina, they reconstruct cultural traditions.

In “Exile, Nomadism, and Diaspora,” Durham Peters states: “Exile has been a leitmotif of Jewish thought, not only political but metaphysical” (23). Diaspora as it is used today in the theoretical framework of exile is very much related to the Jewish experience. As previously discussed, diaspora is “the dispersion of an originally unified entity and is applied to cultural markers, like language and social practices, that were at one time geographically concentrated and are now deterritorialized” (McClennen 15).

The Jewish-Argentine experience represents a piece of that fragmentation that was once concentrated in a specific geographic location and commonly linked to the Hebrew language. Some Jews feel that Argentina is a safe haven that they can call home, whereas others see Argentina as merely another dot on the map of constant displacement. The first generation German Jews of *Ya pesar de todo…los judíos de habla alemana en la Argentina*, do not fall decisively into either category, but rather partially into both. Although they call Argentina their home, it is the cultural tradition of constant displacement, diaspora, which facilitates this categorization of Argentina as home.

In the process of recreating “home” by reinforcing their own cultural traditions, the first generation Jewish-German subjects of Schwarcz’s study dissimilate from Argentine-national culture. Rather than learning the language of the new nation, integrating themselves into Argentine society, and familiarizing themselves with local religious and cultural traditions, they build their own community of other members sharing similar traits. The subjects of Schwarcz’s study, like Zweig, Zech, Herr A., and Frau M., were forced to leave their *Heimat* as a result of dominant cultural nationalism.
As previously discussed, McClennen (23) argues that there are two important ways in which the exiles challenge official versions of national culture. Whereas Zech, for example, challenged the official concept of national culture by exposing repressive connections between the self and the state via his writings, the first generation German Jewish exiles created an alternative or counterculture. In creating this counter culture, they dissimilated from Argentine society. Schwarcz’s first-generation German-Jewish exiles, unlike Herr A., did not make an exorbitant effort to learn Spanish and become an integrated part of Argentine society.

1937 was the year marking the creation of the first German-Jewish organization created by the German Jews themselves. It was first called the *Jüdische Kulturgemeinshaft* (J.K.G), but later the organization took on a Spanish-language name: *Asociación Cultural Israelita de Buenos Aires* (A.C.I.B.A). This change in name shows the gradual change from the cultural dissimilation of the first-generation German-Argentine Jews, described in Schwarcz’s text, to the mélange of cultural practices of the post immigration generation. The A.C.I.B.A, although clearly distinguishing itself from the official religion of Argentina (Catholicism), simultaneously links itself to Argentine culture via the use of Argentina’s national language. One of the first mentors of this organization, Juan Zweig, describes its founding development.

Sin dominar todavía el idioma extraño, habitando por lo general hocosas pensiones, no sabían ellos qué hacer con su tiempo libre. La ópera, el teatro, los conciertos exigian gastos superiores a los que ellos podían afrontar. Acaso tenían lo suficiente para ir alguna vez al cine, pero esas funciones no condeían con su gusto de formación europea. Y así finalmente se citaban con sus compañeros de infortunio en los cafés y permanecían ahí sentados con el cubilete, los naipes o
sosteniendo conversaciones estériles, hasta que, fatigados y deprimidos, retornaban a sus moradas exentas de toda alegría. (qtd in Schwarz 136)

The J.K.G. (*la Jüdische Kulturgemeinschaft*) is described in Schwarz’s work via an interview with a Jewish-German exile. This organization served to fill the necessary void, enabling the German Jews’ newfound residence in Argentina to become an actual “home”.

Si bien no faltaron las voces que señalaron la necesidad espiritual de los inmigrantes, las organizaciones existentes no estaban en condiciones de incluir en su obra de socorro la tarea de llenar semejante vacío. De manera que los nuevos inmigrados echaron mano a la autoayuda y es de estimar como señal de su vigoroso sentimiento vital judaico, el que ya el 6 de octubre de 1937, en un acto anexo al servicio religioso organizado por ellos mismos, por primera vez con motivo de las altas fiestas, fundaron ellos la ‘J.K.G’, la Jüdische Kulturgemeinschaft’…Era su ‘leitmotiv’ crear algo que sustituyera el ambiente cultural y social de la vieja Patria, en el país nuevo, y dar a todos aquellos que se veían amenazados de alguna mutilación moral debido a sus aislamiento espiritual, un nuevo centro cultural judaico… (qtd. in Schwarcz 136)

Although Argentina is a nation comprised primarily of emigrants who came in search of improved economic opportunities and a better life, the German Jewish subjects of Schwarz’s study were simply forced out of their homeland. Argentina, therefore, was not their symbolic Utopia for a better life, but rather their only option for survival. The first-generation interviewees of Schwarz’s *Y a pesar de todo…los judíos de habla alemana en la Argentina* can, therefore, be classified as exiles; they left urgently and did not leave in hopes of increased financial opportunities.
No hay que olvidar que en su inmensa mayoría se trató de una emigración forzada como consecuencia de una feroz persecución. Abandonaron sus países de origen para sobrevivir y no para buscar mejores horizontes, como es el caso de otros grupos migratorios. (qtd. in Schwarcz 61)

Because of their dissimilation from Argentine culture, the first generation Jewish-German Argentines retain a strong connection to their previous European-cultural identity. That is to say, they associate their identity with their German *Heimat* rather than with Argentina, feeling much more “German” than “Argentine.” In this sense the retention of their previous identity is comparable to the identity politics and essentialism of Zweig. Nonetheless, these German-Jewish exiles are able to accept new surroundings as part of “home” due to a cultural tradition of displacement (diaspora) instead of feeling a complete loss of identity and consequent loss of self (like Zweig). It is the recreation of community by means of Jewish traditions that allows Schwarcz’s subjects to build a new “home,” whereas Zweig was not able to recreate this type of community. Neither Zweig’s nor Schwarcz’s first-generation subjects felt “at home” in mainstream Argentine society or considered Argentina their *Heimat*, but Zweig, unlike Schwarcz’s subjects, felt an intrinsic geographical connection to Central-European culture which equated physical displacement with identity displacement.

Another aspect that Schwarcz examines is the cultural conflict between the German Jews born outside of Argentina and their Argentine-born children. For these families, the differences between parent and child were not merely generational, but rather encompassed all aspects of everyday existence. The cultural differences that served to isolate the first generation from the rest of Argentina also served to form a rift between
the Jewish German exiles and their children. Whereas the first-generation German Jews recreated “home” on Argentine soil by reinforcing their own language, religion, and community, the second-generation “home” was comprised of a mélange of Jewish-European cultural practices learned from their parents and cultural practices learned through Argentine society. Consequently, there was a noted disassociation from the culture of their parents.

Pienso que nuestros hijos han percibido explícita e implicitamente mucho más de lo que suponemos de nuestra condición de inmigrantes y desarraigados. Al menos en nuestro caso pienso que nos hemos empecinado con éxito relativo en que nuestros hijos se sientan realmente identificados con la Argentina e integrados. El retorno a Europa de mi hijo mayor demuestra claramente cuánto aún vive en nosotros de nuestra ex-patria, de lo que indudablemente hemos transmitido a nuestros hijos. El idioma materno (alemán) ya los diferencia enormemente de los que tienen por idioma materno el castellano. Pienso y espero que la próxima generación (la de nuestros nietos) ya no tendrá estos problemas que no tienen solución. (qtd. in Schwarcz 73)

The second generation of German Jews in Argentina have a different sense of identity than their parents. Whereas the first generation maintained their Heimat identity and still thought of themselves as Germans, the second generation identifies more with Argentine culture. Although the second generation experiences a feeling of multicultural identity, it is Argentina, not Germany, which they define as their Heimat. The second generation did not assimilate from Argentine culture, like their parents, but rather assimilated to Argentine society communally and linguistically. Simultaneously they somewhat disassociated themselves religiously from their parents' generation. The second generation incorporated themselves into Argentine community (instead of associating
primarily with other German Jews). Although most second-generation German Jews still classify themselves as Jews, it became a less prominent differentiation from the Catholic Argentine majority than the religious disassociation exhibited by their parents. This was due to the fact that the synagogue, for the Argentine born German Jews, no longer formed the dual function of fulfilling both spiritual and social needs. The latter, for the second generation, could also be found outside of the German-Jewish community in mainstream Argentine society.

Language was probably the most influential factor in assimilation to the Argentine society. Whereas the lack of Spanish linguistic capabilities dissimilated the first-generation German Jewish exiles from Argentine culture, acquisition of the Spanish language succored the assimilation of the second-generation German Jews. Language is a critical basis for representation, in that language is often the primary tool of representation. Brummet (4) states, “I.A. Richard’s well-known definition of rhetoric as ‘a study of misunderstanding and its remedies’ is clearly keyed to a sense of language’s ability or failure to represent our thoughts to ourselves and to others.” In this sense, the generational rift of language deference served to further distinguish representations of the first generation Jewish exiles from those of second-and third-generation exiles.

As examined in the first chapter, immigration is undergone with the intentions of establishing permanent residence, whereas exile may or may not be permanent. Kaplin (109,110) states that “…what separates the exile/expatriate from the immigrant in many contemporary discourses of displacement is that the immigrants intend to assimilate: they leave their homes without reluctance and they face a new situation with an eagerness to become as much a part of the national community as possible.” Alberto Gerchunoff, a
first-generation Jewish immigrant, differentiates himself from the first-generation Jewish exiles, discussed in Schwarzc’s text, in his eagerness to become part of the Argentine-national community. Non-first-generation immigrants Samuel Eichelbaum and Carlos Grünberg, however, have different representations of what it means to be a Jewish immigrant in Argentina. We will see that although first generation immigrants (for the most part) tend to retain more of this idealistic eagerness, later generations are much more apt to represent the immigration experience and idea of being “the other” in a different light.

Alberto Gerchunoff, who lived from 1883 to 1959, is one such example of the eager immigrant and offers a view of the pre-II World War Jewish-Argentine experience. He was born in Russia and immigrated to Argentina in 1889, settling first in the colony of Moisesville (Santa Fe), then in Rajil (Entre Ríos), and finally in Buenos Aires. Compared to the previously examined representations, those produced by Gerchunoff show him to be the most adamant proponent of free will. Although he (like Herr A.) recognizes his inability to combat injustices towards Jews in his native land, Gerchunoff believes in the idea that he, as an individual, has the choice and opportunity to shape his own identity. Although he is not German like the subjects of Schwarz’s text, he shares with them his Jewish identity. It is the connection to a Jewish identity, rather than the connection to a previous national identity, which would prove to be the main topic of concern for second- and third-generation Jewish immigrant and exile authors.

Alberto Gerchunoff, unlike the first generation exiles of Schwarz’s text, assimilates to Argentine culture. Gerchunoff, like Herr A., acquired Spanish as a non-native language, a feat which greatly facilitated his integration into Argentine society.
Although Spanish was not his first language, Gerchunoff acquired it as a young child, and therefore was able to express himself freely and fluently in the national language of Argentina. Another mark of his assimilation is his choice of Spanish as his language of representation.

Gerchunoff’s representations, like those by Zech, were greatly influenced by personal experiences and contained many autobiographical components. In 1910 he wrote *Los gauchos judíos*, a work in which Creole nationalism and the drive for integration formed the central theme. The motivation for Jewish immigration in Argentina is depicted as an escape from persecution. Gerchunoff consequently, offers a hopeful, optimistic portrayal of the Argentine immigration experience in which Jews are portrayed as willing participants in the assimilation process of becoming part of the national society. In *Los gauchos judíos*, Argentina is compared with the Jewish holy land of Palestine, as Jewish immigrants proclaim the following verse.

A Palestina y Argentina,

iremos a sembrar,

iremos, amigos y hermanos,

a ser libres y a vivir…

(Gerchunoff *Los gauchos judíos* 50)

This dramatic comparison not only portrays Argentina as a safe haven, but also expresses the tie of the Jewish Argentine to the land of Argentina, as a fully integrated cornerstone of society.
Gerchunoff views assimilation as the means by which he can successfully make Argentina not just his place of residence, but also his “home.” Assimilation to Argentine society can be done by means of working hard in the new land and making a respectable living in a necessary trade. Gerchunoff (51), who spent his youth as part of the agricultural community, represents this viewpoint in his work *Los gauchos judíos*:

“…trabajaremos nuestra tierra, cuidaremos nuestro Ganado y comeremos nuestro pan.”

His representations of the reconstructions of “home” is comparable to Frau M. and Herr A. who are able to identify with their new home while still maintaining some of their own cultural traditions. In Gerchunoff’s *Los gauchos judíos*, Jewish immigrants combine their own practices and traditions with those of the rural Argentine society in order to successfully achieve integration into their new community and create a new “home”.

Gerchunoff’s tales of reconciliation emphasize the variety of social forces that shape the assimilation process: the immigrants’ hopes for a better life and their children’s desire to fit in; the strong institutional pressure to create a common national culture coming from the state and public schooling; and, equally important, the cultural intersections that increasingly began to define cosmopolitan Argentina. (Nouzeilles 193)

According to Gerchunoff’s representations, Argentina was, for the Jews, the New Zion. Two central themes of his work are the heartland and the homeland. The heartland is associated with Judaism, whereas the homeland is associated with Argentina. This classification of *Heimat* differs from that of Frau M. and Herr A. Whereas Frau M. and Herr A. identify their *Heimat* as Germany, Gerchunoff classifies Argentina as his *Heimat*. 
Aizenburg emphasizes the importance that Gerchunoff’s work places on the drive for integration in the Argentine community. Integration is vital for the success of the Jews to get rid of the “other” status and become successful, functioning members of the society in their newfound homeland.

The essence of *Los gauchos judíos* is territoriality, the desire to belong to a specific place and history. For the Jews to be gauchos means they are domesticated, entrenched, and for Argentina to be a promised land means it is a permanent home, a country where Jews will no longer be outsiders. (Aizenburg 23)

In his literary representations, Gerchunoff displays heartwarming stories of successful immigration into Argentine society and the creation of a new homeland. Take for example, the story that Gerchunoff (149) tells of rabbi Guerdalí in *Los gauchos judíos* who, after suffering hardships in his native land of Russia and elsewhere, was able to find a new home in Argentina:

…cuando la servidumbre quedó abolida, fue despojado de sus tierras, y su fortuna sufrió todavía más hondos quebrantos con la guerra emprendida por Alejandro II. Rico aún, continuó viviendo en la ciudad que había fundado hasta oír noticias de América. Peregrinó a Jerusalén y regresó triste, pues declaró preferir una región cualquiera al cuadro que ofrece la capital sagrada de los judíos, con sus conventos, cruces y mezquitas. Y vino con las primeras inmigraciones a Entre Ríos. En Entre Ríos completó el ideal de su existencia, que fue siempre labrar la tierra y comer pan de su trigo y legumbres de su huerta.
Unfortunately, later events in Argentina would result in xenophobic nationalism and anti-Semitism, and consequently make the integration that the Jewish community sought to achieve much more difficult. An acculturation process, that is to say assimilation in which aspects of Jewish culture become increasingly less prominent as they fuse with preexisting traditions and become incorporated with elements of Argentine culture, appeared to be the key for successful infiltration into non-outsider status for the Jews. The Jewish-German and Jewish-Russian immigrants who initially integrated to the Argentine culture achieved similarity between the two cultures at the expense of their Jewish traditions. Interestingly enough, the representation of the Jewish situation by Gerchunoff would later come under harsh scrutiny. Gerchunoff’s optimistic stance on Argentina as the new Jewish homeland would be put into question, as his work paradoxically suggests the willing sacrifice of one’s own Jewish cultural identity in order to transform oneself to meet specific predetermined “national ideals.” Gerchunoff does not feel that Jewish identity must be abandoned in order to integrate into society. Nonetheless, due to the discrimination that many Jewish immigrants encountered, other prominent Jewish immigrants to Argentina would question the relationship of their identity as a Jew and their ability to make Argentina their “home.”

Carlos Grünberg, a Judeo-German belonging to the post-immigrant generation, is one of the pioneers of a new phase in Argentine-Jewish literature. He, unlike Gerchunoff, was born in Argentina in 1903, and not being a first-generation immigrant himself, but rather a child of immigrants, allows for him to give a different perspective on the Jewish immigration experience. A phase that had formerly been characterized by a grateful tone changes with his work in that he is not afraid to protest the injustices of Argentine
Society. Anti-Semitic attitudes held by some Argentines seemed to have earlier been a taboo topic for Jewish writers (that is, it was it an insult to criticize the “land of hope”), but Grünberg is not afraid to engage these topics directly. The negative stigma associated with criticizing the “land of hope” was clearly associated with the first generation, and Grünberg’s literary representations show a new generational attitude which portrays Argentina in clear opposition to the utopia presented by first-generation immigrants such as Gerchunoff. Grünberg, like Gerchunoff uses personal representations that reflect his own life experiences. Nonetheless, Grünberg represents an entirely different Argentina than Gerchunoff, even though both lived there during practically the same time period, separated by less than a decade in age.

Jorge Luis Borges was very fond of Grünberg’s work, and in the prolog of Mester de la judería, Borges makes the following statement concerning his revolutionary, non-reclusive tone.

En las lúcidas páginas de este libro, Grünberg refuta con ponderosa pasión los mitos y falacias que ese impostor y sus prosélitos han predicado al mundo. A pesar del patibulo y de la horca…el antisemitismo no se libra de ser ridículo…En Alemania cuya lengua literaria se basa en la versión de textos hebreos que ha legado Lutero, Hitler no hace otra cosa que exacerbar un odio preexistente; el antisemitismo argentino viene a ser un facsímile atolondrado que ignora lo étnico y lo histórico (qtd in Aizenburg 37-38).

Grünberg would be placed on the opposite side of the spectrum from Gerchunoff with regard to the binary oppositions of free will and essentialism. Grünberg is somewhat essentialist in his views, and in this sense, he is comparable to Zweig. Grünberg sees Jews as not being able to change the essentialist nature of their Jewish identity, as Zweig
believes firmly in his identity as a Central European. Nonetheless, Grünberg differs from Zweig in his conceptualization of this essentialist nature of human beings. Whereas Zweig was unable to protest an identity that had been subjected to torturous treatment and partial extinction, Grünberg is able to combat the injustices that he is forced to face as a Jew and a German. Grünberg also differs from Zweig in his ability to form a multicultural identity. Although Grünberg clearly categorizes himself as “the other” due to his Jewish identity and dissimilates himself from mainstream Argentine society, he has nonetheless acquired certain necessary cultural practices (i.e. the Spanish language in which he writes) to be able to function in Argentine society. Additionally, Grünberg is able to use his multicultural heritage to his benefit in some ways. For example, he translated German works (i.e. Heinrich Heine 1797-1856) into Spanish for financial gain. In this way, Grünberg creates a new definition of what it is to be Argentine or German, and his dissimilation from mainstream society, which was undoubtedly influenced by discrimination, both reinforces and contradicts the essentialist claim. Grünberg is essentialist in his Jewish identity, but ridicules the idea that his identity as a Jew also somehow prevents him from being an equal member of society. He consequently uses his own free will combat the hypocrisy of such an essentialist belief.

Grünberg’s work *Mester de judería*, a play on words with the twelfth- and thirteenth-century Spanish literary genre *Mester de la juglaría*, blatantly protests the unfair treatment of the Jews in the Argentine society of the 1940s, a time in which anti-Semitic feelings were at a high point. The poetry of *Mester de la juglaría*, to which Grünberg’s twentieth-century poem makes reference, was transmitted orally by juglarías, people of humble origin that made their living as clowns and buffoons. The trade of the
middle age juglarias seems ironically applicable to the plight of the Argentine Jews of the first half of the twentieth century. Their trade is often mocked and ridiculed and they are treated like second-class citizens. The Jews in Grünberg’s Mester de judería are portrayed as ostracized members of a society in which they are unappreciated, ridiculed and eventually persecuted. The optimism among Jewish immigrants towards integration into Argentina society, as portrayed in the work by Gerchunoff, is nonexistent in Grünberg’s work. Grünberg is not afraid to protest the difficulties that Argentina’s Jews encountered, as we see in the following work Perseguidos (persecuted) which formed part of Mester de judería

¡No somos perseguidos! Nuestros perseguidores
No hacen el endoso de su persecución;
La mudan- impudentes prestidigitadores-
De sus perversas manos a nuestro corazón

¡Estamos perseguidos! ¡Estamos perseguidos!
Lo estamos en la calle y en la universidad
Lo estamos por bandidos; por hatos de bandidos’
Por el género humano; por la ¡hum!amidad.

¡Estamos perseguidos! Los bárbaros desatan
Mueras y maldiciones sobre nuestro salom
Los bárbaros nos hieren. Los bárbaros nos matan.
Los bárbaros nos cuentan por carne de pogrom.

Estamos perseguidos hace ya largo rato
Y no será, sin duda, mejor lo porvenir

Vuestro oficio, verdugos, es el asesinato.

Nuestro oficio es la muerte; nuestro oficio es morir.

Grünburg’s work is declarative representation of the onerous plight of the Argentine Jews that holds striking parallels to historical marginalization in a pre-modern society. In *Mester de la judaría*, the linguistic differentiation between the verb forms *ser* in the first and forth stanza and *estar* in the second and third stanza contrast the idea of Jewish identity versus the Jewish situation throughout history. Although the Jews are not intrinsically predestined to be persecuted, their then-contemporary reality shows that this in fact seems to be the case. The alternation between these two forms seems to ridicule the idea that the Jews are predestined in some way to be marginalized. The play on words of the title also suggests that the Jews, like the *juglaría*, inhabit a pre-modern society in which certain people are marginalized on account of their trade or family background. Ironically, twentieth-century culture nationalism (in both National-Socialist Germany and Argentina) and the exaltation of certain “unique cultural characteristics” is a reflection of this pre-modern society. Grünberg reacts to cultural nationalism by showing repressive connections between the self and the state. His literary representations critique the idea that Argentines should have a homogenous culture, which does little to recognize citizens not possessing “unique cultural traits” (namely the Jews).

Samuel Eichelbaum, a second generation immigrant and playwright born in 1894 in the agricultural colony Domíngues, Entre Ríos (established by Baron Maurice Hirsch at the turn of the century with other prominent writers including Gerchunoff), offers another unique representation of the Jewish situation in Argentina. Eichelbaum, like
Gerchunoff, has Russian heritage, his father being a mechanic in the Russian Navy, but also German ancestry as evident by his German last name. Eichelbaum does not, like Gerchunoff, view Argentina as a safe haven and land for Jews to fulfill their dreams, nor does he, like Grünberg, attempt to separate himself from mainstream Argentine society. Eichelbaum, like Grünberg, sees Argentina as a place where the Jews live as second class citizens and must constantly fight discrimination. Nonetheless, Eichelbaum differs from Grünberg in his emphasis on the Argentine Jew’s own personal identity and the role that this identity (associated with inner turmoil and self-hate) plays in perpetuating negative sentiments.

Like Zweig’s *Schachnovelle*, Eichelbaum uses fictional representations which are greatly influenced by personal experiences. His 1925 work, *Un monstruo en la libertad* (A Freed Monster), was influenced by the 1919 *Semana Trágica*. During this tragic week, Jewish homes and businesses were burned and Jewish-Argentine citizens became the victims of brutal beatings. His work *El judío Aarón* (1926) portrays a conflict between Jewish elders and Jewish youth, due to the fact that the youth invest their time and savings in trying to imitate Argentine bourgeois attitudes and dress. The Jew Aarón is of the first generation, and the linguistic barrier between first and second generation immigrants is exemplified in Aaron’s manner of speech. Although his children speak fluent, native Spanish, he still struggles to express himself in his own non-native language. The following passage from *El judío Aarón* demonstrates the marked influence of another language on Aarón’s spoken Spanish.
El Talmud, noistre biblie, qui dice tantes coses lindes, dice qui es mejor sembrar qui hacer sembar.

This passage also exemplifies the strong connection that Aarón feels to his Jewish identity. He is concerned about being a good Jew and a true Jew. Aarón’s statements also imply that he holds a true Jew to be a person of high moral conduct, a person that he himself classifies himself as and a person that he strives to be. Although Aaron’s son, Goyito, still classifies himself as a Jew, he does not, like his father, disapprove of the idea of marrying a non-Jew. That is to say, Goyito does not contribute to the essentialist belief that a specific religion is also the foundation of moral fiber. He does not, however, like many of his Argentine contemporaries, form the null hypothesis that a specific religion (namely Judaism) is the driving factor in the deterioration of moral behavior. When Goyito falls in love with a merchant, the non-Jew Cecilia, and wanting to fit in mainstream Argentine society, starts to imitate Argentine bourgeoisie attitudes and dress, his father Aaron strongly disapproves and a rift is formed between father and son. Nonetheless, the motivation for Goyito not wanting to mimic the dress and behavior of his father’s generation is also clear. Take, for example, the discriminatory behavior of the Argentine society towards Aarón when he, with good intentions, tries to establish a communal fund within the agrarian community in which he lives.

Comisario- ¿Quiere permitirme una palabras don Aarón?
Aarón- ¡Cómo no! ¡Cómo no!
Comisario- Quería decirle don Aaron, que usted está difundiendo ideas demasiado atrevidas. Hay mucha gente que lo asegura. Y usted ¿sabe qué delito es? Es muy grave. Yo no quiero proceder contra usted porque yo creo que usted es una buena persona, pero quiero advertirle que se cuide.

Aarón- Veie comesarie. Yu nu robo a nadie, yu nu mata a nadie. Yu nu astoy cremenal, nu astoy ladrón. (Eichelbaum, *El judío Aaron* 84)

Another Jewish character in *El judío Aarón*, El dóctor Gorovich, exemplifies another aspect of Jewish identity dissimilation. He no longer identifies himself as a Jew. His high status in society leaves one to wonder if embracing his Jewish heritage would have fostered the same outcome.

El dóctor Gorovich- Sí soy judío, pero no como todos. Figúrese, que casi nunca me acuerdo de lo que soy. Por eso, a veces, de puro olvidado, digo que no. (Eichelbaum, *El judío Aaron* 74)

In Eichelbaum’s play *Divorcio nupcial* (1941), the character Leber represents the uncertain Jew who desires acceptance in Argentine society at the expense of personal identity. Leber, an urban Jew, mocks the Jews in order to gain approval from anti-Semites and consequently not receive harassment within the community. Eichelbaum’s *Divorcio nupcial* depicts how Jewish self-hate has served as a mechanism for surviving in the anti-Semitic Argentine society of the first half of the twentieth century. Take for example the self-degrading words of Leber when speaking to a prominent member of Argentine society:

Ya le he dicho que me exponía gustoso a que usted pensara lo peor de mí. Soy para usted un intruso audaz que no sabe respetar lo más delicado, lo más íntimo. Debo parecerle un hombre que
Eichelbaum’s works depict a clear contrast to Gerchunoff’s optimistic representation of the Jewish-Argentine immigrant experience. Surprisingly, their literary representations are produced during the same time period; the two writers were born less than one year apart. Their main differentiation is that Gerchunoff is a first-generation immigrant, whereas Eichelbaum is a second-generation immigrant.

In his literary representations, Eichelbaum, like Grünberg, veers toward an essentialist perspective. The Jewish origins of Eichelbaum’s literary characters form an overwhelming presence, and despite their desire to assimilate to Argentine culture they are never able to fully fit in. In other words, his works seem to portray the message that due to their “Jewishness,” the Jews will always be still be “outsiders” in some respect. Salgado Gordon examines the essentialist tendencies that Eichelbaum portrays in his writings: “…it would appear that his condition as a Jew, far outweighed the authenticity of his birth as a native (Argentine) son to create equally authentic Argentine drama” (qtd. in Lockhart 134).

As represented in his work, Eichelbaum feels that the Jewish immigrant experiences a simultaneous assimilation into, dissimilation from, and discrimination within Argentine society. Dissimilation, in this sense, is a separation produced by the self, whereas discrimination is a separation from society produced by the mainstream. Both factors contribute to the Jewish-Argentine experience described by Eichelbaum; they are not mutually exclusive. This assimilation can be noted in Eichelbaum’s use of the Argentine national language, Spanish, in his literary representations as well as the
desire for the Jew to fit it (exemplified in both *El judío Aarón* and *Divorcio nupcial*).

There is also a portrayal of dissimilation from Argentine culture in his works. This dissimilation is portrayed via the critique of national culture and repressiveness of national culture, as exemplified in his *Un monstruo en la libertad* when the Jews, those lacking the “unique Argentine cultural traits” were victimized during the *Semana Trágica*. In this work he also reacts to the cultural nationalism of Argentine society, by showing repressive connections between self and state in his literary representations. The simultaneous assimilation and dissimilation, that is say the retention of Jewish traditions coupled with overwhelming desire and attempts to blend into Argentine society, causes internal conflict.

In terms of his personal identity, Eichelbaum seems to present his own identity as Jewish above Argentine. This is evident when a number of the protagonists of his dramas discuss the qualities of a good Jew and strive to be such, as exemplified by the aforementioned quote from *El judío Aarón*. Nonetheless, it appears that he desires to be able to identify himself as an Argentine, but cannot due to the anti-Semitic attitudes in mainstream Argentine society. His Jewish characters that ape Argentine bourgeois culture, but never actually achieve “Argentine bourgeois culture status,” portray this Jewish-Argentine identity turmoil. This conflicting identity is directly related to the phenomenon of self-hate.

In conclusion, the four authors examined in this chapter, José Luis Schwarcz, Alberto Gerchunoff, Samuel Eichelbaum and Carlos Grünberg, each represent the Jewish-Argentine experience in a distinct way. Gerchunoff views Argentina as a safe haven and land in which to fulfill one’s dreams, whereas Eichelbaum and Grünberg see
Argentina as a place where the Jews live as second-class citizens and must constantly fight discrimination. The latter two also view the Jewish Argentine experience as one of a double marginalization; not only does the outsider status result from their situation as new immigrants and exiles in Argentina, but they experience an additional marginalization on the basis of religious heritage. Schwarcz presents yet another perspective sandwiched between these two extremes, in which the German-Jewish Argentine is able to create a new home in Argentine through dissimilation from mainstream Argentine culture and the recreation of *Heimat* cultural traditions. The Jewish perspective on the complex phenomena of exile and immigration to Argentina is as wide-ranging as individual human personalities. The diverse representations of how Jewish Argentines conceptualize their post-immigrant / exilic identities, permit an understanding of the variety of modes of adapting to life in their transatlantic residence.
CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, the human species is unique for its extraordinary ability to record displaced experiences, recollections, and memories in the form of literary representations. The multifaceted emigration and exilic literary works pertaining to the German-speakers who found a new transatlantic home in Argentina allows for a distinctive examination of the complexities, politics, and contradictions encompassing the human cross-cultural existence. It is because of immigration and exile that infinitely many human cultures have been destroyed, shaped, influenced and molded through the millennia, and literature is unique in its ability to record individual perspectives on these phenomena.

Statistically speaking, Argentina is home to more German heritage citizens than any other South American nation. The literary representations by Zweig, Zech, Kruse, Schmitt, Schwarcz, Gerchunoff, Grünberg and Eichelbaum piece together the multifaceted dimensions the immigration and exilic experience. When pieced together, these representations serve to form a semi-completed puzzle whose image reflects the decisive role that various German-speaking immigrants and exiles that have formed in shaping contemporary Argentine society. The German Jews who immigrated to or were exiled to Argentina form another dimension of this immigration and exilic mosaic in that they not only represent a confrontation of distinct nationalities but also a meeting of differing religions and the cultural tradition of diaspora. Religious heritage becomes an issue that interconnects the experience of German Jews, like Herr A., Frau M. and the subjects of Schwarcz’s literature, with Jews of other nationalities such as Alberto Gerchunoff.
With regard to the emigration and exilic experiences previously discussed, literature is the most powerful repetitive tool, in that it depicts a compilation of memories and images encompassing the unique experiences of various individuals. We see from their works that the immigration and exilic experience can never be neatly categorized and packaged into one sole all-encompassing theory. Various social sciences and cultural nationalism lead to and are influenced by these phenomena. Nonetheless, applying the theoretical framework of immigration and exile to the literary offers a platform from which to better explain and interpret the literature produced in correlation with German-speaking exiles and immigrants in Argentina.

An individual’s uniqueness is representative of the unique manners in which immigration and exile is viewed. For some the transatlantic journey represents a death of sorts, as in the case of Zweig. For others it is a symbolic new birth and new beginning (as exemplified by Gerchunoff), and for other individuals immigration and exile is a mélange of the two extremes. Through the literary representations by Zweig, Zech, Kruse, Schmitt, Schwarcz, Gerchunoff, Grünberg, and Eichelbaum a vast spectrum of how the individual views and conceptualizes emigration and exile is examined. These literary works are significant in that they not only represent the wide range of situations that human beings are capable of creating (from atrocities to whole-hearted melting pots of diversity and harmony), but also represent the diverse manners that individuals deal with adversity and change.
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