HEIMAT AND MEMORY IN THE CITY: REPRESENTATIONS OF NEW YORK CITY AND VIENNA IN AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL WORKS OF EXILED VIENNESE AUTHORS

A Dissertation
submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Georgetown University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in German

By

Wendy Sue Wilson, B.A.

Washington, DC
June 15, 2009
ABSTRACT

This dissertation investigates the notion of Heimat as it intersects with memory through representations of Vienna and New York City (NYC). I contend that characteristics of NYC allow exiles to (re)discover elements of their former Heimat, as they come to terms with their new lives in the United States. Moreover, I offer two new perspectives on the notion of Heimat. First, it is a fluid notion that can change under the influence of new circumstances and second, cityscape rather than landscape or nature plays a significant role in its development.

To show this, I have examined Franzi Ascher’s memoir – Bilderbuch aus der Fremde, Friedrich Heydenau’s exile novel – Auf und ab, and Elisabeth Freundlich’s autobiography – Die fahrenden Jahre. Ascher, Heydenau, and Freundlich spent the majority of their exile from the Third Reich in NYC and their works offer ample opportunity to examine representations of both cities. This dissertation assesses the influence and function of the notion of Heimat and memory in their representations and considers how do they shape or maintain identity. What effects does this rupture have on their function? Do they repair this rupture? Focusing on function, while analyzing the reciprocal influence of the central locality of their original Heimat – Vienna and their...
exile locality – New York City allows me to address these questions and present three simultaneously congruent and divergent notions of Heimat.

Finally, I employ Heimat and collective memory theory, analyzing both individual and collective aspects of the formation of memories and the notion of Heimat. My theoretical approach begins with Maurice Halbwachs’ seminal work On Collective Memory and Peter Blickle’s work, Heimat: a Critical Theory of the German Idea of Homeland, Heimat. I agree with the predominant school of thought, which asserts that the social frameworks – such as family, religion, and social class – shape one’s memories and demonstrate that these coincide with the social frameworks that shape one’s notion of Heimat. I show however that while both may be formed in or defined by a “collective,” they remain distinctly personal, and I support this by highlighting the collective commonalities and the individual differences.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This dissertation investigates the intersection of *Heimat* (home/homeland) and memory in the representation of New York City (NYC) and Vienna by exiled Viennese writers. I propose that NYC, while foreign and new for the authors, nonetheless offered them elements of *Heimat* through the large community of German-speaking authors and intellectuals living in NYC and the city’s own history and culture of immigration. The community offered exiles concrete associations with their former lives in Vienna, and NYC’s culture and landscape allowed the many members of the exiled population to find elements of their former lives. I support this contention by examining the representation of both NYC/Exile and Vienna/Heimat in the autobiographical works of Franziska (Franzi) Ascher, Elisabeth Freundlich, und Friedrich Heydenau (née Oppenheimer).

With the exception of Elisabeth Freundlich, these authors are relatively unknown, confirming that the abundance of exile materials – which I address below – still offers exile scholars the opportunity to investigate “new” authors, topics, and deepen previous research. By selecting these authors, it is not only my goal to contribute new research to the field of exile studies, but also to offer a cross-section of the notion of *Heimat* amongst Vienna’s bourgeoisie. While all three authors were ethnically Jewish, the subsequent chapters show that they primarily identified themselves as Austrians. For Franzi Ascher, her identity was firmly linked to pre-*Anschluss* Austria. Elisabeth Freundlich’s Austrian
identity was influenced by her political activity and Friedrich Heydenau’s identity was colored by his military service in the Imperial and Royal Army.

With this selection, I examine the works of three authors who were raised in affluent middleclass homes. As the daughter of the composer Leo Ascher, Ascher grew up in Vienna’s musical milieu and initially pursued a career as an opera singer. Freundlich’s father was a successful lawyer and well-known socialist in Vienna who was incarcerated briefly in 1934 after the Austro-Fascist government came into power. According to Freundlich, this arrest led directly to her political activity. Heydenau’s military education translated into a successful military career, as he reached the rank of officer at a young age. The similarities the authors share offer a potential common link in their notion of Heimat, while their differences promise diversity in that same notion.

The role of Heimat and host countries in exile literature has been investigated to varying degrees. For example, the well-known exile scholar Helmut Pfanner has written extensively on NYC’s role as a host city. One volume he published in 1983 looked at Austrian and German authors living in exile in NYC and included a chapter on New York as a “borrowed home” for post-exile authors (Exile). He also edited a volume of presentations on cultural interactions following a symposium on German and Austrian exile literature in 1985 at the University of New Hampshire, which has interesting contributions to the topics of Heimat, identity, cross-cultural exchanges, etc (Kulturelle Welchselfelbeziehungen). Though Pfanner examines the life of German-speaking exiles in NYC, he claims that NYC in and of itself was not a central topic in exile literature and
noted that NYC is largely missing from the works of well-known exile authors, appearing mainly as a backdrop to the story, if at all (“New York City” 364).

The exile scholar Wulf Koepke shares Pfanner’s contention. He asserts that very few of the exiles’ experiences in the United States have permeated their literary works and NYC – the most prominent exile city in the United States – has not found a “gültige Darstellung” in the works of prominent exile authors. In his opinion, representations of NYC in exile literature are dominated by clichés (“‘Innere’ Exilgeographie?”). Regarding the role of NYC in the works of well-established exiled authors, Michael Winkler makes a similar observation as Koepke and Pfanner. In his article on NYC as a topic of German-language literature he states: “Zu registrieren ist nämlich die Tatsache, daß keiner unter den großen oder etablierten Autoren des deutschsprachigen Exils sich der Herausforderung dieser Stadt gestellt hat” (“Großstadt” 304).

More recently, the researcher Valerie Popp used comparative imagology to examine the representation of the United States in exile literature in the texts of four German-speaking authors. In her essay – “Vielleicht sind die Häuser zu hoch und die Straßen zu lang‘: Amerikabilder der deutschsprachigen Exilliteratur” – she analyses NYC as the dominant exile city in the United States and concentrates on the depiction and analysis of life in exile circles, the ambivalence of refugees towards their new “home,” consumerism in America, and language change. In her analysis she focuses on “stereotype Etikettierungen,” asserting that the function of a national stereotype is more important than the accuracy of the image. Whether or not it approximates reality is less
important than, “wie das Bild der USA in den Texten selbst gezeichnet wird und welchen argumentativen Interessen es dient” (111). Popp’s assertion about the literary role of the United States and her own research on images of America in German-language literature can serve as a departure point for further investigations of its representation in exile literature.

While exile research principally asserts that “Amerika in der Literatur des Exils keine gültige Darstellung erfahren habe,” Popp contends that there are many informative and worthwhile texts in which to analyze the representations of the United State and NYC, in particular from the younger generation of exile authors. As such, the literary examination of the United States as a host country in exile literature is wider spread than previously acknowledged in the research (109-10). I agree with her assertion and would also contend that even when a city or place appears as a backdrop in a story, it is not simply a neutral representation, but rather one that is influenced and informed by the author’s experiences.

For this reason, further investigation of the representation of the United States can offer insight into how these images are formed and what influences them. This is the central focus of my analysis. Implementing theories surrounding the German notion of Heimat and collective memory I consider how both the representation of Vienna and NYC are formed and transformed in the works of Ascher, Freundlich, and Heydenau, and how these (trans)formations are specifically influenced by each author’s notion of Heimat and his or her memories. Before I present my theoretical approach, I consider the
situation in the USA into which the exiles entered and the development of exile studies – primarily in the United States – which began in the early stages of exile.

A. Exile and the United States

Between the years of 1933 and 1945, the United States emerged from its post-World War I isolationism to take on a significant role on the world stage. Along with the Soviet Union, Mexico, Brazil, Great Britain, and other nations, the United States became a land of refuge and housed thousands of artists, politicians, and writers, who had fled Nazi forces that were steadily advancing in Europe. These refugees, of both Jewish and non-Jewish origins, came to a country that in the previous century had been romanticized in German-language American novels. The image of America as a so-called “Land of Unlimited Possibilities” was marked by fairy-tale like qualities. Moreover, the United States grew in importance, as it became clear that fleeing the Third Reich had saved their lives from death in Nazi concentration camps.

The actual situation in the United States revealed itself to be everything but fairy-tale like. There were many social and foreign policy difficulties for the exiles, both in

---

1 For example, Heinrich and Thomas Mann, Berthold Brecht, Johannes Urzidil, Oskar Maria Graf, Carl Zuckmayer, Franz Werfel, Alfred Polgar, Leon Askin, Max Reinhardt, Fritz Mahler, Joseph Buttinger and many others.

2 Manfred Durzak sketches the development of the image of America in 19th century German literature. The US was not only viewed as “Land der unbegrenzten Möglichkeiten,” but it was also connected to utopian ideas, such as the glorification of the “noble savage.” At the same time, one can observe negative correlations and oppositions in the literature, which call the utopian representations into question, see Amerika-Bild 9-10.
getting to the United States\(^3\) and after they arrived.\(^4\) And although, the United States accepted the largest number of exiles (Durzak, “Literarische Diaspora” 41), it was viewed by many of them with skepticism and frequently seen as a final option.\(^5\) A very telling example of this skepticism is found in the attitude of the authors Carl Zuckmayer and Franz Werfel, which Zuckmayer described in a lecture held at the University of Zurich on November 10, 1948. While sitting in a bodega in Switzerland, both men complained about the conditions in a country that neither knew well and they refused to go to the American consulate to obtain the necessary travel visas for the United States. Yes, the country offered them safe haven, but it was an undesirable refuge:

Ich war noch nie, Werfel nur einmal zu einem kurzen Aufenthalt in New York drüben gewesen. Aber wir wußten alles ganz genau, was es da drüben gab oder nicht gab, vom schlechten Essen bis zur seelischen und erotischen Frigidität, und der Sherry half uns dazu, es in Worten dithyrambischen Abscheus auszudrücken. Ein Land der phantasielosen Standardisierung, des flachen Materialismus, der geistfremden Mechanik.

\(^3\) With the restrictive policies of the US government, the work of private initiatives to bring refugees to the US was crucial. Joseph P. Strelka specifically mentions the activities of the “Emergency Rescue Committee” and the private citizen Varian Frey, who himself went to Marseilles to secure passage, by whatever means possible, for many refugees from Hitler’s Third Reich, see “USA als Exilland” 154.

\(^4\) In a lecture held on June 7, 1995 at the city hall of Vienna, Walter Sorrell addresses his exile experience in the US. He arrived in 1939 and describes the county as „das der bereits begrenzten, aber doch noch weit offenen Möglichkeiten.“ He was also surprised by the opposition he encountered there, see 31-32.

\(^5\) Anthony Heilbutt explains the belief was held amongst refugees that law enforcement and the FBI in the United States were collaborating with Hitler’s government. This belief was held because the United States joined the International Police Commission (now Interpol) which was dominated by Germans and because of J. Edgar Hoover’s connections to several anti-Semitic demagogues, see 31-32. Furthermore, Heilbutt describes the anti-Semitism that existed in the United States, for example restrictions on jobs and homes for Jews, see 49-50.
Ein Land ohne Tradition, ohne Kultur, ohne Drang nach Schönheit oder Form, ohne Metaphysik und ohne Weinstuben, ein Land des Kunstdüngers und der Büchsenöffner, ohne Grazie und ohne Misthaufen, ohne Klassik und ohne Schlamperei, ohne Melos, ohne Apoll, ohne Dionysos. Sollten wir der Versklavung europäischer Massendiktatur entrinnen, um uns unter die Tyrannei des Dollars, des business, der Reklame und der Modellmädchen zu begeben? (172-73)

Zuckmayer acknowledges later in his lecture that their attitude cost them precious time; the gates and the boarders of Europe were being sealed around them:

Dieser Morgen in der Bodega hat uns viel gekostet. Denn es folgten ihm einige andere, an denen wir auch nicht aufs amerikanische Konsulat gingen, die Quota wurde geschlossen...ganz allmählich begannen sich die europäischen Gefängnistore zu schließen. Ich mußte mich, anderthalb Jahre später, über Cuba in die Vereinigten Staaten einschleichen, die unser letzter Hafen geworden war, und Werfel, nach wieder einem Jahr, mußte erst durch ganz Frankreich, über die Pyrenäen und durch Spanien und Portugal fliehen, um das ungelobte Land unserer Rettung und Hoffnung zu betreten.” (173-74)

Despite difficult detours, both men managed to arrive in the United States, where Franz Werfel died of a heart attack in 1945. Carl Zuckmayer remained in the United States until
1957, when he made his final and permanent return to Europe, settling in Visp, Switzerland.

This aversion to the United States was not unusual amongst the exiles. Fleeing to America meant having to learn a new language and culture. The refugee potentially had to give up traditional customs and conform to new ones. Nonetheless, as Nazi advances in Europe continued, fleeing to the United States became a bitter necessity amongst waning options.6

Cultural differences, difficulties with finding work, and suitable living arrangements were only a few of the challenges in the United States. The actions and the foreign policy of the American government brought additional trials for the exile population. The US-foreign policy was marked by isolationism and partially based on experiences during World War I and the Great Depression. For example, the inability of President Woodrow Wilson to convince Congress to join the League of Nations7 after the Great War was symptomatic of the extreme national autarky in the United States at that time (Middel et al). This national autarky and isolationism lead the government to maintain a neutral stance towards the government of the Third Reich until after World War II had begun.

---

6 The majority of German-speaking authors fled to the US from 1939-1940, after the Nazis established the puppet government in Vichy, France, see Cazden 138.
7 President Wilson considered the League of Nations to be a worldwide peacemaker. Nonetheless, it remained without any real political power, as its resolutions were nonbinding and no measures were taken to ensure their legal stature. The League of Nations existed from 1920-1960 and is considered the precursor to the United Nations.
Despite reports, letters of protest, and personal conversations describing the actions of the Nazi regime, the majority of isolationists in the US-government remained unmoved (Middell et al 33-34, 35-36, 45-46). Only after the Anschluß of Austria can we observe a slow shift in policy. Nevertheless, the supporters of isolationism held the majority in congress and as such, no significant policy changes came until 1939, when the Third Reich invaded Poland. Only after the attack on the Soviet Union in 1941, the United States broke off diplomatic relationships with the Nazi regime and closed the US-embassy in Berlin. The final turning point and end of the government’s isolationist policies came with the attack on Pearl Harbor (36-37). Yet while policies were changed, they were marked by restrictions on foreign nationals and a less than hospitable attitude towards refugees from Europe by the general population.\(^8\)

The well-known words of comfort and assistance that are inscribed on the Statue of Liberty\(^9\) and the similar words spoken by Thomas Jefferson (Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on

---

\(^8\) According to a survey conducted by Fortune magazine in 1939, 83% of those surveyed said that if they were a member of congress they would not approve a law that would open “die Tore der Vereinigten Staaten für eine größere Anzahl europäischer Flüchtlinge über die gesetzliche Quote hinaus,” see Durzak “Exilsituation” 145.

\(^9\) The sonnet “The New Colossus” is engraved on a bronze tablet at the base of the Statue of Liberty. It was written in 1883 by Emma Lazarus: Not like the brazen giant of Greek fame/ With conquering limbs astride from land to land/ Here at our sea-washed, sunset gates shall stand/ A mighty woman with a torch, whose flame/ Is the imprisoned lightning, and her name/ Mother of Exiles. From her beacon-hand/ Glows world-wide welcome; her mild eyes command/ The air-bridged harbor that twin cities frame./ ”Keep, ancient lands, your storied pomp!” cries she/ With silent lips. ”Give me your tired, your poor,/ Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,/ The wretched refuse of your teeming shore./ Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me,/ I lift my lamp beside the golden door!”
this globe?\textsuperscript{10} do not conform with the reality that awaited the majority of exiles who fled to the United States. Emigrants from Germany, Italy and Japan were labeled “enemy nationals” and had to come to terms with restrictions and special laws. For example, they were required to obtain travel permits for movements within the United States; in California they had to contend with a curfew from 6:00 pm to 8:00 am.\textsuperscript{11} The romantic notion of the United States as “das Land der Herberge für Unterdrückte und Verfolgte” (Middell et al 68) had a flipside. Refugees and emigrants, who successfully navigated their way through the bureaucracy, struggled daily to survive. For the majority of exiles, this depended on day labor and contributions from charitable organizations. For most writers, earning a living through their literature was simply not feasible. Business and profit seemed to rule the artistic world, just as it did Wall Street; many of the German-speaking authors simply wrote “too German” for American tastes,\textsuperscript{12} and aside from a few exceptions, their previous work was not very well known. Consequently few new works were published by the German-speaking exile community between 1933 and 1945 (Middell et al 70-71).

However, there were established German-speaking artists and writers, who managed to enjoy continued – albeit limited – success.\textsuperscript{13} It is important to be cognizant of the difficult situation that confronted the majority of exiles, while recognizing that the

\textsuperscript{10} Quote stems from Jefferson’s annual message from December 8, 1801, see Durzak “Exilsituation” 144.
\textsuperscript{11} This prohibition was lifted in April of 1944, see Durzak “Exilsituation” 148.
\textsuperscript{12} For an example, see Zuckmayer 179-180.
\textsuperscript{13} For Example: Bertolt Brecht, Hermann Broch, Ferdinand Bruckner, Alfred Döblin, Lion Feuchtwanger, Heinrich Mann, Thomas Mann, Max Reinhardt, Anna Seghers, Franz Werfel, Billy Wilder, Carl Zuckmayer, etc.
individual and personal experiences of the exiles were just as diverse as the exiles and emigrants themselves. In the midst of this diversity, it seems that there was one constant that bound the exile experience and the literature that stemmed from the German-speaking exile community: their consummate rejection of Adolf Hitler (Strelka, *Exilliteratur* 16). While circumstances and attitudes changed over the course of time, this one constant remained. For example, Zuckmayer’s strong judgment of the United States had so changed over time that at the end of his speech in Zurich in 1948, he stated the following:

> Aber Amerika hat mir die Chance gegeben, in meiner Arbeit, in meinem Denken, Fühlen und Schaffen, in meinem Lieben und Hoffen, kurz: im Kern meines Wesens europäisch – ja durchaus deutsch – zu bleiben und doch in seinem Boden Wurzel zu schlagen und auf diesem Boden selbst in härtesten Zeiten ein freier Mensch zu sein... (201)

Walter Sorell seems to have had a similar experience with America. When asked if America had become his *Heimat*, he responded: “Amerika war meine Heimat geworden, doch ohne mich zu einem Amerikaner machen zu können. Dazu muß man geboren sein” (33-34).
B. The Development of Exile Studies

Exile research began in the early stages of exile. Initially, it was conducted by refugees themselves and while over the decades literary, social, and historic exile studies have received varying degrees of attention in their respective fields, it is an area of research that is being actively pursued today. My intention here is to show the developments and importance of exile studies, considering the various approaches, emphases, and levels of validation it has received over the past six decades. Moreover, I plan to show that literary exile studies play a viable role in the broader field of Germanistics, in particular with the emphasis on interdisciplinary approaches that many exile scholars have implemented and advocated in recent years.

Although most exile authors did not support themselves in the United States by literary means, the period between 1933 and 1945 was a highly creative one for many exiled authors; after 1945, this creativity led to published works. As such, scholars have an abundance of works from exiled authors. As in every literary phase, exile literature offers a broad spectrum of genres and talent (Durzak, “Exilsituation” 153), as Strelka

---

14 Peter Strelka describes this as “dichterisch Bedeutendes aus dem Leben,” as he discusses the “mehr oder weniger unmittelbaren physischen Tod,” with which exile was intricately tied in antiquity. Meaningful poetics arose “aus der Konfrontation mit dem Tod,” see Exilliteratur 15; Kurt Pinthus describes this in the following manner: “daß all diese Dichter auch an der Front des ersten Weltkriegs, wie in Verfolgtsein und Exil, in Heimatlosigkeit und Verzweiflung, in Krankheit, Unverstandensein und Elend, immer weiter schreiben und dichteten, wo sie auch waren auf diesem Planeten, von Rußland bis zum südlichsten Feuerland, verfolgt und verfemt in der Heimat, in Frankreich auf steter Flucht und in Verborgenheit, in England oder Amerika in den elendesten Berufen neu anfangend,” quoted in Middell et al 206; Also, Durzak points to the results of an East German exile research group, which determined that 420 exiled dramatists wrote “724 Theaterstücke, 108 Hörspiele, 398 Filmmanuskripte und Drehbücher” during their expulsion from Germany, see “Literarische Diaspora” 40.
states: “Literatur von ‘höchster, ja weltliterarischer Qualität bis hinunter zu …
Trivialliteratur’” (Exilliteratur 36). At least one researcher contends, however, that
despite the variety and occasional “world-class” quality of exile literature, the works
produced were damaged by the authors’ exile. He claims that the political and material
circumstances under which the literature emerged were so destructive, that it can only
bear witness to destruction. He attributes this to the actual state of the “conditio humana”
and claims this expresses the destruction of any individuality.15 These differing attitudes
towards exile literature reveal the diversity and contrasting views found in exile studies.

As is well-known, during World War II, the Nazis rejected and/or denied the
value and significance of literature from exiled authors. These so-called “degenerate”
artists produced literature that was not worthy of the German people. Only works written
by authors on German soil or loyal to the Party deserved to be published and read by
“true” Germans. Following the end of World War II, this attitude remained amongst
conservative German-speaking scholars. Rather than addressing the circumstances under
which both exile and non-exile literature was written, rather than considering their value
based on the individual works, literature that was written in the Third Reich was
considered to be the “best literature” produced during the reign of the National
Socialists.16 This mind-set towards exile literature is common knowledge and not

15 Bernhard Spies is supporting his position by referencing Egbert Krispyn’s Anti-Nazi Writers in Exile,
which was published in 1978, see 15.
16 In an article outlining the development of exile literature and studies, Durzak quotes from the inaugural
lecture of exile scholar Wieland Herzfelde at the University of Leipzig in 1949: “So wurde die
apologetische und publizistische Ansicht übernommen, daß die deutsche Literatur ins Exil gerettet wurde,
während sie im Dritten Reich mit wenigen Ausnahmen ins Nichts versank. Diese Meinung hält den
surprising. What is surprising is that even in the late sixties, the majority of conservative scholars and West German textbooks appeared to still disregard the work of exiled authors (Reinhold 82; Stern 167).

This attitude sheds light on the difficult work that laid ahead for exile scholars. They had to overcome negative and dismissive attitudes prevalent in western German-speaking Europe before beginning research projects. Perhaps because of this, the earliest research was conducted by scholars in exile in various host countries. Positivistic research projects\(^\text{17}\) began in the early phases of exile and continued through the war and post-war years. Several early volumes include: *Unter fremden Himmeln* from F.C. Weiskopf, *Verboten und Verbrannt. Deutsche Literatur, zwölf Jahre unterdrückt* from Richard Drews and Alfred Kanotowicz, and *Die humanistische Front* from Walter A. Berendsohn (Brenner; Reinhold 75-78; Durzak “Deutschsprachige Exilliteratur”).

Of these, it is important to note the role Berendsohn played at this stage of exile research. He spent his exile in Denmark and Sweden and is regarded as the father of German exile research.\(^\text{18}\) Spalek acknowledges Berendsohn’s position in early exile research and praises his “tireless work.” According to Spalek, his work had wide spread influence on other scholars. For example, through correspondence with Guy Stern and collaboration with Joseph P. Strelka, a community of exile scholars was established in the

\(^{17}\) Scholars primarily collected biographical information of exiles and literary surveys, which formed a foundation for future research.

\(^{18}\) Berendsohn wrote *Die humanistische Front* in 1939, while in exile in Denmark. In 1940, he settled in Sweden. For decades he was an active exile scholar at the University of Stockholm.
late sixties (157). Besides the work of exiled scholars, the individual stories of those who had fled Nazi Germany began to appear. Exiles recounted their experiences and difficulties in various genres, such as autobiographical texts, essays, fictional tales and anthologies.

In the fifties and sixties, exile scholars continued with positivistic research, as victims of the Third Reich continued to put their stories to pen and paper. During this time, works were published that had been written both in exile and the years following the end of the war. In addition to autobiographies, poetry collections, exile novels, and eyewitness accounts added to the stories and histories that had been previously published.¹⁹

As literary sources continued to emerge throughout the fifties and sixties, some exile scholars struggled to define the parameters of both exile literature and research, which guided the broader context of the scholarship at that time. Germanists in the United States and Canada began to wrestle with the question of the legitimacy of exile research as its own separate field, asking themselves what role exile literature had in the grand scheme of German-language literature studies in North America and how it should be approached. For example, Ernest Reinhold from the University of Alberta notes that in 1968 and 1969, the MLA attempted an integrated approach to the study of German exile literature by offering seminars on the topic at the Association’s yearly conventions. Also in 1969, the first international convention on exile literature was held in Stockholm,

¹⁹ For a sampling of texts, see Cazden; Grossberg. Also, Kaiser and Reinhold reference essays, anthologies, and lexica from this time.
during which scholars from North America and Europe addressed foundational questions surrounding exile literature studies (Reinhold 75).

In 1970, Reinhold summarized the status of the research to date. In his article, he draws attention to the fact that the convention and seminar participants were addressing questions of terminology, time frame and the breadth of exile literature (75). He describes the difficulties that these three areas created for scholars. For example, should the literature be referred to as exile or emigrant literature? Is there a valid time frame that establishes what texts can be labeled exile literature (and in the converse, which texts have not “earned” that label)? Should it be 1933 to 1945 or 1933 to 1947? Or are texts published or written after this time period also valid exile texts? At that time, there was limited consensus in the scholarly community – as is still the case today – but more importantly scholars called for continued research.

In an article published in 1971, Guy Stern addresses concerns about the placement of exile literature within the broader context of literary studies. Here he asks whether exile literature is a “misnomer” or an appropriate subdivision for German-language literary studies. According to Stern, literary history and re-examination of exile literature provide strong reasons for the appropriateness of exile studies (166). He contends that themes such as flight, migration, and estrangement are the “most convincing proof of the ubiquitousness of the exile experience in the works of the refugees” (173-74). In addition, he asserts that linguistic and symbolic similarities support the notion of exile literature as a separate category and that detailed studies will reveal the “distinctiveness of exile
literature” (174-75). To emphasize this distinctiveness and exile literature’s significant position in German literary history, Stern poses a rhetorical question: “Also did not exile literature preserve, in unbroken continuity, stylistic and thematic ties to the German Enlightenment, to the revolutionary literature of the nineteenth century, to Expressionism, and to Jewish writers of the past, while their influence was being suppressed in Germany” (176)?

Stern’s understanding of exile literature and its important role in the history of German-language literature is shared by other Germanists. In 1972, exile scholars met in Copenhagen at the second symposium on exile literature. In addressing the question: what constitutes exile literature, an important implication from the symposium for my project arose. Researchers called for an expanded understanding of the term “exile literature.” Walter Berendsohn expressed this in the following manner: “Sie umfaßt nicht nur die sogenannte ‘schöne’ Literatur, sondern auch die politische und wissenschaftliche, bei der es wohl ratsam ist, sich auf die [H]umaniora zu beschränken” (qtd. in Durzak, “Deutschsprachige Exilliteratur” 11).

The expansion of the term exile literature to include political and scientific literature increased the amount of materials and necessitated the continuation of positivistic research. At the same time, the need for specialized analysis and research became apparent.20 One concern expressed by some scholars was that specialized

---

20 In an article, Durzak presents contributions to the discussion surrounding exile research from scholars such as Berendsohn, Berthold, and Mierendorff, who took part in the second exile literature symposium in 1972 in Copenhagen, see “Deutschsprachige Exilliteratur.”
research could suffocate under the abundance of materials (Middell et al 12). Despite the fact that there were still many sources to be collected and/or cataloged, these scholars asserted that within exile studies, specialized analysis could not wait. Both areas of research needed to occur simultaneously, so that the exile scholars did not forego their role in examining the Nazi period and the Vergangenheitsbewältigung that was inextricably linked with it.

Notwithstanding the importance of such a role, according to one scholar exile research at that time had to contend with difficulties, both in its methodology and dissemination. Bernhard Spies asserts that the desire of scholars to discover an ideal unity of exile literature, by which to classify it compromised both the methodology and dissemination of the research. In his article, he expounds on three theoretical tendencies used by scholars to establish this ideal: "moralisch-politische Intentionalität,” “literarisch-ästhetische Einheit,” and “psychologisch-anthropologische Deutung” (12-17).

In the early seventies, it was the supposed “moral-political intentionality” that united exile literature. Spies claims that this approach exhibited itself in the negative though, as it revealed the “political disunity and organizational dissention of exile literature” (13).

Given the heterogeneous politics views and personalities of the exiled authors, Spies’ assertion is logical. Nonetheless, he seems to overlook the fact that the German-speaking exile community was well aware of their differences and as such, willing – to an extent – to overcome them, in order to work together against fascism:

21 According to Durzak’s account, exile research appeared to be at risk of being crippled by the abundance of materials, see “Deutschsprachige Exilliteratur” 9-14.
Man überwand seine individuelle Vereinzelung und bekannte sich in der Kritik am faschistisch gewordenen Deutschland zu einer politischen Haltung. Man sah sich zur künstlerischen Produktion, soweit es möglich war, aufgerufen, um die Kontinuität einer kulturellen Tradition aufrechtzuhalten, die der Nationalsozialismus zu vernichten drohte und für deren Fortbestand man mit den eigenen, im Exil entstandenen Werken zeugte. (Durzak, “Literarische Diaspora” 41)

While this statement does not negate Spies’ assertion, it seems confirm that there was a “moral-political” objective for exile authors. This is certainly not an “ideal unifying factor,” but it can be viewed as a tendency that characterizes exile literature.

Throughout the eighties, we see a focus on the experiences of the refugees within the research. While some criticism from previous decades still lingered, exile studies had established itself in the broader context of Germanistics. The decade began with a fourth symposium on German and Austrian exile literature at the University of California, Riverside, which appears to have laid the groundwork for scholarship in the following years. In 1982, a volume of the proceedings was published, revealing the primary focus on experience (Daviau and Fischer). Organized into three sections, scholars address issues within a variety of host countries in the first section, critically analyze various

---

22 Such as, emigration in France, New York and Los Angeles, exiled dramatists on Broadway, the German university in France or the contribution of radio in the battle against Hitler and the Nazis in the US context.
exile works in the second section, and consider the inheritance and consequences of exile in the final section.

As mentioned, Das Exilerlebnis presents the major themes of exile research which were being discussed by scholar in the United States in the eighties and we can observe a continuation of these investigations throughout the decade. For example, the individual situations in different host countries and their influence on exiled authors and their literary works were key topics. Scholars were also engaged with themes such as exile, the city and Heimat, exile and autobiographical writings, and women in exile. In addition, numerous reference works were published upon the conclusion of lengthy research projects.

Wulf Koepke’s contribution to this volume looks critically at the difficulties faced by exile authors and scholars (“Probleme und Problematik”). He addresses the longstanding issue of the resistance and/or refusal of conservative scholars to recognize the place of exile literature in German-language literary history. Furthermore, he points to

---

23 From authors such as Elias Canetti, Joseph Roth, Anna Seghers, Thomas Mann, Franz Werfel.
24 Here we find scholars examining problems within exile research, questions of the reception of exile literature, and difficulties faced by exiles in a post-war world: to return home or not.
25 The symposium at UNH in 1985 and the volume of the symposium proceedings edited by Helmut Pfanner bear witness to this. Wolf Koepke’s contribution “‘Innere’ Exilgeographie?” is particularly interesting for my work, as he focuses on the image of the host countries in the works of exiled authors.
26 For a sampling of materials on these topics, see Winkler, “Großstadt;” Pfanner, Exile and “In einer geborgten Heimat”; Bauer, “Die mitgeschleppte Heimat.”
27 For a sampling, Kleinschmidt; Critchfield, “Einige Überlegungen” and “Autobiographie.”
28 Lutz Winckler points out that women’s studies in the 1980’s lead to new research and publications within exile studies and cites the example of Krohn et al, Frauen und Exil, see Winckler 13.
29 For a sampling of texts, see Middell et al; Koepke and Winkler; Spalek and Strelka, this volume is only one part of a much larger research project. The first volume of the series was published in 1976. Besides Strelka, Spalek collaborated on additional volumes with Sandra H. Hawrylchak and Konrad Feilchenfeldt. To date, there are three volumes.
the division and discontinuity in German-language literature caused by the historical circumstances of the Hitler era as possibly the main obstacle for an adequate analysis and interpretation of exile literature (339). Historically, we can see how the Nazi era and the subsequent division of Germany led to a division of the literature based on political affiliations.  

Broadly stated, on one side are the exiles, who felt they were maintaining the “true” German literary tradition; on the other, are the National Socialists, who believed they were maintaining the “pure” German tradition. The end of the war brought new divisions, in particular with the eventual establishment in 1949 of East Germany. The exile author and scholar Hermann Kesten suggested that as early as 1945, German literature had already been quartered: “Da gab es die westdeutschen und die ostdeutschen Schriftsteller, die Exil-Autoren und die Nazis” (qtd. in Koepke, “Probleme und Problematik” 339).

Koepke asserts that despite these divisions time would reveal a certain continuity between all the literatures of this time period and thus advocates for understanding exile literature as a part of a literary epoch, not an epoch in and of itself. Koepke’s assertion is a departure from the perspective of the majority of previous exile scholarship.

---

30 Koepke asserts that this limited post-war literary studies as the effects of Nazi propaganda and the use of literature to advance a political agenda had left the community looking for a literary concept that stressed general humanity and transcended political bounds, see “Probleme und Problematik” 339.
31 In “Probleme und Problematik,” Koepke describes the self-defined role of exile literature as “engagierte Literatur, Erfüllung der Forderung des Tages in der Sprache von Thomas und Klaus Mann” and “die ‘eigentliche’ deutsche Literatur,” literature, whose function it was to maintain and further develop “die große Tradition des deutschen Geistes und der deutschen Sprache,” see “Probleme und Problematik” 338.
Moreover, he claims that it was the closeness to the events, the subjectivity this produced, and the perspective that the “other” or previous literature was the “enemy” that led to the need to be radically different and separate. Time is needed to bring the necessary “objectivity” into the field of exile research (339).

In 1989, a further collection of essays edited by Koepke and Winkler was published with a familiar title: *Exilliteratur: 1933-45*. In the introduction, the editors review the developments in exile literature scholarship. They end by explaining both the importance of exile research for Germanistics and why its analysis is not yet complete:

*Exilliteraturforschung ist ein begrenztes, wenn auch komplexes Arbeitsfeld. […] Nicht nur ist weiterhin die systematische Aufarbeitung der Fakten, ist methodisch und interpretativ viel Einzelanalyse zu betreiben. Auch die geschichtliche Einordnung der Exilliteratur ist in vieler Hinsicht noch zu bestimmen oder wenigstens zu präzisieren. Gleichfalls sind komparatistische Fragestellungen notwendig wie solche aus dem gesamten Bereich der Rezeptionsforschung. Exilforschung ist ein Musterbeispiel für die Notwendigkeit interdisziplinärer Zusammenarbeit; ihre Ergebnisse resultieren aus den Belangen verschiedener Fachgebiete und fallen deshalb mit deren Fortschritten zusammen.* (18)
The call for interdisciplinary collaboration came from various scholars. The broader understanding of exile literature to include non-literary texts had opened up the field of exile studies to cross- and interdisciplinary topics that scholars felt would be beneficial to the larger context of exile research. Paul Micheal Lützeler supported this perspective. Placing the research of Hans-Albert Walter and Guy Stern between historiography and literary history, he asks if Germanists are ready to move into new territory, by moving away from strictly literary texts. Also, he poses a similar question to the experts: would the jurists, psychologists, cultural historians, and political scientists be ready to approach the works of exiled authors that are not a part of the “mainstream” in their fields (78)?

While the texts investigated in this dissertation are literary texts, my approach is interdisciplinary in nature. In implementing Heimat studies and collective memory, I reach beyond the borders of literary theory and consider social and cultural contexts. The texts from Ascher, Freundlich, and Heydenau are well suited for such an approach. All three texts in one form or another address the personal and/or political rupture caused by Hitler’s rule in Europe. For this reason, the stories and images presented in the texts offer an excellent opportunity to examine the function and influence of the notion of Heimat.

---

33 For examples of this, see Koepke “Anmerkungen;” Winckler 78-80, he addresses the potential for expanding exile studies beyond the perfunctory 1933-1945 and using the scholarship to raise awareness of fate of other ethnic minorities and marginalized people groups; Borst 11, she addresses the potential exchange between literary and social sciences in conjunction with exile and migration studies.

34 This particular chapter originally appeared in 1986 in Pfanner’s Wechselbeziehung. Its reprint in and the title of the author’s book reveal that within exile studies the need of interdisciplinary research was still felt.
and collective memory on said images. In my approach, I affirm the call for more interdisciplinary research in the field of exile studies.

Returning to exile scholarship of the late nineties, we find exile scholars approaching new topics or expanding prior scholarship, while attending to an apparent identity crisis within the field. Exile scholars addressed the problematic means by which exile studies had created its position within the literary community, and some asked the provocative question: is exile literature a closed chapter in the study of German literature? For example, Spies poses this question rhetorically; in his essay, he discusses why exile literature is not a closed chapter; he states “die literaturwissenschaftliche Erforschung des Exils [hat] zwar respektable Ergebnisse erarbeitet, aber bei weitem nicht alle bedeutenden Aspekte ihres Gegenstandsbereichs ausgeleuchtet” (11) and asserts that stagnation in exile studies is the result of unresolved methodological problems, rather than exhaustive research (12).

The active pursuit of exile studies in recent years suggests that many scholars agree with Spies. Over the past decade, we can observe new approaches to exile research. First, reoccurring themes were treated at greater lengths and/or from a specific

35 Winckler presents three myths used to create an identity within the literary community. He labels them: 1. Realismus or engagierte Literatur; 2. Antifaschismus; and 3. Kultur-Nation. According to the author, none of these approaches are adequate to fully establish the orientation or identity of exile. One feasible reason for this is the heterogeneous character of what we understand to be exile literature. Exile authors came from widely varying political and social backgrounds. In addition to this, while scholars have discussed the role of the novel and lyric for exile literature, exile studies encompasses literature in its broadest terms, leaving little room for the notion of a specific genre of exile literature, see 68-81.
perspective, for example, exile coupled with *Heimat* and identity\(^{36}\) or the role of host countries in the literature.\(^{37}\) Also, the field continued to grapple with the sheer magnitude of material available to exile research, which resulted in the publication of a biographic reference work devoted to Austrian exile authors (Bolbecher and Kaiser).\(^{38}\) This large volume not only contains brief biographies of the authors, but also offers an overview of the situation in Austria, comprehensive lists of the diverse authors’ works, and references for future research. Furthermore, it reveals that even today there is opportunity for positivistic research, not to mention the eventual, and hopefully fruitful, effect of the critical reflection of scholars on the direction of exile research.

Koepke and Winkler’s assertion that the reception of exile literature had not been sufficiently examined resonated in the exile studies community. In 1991, the first international symposium on the reception of exile literature was held at Vanderbilt University. The symposium and the subsequent publication of the conference papers brought together a wide-spectrum of viewpoints on and approaches to exile literature, questioned the reasons behind the lack of reception of certain works and authors, and hoped to engender new research.

---

\(^{36}\) For a sampling of materials, see Shipley; Kuhlmann; Borst; Boveland, Boveland has a Ph.D. in environmental psychology. Her book contains the personal histories of participants in her study. The book is primarily a descriptive narrative, but the complexity of the question of identity and of identifying oneself with a *Heimat* that drove an individual away and wanted him or her dead is very evident.


\(^{38}\) The editors explain that Austrian here is understood as the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the First and Second Republics of Austria. Also included in the volume are German authors whose exile began in Austria and while there became Austrian citizens.
In 2003, a volume was published on the reception of Austrian exile. Though focusing on Austria, it resonates with previous scholarship. In the foreword, the editors question the assertion that exile research is a closed chapter in German-language literary history:


The editors also offer a new perspective on exile literature and studies. Not only do they seek to establish continuity in German-speaking cultural history, but they claim the investigation of the reception of exile literature is central for Austria’s cultural and analytical history, as well as for establishing a democratic culture in response to the break brought by the Holocaust. In a broader context, the editors assert that this question of
reception and/or non-reception is not only paradigmatic for Austria, but for exile studies in general.

The benefit of interdisciplinary studies promises to bring better understanding of the events in Hitler Germany and their ramifications, not only by literary means, but also through historic, social and cultural avenues. I would like to mention two recent publications that investigate the effects and consequences of exile for Austrian réémigrés and highlight this interdisciplinary trend in Austrian exile studies: Jacqueline Vansant’s *Reclaiming Heimat: Trauma and Mourning in the Memoirs by Jewish Austrian Réémigrés* and *Vom Weggehen. Zum Exil von Kunst und Wissenschaft* edited by Sandra Wiesinger-Stock, et al.

An addition example edited by Adunka and Roessler contains essays addressing not only literary topics, but also sociology, music, and cultural studies. In other works, the themes of *Heimat* and host country remain popular topics for exile scholars and exile autobiographies seem to provide fertile ground for this. Also, we can observe a growth in research analyzing specifically Jewish literature and/or cultural and social elements, an aspect that has been underrepresented in the field of exile studies.

In sum, through literary studies, exile research has the potential to create greater understanding of the public and personal ramifications of the historic events surrounding

---

39 For a sampling, see Brudlom; Pfanner, "New York City"; Popp.
40 For a sampling, see Bunzl; Confino; Melton.
41 For a sampling, see Boveland; Vansant; Wimmer, in this text the author presents a collection of essay from Austrian-Jewish exiles accounting their experiences both in Austria and exile. Instead of analysis it offers personal accounts from those who managed to escape Hitler’s Austria.
42 Koepeke notes that Jewish and Holocaust studies occur under separate disciplines and something he finds “bedauernswert,” see “Anmerkungen” 88.
the Third Reich. Moreover, including an interdisciplinary analysis promises to enhance prior scholarship with historical, social, and cultural perspectives. Additionally, a general consensus amongst exile scholars exists that sees limiting exile literature to that written between the years 1933-45/47 as an artificial demarcation. This consensus affords a broader representation of the time period, as a myriad of works have been published since 1947. Analysis of post-1947 texts will certainly reveal the marks of exile among the works of the generation of exiles, who were children or teenagers when they fled.

Finally in considering my own research, the representations of host countries, the effect of the host culture, and the role of the host country for exiles are all topics that have been addressed in exile research, but as the research reveals, there are still gaps. For example, in 1992, Dieter Sevin noted that research had yet to be done on “second or third row” authors (7-8). Valeria Popp’s project reveals that several years later not much had changed, when she notes that most exile scholars contend that NYC is not a prominent theme in the literature of prominent exiled authors and as such not a theme of exile literature. She disputes this assertion and for her own project investigates the works of four authors of the younger generation (109-10). In 2003, Erika Weinzierl, an Austrian exile scholar, noted the relatively low number of dissertations or master’s thesis from Austrian institutions addressing exile. Weinzierl reminds her research colleagues that exile studies in not only a topic for historians (“österreichische Geschichtsforschung” 37-41). Later in another essay, she describes a lack of Austrian national consciousness regarding the importance of exile research and stresses its importance for Austrian
society as a whole, and not only for exile scholars (“Gesellschaftliche Perspektiven” 32-33). As such, I see my project filling several of these gaps, as I not only examine works of lesser known Viennese authors, but also consider how NYC is represented and the influence that Vienna, the primary source of the authors physical Heimat, plays in this representation. I now turn to the roles of Heimat and memory in exile literature.

C. Exile: Heimat and Memory

_Ein Mann hat Heimweh_

Die Heimat verloren, die Träume zerronnen,
Ich habe mein Leben von vorne begonnen;
New York ist der Schmelztiegel, wo man das kann.
Wenn ich Heimweh hab’, bild’ ich mir ein,
daß mein Coca-Cola ein Glas Wein,
daß der Woolworth der Herzmansky 43 ist
und im Hudsontal die Donau fließt.
Ist der „Hector“ 44 nicht ein Ringcafé
Und die East Side der Franz Josefs Kai’

---

43 On March 3, 1863 August Herzmansky opened a small general store. The second store, which was open in 1897, became the largest textile house of Austro-Hungary; in 1928 it was moved to Mariahilfer Straße. In 1938, Herzmansky’s was owned by Max Delfiner, who had to flee after the _Anschluß_. The textile house was taken over by the firm Rhonberg und Hämmerle. In the last days of the war, it went up in flames. In 1948, ownership was restored to Max Delfiner: [http://www.wien-vienna.at/blickpunkte.php?ID=582](http://www.wien-vienna.at/blickpunkte.php?ID=582).

44 A Diner in New York City.
Und der Times Square ist der Stefansplatz
Und das Drugstore Counter-Girl mein Schatz;
Für Grand Central setz’ ich Westbahn hin,
für die Liberty – die „Spinnerin“\(^{45}\);
und der Bronzer Zoo ist mein Schönbrunn,
wo der Aff’ sich kratzt am After-noon.
Wenn ich Heimweh hab’, bild’ ich mir’s ein
Und dann fühl’ ich mich nicht so allein.

Ich sparte und legte das Geld schon beiseite
Und endlich, da fuhr ich auf Urlaub nach Wien.

Doch alles war anders, die Stadt und die Leute,
’s war seltsam! New York ging mir nicht aus dem Sinn.

Ich hab’ Heimweh! Und so will ich mein
g’wohntes Coca-Cola, keinen Wein;
einen Woolworth, wo Herzmansky ist,
einen Hudson, wo die Donau fließt
einen „Hector“, nicht ein Ringcafé
und die East Side statt dem Franz Josefs Kai;
en einen Times Square, keinen Stefansplatz
und ein Drugstore Counter-Girl als Schatz.

Westbahnhof? Da g’hört Grand Central hin!

\(^{45}\) A Viennese legend about a spinner, who waited patiently many years by a cross she had sculpted for her husband to return from the Crusades. He returned to her after years of imprisonment and they lived “lange und glücklich bis an ihr Ende.” The legend is represented by two gothic pillars called Die Spinnerin am Kreuz; one is in Vienna and the other in Wiener Neustadt.
LIBERTY anstatt der „Spinnerin“!
Einen Bronxer Zoo anstatt Schönbrunn,
wo sich jeder kratzt am After-noon!
Ich kann diesen Wandel nicht verstehen.
Wien, ach warum ließest du mich gehen! (Grossberg 43)

In Ein Mann hat Heimweh, the Austrian author Greta Hartwig offers the reader a lyrical representation of the effect of exile on the notion of Heimat. The lyrical persona faces a situation that was common for many exiles. After fleeing the Nazi regime, they found themselves in a difficult predicament. Driven from their homes, they were scattered throughout the world and forced to start a new life. For some, exile was temporary, as they returned to their home countries at the end of World War II. For others, while their return brought them back to Europe, they were unable or unwilling to return to a country that had forced their emigration. Still for others, there was no return. Their exile, the events of World War II, and the Holocaust had so transformed their former homes that they, for personal as well as practical reasons, stayed in their adopted lands or settled in a “neutral” third country.

Helmut Pfanner states in an essay on exiles in NYC that “[n]ach Jahren in der Fremde kann ein Emigrant nicht einfach in seiner alten Heimat wie früher weiterleben” (“In einer geborgten Heimat” 75). The quandary of the lyrical persona in Hartwig’s poem represents the quandary in which many who had fled from Hitler found themselves. In it, we see the lyrical persona longing for his former life in his Heimat Vienna, while coming
to terms with his new life in NYC. He is confronted by the differences of the cities and their customs and these differences produce a feeling of Heimweh for him. Yet, the memories that create his longing for the familiar and maintain his notion of Heimat are being so transformed and influenced by the new city that when the lyrical persona returns to his former Heimat, his quandary takes on a new face: he misses NYC. The aspects of NYC that he once contrasted with Vienna now appear to have replaced them and in a surprising twist, the Heimweh he felt in NYC, he now experiences in Vienna.

This lyrical representation shows the interaction of Heimat and host country evoking the ambivalence, estrangement, and loss experienced in exile; the lyrical persona is caught between two seemingly unrelated worlds – in an emotional no-man’s-land, but both contributing jointly to his notion of Heimat and to his feelings of Heimweh. The abundance of secondary literature associated with this topic reveals that this quandary was not unusual for exiled authors, making their literature fertile ground for investigating the representations of both Heimat and host country. I will now outline my approach to the works I analyze in the subsequent chapters, which incorporates elements Heimat studies and collective memory theory.

The German notion of Heimat is one that can appear very simple, but reveals itself to be complex. It is individual and communal, and imbedded in the lives and memories of many in the German-speaking world, from the worker to the politician, from the child to the adult. In his study – Heimat: A Critical Theory of the German Idea of Homeland – Peter Blickle asserts that Heimat
enfolds the public with the private, the individual with the social, the self with nature, dream with reality, utopia with landscape; it seeks the preverbal in the verbal, the premodern in the modern, the noble peasant in the burgher, the inside in the outside.

In his article – “Heimat als Identitätsfabrik” – Konrad Köstlin critically expounds on the supposed homogenous and stabilizing characteristics of Heimat. Comparing more recent uses of the notion of Heimat to museum practices, he sees the application of Heimat in the mundane as an autarisation of the banal and the term as the short form for a – albeit questionable – sense of belonging to a greater whole, as well as a place of contentedness, retreat, and creativity (323, 326).

In the introduction to The Heimat Abroad, the editors begin their discussion of Heimat and German-speaking emigrant communities by recounting the experience of a visitor to an “idealized German village” that happened to be in Brazil. There the visitor sees the “flowers of grandmother’s Heimat” (O’Donnel, Bidenthal, Reagin 1). This short anecdote reveals how these communities attempted to reestablish their notion of Heimat in their new countries.

The O’Donnel, Bidenthal, and Reagin continue by discussing how this notion was bound to cultural and familial ties that helped them preserve a German identity; this identity was in turn maintained in the domestic sphere by women and in the public sphere by community and institutional organizations (1-3). Ascher’s Bilderbuch aus der Fremde offers an excellent example one family’s attempt to sustain their former Heimat in the
domestic sphere. Ascher describes how her mother tried to recreate their Viennese home within the confines of their small apartment on NYC’s Riverside Drive (53). In the public sphere, both Ascher and Freundlich were active in several German-speaking communities, which strove to maintain the cultural or political identities they had had in Austria and Europe. In doing so, they preserved elements of many German-speaking exiles notion of *Heimat*.

In considering *Heimat*, I contend it is a very fluid notion: while it evokes certain images and feelings for an individual that are influenced by the person’s experiences, these images and feelings are continually influenced by new circumstances and/or surroundings. We can observe this in Hartwig’s poem. Initially, Vienna is the embodiment of *Heimat*; but in the latter half of the poem we see that this is not a fixed and stable attachment, in it NYC embodies *Heimat* and evokes *Heimweh*. I believe the influence of exile on the notion of *Heimat* is a characteristic of exile literature and offers the opportunity for further examination of *Heimat* as a fluid notion.

To underscore the influence of new localities, communities or life experiences that shape and transform an individual’s perceptions, I would like to present comments from exile scholar Egon Schwarz. Himself an exile, Schwarz recognizes that factors such as time and place, biology and social class, are not chosen by the individual, but they are nonetheless “mächtige Faktoren in der Entwicklung des Einzelnen” (3). As an individual continues developing over a lifetime, it is reasonable to expect that perceptions will

---

46 For example, the Austro-American Tribune (AAT) and the German-American Writers’ Association (GAWA).
change. For example, Schwarz asks if simply growing up in a predominantly Jewish Bezirk or having siblings would have changed his perspective on his youth in Vienna as “[a]lles hängt von der Perspektive ab, aus der man etwas betrachtet, vom Standort, auf dem man eine Sache erlebt” (21). If a change of neighborhood can alter one’s perspective, then how much more the drastic changes imposed on the exiles by Hitler? As the poem above reveals, the changes of exile significantly altered the lyrical persona’s perspective.

Another crucial element of the notion of Heimat is its relationship to identity. In Blickle’s study on Heimat he presents the development of this particularly German notion. Blickle traces the emergence of the modern idea of Heimat in close proximity to the development of philosophical thought surrounding identity, which began in the early eighteenth century with Descartes. He recounts how in German cultural history both ideas emerge around the same time and since the late eighteenth century shifts in both notions have developed parallel to one another (64). In response to Ina-Maria Greverus’ assertion that “Heimat resembles identity,” Blickle states firmly that “Heimat is not only like identity, it is identity.” He continues by underscoring the intimate connection between identity and Heimat found in their social/communal nature: “Heimat is more than a trope of identity. It is a way of organizing space and time and a communally defined self in order to shape meaning. Heimat is identity manifested in a social, imagistic way” (66).

47 By his account, it was marked by isolation (from Christian as well as other Jewish youths), the half-hearted religious practices of his parents, and anti-Semitism, see 17-21.
The intricate connection to identity seen in this quote highlights another aspect of *Heimat*. In his introduction, Blickle describes *Heimat* in the following manner:

“Language, identity, geography, politics, and notions of self and reference intermingle in *Heimat* in a manner that rationally trained thinkers find discomforting. The German idea of *Heimat* is emotional, irrational, subjective, *social*, political and *communal*” (8, my emphasis). This social/communal aspect of the notion of *Heimat* is the third focal point of this work.

Others scholars have also underscored the importance of the social/communal aspect. For example, Joachim Riedl makes the following statement about the role of society in the formation of one’s notion of *Heimat*:

> Das kollektive Bewußtsein einer Gemeinschaft prägt den jeweiligen *Heimatbegriff* aufgrund der jeweiligen Erfahrungen des Kollektivs; dabei ist der *Heimatbegriff* einem steten Wandel unterworfen. Er wird bestimmt durch Geschichte, Umgebung, Ängste, Zuversichten, Hoffnungen; er ist der Jeweiligkeit einer historischen Situation unterworfen.  

Riedl’s presentation here not only emphasizes the fluidity of the notion of *Heimat*, but it also underscores the concept of *Heimat* as a social construct.

It is in this understanding that the individual’s notion of *Heimat* is formed socially that I see an important connection to the concept of collective memory. Both the notion of *Heimat* and the formation of memories, while belonging distinctly to an individual, are

---

48 This volume was published following an exhibit on the subject at Vienna’s Jüdisches Museum that ran from February 10 to March 27, 1995, see 8.
developed in and influenced by a collective. In the case of Ascher, Freundlich, and Heydenau, we can observe this influence as it manifests itself in their representations of NYC and Vienna. How do the authors remember Vienna and NYC in their texts, what images are evoked, and what does this tell us about their notion of Heimat?

In his seminal work *On Collective Memory*, the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs develops his concept of collective memory. While memories are a part of an individual, society plays an essential role in their formation through established frameworks by which one’s recollections are determined and retrieved (43). Halbwachs asserts, “We cannot properly understand [memories’] relative strength and the ways in which they combine within individual thought unless we connect the individual to the various groups of which he is simultaneously a member” (53). The individual, the society to which he or she belongs, and the memories he or she has are all – according to Halbwachs – not only intricately interwoven, but these memories can only be “understood” in the context of the “thought of the corresponding group” (53).

John Meacham takes this supposition to another level and – in contrast to Halbwachs – appears to dismiss the perspective of the individual. He presents the concept of remembering or reminiscing as a “process of social construction” and claims that validity of memories or reminiscences is maximized when socially constructed by members of equal standing in a society (46). Meacham also argues that “[a]ll our reminiscences belong not to individuals, but to the community and the society” (48). While I agree with Meacham that memories are formed in society or a collective and can
be supported or rejected by the society, I contend that they remain highly personal and can only belong to the individual, for it is from his or her perspective that the memory is held. In the preface of *On Collective Memory*, Halbwachs affirms the importance of individual perspective within the social frameworks of memory. Furthermore, Schwarz underpins the importance of perspective, when he states that everything is dependent on it. This phenomenon can be observed in literature; the author – while influenced by his or her society – writes from his or her perspective.

Moreover, Meacham does not appear to consider personal function of a memory for the individual as we saw from Valerie Popp. For Meacham, the validity of a memory is found in its social construction. This stands in contrast to Popp’s assertion that the function of the memory for the individual is more important than its factual basis. In considering both Meacham and Popp’s viewpoints, I would argue that the function of the memory for the individual is more important than his or her society’s validation of the memory. For instance, in Ascher’s *Bilderbuch*, we will observe how the author recognizes the function of her memory in the restoration of her notion of *Heimat*, while she asserts that members of her own society can call the image evoked by her memory and notion of *Heimat* into question.

Still, the intricate connection of society to memories cannot be overlooked. The reader finds this connection in Hartwig’s poem. Her lyrical persona and the transformation of his notion of *Heimat* offer us the opportunity to reflect on the function of private experiences and memories that are tied to a specific society. The society to
which he belongs before his exile shapes his concept of Heimat and sets the stage of his memories. Removed from the society and location, from the previous frameworks that had ordered his life, he not only experiences Heimweh, but a transformation of his notion of Heimat occurs.

In the first half of the poem, he longs for the Heimat he remembers. Through his memories, he is able to compare elements of his present life, with elements of his former life. Due to his exile, this comparison is dependent on his memories. In the second half of the poem, it is revealed that these memories in the lyrical present are to be understood through the lens of his new life circumstances. The predicament of the refugee is presented clearly: during his exile there has been a shift in his perspective. This shift first becomes clear for the lyrical persona, when he travels back to his former Heimat. He recognizes that this change of venue has brought new experiences and memories. As such, NYC not only has significant influence on his notion of Heimat, it has become his Heimat and through a set of alternate parallel images is a part of the new framework that structures his notion.

The lyrical persona has become a member of a new social group; another frame has been added to his life, another lens, if you will, through which he observes and filters his life circumstances. In his work on cultural memory, Jan Assmann refers to these frames as the “konnektive Struktur” (16). He contends, “[j]ede Kultur bildet etwas aus, das man ihre ‘konkektive Struktur’ nennen könnte.” He goes on to explain that this connective structure binds “den Menschen mit seinen Mitmenschen” (16). Occurring in
both social and temporal dimensions, this structure gives meaning to joint experiences, expectations, and actions, while also creating trust and orientation through these bonds (16). Assmann explains further that an individual is bound to the “we” – a collective – because he or she shares common knowledge and a self-perception that is based “zum einen auf [der] Bindung an gemeinsamen Regeln und Werte, und zum anderen auf [der] Erinnerung an eine gemeinsam bewohnte Vergangenheit” (16-17).

In her work *Frames of Remembrance*, Irwin-Zarecka contends that collective memory is a “significant orienting force,” as it is intricately related to the “collective identity” and imbued with the moral imperatives that inform the individual’s life (9). We can observe a correlation to Assmann’s perspective on cultural memory in this regard. He claims that two aspects of culture – the normative, which establishes moral imperatives and the narrative, which tells the story of a culture – are the foundation of one’s sense of belonging and identity. Thus the “we” is shaped in a collective and supported by perception of the individual (16-17). Assmann expounds on the centrality of collective memory for group identity when he states,

> Die Raum- und Zeitbegriffe des kollektiven Gedächtnisses stehen mit den Kommunikationsformen der entsprechenden Gruppe in einem Lebenszusammenhang, der affektiv undwertbesetzt ist. Sie erscheinen darin als Heimat und Lebensgeschichte, voller Sinn und Bedeutung für das Selbstbild und die Ziele der Gruppe. (39)
In this quote from Assmann, there are two significant references to *Heimat*. Not only does it connect the notion of *Heimat* to the concepts of time and space within the sphere of collective memory, but it also portrays this notion as one of the factors that gives meaning to the identity and goals of a given group. As with Irwin-Zarecka, we see the significance of collective and (in Assmann’s case) cultural memory for the formation of identity, supporting Blickle’s affirmation that, “*Heimat* is not only like identity, it *is* identity” (66).

Nevertheless, if we accept Blickle’s assertion that *Heimat* is identity and the formative role played by collective memory, we also have to acknowledge the flipside: both the notion of *Heimat* and a society’s collective memory can be used as an exclusionary devise. This negative use of *Heimat* and a distortion of history influencing the collective memory can be observed in Nazi Germany, which used racist policies to exclude and eliminate those deemed undesirable to their specific rendering of the German *Heimat*.

In considering this, the question arises as to how the exclusion and expulsion of the refugees from a place that once formed and informed their identity affects their notion of *Heimat* and their memories. The reaction of Hartwig’s lyrical persona as seen in the last line of the poem offers one response: “Wien, ach warum ließest du mich gehen” (Grossberg 43)! This statement is open to various readings, but when considering *Heimat* I find two that offer interesting departure points. One, we can assert that the lyrical persona is living in a state of denial, forgetting that Vienna did not “let” him go, but
rather forced him to flee for his life. Or the lyrical persona is questioning why his Heimat did not resist and allowed his expulsion. Both readings portray Vienna in a slightly different light. In the first, Vienna is actively complicit, while in the second it is passively complicit. In considering both, we can ask what influence denial, ambivalence, animosity, and memory gaps will have on the representations of Heimat in the works I have chosen, will we find a Heimat that is the perpetrator or the victim?

D. Conclusion

The correlations between the notion of Heimat and collective memory are intriguing ones; analyzing autobiographical works from Viennese authors from similar backgrounds allows me to consider historical and social underpinnings of Viennese society in the time before the Anschluß that influenced and framed the authors’ notion of Heimat and their memories. The use of autobiographical texts also insures that both images of Vienna and NYC are present in the works, offering me the opportunity to analyze these representations. Ascher’s text focuses on Vienna, primarily in the time around the Anschluß and on NYC and her experiences in exile. In Freundlich’s text, the author shares her memories from Austria, France, and the United States, with Vienna, Paris, and NYC playing primary roles. In Heydenau’s novel, the protagonist follows the same escape route as the author, fleeing Vienna via Japan and traveling across the United States until he reaches NYC.
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While my primary literature is autobiographical, only one is a traditional autobiography, *Die fahrenden Jahre* – published in 1992 – from Elisabeth Freundlich. In it, Freundlich narrates the events of her life in primarily chronological order. However, she also reflects on these events, in both their private and public ramifications. Franzi Ascher wrote the memoir *Bilderbuch aus der Fremde* at the request of a friend in Austria, who wanted an eyewitness account of life in exile from an Austrian for Austrians. The memoir – published in 1947 – begins on the eve of the *Anschluß*, recounts Ascher’s flight with her parents to NYC and her adjustments to life in exile. It concludes shortly after the end of the war. The novel *Auf und ab* – published in 1953 – from Friedrich Heydenau is a fictional account of a young Austrian who fled Vienna for NYC via Sweden and Japan. It opens in Japan, as the protagonist awaits passage to the United States and narrates his tumultuous life in NYC. It ends with the protagonist finding a new home in NYC. While there are differences to the author’s own exile experience, the novel is replete with autobiographical imagery.

Thus, these three texts offer descriptions, reflections, and written memories that allow me to analyze the interaction of *Heimat* and memory in their representations of Vienna and NYC. My analysis of these texts is framed by the three elements of *Heimat* I mentioned above: fluidity, identity, and social construction. To examine these elements I focus primarily on the following frames: public and private spaces, social class, and community. Moreover, we should note the widespread publication dates of the texts. Although this is not the main focus of this dissertation, this factor may have influenced
what the authors chose to emphasize within these frames and offers an explanation of the differing emotive quality of the earlier works from Freundlich’s text. While Ascher and Heydenau’s texts contain personal narratives and emotional descriptions, Freundlich’s autobiography maintains a more factual, almost historical quality; temporal distance from the events of World War II and her exile could account for this.

Ascher, Freundlich and Heydenau fled Austria after Hitler marched into Vienna and the Anschluß in March 1938; eventually arriving in NYC they spent a significant portion of their exile there. In considering public and private spaces, I draw on Popp and Irwin-Zarecka, looking not only at which spaces are portrayed, but also how the space is portrayed and to what possible end. At the same time, I consider the influence and interaction of their memories and notion of Heimat on the portrayals.

In considering the social class of the authors and/or protagonist, I first describe their familial backgrounds, as the family is the first community to which we as individuals belong and which largely determines social standing, considering how this shaped their lives in Vienna. I then consider how this changes in exile, primarily in the work place and social interactions in NYC. Finally, I reflect on how each individual deals with and adapts to these changes as seen through their representations of Vienna and NYC.

Regarding community, Helmut Pfanner points out that exiles who settled in NYC (like Ascher, Freundlich, and Heydenau) were in the company of many German-speaking refugees, who were “from the cultural centers of Berlin, Munich and Vienna, and
therefore opted for life in America’s cultural metropolis of NYC over the country’s vast hinterland, with the exception of Southern California” (“New York City” 364). Still, NYC was not only a cultural metropolis in the United States that appealed to the former residents of the largest cities of German-speaking Europe, it also was home to an established German immigrant community. In considering community, I look at the influence of both the German-speaking exile community, the established immigrant community and the influence of the authors’ communities both in Vienna and NYC, focusing on how these communities shaped and reshaped the authors’ images and notion of Heimat.
Chapter II: Franziska Ascher – A Changing Notion of *Heimat*

In this chapter, I examine Franziska (Franzi) Ascher’s notion *Heimat* as presented in her post-World War II work *Bilderbuch aus der Fremde*. At the request of a friend in Austria, Ascher wrote *Bilderbuch* to share her exile experience with a primarily Austrian audience. Due to this focus, the text is replete with images of Vienna and NYC, references to *Heimat*, and memories associated with both *Heimat* and exile. While the dominant exile scholarship asserts that the United States has not been adequately represented in the works of well-known exile authors (Koepke “‘Innere Exilgeographie;” Winkler “Grossstadt”), Valerie Popp – a newer voice in exile studies – contends that the generation of younger, lesser known exile authors offers wider spread representations of the United States than hitherto acknowledged in the scholarship (9-10). As an example of the treatment of the United States in an exile text from such an author, Ascher’s *Bilderbuch* supports this contention.  

In my examination of *Bilderbuch*, it is my goal to assess the function of the representations of Vienna and NYC in the development of Ascher’s notion of *Heimat*. To facilitate this examination, I have selected three frames to serve as guides: public and private spaces, social class, and community.

---

49 Years before Popp made her assertion, exile scholar Dieter Sevin also noted the lack of exile research surrounding younger authors. Nevertheless, the situation had not changed much before Popp completed her project.
This chapter begins with an overview of Ascher’s life to establish the social and historic context in which she lived. This is followed by a synopsis of the text, highlighting its affective qualities as well as its content. The final sections offer an examination of her notion of *Heimat* through the abovementioned frames and the correlation of said notion and collective memory, highlighting their interactive qualities.

A. Childhood and Youth in Vienna

Franziska (Franzi) Ascher was born in Vienna on November 12, 1910 to Luise (née Frankl) and Leo Ascher, the well-known operetta composer. Ascher enjoyed the benefits of bourgeois life in Vienna and being reared in a musical household. Her education began at home with a private tutor. Later, she attended the *Humanistisches Gymnasium* in Vienna, during which time she also took voice lessons. In 1928, she earned her *Matura* with honors. Desiring a career as an opera singer, Ascher studied voice from 1928 to 1932 at Vienna’s *Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst*. During this time she was a member of the ensemble of the *Volksoper*, actively pursuing her dream of becoming an opera singer.

In her unpublished autobiography *Lauf, lauf Lebenslauf. Der rote Faden einer Autobiographie* written in 1978, Ascher describes her years at the *Akademie* in great detail. We see here her drive and zeal to become a great opera singer. Her instructor at the *Akademie* was a former luminary of Vienna’s *Hofoper*, Mrs. Mark-Neusser, who
encouraged Franzi greatly in her singing. Under her tutelage, Ascher found her voice, which previously had been unreliable and forced; also, Mark-Neusser found appropriate singing engagements for Ascher. It appears, though, that the unreliability of her voice and her drive to establish herself in the world of opera brought an early end to her singing career. Ascher had accepted the offer from the Volksoper as “Elevin mit der Minestgage” against the advice of her mentor. Her singing career came to an end, when Ascher agreed to stand in for a colleague at the Volksoper and her voice gave out during the performance. While friends and colleagues tried to encourage her, as Ascher tells the story, she knew she would never have a career in opera.

While opera was her first love, Ascher was also a talented writer. Initially though she did not recognize her talent. One of her first short stories was published in “Der Tag,” a Viennese daily newspaper. Her uncle had shown “Kleine Suite als Auftakt zum Tanz” to Rudolf Kalmar, the editor in charge, who expressed an interest in printing it and other short stories by the young Ascher. Upon learning this, Ascher exclaimed, “‘Kurzgeschichten!’ rief ich und erstarrte vor Verblüffung. ‘Ich bin doch keine Schriftstellerin’” (Ascher-Nash 59)! Nevertheless, she continued to write short stories and essays for other newspapers and journals in Vienna, some of which were published under the pseudonyms Georg or Georges Petri. In 1936, she traveled with her father to London, where they lived for one year. In light of the historical events in Austria that followed and the political climate in Germany at that time, it seems that Leo Ascher suspected that the politics of the National
Socialist would not remain within Germany’s borders. He had hoped to reestablish his career in London, but father and daughter returned to Austria in 1937, where Franzi then worked for United Artists as a translator of film dialogues, until she fled Vienna with her parents in 1938.

Despite the disappointment of not fulfilling her dream of being an opera singer, Ascher seemed to enjoy a relatively harmonious and pleasant life in Vienna prior to the Anschluß; although she came from a Jewish family, she was, for the most part, shielded from daily realities of anti-Semitism, such as those faced by Egon Schwarz. Still, Ascher acknowledges to her readers that, on at least one occasion, she was the recipient of anti-Semitic slurs.

Schwarz begins his description of Vienna as follows: “Ich wurde in Wien geboren, der Kaiserstadt, unter sprichwörtlich sanges-, liebes- und eßlustigen Leuten, ausgerüstet mit dem vielgerühmten goldenen Wiener Herzen.” The reader quickly see that this is a superficial image: the Viennese as “heimatliebende,” who cannot do without their “resche[n] Kaisersemmeln” and “Hochquellenwasser:” who trivialize the difficult relationship with unwanted minorities in the local dialect was just “das Wien der Legende” and not the Vienna that Schwarz knew, see Schwarz 3; His contemporary, Hans Eichner, points to the Bezirk, in which Schwarz grew up and his school as major factors in how he experienced anti-Semitism in Vienna. Eichner grew up in the predominately Jewish second Bezirk and was spared the anti-Semitic taunts that Schwarz faced regularly in the third Bezirk. Also, in Eichner’s Gymnasium, the Christian and Jewish teachers worked side by side (albeit ignoring one another) and showed kindness to their students, as opposed to the enmity that defined the relationship between student and teacher at Schwarz’s Gymnasium, see Eichner 22.

Ascher-Nash describes how in 1928 she had a substitute German teacher who was known to be a “deutschnational.” One of Ascher’s classmates wanted to impress the teacher and made anti-Semitic remarks in front of Franzi and the teacher. After this, she refused to speak to her classmate, until her father phoned Leo Ascher, who intervened: “Um Himmelswillen, stell’ dich nicht mit Lappalien her – das ist eine dumme Gans, lass wieder gut sein.” The next day, Franzi spoke to her again briefly, see Lauf, lauf 18-20.
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50 Schwarz begins his description of Vienna as follows: “Ich wurde in Wien geboren, der Kaiserstadt, unter sprichwörtlich sanges-, liebes- und eßlustigen Leuten, ausgerüstet mit dem vielgerühmten goldenen Wiener Herzen.” The reader quickly see that this is a superficial image: the Viennese as “heimatliebende,” who cannot do without their “resche[n] Kaisersemmeln” and “Hochquellenwasser:” who trivialize the difficult relationship with unwanted minorities in the local dialect was just “das Wien der Legende” and not the Vienna that Schwarz knew, see Schwarz 3; His contemporary, Hans Eichner, points to the Bezirk, in which Schwarz grew up and his school as major factors in how he experienced anti-Semitism in Vienna. Eichner grew up in the predominately Jewish second Bezirk and was spared the anti-Semitic taunts that Schwarz faced regularly in the third Bezirk. Also, in Eichner’s Gymnasium, the Christian and Jewish teachers worked side by side (albeit ignoring one another) and showed kindness to their students, as opposed to the enmity that defined the relationship between student and teacher at Schwarz’s Gymnasium, see Eichner 22.
51 Ascher-Nash describes how in 1928 she had a substitute German teacher who was known to be a “deutschnational.” One of Ascher’s classmates wanted to impress the teacher and made anti-Semitic remarks in front of Franzi and the teacher. After this, she refused to speak to her classmate, until her father phoned Leo Ascher, who intervened: “Um Himmelswillen, stell’ dich nicht mit Lappalien her – das ist eine dumme Gans, lass wieder gut sein.” The next day, Franzi spoke to her again briefly, see Lauf, lauf 18-20.
B. Fleeing Hitler’s Vienna

Hitler’s march into Vienna in 1938 brought great turmoil for Vienna’s Jewish population and the Ascher family was no exception. Franzi describes the changes in her beloved Vienna not only in her autobiography and *Bilderbuch aus der Fremde*, but also in an essay from 1944 entitled “And What about Austria.” Franzi experienced the same racist laws that affected all of Vienna’s Jewry and describes how Vienna had been altered: she could walk through the Prater, but she was not allowed to sit on the benches (Shipley 193); the voices of the Brown Shirts rang out in familiar Austrian tones, but they were louder and different (Ascher, *Bilderbuch* 17). The Austria of her life thus far was fading into the Ostmark of Hitler’s Third Reich and being the daughter of a well-known Austrian composer would not protect her family from the racist policies of the Nazi regime.

The arrest of her father during a pogrom in 1938 proved this. After his release, the family concentrated their efforts on arranging affidavits of exile to the United States. The scholar Suzanne Shipley reports how they poured over telephone books from NYC looking for other Aschers, who might be able sponsor them as “relatives.” After writing many letters, a man by the name of Albert Ascher responded. He told the Ascher family to go see his lawyer and subsequently signed his fifteenth affidavit to secure Franzi and her parent’s passage to America (Shipley 194).
With their affidavits secured, the family prepared for their departure. It was an emotionally charged time for the family; Franzi describes how they were demoralized by the implausibility of it all and “[d]as hing ja alles so in der Luft, so schien es uns. Und das sollte unsere Rettung sein? Es war unsere Rettung” (Ascher-Nash 104-5). For her, their last two days in Vienna do not exist in her memory: “Ich sehe uns nur alle auf dem Gang stehen, hoerte, wie die Wohnungstuer hinter uns ins Schloss fiel und entsinne mich eines lahren und schwachlichen Erstaunens darueber, dass es so etwas wirklich gab” (115). 52

Franzi’s uncles Viktor and Albert accompanied the family to the train. At the Westbahnhof, they were not spared one last insult as they fled the city that was their home and a central part of their lives; the same city that had rejected them and forced them out. The Nazi magistrate who searched their hand luggage noticed sheet music in Leo Ascher’s bag; realizing who he was, the magistrate exclaimed: “Mein Gott, Herr Doktor […] Hoheit tanzt Walzer. Ich war ein Bub, wie ich’s zum erstenmal gsehn hab. Und ’Frühling im Wienerwald‘. Das war doch erst vor zwei Jahr. Die schöne Musik!” According to Ascher, the exchange terrified her mother and the disgust felt by her father was visible as he turned his back on the man (Bilderbuch 20). Twenty minutes later, the Ascher family began their journey to safety, which ended on December 9, 1938 with their arrival in New York City.

52 Throughout the body of this dissertation, quotes will maintain the spelling conventions from the original texts.
In the essay – “And What about Austria” – written in 1944 while Ascher was still in NYC, she reflects on what Austria had become at the time of her family’s departure on November 24, 1938: “Austria, at the time I left her, still had retained the contours of her beloved landscape; she had, at that time, still retained the unbroken beauty of her cities and towns – but she had lost her face, her identity.” Not only did Austria lose its face and identity, but its exiles did as well and their representations of Austria speak to the affect of this loss.

C. Life after Vienna

Once the Aschers reached New York, life began anew and the family started successful efforts to rescue their close relatives from the Third Reich. Financially, royalty checks for performances of Leo Ascher’s operettas helped sustain them. Franzi describes the shock she felt after the first check arrived: “Ein Riß geht durch mich. Europa lebt weiter? Die Operetten meines Vaters werden in manchen Ländern gespielt? Man könnte in Europa weiter leben” (Ascher, Bilderbuch 42)? Time revealed though that the Ascher family had made the right decision to flee to the uncharted territories of America.

Even before her father’s premature death in 1942, Franzi took on various jobs to contribute to the family’s coffers. She worked as a secretary on Wall Street and in one of NYC’s public libraries. She also worked as a translator and joined the German-American Writers Association (GAWA), which led to her first publications in America in New
York’s German-Jewish newspaper *Aufbau*. Ascher wrote radio plays and in 1940 took part in radio broadcasts for the “Freie Deutsche Radiostunde,” with the goal of “[educating] the American public about the dangers of Nazi Germany and [promoting] support for the exiles. The founders of the “Radio Hour” also hoped to facilitate communication and understanding among the exiles” (Schreckenberger, “Exil” 53). With titles such as “Eine Wienerin sieht New York” (a collaborative project with Alfred Farau) and “Frauenklubs in Amerika” (based on lectures that Ascher held under the auspices of the *New York Herald Tribune* for various women’s association in the greater NYC area) Franzi tried to build bridges and understanding between her home and host cultures. In addition to this, she wrote music reviews for the New York based *Neue Volkszeitung* (1941-49) and the *Austro-American Tribune* (1944-49).

In 1944, Ascher became a U.S. citizen and she remained in the United States until her death in Millersville, Pennsylvania in 1991. The years following the war, she continued with her literary pursuits, writing short stories, essays and poetry in both German and English, many of which remain unpublished. She lectured at both the New School for Social Research and the Manhattan School of Music. In 1959, she married the musician and composer Edgar Nash, also formerly from Vienna. Ascher also hosted her own radio program, broadcast from Fordham University, which ran from 1962-1964. Writing and lecturing became her life’s work. However, her last major project took her to Millersville University, where she established the “Leo Ascher Award,” a music scholarship honoring her late father.
D. Bilderbuch aus der Fremde: A Story from Abroad

In Bilderbuch aus der Fremde (Bilderbuch), Ascher offers the reader three pre-exile images of America. First, it represented something “Grelles und Klarrendes” (11); it had the characteristics of a carnival, with workers, who tried to draw people in with promises of something new and exciting. Second, it was a land found in novels with characters, who were “unerlöst auf sonderbare Art, voller Begabungen und voller Unzufriedenheit, ruhelos wandernd nach einem Licht, das sich zuweilen als Irrlicht erwies” (11). Third, it was a land of films, in which men are portrayed in a clear and transparent way that Ascher calls “idealisierte[n] Naturalismus” (12).

But even with these three unfamiliar images, Ascher still felt something “Freundliches and Vertrautliches” thanks to the success of her father’s operetta “Hoheit tanzt Walzer” in NYC during World War I. Ascher explains that this experience during her childhood made America like all the other countries where her father’s music echoed in the halls of stately opera houses (12-13). But the consequences of the Anschluß transformed Ascher’s pre-exile image of America into a “ein gestaltloser Ort der Zuflucht und der Freiheit und nichts weiter” (18). In Bilderbuch, the reader goes on the journey with the young Ascher into this strange, yet somehow familiar land of refuge.

As mentioned above, Ascher wrote Bilderbuch shortly after World War II ended at the request of an Austrian friend, who wanted a first-person account of life in NYC from an Austrian perspective. Written in two sections, the first part begins with a
reflection on the word *Amerika* as described above. It continues with the events, both personal and public, on the eve of the *Anschluß* and the immediate consequences felt by Ascher and her family.

From there the reader is given a picture of the family’s departure from Europe and the long journey by ship into NYC’s harbor. Ascher gives this chapter the title: “Franz Schubert: Der Wegweiser.” Serving as a subtitle is a line from a Schubert song: “Und ich wand’-re son-der Ma-ßen, oh-ne Ruh’ und su-che Ruh’” (35). This serves to underscore not only the effect of the Aschers’ forced emigration, but also the role of music for her and her family. She then offers the reader her first impressions of NYC, in which one can see a virtual “collision” of her two worlds: NYC is not Vienna and the disparity she experiences seems to highlight her loss.

Ascher closes out the first section of *Bilderbuch* by focusing on her secretarial job on Wall Street. It was not a difficult job, as Ascher tells it, and the daily routine allows her to feel settled and to reflect on the circumstances of her life. The routine of her work helps her become very familiar with this particular part of the city. During her lunch breaks, she goes for walks and takes in all that the Wall Street district has to offer. According to Ascher, it was the settled feeling that she experienced that gave her the desire to look back, and she recognizes, “daß mir auf einmal nicht mehr unheimlich war” (68). She is ready to reflect on the events of the past several years and through this reflection, an image comes to her that is “das Bildnis Österreichs, so wie es mir gehörte, als Erbe und als Herzschlag meines Lebens” (69).
The final chapter of the first section, “Johannes Brahms: Alte Liebe,” Ascher presents her restored image of Austria and its formative function for her identity and notion of Heimat. What we discover here underpins the importance of function over factuality for the author. Ascher states:

Das Bildnis Österreichs, das in den Nebeln des Hafens von New York allmählich in mir aufstieg, war mein Österreich – unvollständig und idealisiert. Viele könnten mit Recht sagen, daß es nicht das wahre Österreich war, sonderbarerweise aber ändert dies nichts an der Tatsache, daß dieses Bildnis, in all seiner Fragwürdigkeit vor dem klaren Forscherauge, meine innere Existenz gerettet hat. (70)

Her new image of Austria may be questionable, but what matters most to the author is that it is restorative for her identity. What the reader finds in this chapter is the intimate connection between Heimat, memory, and identity (I consider this connection more fully in section E. The interaction of Heimat and exile, and the influence of memory) as Ascher reflects on the role of the former two in the formation of the later.

In the second section of Bilderbuch, Ascher begins with a description of the five NYC boroughs, highlighting their individual personalities and characteristics. She then moves into a realm that clearly evokes memories of home life and feelings of Heimat: music, which she refers to in the title of this chapter as “das freieste Gut New Yorks”
(93). From this love of music that New Yorkers and the Viennese seem to share, Ascher moves into the differences between Austria and the United States. 53

The second half of the book ends with Ascher reflecting on the influence of New York on her and how she has changed since coming to America in “Vergleiche und Lehre.” In “Dem Mentor meiner Jugend zugeeignet,” she is grateful to the character Settembrini in Thomas Mann’s Zauberberg for sharing her disgust for the “Phänomen des Leidens” (124). According to Ascher, her perspective on suffering stands in strong contrast to her generation’s belief in the good that can come from suffering. In the character of Settembrini, she finds a like-minded figure who can instruct her in the ways of humanism and democracy. Ascher titles the final chapter of Bilderbuch “Robert Schumann: In der Fremde.” In it, she reflects on the events of the last seven years: the Anschluß, her exile and Austria’s liberation from Nazi Germany. She considers what possibly lies ahead, but leaves the question of returning to Austria open, recognizing her attachment to both places and her inability to know what the future holds.

As Ascher wrote Bilderbuch with the explicit intention of sharing her experience in the United States with non-exiled Austrians, the reader can expect to find many contrasts and comparisons of Austria and NYC in this book. I will now consider her representations of Vienna and NYC, focusing on the three elements of the notion of Heimat that I outlined in my introductory chapter: fluidity, identity and social

53 Ascher shared these observations in her lectures with many (primarily) women’s associations throughout the greater NYC area. Through these lectures she can reflect once again on her own experiences and be a voice for Austria in Exile.
construction within the frames of public and private spaces, social class, and community. I begin with her representation of Vienna and Heimat and then focus on NYC. After this I examine the interactions of Heimat and exile in Ascher’s depictions and consider the influence of memory on them. In the conclusion, I summarize the changes in Ascher’s notion of Heimat, focusing again on fluidity, identity and social construction.

a. Vienna and Heimat

Vienna during Franzi Ascher’s childhood experienced great transition and turmoil. She was only four years old when World War I began and six when Austria’s beloved Franz Joseph died. While the city was rich with history, culture and tradition, Ascher experienced war, the dissolution of the empire, an economic depression, the rise of Austro-Fascism and the Anschluß, before she was 30. From Ascher’s accounts, it appears that until the Anschluß these major historical events had little effect on her daily life in Vienna.

Thanks to her father’s success, the family lived comfortably and enjoyed the company of Vienna’s musical and bourgeois circles. Also, the advent of Austria as a Christian Corporatist State appears to have done little to change that, which stands in stark contrast to the experience of Elisabeth Freundlich. In this regard, we can speculate that Leo Ascher was not particularly political or at the very least neither a socialist nor a communist. While anti-Semitism was a reality in Vienna, the official racist policies that
marked National Socialism in Germany and Austria after the Anschluß were not shared by the Austro-Fascist government, which appeared more interested in banning opposing political parties and arresting their members.

Still, as the Nazi Party grew in power and Hitler’s rhetoric continued to condemn Europe’s Jewry, simultaneously calling for the unification of all German peoples, the general mood in Austria, in particular “red” Vienna as it was known, grew more and more tense. I want to first examine Ascher’s depiction of public Vienna at the height of this tension and the influence the city – prior to and following the annexation of Austria into the Third Reich – continued to have on her notion of Heimat, after her parents and she fled to the United States.

i. Public and Private Spaces: The Haunting

In the public space of a movie theater, we are introduced to a Vienna encompassed by darkness and palpable evil. On the eve of the Anschluß, Ascher attends the premiere of a Polish film called Der Dybuk in her uncle’s movie theater.54 The film’s central themes are based on kabalistic motifs and it is marked by dark and haunting images. Ascher’s choice of words to describe the film shows the fear she felt while

54 The film premiered in 1937 under the direction of Michal Waszynski and was based on a Yiddish play from Salomon Ansky. It was so popular in film industry circles that Ascher's uncle secured exclusive rights to show the film in Vienna. According to Jewish folklore, a dybuk, also spelled dybbuk or dibbuk, is the soul of a malicious person, who is unable to move into the afterlife, because of some horrible act committed while they were alive. The dybuk travels around looking for another human to possess. See "dybbuk." Encyclopedia Britannica. 2008. Encyclopedia Britannica Online. 08 Aug. 2008 <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/174964/dybbuk>
watching it: “Gespenstisches … Gesichter voll Jammer und heimlicher Besessenheit … eine Hochzeitsszene … so voller Vorwissen um das kommende Teuflische” (Bilderbuch 14). Ascher’s depiction of her emotional state here foreshadows the emotional effects of the impending events and her understanding of them: Austria is about to fall victim to its own “dybuk.”

Ascher poignantly describes the fate of those possessed by the dybuk:

[Ich] sah wehrlos mit an, wie Menschen sich wanden vor einem unbegreiflichen Bösen, dem sie nicht entgehen konnten; wie ihre Seelen vor Angst aus ihrer Wurzel gerissen wurden, so daß sie am Ende nichts mehr von sich wußten als eine Trauer, die größer war als sie selbst, und in der sie untergingen wie in gnadenloser Umnachtung. (15)

The parallels between the fate of Austria and Europe under Hitler and the victims of the dybuk that Ascher draws here become clearer, as one continues to read.

Ascher hopes that the end of the film will bring her relief. Once the lights go up, she should be able to breathe again, but this is not the case:

Jetzt wird alles besser werden, meinte ich und sah mich im hellen Saale um. Aber kein plötzliches Aufatmen kam und keine Befreiung. Das ist ja wie ein böser Traum, dachte ich und wünschte nichts so sehr wie rasch aufwachen zu können. (15)

Franzi does not wake up, though. She finds her uncle talking with other men, who have just learned that the planned plebiscite to confirm Austria’s continued independence from
the Third Reich has been canceled. By the time she arrives at home, Schuschnigg has abdicated and on the following day, Nazi troops march into Vienna.

In this account, Ascher represents Vienna clearly as a victim. We see this in the parallel narratives of the film and the Anschluß. Vienna appears the same, yet very different; something has overcome her and she, like the victims of the dybuk, cannot resist it: “Alles war und war auch wieder nicht. Der Opernring stand noch da und der Josefsplatz, aber sie waren wie versunken, und ihre Versunkenheit war beklebt mit fremden Leben: von ihren Dächern wehten dünnen Hakenkreuzfahnen, und an ihren Mauern strichen Menschen vorbei mit Augen so tot wie ihres Führers” (17).

Today, when we consider the fact that non-Jewish Austrians greeted Hitler enthusiastically and that the myth of Austria as the First Victim of the Third Reich has been debunked, it is perhaps difficult to understand the pathos of Ascher’s description. Was she not – as a Jewess – also a victim of Hitler? Of course she was and in her depiction of her family’s last days in Vienna, she draws a parallel to the city which reveals this: “Das eigene Leben bestand noch und bestand auch wieder nicht mehr” (18). As with Vienna, everything still existed, but nothing existed as they once knew it. Vienna and Austria were the primary victims of Nazi Germany, but its citizens, Jewish or otherwise, suffered a similar fate.

Moreover, throughout Bilderbuch Ascher draws little to no distinction between Vienna’s Jewish and non-Jewish populations in regards to what it means to be Viennese and she exhibits a strong sense of belonging. Nevertheless, she concedes her
estrangement to all that Austria became after March 13, 1938, creating a line of
demarcation between pre- and post-\textit{Anschluß} Vienna (145). Pre-\textit{Anschluß} Vienna is the
cornerstone of her notion of \textit{Heimat}; a \textit{Heimat} that is pure and needs to be protected, as
the parallels she draws between the plot of the film and the historic event of the \textit{Anschluß}
reveal. This is reminiscent of a common condition of \textit{Heimat} that Blickle describes:
“\textit{Heimat}, like nature, religion, language and the mother, is for German speaking middle
class citizens something larger than oneself, something worth caring for, but also
something in the face of which one feels essentially innocent and taken care of” (149).
Through the political events, \textit{Heimat} has lost function as loving caregiver for Ascher, but
remains something that needs taken care of. The evil came from without and took
possession of this beloved city and country; they were not willing participants, but they
were also not able to resist.

This highly idealized image is problematic, as it does not address the country’s
complicity and the willingness of many of its citizens to participate in Nazi atrocities. For
example, Vienna’s large population of Jews was an easy target during the November
Pogroms. Of the over two hundred synagogues destroyed during these attacks in the
Third Reich, forty-two of them were in Vienna alone (Pohanke 18). Still, it is important
to remember that Ascher wrote \textit{Bilderbuch} directly following World War II, without the
benefit of distance from these events. Moreover, Ascher reveals in her own words that
her notion of \textit{Heimat} contains a highly idealized image of Vienna and Austria. Though
both were profoundly impacted by the events of her day, they remain central to this notion.

The representation here of Heimat reveals several characteristics, many of which are familiar in Heimat studies: Heimat is associated with a physical place, buildings and parks in this place, and family. Yet the main characteristic of Heimat as victim, which Ascher fronts through the film narrative, is striking. This reveals an idealized image of Vienna as Ascher’s Heimat. She depicts Vienna with “typical” Heimat characteristics: it is feminized, pure, and innocent, like the young victim in Der Dybuk; it is absent of any kind of malice. It is the “dybuk” that changes the city; the Heimat remains intact. Like the young woman in the film, Vienna was changed into something uncanny. This change affects her family, as we saw above, but by going into exile, they escape the influence of the dybuk.

Nevertheless, the film and Vienna’s uncanny transformation, as Ascher experiences it, have a longstanding impact on her notion of Heimat. She is dislocated from her Heimat and even as her family life continues in NYC in much the same manner as it did in Vienna, in the early days of her exile, Heimat becomes something unattainable. In her description, we see the intimate link between Heimat and identity.

---

55 In addressing Heimat and innocence prior to the Holocaust, Blickle points out that “Heimat, in its regressive tendencies, is closely related to memory and tradition and as such, to the notion of what Claude Lévi-Strauss calls ‘reversible time.’ A selective memory is at work in shaping representations of Heimat, so that even a reeking sewage canal receives a glossy sheen.” This tendency comes through in Ascher’s depiction of Vienna as victim, see 134.

56 Suzanne Shipley points out that Ascher saw herself first as Austrian and not Jewish. Having her status, which was previously based on class and education, removed on the basis of “artificially racist terms” shocked Ascher and many of her Jewish compatriots. In Bilderbuch, we see that this was not simply a shock, but rather an uncanny experience that only over time would resolve itself, see 193.
The strong connection between Vienna and Ascher’s identity is revealed by her lingering feelings of unease. Her dislocation from both the physical and emotional Heimat has created a disjuncture in her self-image that, as we will see, is only restored once her image of Heimat is also restored.

ii. Social Class: Family

The disjuncture can also be observed in the influence of family life on Ascher’s notion of Heimat. Blickle states: “We see Heimat – like concepts of nature, nation and family – as an attempt at unity and centeredness in the face of disjunction and fragmentation” (62). In the early stage of her exile though, Ascher could not find “unity and centeredness,” even surrounded by her dearly loved parents. They shared a small apartment on Riverside Drive that offered them a view of the Hudson River. This apartment helped the Aschers maintain a life that was, if not the same, quite similar to their lives in Vienna. Ascher describes how everything was fine, despite the fact that their lives had been downsized (Bilderbuch 52). Her mother maintained their small Riverside Drive apartment with the same care and comfort as she had in their large apartment in Vienna. Frequently, she would come home to the apartment and as if nothing had changed, hear the familiar tunes of her father on the piano (53).

Nonetheless, all this familiarity did not help. The uncanny feeling that begins that night in the movie theater does not leave her. With all that is happening and as the war...
continues in Europe, despite all the loving care, the hominess of her father’s music, the very presence of her parents, nothing seems to restore a semblance of security that she once had had. The comfort that one should find in family, she cannot. Ascher states: “Nichts half es, daß ja ‘alles da’ war. Ich selbst war nicht da. Und deshalb war es immer wieder und immer weiter, als stünde in oder vor mir ein Brett zwischen mir und meiner Umwelt“ (53) Ascher’s assertion that nothing helped, underscores the strength of her emotional connection to Vienna. It appears that as long as she could not come to terms with the political events that had destroyed her notion of Heimat, she would not be able to come to terms with her new life.

iii. A Haunted Community

In considering the final frame of community in Ascher’s depiction of Heimat and Vienna, we find little in Bilderbuch that explicitly highlights the role of a specific community in the formation of Ascher’s notion of Heimat. First, it is important to restate that while Ascher was Jewish, like many in her social class she considered herself Austrian first. The incident with the substitute teacher and her classmate reveal that she knew this, but it was secondary. As such, Bilderbuch does not offer insight into her religious life or the role of religious community.

What we can conclude from her story though, is that the German-speaking exile community, like her family life, could not help Franzi restore her Heimat and free it from
the dybuk. Her main contact to the German-speaking community came through the German-American Writers Association (GAWA), of which she was a member. At the Association, she had contact to other exiled authors with similar backgrounds and experiences. At the very least, these contacts could help her rediscover a piece of *Heimat*. But Ascher states that she felt lost among them; for her, the GAWA remains a “Phantom,” a broken shadow of a former world and its members are unable to bring the pieces together as a whole again (*Bilderbuch* 45).

Ascher’s use of the word “Phantom” establishes a direct link between the GAWA community and Vienna. While Vienna is haunted by an “outside force,” the members of the GAWA (not all of whom are from Vienna, but are haunted by the same force) live in a “no-man’s-land.” They try unsuccessfully to piece their lives back together, which in turn makes them slaves of the patchwork they created. According to Ascher the only person to escape this no-man’s-land was the chairman of the GAWA, Oskar Maria Graf.

Graf appears to have been a rallying point for Ascher and the exile community. She compares him to a large, uprooted tree. This tree has such strong and deep roots that clods of soil remain hanging on them. This soil continues to surround the roots of the tree, so that it can scoff at the storm surrounding it (45). In this imagery, Ascher presents Graf as an example of an exile who does not attempt to piece his former life back together, but rather as one who displays a singleness of purpose in exile. He carries his *Heimat* within himself without being distracted by it or what he experienced in it. It is of greater importance to be a mouthpiece for all and tell of everyone’s fate (45). Despite the
respect Ascher shows for Graf in this passage and the leadership he displayed in exile, in her opinion this was an impossible task, as many exile authors had lost their ability to write (45).

Ascher’s description of her interaction with the members of GAWA is very brief, but it reveals another aspect of her notion of Heimat: Heimat can be lost. Without a deep, well grounded connection to Heimat, the havoc and tragedy Hitler brought upon Europe shatters the notion of Heimat for his victims and survivors. In the case of Ascher, she cannot yet reconcile her notion of Heimat with her current life circumstances and her personal loss. For this reason she – like many others – is stuck in this no-man’s-land, without any apparent connection to her former Heimat.

Ascher’s reaction to her loss of Heimat illustrates an understanding of Heimat as identity. Blickle highlights this connection by stating, “[T]he interrelationship between a sense of self and the perception of one’s world is a central aspect in the formation of a sense of Heimat” (61). In the early stages of Ascher’s exile, we see Heimat represented as the victim – now it is lost and unattainable. Her sense of Heimat is deeply disturbed and so is her sense of self. We see this in her interaction with an American novelist who has visited Austria and Vienna. She exclaims to Ascher:

Tell me about Austria, tell me about Vienna! Es stellt sich heraus, daß ich nichts zu erzählen weiß. Das Brett vor oder in meinem Kopf stellt sich nicht nur zwischen mich und die Gegenwart, sondern auch zwischen mich und die Vergangenheit. (47)
Caught between two worlds, one that appears to have been destroyed and one that she does not yet understand, she cannot find her footing and as such cannot shake the uncanny feeling that began in her uncle’s movie theater and remains as a wall between her past and her present.

In sum, what we observe to this point in Ascher’s representation of Vienna – her original Heimat – is an inability to reconcile a pure and idealized notion of Heimat with the political transformation of Vienna and the consequences this brought with it. Ascher encounters elements of Vienna and Heimat in exile; she has her memories of life prior to the Anschluß and exile, but none of these help her, initially, to recapture a sense of Heimat. The disconnect between Ascher’s idealized notion of Heimat and what she has experienced in Vienna not only create the aforementioned wall, but it is the direct cause of her unease. We will observe, however, that over time this changes under the influence of her perception of NYC. I will now turn to Ascher’s representation of the city and exile, before considering the interaction of Heimat, exile and memory, which transform Ascher’s notion of Heimat.

b. NYC and Exile

“Das Leben, das ich hier in Amerika führe, ist ‚zu groß‘ für mich. Zu groß die Vielfalt, zu groß das Format alles dessen, was mich umgibt, zu groß alles, was an Weltwerten in diesen Jahren des Krieges an Haaresbreite hängt“ (Bilderbuch 79). In her
own words, life in America is simply too big for Franzi Ascher, even after having lived in NYC for over six years, she had not gotten used to it. But still, she also describes herself as a “wohl assimilierte New Yorkerin” (97). Before I examine Ascher’s representations of her exile city and reflect on the ambivalence represented in these two statements, I will give an overview of Franzi Ascher’s life with her family in NYC. This overview stems from Bilderbuch, unpublished texts from Ascher’s archive housed at Millersville University in Pennsylvania, and several secondary sources.

After their arrival, the Aschers began familiarizing themselves with their new situation. After initially living in a hotel, they moved into a small apartment on Riverside Drive. At home, life continued much in the same fashion as in Vienna, thanks to Luise Ascher’s care, while Leo Ascher strove to reestablish himself as a composer. During his life in NYC he composed musicals, patriotic and children’s music. For Franzi, life eventually took on a different role, one that was not uncommon for women in exile, but one that would have been quite different had she not had to flee Vienna. Since her father’s royalty checks stopped coming after the outbreak of the war in Europe, Franzi stepped in and found a job as a secretary on Wall Street to help support the family financially.

In addition to Leo and Franzi finding work, the family also visited organizations like the National Refugee Service and the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS), to secure not only aid for themselves, but also to begin the process of bringing their loved ones to the United States. This was not easy. Ascher even calls the way to the HIAS a
“dead end” indicating the struggle it was to rescue family members from Austria. But they succeeded. For example, Shipley recounts the arrival of Franzi’s Uncle Viktor, complete with presents for his niece, as was his habit, “[h]e had to bring Franzi something, no matter where he came from. Even if he came from hell” (196).

Three years after arriving in NYC, Leo Ascher died unexpectedly and Franzi became the primary provider for her mother and herself. We know that besides working as a secretary and in a public library, Franzi wrote essays, short stories and worked as a music critic. She also broadcasted radio plays and programs (Bolbecher and Kaiser, “Franzi” 44-46). According to her account in Bilderbuch, it was through her work as a secretary on Wall Street that she finally was able to come to terms with the upheaval in her life and to gain an understanding of NYC. I will examine Ascher’s early impressions of the city, concentrating in particular on her description of public spaces. But I will also show how changes in her social status and the music community influenced her image of the United States.

i. Public Spaces: Times Square and Wall Street

There are two descriptions of public spaces in Bilderbuch that highlight the transformation of Ascher’s image of NYC and its influence on her notion of Heimat. First, on the taxi ride from NYC’s harbor to the hotel where her family briefly lived, Ascher recognizes that she had arrived on another part of the planet (34). Initially, her
impressions of NYC are full of references to Vienna and clearly marked by the emotional turmoil she felt. She sees the differences and contrasts both. For example, the houses surrounding the hotel are higher than in Vienna and the crescent moon sits at a different angle to the celestial axis as in Vienna (34). Her first trips to Time Square and Broadway seem to only confirm some of her pre-exile impressions of the United States.

Ascher’s first description of Times Square shows a certain amount of incredulity: “Das ist der Times Square? Das Zentrum New Yorks” (35)? Times Square is littered with newspapers and the people on the streets look like they have just come from a “night asylum.” The bright neon lights that even burn during the day are reminiscent of a carnival, with the shooting galleries just a few blocks away (35). Ascher’s encounter with Broadway is marked by strong negative emotions, even disgust. Walking with her father one evening, she is struck by the unsightliness of NYC’s “Great White Way” in the day light. The bright lights, clamor, and smirks of Luna Park are gone and all that is left are the ugly silhouettes of the houses and a maelstrom of humanity that moves in and out of each other in a slow steady pedal tone on the narrow sidewalks (39). The beauty and ease of life that Franzi knew in Vienna is gone; it has been replaced by the unexplainable that is NYC (38).

Still, after Ascher begins her Wall Street job, this image of America as a carnival, loud, dirty and strange, starts to change as she explores the Wall Street district during her

---

57 Pfanner asserts that focusing on the differences between their home country and exile was common amongst the refugees, see “In einer geborgten Heimat” 75.
lunch break. There she discovers the many faces of Wall Street, three of which speak to her in three part harmony: das Vorderhaus, das Hinterhaus and die Vergangenheit.

Her descriptions of the front and rear buildings share a commonality: Ascher blends in images from nature. The Vorderhaus resembles a palace complete with chandeliers and large rooms. Observing the activity from above, she sees narrow straits between masses of stone, where the people go in and out. The rear building resembles a steep cataract flowing down from the high skyscrapers to the small, dilapidated buildings below. This image reminds Ascher of small farmhouses at the base of rugged mountains (63-64).

The past is represented by Trinity Church and its graveyard. She states: “Nicht wie ein armer Rest wirkt diese Vergangenheit, nicht wie ein Überbleibsel, das man aus Pietät achselzuckend hatte stehen lassen. Im Gegenteil. Sie, die Vergangenheit, war das Gültige und Bodenständige” (64). In its representation of the past, the church here also stands for life “as it should be.” Ascher equates the church and its function, despite the small space it occupies, to that of a mother, who helps her descendants (in this case the city) become what they meant to be: “Und nur auf ihre gnädige und ausdrückliche Erlaubnis schien es zurückzuführen, daß ihre Nachkommen so gewaltig in den Himmel wachsen durften” (64).

These representations of the Wall Street district reveal new elements of Ascher’s image of NYC. We see that it is no longer a large dirty carnival; it is a place with a multitude of faces. In these different faces, Ascher discovers glimmers of Heimat that I
believe are revealed by both her use of nature and church/mother in her descriptions, descriptions that are reminiscent of late 19th century bourgeois images of Heimat, as examined by Konrad Köstlin.

Köstlin recounts the transformation of the notion Heimat in the 19th century from a legal right, something only a few men possessed, to an idea and literary motif that became both emotional and feminine (329-30). Through Heimatlieder of that era, it also became a transferable notion that was associated with images of peaceful meadow and springs and a highly idealized rural life of noble poverty (330). Köstlin asserts that in light of a growing forced migration the notion of being settled became more appealing and a part of the understanding of Heimat. He contends that this led to a glorification of the past, which in turn couched the notion of Heimat in a contemplative and assasive, almost religious Gegenwelt (330).

The religious imagery and the ideal of a settled life underscore Ascher’s representation of bygone times, as the church represents both of these notions. The religious imagery is obvious, but we can also understand the function of a church as a unifying factor that offered security and permanence to a settlement. And this particular function has clear parallels to Ascher’s job on Wall Street. Through her job, she begins to feel settled in America, despite the differences in Vienna and NYC. By her account, she is now ready to see New York for New York; this in turn will lead to her rediscovering

---

58 Regarding the unifying nature of a church, I do not overlook the exclusivity that is also associated with the Christian church. But Ascher does not use the image here in this manner. While it is a Christian symbol, Ascher seems to speak of the church here in broader humanistic terms: it is like a mother, and as such its unifying function is available to all.
Vienna, as I will show when I examine the interaction of *Heimat* and exile below. But first, I want to consider Ascher’s account of her Wall Street job as it connects to the frame of social class.

ii. Social Class: The Work Place

Luise Ascher represents the primary and almost exclusive role of women in the Ascher family’s social circles; she was the caretaker of home and family. Her role did not change significantly once the family was in exile, with the exception of no longer having a “Dienstmädchen” to help her with her household tasks. Circumstances dictated that Franzi step out of the traditional bounds of her social class that, while it afforded her a good education and status, saw her role primarily in the home, not in an office.

This move from the home to the work place initially scares Ascher. She fears that “das Unheimliche noch ärger werden wird unter diesem neuen Ungewohnten” *(Bilderbuch 58)*. But this is not the case. Two days into her new job, Ascher realizes that the work is pleasant and that it offers her a chance to get away from the trials of the world, if for even a short time (58). She describes how, over time, her work, growing familiarity with the Wall Street district, and a sense of freedom help her come to terms with her circumstances and even give her the desire to reflect on all that has transpired since that fateful night in the movie theater: “Dort oben im Büro war ein Stück meiner

---

59 Ascher’s use of the word “unheimlich” shows that Ascher is still haunted in NYC by the “dybuk” in Europe.
Identität wiederhergestellt worden […] Ich will zurückschauen, dachte ich, und erkannte, daß mir auf einmal nicht mehr unheimlich zumute war” (67-68).

The change in social status, which in Austria would be viewed as a decline, brings not only a new opportunity for Ascher, but it also awakens an awareness of her own identity. Through her work, Ascher rediscovers a part of her identity. While copying a manuscript addressing modern times, man, and art written by her employer, she discovers she has an opposing opinion of modern art. Ascher finds in the manuscript that he is dissatisfied with modern art and finds its lack of harmony disruptive. The former banker from Hamburg is “ein mit dem gegenwärtigen Stand der Kunst auf intime Art unzufriedener, sich um seinen Kunstgenuß betrogen fühlernder Kunstgenießer” (59). Not expecting to be asked her opinion, Ascher is surprised when her boss asks her what she thinks. Although she believes there is too much distance between her and the art to comment on it sufficiently, she attempts an answer and realizes that for her the works of a Picasso, Joyce or Schönberg are the perfect representation of the times:

Nur schien es mir plötzlich, mitten im Antwortgeben auf die ungewohnte Frage, als wäre das Zerrissene im Werk dieser Meister, das Harmoniehassende und Form Zerstörende eigentlich ein vollkommen angemessener Spiegel für das Zerrissene und Zerstörerische unserer Zeit, deren Klang sich beim besten Willen nicht mehr auf eine erkennbare Grundtonart beziehen ließ, sondern unverkennbar ‘atonal’ geworden war. (61-62)
Regarding Ascher’s sense of identity, one can see here that despite a so-called social setback, she can engage the art world once again and in this engagement, she gains an understanding of the times. Whether or not remaining at home with her mother in a more traditional role would have lead to the same discovery, we cannot say. But it is evident from this account that her work in the office was significant contributor to the reestablishment of her sense of identity, which in turn was a vital factor in her coming to terms with the circumstances of the day: “ich [sah] als erstes Übereinstimmung und Harmonie selbst innerhalb des Disharmonischen” (62).

iii. Community: The World of Music

When considering her own love of music and her upbringing in a composer’s household, one can expect that music had a significant influence on Ascher. For example, we saw above that her father’s piano music coming from their Riverside Drive apartment takes her back to her Heimat, but the uncanny feeling she cannot shake in the early stages of her exile prevented her from sensing Heimat. Moreover, the music in NYC mystifies and bewilders her; Franzi does not recognize what she hears. Her father reacts differently to this new music; his musical curiosity moves him to listen to “Your Hit Parade,” a Saturday evening radio program, so that he can understand how American composers write. Nonetheless, Franzi finds this music to be nothing like the “Broadway-Melodie” that she heard in films in Vienna. Again she poses a question full of incredulity: “Ist das
auch Amerika? dachte ich. Kitsch über Klarrendem” (40)? For her, the hominess of music was gone; it was now strange and baffling. We will see how Ascher’s representation of NYC through the frame of the music community reveals a significant shift in Ascher’s notion, both of American music and NYC.

Ascher comes into contact with the music community through her father. She explains that his last operetta “Um ein bißchen Liebe” is being reworked for American audiences. The man responsible for this is Bill Johnstone, an illustrator, lyricist and playwright. His work with Ascher’s father is a highlight for Franzi: “Die Abende, an denen Bill zu uns kommt, bedeuten kleine Unterbrechungen des Unheimlichen” (48).60 Johnstone is a breath of fresh air, a man who not only shares her father’s musical talents,61 but one whose personality reflects a stereotypical relaxed, confident American demeanor. He calls her father “Doc” and praises her mother’s “million dollar personality” (49).

Johnstone also brings young musicians into the Ascher home. During their times together they enjoy music session, playing compositions from Leo Ascher in American swing. Astounded by this, Franzi nonetheless concedes that this transformation does not harm her father’s music (49). She initially reacts to the music with the same sense of strangeness and difference, but eventually finds refreshment in the newness and difference of American music.

60 At this point, Ascher is still plagued by the “dybuk,” but “its” effect on her is beginning to be broken. 61 Ascher tells how her father and Johnstone would sit at the piano and improvise together, something she claims her father could only when “der, der neben ihm saß, durch und durch musikalisch war.”
We see this relationship to American music develop, not only through her contact to the music community, but also its influence on her daily routine. She describes music in NYC as the freest commodity of NYC and devotes a chapter to describing free music that flowed constantly through Manhattan (93). She compares music to water; like water from a well that is available to everyone, free music flows so that no one dies of “thirst.” The water/music analogy shows not only the centrality of music in Ascher’s life, but also its necessity. And NYC gives her what she needs: “Und überall, überall wird der Adel der Klänge rein erhalten durch seine Freiheit, für alle da zu sein ohne die ärmliche Schranke des Geldes” (96). Through music and the music community, NYC is free, it not only sustains life, but also it brings relief from its trials.

In Ascher’s descriptions of NYC, we see very diverse images interacting and transforming one another and her sense of Heimat. The images of great palaces and rugged nature replace the carnival images Ascher brought from Vienna. The music that was so strange and baffling in the beginning has become sustenance for Ascher. It is an equalizing factor, available to all New Yorkers and in Ascher’s representation it is evidence of her assimilation to life in NYC.

For Ascher, NYC is virtually all things: a carnival, a cataract, strange and unfamiliar, yet it offers opportunity, it is refreshing, new, and life giving. Nevertheless, despite her “assimilation,” it remains too big. Even as the disgust she felt fades, as NYC refreshes and revives her, makes her its own, she is not completely transformed. Ascher asserts in Bilderbuch that she has become a New Yorker, but at the time of its publication
in 1948, she is still ambivalent towards this new home. This indicates the interaction of exile and Heimat and their influence on one another. I will now turn to the interaction, considering at specific episodes in Bilderbuch that illustrate this interaction and the formative influence that memory plays in it.

E. The Interaction of Heimat and Exile, and the Influence of Memory

Wohin mein Weg mich führen wird, das weiß ich nicht. Ich weiß nur, wo ich heute stehe, und daß mein Stand ein eigentümlicher Querstand ist: An Österreich bis zum 13. März 1938 bin ich gebunden wie an mein eigenes Leben. Allem, was sich seit jenem Tag in Österreich abgespielt hat, aber auch allem, was sich bis in eine geräumte Zukunft hinein abspielen wird, bin ich von Grund auf entfremdet.


Beide Bande trag’ ich heut in mir.

Dies ist die Gegenwart. (145)
With these words, Franzi Ascher describes the unbreakable bond of both her Heimat and her exile. Here, she recognizes that both exile and Heimat coexist in her and are the foundation of her present identity. I will now examine descriptions of events that lead to Ascher’s conclusion above and the role of memory in them.

As Helmut Pfanner states, “[n]ach Jahren in der Fremde kann ein Emigrant nicht einfach in seiner alten Heimat wie früher weiterleben” (“In einer geborgten Heimat” 75) In the second half of Hartwig’s poem, we clearly see this influence in the lyrical persona’s reaction to Vienna after years in NYC; Vienna was once the source of his longing, upon returning there he experiences being homesick for NYC. The first half of the poem reveals that the opposite of this is also true. Once in exile, the refugee cannot live his or her new life without the influence of his or her former life.

In Ascher’s case, we can observe this reciprocal influence throughout the narrative: we see Heimat influencing exile in her early descriptions of NYC and as time passes exile influencing Heimat. We will also see this in the subsequent two chapters. Both the protagonist of Heydenau’s Auf und ab and Freundlich in Die fahrenden Jahre clearly show that their lives in NYC were influenced by their former lives in Vienna. But let us turn to two passages from Bilderbuch that particularly exemplify this reciprocal influence in Ascher’s story.

In the chapter “Vergleiche und Lehre,” Ascher recounts how she retrieves an object from her family’s overseas crates at a storage facility on the East River. She finds the object, wrapped in a newspaper from Vienna which contains a critique of a new
production of “Elektra” at the state opera house. Written by a well-known Viennese music critic, Ascher reads the critique out of curiosity: “welche Sänger [hatten] die Nebenrollen gesungen, wie [war] der Wiener Kritiker im allgemeinen zu Richard Strauss gestanden, und der gleichen.” What she finds in the critique though is a “feindliches Tier.” It is not the content that causes this reaction, though, but rather the writing style of the critic: “Sie war pompös und sprunghaft zugleich, voll von überflüssigen Nebenbemerkungen und vollkommen undurchsichtig” (113).

This discovery takes Ascher’s breath away and she questions whether or not her assessment of this esteemed critic stems from her contact with American literature (113)? To find an answer to this question, she starts comparing various forms of American literature with its European counterparts. She concludes that American literature shows a greater sense of responsibility towards the chosen literary style and takes more care in the arrangement of individual motifs. She also asserts that American books in general contain a more understandable and logical organization of their material, regardless of the subject matter (116). For Ascher, American literature is marked by a spirit of order and clarity. She is grateful for this clarity and the effects of the “process of purification” on her own work, a process she attributes solely to her life in the United States (116-17).

This episode portrays the reciprocal influence of Heimat and memory, an influence that Ascher had apparently not recognized before she read the newspaper. In reading the newspaper Ascher returns to Vienna and like Hartwig’s lyrical persona, she experiences the influence of NYC on her notion of Heimat. In this, it appears that her
memories betray her. Perhaps this esteemed music critic is not as important to the music community of Vienna as she remembers? Nevertheless, he was someone she read regularly in Vienna, but now his writing style appears to be too verbose and exaggerated. In contemplating her unexpected reaction, Ascher recognizes that her new assessment of this critic stems from the influence of her new home.

This recognition is reminiscent of Maurice Halbwachs’ idea that remembering the past remains “under the influence of the present social milieu” (49). This notion in turn is underscored in exile studies and amongst exiles themselves, when it is asserted that the exile locality and Heimat mutually influence one another. Scholars such as Bauer, Koepke, Pfanner, and Popp have all addressed the influence of “present social milieu,” – in this investigation I regard this as the exile locality and its communities – on the exile’s notion of Heimat and the interaction of the two.62 In 1995, the scholarly journal *Exilforschung: Ein internationales Jahrbuch* published the volume entitled *Kulturtransfer im Exil* dedicated to this phenomenon. In Ascher’s account, we see the influence of the present on both her memory and her Heimat. Her newly acquired “American” sensibilities tell her that the critic’s style is now too verbose and exaggerated; her memory of him has changed. Her grateful acceptance of what she calls the “process of purification” of her own writing, shows that she has internalized this American trait and made it her own; the writing style that was practiced and promoted in Vienna has also been transformed.

---

62 For various analysis of this, see Bauer; Koepke, ”‘Innere’ Exilgeographie;” Pfanner, “In einer geborgten Heimat;” Popp.
Nevertheless, the influence of her exile not only serves to make Ascher and her notion of *Heimat* more “American,” it also restores her image of Austria in such a way that it once again becomes a central component in her notion of *Heimat*. Her experiences in New York City interact with her memories of her life prior to March 13, 1938 to transform her notion of *Heimat*.

Gerhard Bauer emphasizes the role of memory for the writings of exiles: “In den Aufzeichnungen der Exilierten spielt die Erinnerung an die Verhältnisse, die sie verlassen mußten, eine entscheidende Rolle – vieles wäre ohne diese Erinnerung überhaupt nicht geschrieben worden” (25-26). Despite her estrangement from Austria, Ascher carries in her the memories of her former life. In the early stages of her exile, these memories were infected by the trauma of her loss; Ascher describes repeatedly the unease and uncanniness she feels. It is not until she begins her Wall Street job that we see a transformation. As shown above, Ascher’s job on Wall Street transforms her notion of the United States and reveals elements of *Heimat* that she had not seen before. Moreover, it gives her a sense of belonging in her new life: lunch time walks to a local pier offer relief from the dybuk. From the heights of her office, she rediscovers a part of her identity (Ascher, *Bilderbuch* 67). But it does not end here. The quote at the beginning of this section shows that Ascher’s identity is bound to both Austria and the United States. I will now highlight how Ascher’s notion of *Heimat* and her identity – as they relate to Austria – are restored through the interactions of *Heimat*, exile, and memory.
In *Bilderbuch* we find that identity is firmly imbedded in the notion of *Heimat* and in the author’s memories. After Ascher’s sense of belonging is restored, her focus turns to the events that had robbed her of it in the first place. While reflecting on these events, she rediscovers her former love, Austria – in the mist on New York’s harbor: “Was magisch aus den Nebeln vor mir auftauchte, war das Bildnis Österreichs, so wie es mir gehörte, als Erbe und als Herzschlag meines Lebens” (*Bilderbuch* 69).

Ascher’s “Bildnis Österreichs” does not function as a factual representation of Austria, but rather as her own personal Austria that gradually leads her back to her own life and identity (75). Ascher is clearly aware of this highly personalized notion when she states:


This image grows slowly in Ascher’s mind and during the process she moves between the “uncanny no-man’s-land” and her memories and visions of Austria that revisit her in the afternoons when she sits at her typewriter (72). Eventually, her picture

---

63 As previously noted, see Irwin-Zarecka 15; Popp 111.
of Austria morphs into a picture of Vienna. Her reaction to this is one of joyful homecoming and self-discovery, but it is also explicitly confined to pre-\textit{Anschluß} Vienna:

\[ \text{Ich fand endlich, ganz am Ende, mich selber innerhalb dieser Stadt wieder. Mich und mein Leben mit allem, was ich je geliebt und gewollt hatten, mit allem, was je in meinem Leben in Wien angefangen hatte, bis ein Abend im Kino es jäh verdunkelte und erstickte.} \] (74)

In her rediscovery, Ascher recognizes that her connection to Austria cannot be broken. She states, “daß die Maße und die Werte Österreichs es waren, nach denen und in denen mein Leben sich gebildet hat” (74). Her Austria is “[d]ie Vielfalt der Bilder in kleinem Raum, mit den sanften Übergängen von einem zum anderen… Das freundliche Licht des frühen Nachmittags, abgewandt von der Mittagshöhe und doch voller Kraft des Leuchtns…Die Musik, die immer eine Ahnung des Tanzens in sich trägt und eine Ahnung des Unendlichen.” And finally,

\[ \text{das Ausgewogene und in seine Gleichgewicht ständig Weiterschreitende, die tröstliche Kontinuität des Lebens mitten in der Vergänglichkeit der Tage – das war Österreich, und es ist das Gesetz, dessen Erfüllung die tiefste Sehnsucht meines Lebens ist.} \] (75)

In this episode, we see the correlation of \textit{Heimat}, exile and memory. The traumatic events of the \textit{Anschluß} and the consequences for Ascher and her parents led to a rupture of her notion of \textit{Heimat}. Once in exile, she gradually discovers elements of \textit{Heimat} in NYC and through them a new \textit{Heimat}, albeit one that remains “too big.” Still,
this new *Heimat* is the starting point for her reconciliation with her former *Heimat*.

Through reciprocal influence of NYC and the memories of Vienna that she carries with her, she returns to her original *Heimat* Vienna. And while Ascher admits that her rediscovered *Heimat* may be questionable for some, its value lies primarily in its ability to restore her identity.

**F. Conclusion**

In *Bilderbuch*, the changes in Ascher’s notion of *Heimat* we observe reflect its fluidity and the reciprocal influence of Vienna and NYC. As with the lyrical persona in the first half of Hartwig’s poem Vienna is central for her notion of *Heimat*, but through the influence of political events the post- *Anschluß* Vienna losses its status as *Heimat*. However, through the influence of her exile in NYC and her own memories, an idealized representation of Vienna emerges as *Heimat*. Ascher is inextricably bound to this *Heimat* and to Vienna as she remembers it.\(^6^4\)

Nonetheless, the influence of NYC and her image of it also play a central role for her notion of *Heimat* and – more importantly for this work – its reinvention. Initially

---

\(^{64}\) This reflects two elements of memory as discussed by Halbwachs and Assmann: Halbwachs asserts that “[n]o memory is possible outside frameworks used by people living in society to determine and retrieve their recollections,” see 43. Moreover, Ascher recognizes the influence of Austrian society in the development of her person and her bond to Austria and credits her society with establishing the measures and values that shape her life, see *Bilderbuch* 74. Here, we find what Jan Assmann refers to as “konnektive Struktur.” According to Assmann connective structures shape a culture, forming the normative and narrative aspects of a culture that in turn bind its members to one another, see 16-17. This bond – supported by collective rules and values – appears in Ascher’s recollections.
viewed with incredulity and disgust, NYC becomes the place that offers her “unity and centeredness in the face of disjunction and fragmentation” (Blickle 62). It is the place where she comes to terms with life circumstances and where her notion of Heimat changes to include NYC’s landscape, social identities, and music. This reveals the fluid nature of Ascher’s notion of Heimat, as she initially found the landscape appalling, her first job frightening, and the music strange and baffling.

In Bilderbuch, Ascher clearly presents the connection of Heimat and identity as she recounts the phases of loss, estrangement, and rediscovery caused by the Anschluß and her exile. On the night of the film, Ascher loses her identity and though she does not state this explicitly, it is implied by her inability to shake her feelings of unease and uncanniness. Periodically throughout Bilderbuch, we see that Ascher recognizes this loss, but only after she rediscovers Heimat – through her vision of the new “Bildnis Österreichs” that rises from the mist in NYC’s harbor – does Ascher address this loss directly. She realizes that she has not only re-discovered, but also redefined both her Heimat and herself.

This is made clear at the end of Bilderbuch when Ascher describes her life as an “eigentümlicher Querstand” that bears the marks of both Vienna and NYC (145). In her reflections, she acknowledges the bonds that firmly link her identity to both Vienna and NYC. These cities, the images she has of them, and the memories that form these images are the centerpiece of her identity; she is Viennese and she is a New Yorker. And while
she places temporal restrictions on their influence – pre-March 13, 1938 Vienna and post-December 9, 1938 NYC – their coexistence in and for her identity cannot be overlooked.

As such, Ascher’s notion of Heimat is defined by change and the influence of locality is unmistakable. Moreover, this notion is seeded with personal memories and the influence of a collective. We can readily observe this when Ascher concedes that her new idealized image of Vienna may conflict with the image of others. In this, I see her acknowledging the significance of the collective, while remaining convinced of the validity of her own image. This reveals that while there are elements of one’s notion of Heimat that are fixed or established by the individual’s community, these elements are still subject to the interpretation and/or perspective of the individual. This in turn underscores that the notion of Heimat – like memory – is shared by members of a community, but it is ultimately the individual who defines their function in his or her life.
To continue my investigation of the notion of Heimat in Austrian exile literature, I will now turn to Friedrich Heydenau’s exile novel *Auf und ab*. In this work we are introduced to Karl Kramer, a young man from Vienna who flees Austria. The reader joins him as he travels from his home in Vienna to NYC via Japan. There he attempts to reestablish his life while negotiating a new country and culture. As we will see, Kramer negotiates this new life in NYC under the influence of his former life in Vienna. The identity he establishes there, his cultural and moral sensibilities, and his desires are reflections of his notion of *Heimat*, a notion that is reflected in his representations of Vienna and NYC.

In this chapter, I investigate the continued development of Kramer’s notion of *Heimat*, as he reestablishes himself in his new home of NYC and remembers his life in his former home of Vienna. In view of his representations of both cities, I consider what they tell us about his notion of *Heimat*: what is its function? How does he sustain it? How does NYC influence it and what, if any, changes can we observe? Through the frames of public and private spaces, social class, and community, the dominant influence of Viennese social and cultural norms of the day coupled with the “American way of life” in NYC on Kramer’s notion of *Heimat* becomes visible.

In *Auf und ab* Vienna is central to the protagonist’s notion of *Heimat* and reminiscent of Ascher’s representation, but it differs in its function. While the locality of
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Vienna is significant, the manner in which it informs the protagonist’s social norms and personal tastes plays the more important role. Furthermore, NYC allows Kramer to maintain his Viennese tastes and preferences, while freeing him from restrictions associated with his pre-exile life. In this maintaining, yet liberating function, NYC becomes the quintessence of Heimat for Kramer.

Again, I begin with an overview of the author’s life in Vienna and exile, establishing the social and historical context. Then I will give a brief synopsis of the novel, highlighting key plot elements. This will be followed by an examination of Heimat through the aforementioned frames, first in the setting of Vienna and then NYC. I conclude with the correlation of the notion of Heimat and collective memory, considering their interaction.

A. Friedrich Heydenau: An Officer and a Writer

What we know of Friedrich (Fritz) Heydenau’s life is mainly reconstructed from biographical information of his older brother, the successful expressionist painter Max Oppenheimer, a couple sheets stored in the manuscript collection at the Austrian National Library (ÖNB) in Vienna, and a large collection of letters written to him from his brother, also housed at the ÖNB. He was born Friedrich Oppenheimer on July 4, 1886 in Vienna to Regina (née Knina) and Ludwig Oppenheimer. His parents were both members of

---

65 In 1936, he changed his name to Heydenau, see “Heydenau, Friedrich.”
Austro-Hungary’s Jewish bourgeoisie; his father’s family came to Vienna in the 18th century from Worms, while his mother’s family was from Prague. They were married in 1885 in Prague’s historic Klausen Synagogue (Puttkamer 15).

Friedrich and Max were raised in an assimilated Jewish middle class home, but in 1902, Ludwig – along with 16 year old Friedrich – converted to Catholicism (Puttkamer 84). Max Oppenheimer’s biographer Marie-Agnes von Puttkamer asserts that Ludwig’s own intellectual pursuits and his career as a journalist largely influenced the classical education of both Max and Friedrich (15). During Friedrich’s childhood the family lived across from Beethoven’s last residence; Ludwig used this fact to encourage Max to intellectual and artistic pursuits. He watched over both his sons’ education and instilled in them the importance of music, art, and literature (15-16). Later, the family moved near the Palais Liechtenstein.

Puttkamer notes that while Max’s education included drawing lessons, Friedrich was sent to a military academy. She states that Friedrich was designated for military service and a career as an officer (16). Heydenau’s own depiction portrays this in a slightly different light. In a self-portrait written in the late 1940’s, he describes his childhood and youth in the following manner:


Dann: Quietschvergnügtes Kind

Dann: Heiterer, artig-vorlauter Junge

66 In a letter from Max Oppenheimer we learn that both Friedrich’s Jewish background and conversion to Catholicism were important factors as he was trying to flee Austria in 1938, see Oppenheimer Hs. 1046/38.
Dann: Respektloser, zwar irgendwie auf Wissen bedachter, dennoch erzfaulter Schüler

Infolgedessen: Vierjährige Gefangenschaft in einer Kadettenschule

(*Selbstportät*)

According to Heydenau, his military education was the result of his behavior in his former school, not something for which he was simply chosen.

Nevertheless he had a successful military career: by the age of twenty he was an officer and when he left the Imperial and Royal Army at thirty, he had achieved the rank of infantry captain, been wounded, and decorated with several medals of valor (*Selbstportät*). His military service and World War I had a lasting influence on Heydenau’s life. One, his journalistic career began during this time, as he was a member of the war correspondence corps (“Friedrich Heydenau” 305) and two, his involvement in Austro-Hungary’s campaign in Bosnia was the impetus for his first novel. In *Sarajevo, das Schicksal Europas*. This novel was published in 1931 under the name Friedrich Oppenheimer and is based on his experiences as an officer in Bosnia.

From Max’s letters to Fritz and their mother Regina, we can glean information about Heydenau’s life during the interwar years. We know that he lived in Vienna and, as was not uncommon due to the economic crisis in Europe, he struggled financially. Also, it appears that there were residual effects from his military service. Writing from Geneva in April 1919, Max expresses concern about Fritz and his future. With his military career over, the older brother stresses to their mother how important it is for him to find an
appropriate position, while intimating at the difficult economic situation in Europe after World War I:

Am Besten ist, er sucht eine passende Stellung, vielleicht bei der Presse, schreiben kann er ja … Eine Stellung für ihn hier zu finden dürfte recht schwer [fallen]… deshalb weil alle Auslandschweizer die ihre Positionen verloren haben jetzt in ihrer Heimat unterzukommen suchen. (Hs. 1046/33)

Two years later, Max writes their mother again. This time he appeals to her not to worry about finances; he will send the necessary funds for her treatment at Karlsbad and Friedrich should accompany her, as he also needs a respite (Hs. 1046/33; 1046/35).67

In the interwar years Heydenau also strove to establish himself as a journalist and writer, an endeavor his older brother supported, but one that was limited by the economic crisis. He published articles in various newspapers and journals,68 but was never able to hold a position for long and apparently depended on his brother’s financial assistance.69

By 1927, he had become a freelance writer and shortly thereafter, he married (Oppenheimer Hs. 1046/36-37).

67 Heydenau also contracted malaria several years after the war.
68 For example, die Stunde, die allgemeine Zeitung, die Münchner Sonntagszeitung. Also mentioned as possibilities for various essays and articles are: das Berliner Tageblatt, die Bohemia, die Bühne, and possibly one or more of the Ullstein-Blätter, see Oppenheimer Hs. 1046/35; 1046/36.
69 In Oppenheimer’s letters, we read repeatedly of this. He promises to send funds, food, cigarettes, etc. to help support both Heydenau and their mother (until her death in 1921). Moreover, he used his connections to the literary world to find publications for Heydenau’s articles, see Oppenheimer Hs. 1046/34-37.
Despite the economic depression in Europe, Heydenau had four novels published in the thirties.\(^{70}\) *Sarajevo, das Schicksal Europas* in 1931, which appeared under the name Friedrich Oppenheimer. It was followed by *Wuk der Wolf, Der Leutnant Lugger,* and *Hejo und Hila,* which appeared consecutively in 1932, 1934, and 1936 under the name Friedrich Heydenau. The novels had some success in Austria and upon returning there in 1947, he receives mention in a press release from Austria’s *Rathauskorrespondenz.* The brief entry lauds his return and anticipates the publication or republication of his works for an Austrian audience (“Wien 1947”).

In addition to *Auf und ab* in 1953, Heydenau published several novels before his death in 1960.\(^{71}\) But despite the hopeful anticipation expressed in the *Rathauskorrespondenz,* his work received little lasting acknowledgement. We find several brief entries in biographical literary lexica\(^{72}\) and very little reference to him or his work in secondary literature.\(^{73}\)

---

\(^{70}\) This was not an easy task. We read repeatedly in his brother’s letters that Heydenau needs to have patience, recognize the difficult times, and not be dejected by rejections from various publishing houses, see Oppenheimer Hs. 1046/37-38.

\(^{71}\) *Österreichische Rhapsodie* (1951), *Gouvero, der Mann der Amerika gründen half* (1953), *Jenseits von gestern oder Der unheilige Franziskus* (1955).

\(^{72}\) Heydenau’s influence on the German-language literary scene seems to be little more than a footnote, see Heydenau, *Fragebogen.* This questionnaire provided information for: *Österreicher der Gegenwart. Lexikon schöpferischer und schaffender Zeitgenossen,* a volume I was unable to locate, but which was published in 1951. For other references, see Schmidt; Giebish and Gugitz, “Heydenau, Friedrich;” Werner Röder et al, “Heydenau, Friedrich;” “Friedrich Heydenau.”

\(^{73}\) Pfanner mentions *Auf und ab* in the context of NYC and exile, see“In einer geborgten Heimat” 77. In another text Heydenau is also listed with other Austrian reémigrés and is briefly mentioned in connection with Viktor Matejka, a civil servant at the *Wiener Stadtrat für Kultur und Volksbildung.* Matejka is well-known for writing countless letters requesting the return of Austrian exiles after the war, see Eppel 112; 131.
There are certainly various reasons for his limited representation in German-language literary history. For example, while Heydenau published four novels prior to his exile, the economic situation at that time appears to have hindered a widespread dissemination of his work. In Max Oppenheimer’s letters we find him admonishing his brother to be patient, as the economic situation limited the projects of publishing houses. Post-exile conditions in German-speaking Europe did not help Heydenau’s situation as an author. Jacqueline Vansant notes that in 1947 Austria only fourteen percent of the population had read books published in the post-war era and this disinterest remained in subsequent decades (28-29).

Furthermore, in an article by Ursula Seeber-Weyrer on book reviews of Austrian exile literature in Austrian publications after 1945 we find no mention of Heydenau. Seeber-Weyrer places particular importance on book reviews as a measure of a society’s literary tendencies and needs. Literary criticism was assigned the task of contributing to the reestablishment of a democratic cultural enterprise after Nazi rule (139-40). Despite the hopefulness in the Rathauskorrespondenz entry and the publication of three novels, Heydenau’s work never became a part of mainstream Austrian literature, nor did it contribute significantly to the task Seeber-Weyrer assigned exile literature.

However, this lack of reception does not exclude Heydenau’s oeuvre from contributing to exile studies today. As a relatively unknown exile novel, Auf und ab supports the contention that to date an abundance of materials remain to be analyzed by exile scholars. Moreover, in its representation of NYC, it is another example that some
exile texts exists, which take on the task of the literary examination of the United States as a host country, albeit often not penned by prominent authors of that time period.

B. Fleeing Hitler’s Vienna

Before the Anschluß, we find references to the political climate in Germany and Austria in Oppenheimer’s letters. Not only was he considering moving back to Vienna from Berlin, as the political situation there was getting worse, but he also advises Fritz to stay in Austria, as Berlin had become too “brown” (Hs. 1046/38). His brother’s letter reveals though that Vienna was also changing, “aber ist Wien freundlicher” (Hs. 1046/37-38)? He returned to Vienna in 1932, one year before the burning of the Reichstag and the persecution of Germany’s Jews and communists that followed (Puttkamer 145), but by 1934 he had moved to Zurich (Oppenheimer 1046/38).

Oppenheimer’s letters help reveal the personal situation of his brother and inform the reader about the political, financial, and professional difficulties that Heydenau faced. Moreover, his own journey into exile is important as he played the primary role in both Heydenau’s escape from Austria and his arrival in NYC. From his vantage point in Switzerland, he observes what is happening in Austria and on Christmas Day 1938, he writes his brother with specific instructions:

74 He writes on November 11, 1931 that “eine Auseinandersetzung zwischen Linken und Rechten kommen muß.”

Oppenheimer goes on to explain that it is imperative that Heydenau get out of Austria. He is to stress that his stay in Sweden will be temporary; once Max is settled in NYC, he will begin the process to bring Heydenau to the United States. Oppenheimer left Switzerland the following day and sailed for NYC on 8 January 8, 1939 (Hs. 1046/38).

What we readily see in these letters reflects the difficulties faced by the majority of exiles as they attempted to flee Austria and Germany. In Heydenau’s case, he initially wanted to escape to Sweden or England. Sweden became the more viable option, as England’s financial requirements for immigrants proved too costly. Still the procurement of his affidavit for Sweden was riddled with bureaucracy and required numerous phone calls, telegrams, and the assistance of influential friends. By July 1939, Heydenau had

75 Göte Hedenquist lead the Schwedische Mission in Vienna from 1936-1940, see “Göte Hedenquist.”
arrived safely in Sweden, as his brother continued the process to bring him to NYC (Oppenheimer Hs. 1046/39).

While in Stockholm, it seems that Heydenau was anxious to get to the United States, something his brother tried to temper. Again, we find confirmation of the cultural difficulties exiles faced in the United States. Oppenheimer’s letter of August 1, 1939 reads like a copy of Carl Zuckmayer and Franz Werfel’s unfavorable judgment of their future exile home, with one key difference: Oppenheimer was already in NYC. He explains to his brother that Sweden is a virtual paradise compared to that which awaits him in NYC. He claims he is not depressed nor has the unbearable heat clouded his judgment; he is simply stating the facts:


Heydenau remained in Sweden until late 1940. While he was there, he continued writing, as both he and his brother tried to secure all necessary travel visas and affidavits to bring him to NYC. During this time, the question of whether or not his wife would join
him went unanswered. Irma Heydenau had remained in Vienna when he fled, but was considering following him. From letters written by Oppenheimer to both Fritz and Irma, I found no evidence that she joined him. They were first reunited in Austria after Heydenau’s return in 1947 (Oppenheimer Hs. 1046/39; 1046/44).

C. Life in NYC

In the early months of 1941, Heydenau arrived in NYC. His long journey took him from Sweden to the Soviet Union via Finland, then Japan and eventually the United States, where he traveled cross country to NYC (Oppenheimer Hs. 1046/39; “Friedrich Heydenau” 305). In NYC, he continued to write. From June to August 1942, he wrote Der Zorn der Adler. It was translated by Barrows Mussey and published by E. P. Dutton under the title Wrath of the Eagles in 1943. Heydenau also began some of his later publications while in exile, including Auf und ab (Oppenheimer 1046/39). Beyond these few facts, we know very little about his daily life in exile, but due to the autobiographical nature of Auf und ab and based on two letters from MOPP, we can make two basic assumptions about his time in exile: one, he struggled to provide for himself, and two, he initially had unsatisfactory living arrangements.77

76 “Friedrich Heydenau,” Bolbecher and Kaiser 305.
77 See letters dated July 10, 1941 and July 20, 1941. In these letters Mopp mentions problems with Heydenau’s living arrangement. In Auf und ab Kramer first goes to one of NYC’s hotel for men and is shocked by the conditions (142-44). Later, he rents a room from a woman and anxiously tries to find a new arrangement after he encounters NYC’s cockroaches (145-54).
D. Auf und ab: A Tale of Exile

Auf und ab is a story about a young man’s flight from Austria and the difficulties he faced after arriving in the United States. Helmut Pfanner describes Auf und ab as an example of the exiles’ search for Heimat. He refers to the main protagonist’s assertion that one has to have a Heimat, even if it’s borrowed, to exemplify this. For Pfanner, Auf und ab represents both the author’s recognition of his American Heimat and his “nostalgic attachment” to his European one (“In einer geborgten Heimat” 77). This is a reasonable assessment of the novel; furthermore it reveals a key characteristic of Auf und ab that lends itself to the examination of both the Vienna and NYC: the search and longing for Heimat.

In the novel, the reader follows the journey of Karl Kramer from Vienna to NYC. Along the way, Kramer is confronted by the loss of Heimat, his status as an immigrant and “greenhorn,” and his desire to fit in and be settled. Heydenau’s choice of the title exemplifies the emotional roller coaster and instability of Kramer’s life that exists throughout the majority of the novel, and something Kramer believes he has overcome at the end of the novel, when he affirms that the United States is his new Heimat and asserts that everyone needs a Heimat, even if it is an adopted one (405).

Auf und ab begins in Kobe, Japan, where Kramer awaits passage on a ship to California. While there he encounters Japan’s geisha culture and has an affair with a young Japanese woman named Kioko. The situation seems ideal to him until the evening
before he is to sail. A man addresses him in German and Kramer fears he may be a Nazi spy. At Kioko’s urging, he spends the night on the ship to avoid being stopped in the morning trying to board. He then departs for the United States without further incident.

Onboard ship, Kramer observes the other passengers, many of whom are refugees from Nazi Germany. Soon he makes the acquaintance of a business man from NYC, Bernhard Grünwald (also Greenwood). Grünwald is a former banker from Prague, who helps Kramer from time to time once he is in NYC. Kramer also meets a young Polish woman named Gloria and is quickly infatuated with her. While the relationship remains superficial, it reveals that romantic relationships comprise an important element of Kramer’s notion of Heimat, which I will discuss below.

After a long journey at sea, Kramer arrives in the United States and travels cross country by train to NYC. Soon he discovers that his friend and patron was struck by a car, dying before Kramer arrives in NYC. Left to his own devices, Kramer attempts repeatedly to find both appropriate work and living quarters. He appears to be driven by his desire to belong and assimilate in the United States. Regarding this desire, we repeatedly find comments, actions, and thoughts from Kramer, which reveal characteristics of his notion of Heimat and his attempt to recover it in exile.

At the same time, a chance meeting with school friends from Vienna and the contact to other German-speaking exiles which ensues, reveal not only the influence of his home culture, but also the role his notion of Heimat plays on his perceptions. In the end though, it is a love affair and marriage to a young American woman and a career
opportunity that help Kramer in his endeavor and offer him the chance to feel truly settled and “at home.”

Several elements of the plot and characteristics of main protagonist reveal the autobiographical nature of *Auf und ab*. Kramer is from Vienna and travels the same route to the United States as Heydenau did. The majority of the novel is set in NYC, where Kramer struggles to adapt and make an existence for himself, and where Heydenau spent his exile. We can also draw parallels to their career paths. Heydenau began his career as a military officer, but after World War I, he pursued an artistic career in writing. Kramer is a secretary in a posh gambling club, but during his exile he can fulfill his dream of being a musician. Moreover – as quoted above – Max Oppenheimer describes his brother *Feinschmecker*. This is a trait that his protagonist shares with him.

Still *Auf und ab* is not Heydenau’s autobiography couched in a fictional story. In it we also find differences between Heydenau’s life story and Kramer’s. Heydenau was in his early fifties and married, when he fled Vienna, while Kramer is in his early thirties and single. Heydenau’s brother Max was also in exile in NYC; Kramer is alone and has no family. Heydenau’s protagonist is a tall, blond, and handsome nominal Catholic from Vienna, who leaves Austria because he stood up against racist laws in the *Ostmark*, by protecting a Jewish acquaintance from Nazis. The author was a dark-haired man with a swarthy complexion, and despite his conversion to Catholicism his family’s background was firmly rooted in Vienna’s Jewish bourgeoisie.
In the following sections, I examine scenes from the novel that reveal traits of Karl Kramer’s notion of *Heimat*. In order to do this, I consider how he represents Vienna/*Heimat* and NYC/exile and reflect on the influence of his exile and memories on his representations. Coupled with this, I contemplate the reciprocal influence of the *Heimat* and exile localities and ask how his former life in Vienna influences his perception of NYC and does NYC change his notion of *Heimat*. Will we find the same fluidity here that we did in Ascher’s *Bilderbuch*? At the same time, will he (re)discover *Heimat* in exile? In both sections, I employ the frames of public and private spheres, social standing, and community to analyze his representations and establish the characteristics of his notion of *Heimat*. I will turn first to his depictions of Vienna/*Heimat*, and then continue with NYC/exile, ending by examining the interaction of the two and the influence of memory.

a. Vienna and *Heimat*

In *Auf und Ab*, the images and representations of Vienna stem almost exclusively from Kramer’s memories and are elicited through his new experiences. They are combined with impressions and experiences in Japan, on the train and ship, and finally NYC. Through these reflections and interactions the reader learns not only about his flight from Vienna and the circumstances surrounding it, but is also given insight into his
notion of Heimat as he remembers Vienna, his experiences there, and reacts to new experiences through the lens of his home culture.

i. Public and Private Spheres: Order, Beauty, and Tradition

As in Ascher’s Bilderbuch aus der Fremde, the physical Heimat, Vienna, can be read as a victim. While the dybuk is missing from Auf und ab, the Anschluß nevertheless represents an invasion or possession of the protagonist’s homeland by the Third Reich (10). Repeatedly he remembers that although Vienna’s parks, buildings, and boulevards still exist the Austria he once knew and loved is no longer there: “Ach – Austria gab es nicht mehr, Germany heiß das Land, von dem es verschluckt wurde” (103), it had become a paradise lost. Nevertheless, Austria the country may have been beaten down and repressed by the hand of an aggressor, and robbed of its freedom, but its substance and function as a representative of Heimat remain intact for Kramer: “Die Heimat war doch tot…! Nein – bloß die österreichische Freiheit ist’s…! Die Heimat lebt – die lebt – die lebt…” (52)!

78 In this scene, Kramer has arrived in the United States and is waiting for his name to be called by the officials. The ship’s passengers are called forward alphabetically by country. When a Bulgarian passenger is called forward first, Kramer is reminded that Austria as a political entity no longer exists.
79 For example, Kramer remembers Vienna’s parks, with their lilac bushes and linden trees, as a virtual paradise. His idealized and romanticized memories of Vienna reveal that he is homesick, see 216.
80 Kramer arrives in California and observes the people around him. The open and relaxed manner he sees bring his thoughts to Vienna: “Und obgleich er das niedergeknüppelte Wien nur aus Beschreibungen und Photos kannte, dachte er jetzt: Keine Hakenkreuze in den Knopflochern, keine Hakenkreuzbinden um die Arme, Menschen weitab der Unterdrückung …!”, see 107.
We also see throughout the novel that the gambling club where Kramer worked is a key contributor to Kramer’s notion of Heimat. The portrayal of the club reveals that it is central to his notion in all three frames: public and private spheres, social standing, and community. In many ways, it is a microcosm of Kramer’s pre-exile notion of Heimat that is intricately linked with his perspective of Austria. It establishes the foundation of his life in Austria and strongly influences his perspectives, as we will observe, in the conflicts he experiences in exile.

In the public and private spheres the club functions as a representative of order and tradition, as it also establishes Kramer’s notions of elegance and beauty. In the novel, his pre-exile life revolves around his work at the club, which in turn becomes an extension of his private life. Kramer describes how his father – a Hofrat in the Habsburg Empire – had foreseen a life of diplomatic service for his son. Kramer’s education and his father’s connections assured that he would receive an attractive appointment. These plans were interrupted by the untimely death of his parents during an influenza epidemic. After their death, family friends assist the then nineteen year old Kramer by securing him a position at the club (12).

Subsequently, the club becomes the focal point of his life; and, in effect, his second family. We see this in several areas of his life. His life is orderly and secure, as he serves its members with his much lauded charm and politeness, and over time his interaction with club members begins to influence his life outside of the club:

“Schließlich kleidete er sich wie sie. Man unterhielt sich gern mit dem hübschen,
wohlerzogenen Menschen; seine unaufdringliche Höflichkeit bestach, seine Bescheidenheit, seine ungekünstelte Art” (12). The standards established in the club become his and his desire to maintain these trump any other career plans he may have had: “Nein, niemals hätte er diesen Posten verlassen. Eine Welt erst mußte untergehen, daß es geschah” (12).

The club not only influences Kramer’s dress and manner, but also his palate. Kramer is a consummate Feinschmecker. In Vienna, his preference for fine food is cultivated in the club by the head chef, James Heringfinger, who also teaches him how to cook. Kramer takes his new talent with him into exile and there we can observe how food and cooking produce a sense of Heimat for him: “In dieser Zeit und angeregt vom Schaufenster eines Grocers, eines Lebensmittelladens, amerikanischer Bruder des wienerischen Greißlers, flammte ihm jäh die Gier nach heimatlichen Speisen und hernach der Gedanke: selber kochen…” (145)!

When Kramer discovers an open market on Second Avenue, he returns home through his “inner eye” and is standing in the middle of Vienna’s famous Naschmarkt. Although he admits that the markets are not the same: in NYC there are push carts, while in Vienna there are stands, the piles of fresh fruits and vegetables and the “lebhafteste Buntheit,” affect him (226). Kramer reacts to the commonalities he sees and becomes homesick. In this case, his memories of life in Vienna with its small grocers and the Naschmarkt are revisited in NYC. His reaction to these encounters and his sense of loss reveal the connection to his notion of Heimat (Blickle 61-62). Kramer is homesick,
nevertheless his ability to recreate an important part of his former life through his cooking shows the intricate connection of *Esskultur* to his notion of *Heimat*, but it is a connection that can be reestablished outside of Vienna and Austria.

Furthermore, the function of the open market for Kramer contrasts with the function of NYC’s landmarks for Hartwig’s lyrical persona and the Austrian music critic for Ascher. Like Kramer, the lyrical persona and Ascher return to Austria, the former physically and the latter in her mind’s eye. In both instances, they discover the influence of NYC on their image of *Heimat* and how the differences have changed it; NYC has become an integral part of their transformed notion of *Heimat*. With Kramer though, while he also “returns” to Vienna through the open market, at this juncture in the story NYC’s influence has not transformed this aspect of Kramer’s notion of *Heimat*, but rather it provides a space for him to nurture it.

Notwithstanding the important role of the club for Kramer’s livelihood and private life, he intimates that he would have liked to have been a music conductor, but that his father’s wishes had superseded his own (12). Despite his love of music, he submits to the notion of order that he knew both at home and later in the club, this in turn stresses the importance of order in his notion of *Heimat*. Nevertheless, Kramer acknowledges the musical side of his person, but relegates it to his private life: “Seine freie Zeit gehörte der Musik. Er spielte Klavier und Geige gleich gut. Und er beneidete einstige Schulkameraden, die er nun als Solisten wußte” (12). While in Austria, this career path was not available to him, but pre-exile Karl Kramer, who has inherited “den
ordnenden Sinn des Vaters, des kaiserlich-königlichen Beamten” (38-39) appears at ease within the confines of his *Heimat*.

The club also contributes to Kramer’s appreciation of elegance and beauty, qualities that are attached to his notion of *Heimat*. This “feudaler Klub” caters to Vienna’s most elegant men and appears to be a remnant of empirical Austria. It seems that Kramer’s position at the club and his interaction with its members infuse his notion of *Heimat* with his sense of elegance and beauty. This is something we can observe repeatedly once he is in NYC. Being forced to navigate this new city alone, Kramer starts exploring. On his walks, he discovers NYC’s hotel quarter. His reaction and feelings towards this neighborhood and the people in it show elegance and beauty to be important elements of his *Heimat* image: “Die Gegend der großen Hotels war vor ihm... - Das war seine Welt, jener des feudalen Spielklubs verwandt, dessen geringer Sekretär er gewesen” (136-37) The hotel quarter on Fifth Avenue becomes a part of his lunchtime routine. He places himself on an advantageous corner and observes swarms of people passing by. In particular, he watches the “captivating” women, who are window-shopping at NYC’s luxury stores (136-37; 140-41). The beauty of both the hotels and the women offer him solace from the difficulties he faces in NYC and at the same time, his reactions reveal another important factor for his notion of *Heimat*, that of social standing.
ii. Social Standing: Bourgeois Class Mentality

While Kramer is not a member of Vienna’s elite, he was raised in a traditional upper middleclass family that savored both its position as servants to the crown and its proclivity for luxury:


As a child, it was impossible for him to accept a lifestyle other than the one he knew at home, or even the possibility of it:

Hätte irgendeiner Karl in der Knabenzeit, also in den Tagen, da es den Vater noch gab, den kaiserlich-königlichen Hofrat, jemals geweissagt, er würde noch in einer Schuhfabrik ums tägliche Brot schuften, es wäre zu seiner ersten Jungenprüfgelei gekommen, selbst in jenem vornehmen Gymnasium. (215)

After the death of his parents, his position at the club allows this lifestyle to continue and in this we observe another facet of his notion of Heimat. In addition to the ordered life that the club embodies, it secures Kramer’s social standing. As mentioned above, he begins to dress like the men of the club; his prior education and intelligent manner enable him to interact with club members with ease. Despite the fact that he is the club secretary,
the members value him to the extent that at least one of them aids his escape from Vienna:

Also kam er dem Einmarsch von Hitlers Truppen zuvor. Oh, nicht mit der Bahn, das wäre schon zu gefährvoll gewesen, machte er sich davon, ein Mitglied jenes Klubs, ein Finanzmann, nahm ihn im Privatflugzeug mit.
Er war beliebt im Klub gewesen, der liebenswürdige, junge Kramer. (10)

Not only do his attachment to the club and the lifestyle it represents speak to the extent of his class mentality, we can also infer it from his experiences in the United States. For example, his friend Poldi Pollak vouches for his affidavit in the United States. Kramer describes him as “bloß ein geringer Beamter in einer geringen Fabrik” and attributes Poldi’s success in sponsoring him to the fact that his escape was prior to the major immigration wave of Hitler’s refugees to the United States (11). This may have been the case, but it also reveals a characteristic of Kramer’s Heimat: in it one cannot wield influence on the powers that be without proper credentials and social standing. A worker in a factory does not have the same legal recourse as a member of upper-class society. Kramer’s depiction of his patron underscores this perspective.

Two further incidences emphasize the class mentality that exists in Kramer’s image of Heimat. First, he takes a job as a janitor in a villa in suburban NYC. He travels to his new job by train and is picked up at the local station by a man he believes to be the home owner. Kramer is stunned when this man helps him with his luggage. He silently chastises himself for expecting the same treatment in the United States as in Austria:
“Falsch Karl, grundfalsch...! Hier bedeutet es nicht Herablassung oder gar Selbsterniedrigung, einem Angestellten mit in paar Handgriffen aus seiner Verlegenheit zu helfen” (179). In his further comparison of the United States and Austria, we recognize that one’s access to democracy and human rights in his physical Heimat is directly related to one’s social class:

Was immer du über Demokratie in deiner Heimat hörtest, war Verwässerung dieses Begriffes. In diesem urdemokratischen Lande besitzt der „private“ Eisenbahnminister nicht mehr bürgerliche Rechte als der Schaffner, der dir vorhin das Ticket knipste, aber auch nicht den Dünkel, er sei – menschlich abgewogen – etwa mehr als dieser. Nicht in Klassen sind die Menschen hier geteilt… (179)

Kramer may perceive this “primal” democracy as the “American way of life” and idealize it, but in this instance the centrality of class distinctions for his own opinions remains clear. Once they arrive at the villa, Kramer discovers that this helpful man is not the homeowner, but rather the real estate agent, a fact that drastically changes his opinion of the man and his actions: “Die Bude gehört gar nicht ihm – Häusermakler ist er…! Und auf dem Broadway – sogar nahe dem schäbigen Viertel, wo ich wohnte…! Und die Ehrerbietung vor Mr. John B. Donald sank um weitere beträchtliche Etagen” (181). His reaction stems not so much from his disappointment in misjudging the situation, but rather from the importance placed on social standing that he learned in Austria. Donald was not just a real estate agent, but he was one with a bad address.
A second incident that supports such a reading occurs several days later. Here Karl makes the acquaintance of Mrs. O’Neill, a well-to-do widow. His companion at the villa, an elderly man named George, is sure she will invite Kramer to her villa for one of her many parties and states: “An die sollten Sie sich halten, Sir.” Kramer reacts out of his Austrian class mentality: “Ich – ein Janitor” (196)? Still in his mind he entertains the thought of marrying her, until his job changes and he has to return to NYC (197-99). In both interactions we see that he is trying to adopt the mentalities of his new Heimat, but that social conventions and cultural norms of his former Heimat still prevail in his judgments.

iii. Community: Family and an Exclusive Club

Initially, the function of community as a frame of Kramer’s notion of Heimat is more difficult to discern, yet on closer examination it can be seen as the meta-frame. Kramer is – for all intensive purposes – an orphan and as he travels to the United States, he appears to be a loner. But I believe this speaks more to his image of NYC and the losses he has suffered than to the importance of community for both his notion of Heimat and his ability to experience a sense of Heimat.

Kramer lost his primary community, that of his parents, as a young man. Nevertheless, as stated above, the club appears to have assumed a familial role after their deaths by assuming the role of community and securing his social standing. We can trace
the influence of the club to typical functions of families: speech, manner of dress, eating habits, preferences etc. Also mentioned above, Kramer would have never left his post at the club. By his own admission, his loyalty to the club is unbreakable and it would have taken unthinkable events to drive him from it. The political events of the day did just that. The place that has established his identity on multiple levels is no longer available to him; the community he enjoyed there is taken from him, just as the unexpected death of his parents had done before.

Both in his loyalty to the club and his loss of the community there, we find parallels to Kramer’s family that underscore its importance and his understanding of community. One parallel is his obedience and loyalty. Kramer does not refuse his father’s career path, although he secretly desires to be a musician. This desire does not dissipate over time, but even after he finds a replacement familial community in the club, he continues to ignore or suppress it, for the sake of maintaining his community.

The second parallel is the unexpected loss. In both instances, his familial community is taken from him by circumstances beyond his control. Kramer would have never chosen to leave his parents or the club, but he is forced to. How then can we read Kramer’s notion of *Heimat* through the frame of community? For Kramer community establishes his identity, but it requires a certain self denial. As seen above, community influences his public and private life, as well as his social standing. Through all three frames, we can analyze his notion of *Heimat*, but community – in the context of his family and the club – is the central contributor.
In his *Heimat* communities in Vienna, Kramer chooses obedience to his father and loyalty to the club in lieu of a career in music. In turn, the orderly life and social standing that both of these afford him establish his identity in the larger community. Kramer first accepts his father’s wishes and a future in diplomatic service. After his father’s death, he continues in an administrative position at the club. Both of these situations supersede any other opportunities that may present themselves. In this, we see an almost fatalistic element to Kramer’s notion of *Heimat*. He was born into a certain community, is willing to accept the standards and constraints that community puts on him, and does not question these. Rather, he continues his life, seemingly contented in his given *Heimat*, until everything is taken from him.

b. NYC/USA and Exile

“Oh, Karl – was maßest du dir an, dir den Weg vorauszusagen…? Hast du den nicht schon genügend Beweise vom Auf und Ab in dieser unendlichen Stadt erhalten…” (290)! These words of Karl Kramer exemplify not only the continual up and down of his struggles in NYC, but also continual adjustments we see in his perceptions in and of the city. They also describe the turmoil that he experienced once he was removed from the comforts of his former *Heimat* and all the facets thereof that provide him with identity and security. As I will show, it is only after he and the young American woman, Patsy decide to marry that his relationship to NYC changes.
In contrast to the representations of Vienna that come through Kramer’s memories as he reacts to new surroundings, NYC is described primarily through his experiences and interactions with and in the city. As the primary location of the plot, the novel contains a plethora of depictions of the city as the protagonist interacts with and reacts to it. These representations highlight both Kramer’s conflicts and his contrasting ideas of NYC, in particular when an incident or experience conflicts with Kramer’s Austrian sensibilities. At the same time, Kramer appears to overcome or push aside these conflicts and memories from time to time, as he (re)discovers his Heimat in the “American-way” of life: “Auch diesmal fühlte er nicht, wie sehr er schon im Begriff war, den “American-way” einzuschlagen, auf dem nur Vorwärtschauen gilt und nicht die sentimentale Welt von Erinnerungen” (266). Before I examine this interaction of Heimat and exile, I want to consider Kramer’s representations of the United States and NYC.

i. Public and Private Spheres: Bustle, Beauty, and Repugnance

Kramer is introduced to the hustle and bustle of public life in NYC on his taxi ride from Grand Central Station to Poldi Pollack’s apartment. He observes NYC’s business district and appears to be ill at ease with what he see. The hectic pace is unfamiliar and this makes NYC – at least initially – an undesirable place to live. From the vantage point of his taxi, Kramer sees the busyness and masses of people as the city comes to life in the early morning. Driving through the streets the skyscrapers block out the sun, making the
narrow streets seem all the more narrow. When he finally arrives at Poldi’s apartment
building, Kramer is shocked and wonders why Poldi has chosen to live in this
neighborhood with its cage-like house? Kramer’s thoughts and impression during the ride
offer a departure point for his perceptions of NYC, for while the city is unfamiliar and
undesirable, he also discovers a bit of his lost Heimat on that cab ride. Let us look more
closely at Kramer’s impressions.

As he observes the city for the first time, he remembers a conversation with
Grünewald, who told him that NYC devours people, but Kramer vows not to fall victim to
the city (112-13). During the taxi ride to Pollock’s apartment – with its “bad” address on
Amsterdam Avenue – he is simply relieved that he successfully escaped Austria and the
Nazi Regime (112). Nevertheless, watching from his cab, he sees sidewalks full of people
and the streets full of cars. He drives by office building after office building, feeling like
he is traveling through a mining shaft. This is not a place to live and for a moment he
seems overwhelmed: “New York, dachte er wieder, New York…! Und weiter…! Und die
gleichen Bilder: gleitende Autos, hastende Menschen. Die Stadt, die auffrißt” (112)!

But then the taxi turns a corner and before Kramer lays Central Park with its
greenery and elegant neighborhoods. Perhaps NYC is a “livable” city, but only here in
this neighborhood that is reminiscent of home:

Nun wandte er den Kopf nach der anderen Seite. Hier aber ragten hohe
Häuser, deren Erdgeschosse nicht Läden aufwiesen. Ab und zu klaffte ein
Tor. Dann stand dort in livrierter Würde, in goldbordürter Kappe, feurig
poliertem Schuhwerk und blendendweißen Handschuhen der “doorman.”

Also erschien ihm diese Gegend vornehm. Hier sollte er wohnen, hier – aber nicht in… (113)

Nevertheless, Kramer recognizes that this is not the America he will be a part of. As the taxi continues through NYC’s busy streets, he hopes the next neighborhood will be Poldi’s. It does not have the elegance of Central Park, but the houses are “stattlich” (113).

Unfortunately for Kramer, the taxi keeps going until it arrives at Poldi’s address on Amsterdam Avenue and his initial shock returns:

Bedrückt, die Finger ineinander, musterte Karl die durchweg brandrote Tünche dieser Bauten. Mit ihren eisernen Gestängen und Treppen vor den Fronten, bestimmt, sich aus Feuerbrunst zu retten, schienen sie ihm plötzlich verrostete Käfige, in die man nur nächtlings ungern zurückkehrt, um zu schlafen. (114)

Kramer enters the building with trepidation, only to have the situation worsen for him. The stairwell is narrow and dark; the air is heavy and musty. He wonders why Poldi would stay here, was his situation so bad (114-15)? What we see from these initial scenes is that Kramer’s image of NYC is largely unfavorable. This is not a place where one lives; this is a place where one survives. It offers a person in Kramer’s situation no comforts, as we see in his reaction to Poldi’s building. While he has escaped imprisonment in Austria, he is safe in NYC, but in a cage.
Kramer’s impressions of the public and private life in the United States that is available to him remain largely negative until the end of the novel. He struggles to find satisfactory housing: smells, small spaces, and cockroaches are just a few adjustments that he has to face. At the suggestion of his landlady, he goes to the cafeteria where Poldi ate before his death, only to discover that this too was another undesirable world:

Nicht der heimatliche Speisenduft wehte ihm entgegen, nach Tabak roch’s. Gesprächslärm brodelte. Er musterte die vollbesetzten, zahllosen Tische, die Männer daran, die die Hüte nicht abgelegt hatten, obgleich doch Frauen an den gleichen Tischen saßen. (120)

Not only the lack of comfort and what he perceives as customary manners bother Kramer, but also the food, which is at the same time tasteless and over salted. In his reaction to it, we see both the importance of food for his image of Heimat, and the lack of Heimat in NYC thus far:

Schnitzel mit Paradeissauce…! Ja, jetzt wählte er die wienerische Bezeichnung, als würde damit die gastronomische Sünde sichtbarer gemacht werden. Er fand das Fleisch zähe und, als Kenner, in zu heißem Fett gebacken und obendrein nicht gesalzen. Dafür war es die Tomatensauce…!

Gesalzene Paradeissauce…! Wie kraftlos der Geschmack…! An die aromatische Süße der Paradeiser, womit der Wiener Naschmarkt beliefert worden war, dachte er, aus Südtirol stammend, aus dem benachbarten
Jugoslawien oder aus dem so nahen Kärnten. – Er mußte die heimatlichen Fleischtöpfe komplett vergessen haben, der arme Poldi, daß ihm dies Cafeteria genügte! (121)

Despite his disdain and strong judgment of life in NYC, Kramer finds positive characteristics of life in America. In the private sphere, he can create an atmosphere of home by putting his cooking skills to use to ease the pain of his loss (145). And as he becomes better acquainted with NYC – as we saw above – he recognizes the beauty and livability that do exist in the city. Places such as Central Park, the open market on 2nd Avenue, and the elegant hotel quarter on 5th Avenue with its beautiful women are all reminiscent of Vienna. In the midst of this diverse city Kramer finds a limited connection to his original Heimat. This reveals the importance of place for his sense of wellbeing. In a restricted manner NYC offers him Heimat, but as we will see in the section on community, his relationship to NYC and its role for his notion of Heimat change considerably when he becomes involved with a young American woman.

Finally, Kramer’s first interaction with the bureaucratic process in the United States confirms to him that the United States is a practical land and that its reputation for promptitude is not an exaggeration. He wants to apply for citizenship and goes to the appropriate office. Here he is pleasantly surprised. While he has to fill out multiple forms, the questions are easily answered. Also, after silently chastising himself for forgetting photographs, the young clerk informs him that there is a photographer in the building (138).
After this positive experience, Kramer then goes to a bank to cash a check from Poldi. As he walks into the bank, he observes his surroundings. The small cage-like work spaces for the tellers remind him of NYC’s subway and the armed guards of the real danger of a bank robbery. But what truly impresses Kramer is how quickly he finishes his business in the bank:

Zwei Dutzend Menschen etwa warteten an jedem Schalter des Bankhauses. Eine Stunde wird verstreichen, ehe ich an der Reihe bin, dachte er verdrießlich…

Sechzig Minuten hier vergeuden…!

Und dann waren bloß zehn verstrichen, als sein Vordermann wegtrot.

Verblüfft zog Karl die Uhr: Ja – knappe zehn…! (138-39)

The contrasting and ambivalent reactions that Kramer experiences regarding NYC are visible in these accounts. While the average culinary standards leave little to be desired, the bureaucratic process is refreshingly easy.

ii. Social Standing: The Working Man and Opportunity

Regarding his former social standing, Kramer knows that life in NYC will be different. His father’s connections and all these afforded him are gone. He is relying on his friend Poldi to help him establish himself in this new country, but Poldi is a “lowly clerk in a lowly factory” and a notorious slacker with a “bad” address (10; 97). In light of
this, his future is very uncertain. Nevertheless, Kramer learns from Grünwald that difficulties in the United States can be overcome; it is the land of unlimited possibilities, where the value of the dollar – not one’s social class – rules. He asserts that Kramer has to put his European mentalities behind him. If he is willing to work diligently and take any job that presents itself, he can live the American Dream:


(98-99)

Initially, Grünwald’s advice takes little precedence in Kramer’s plan. He has five hundred dollars and can live on this for six months until he becomes “America-smart” (137). Kramer begins to explore the city and during one of his long walks he discovers that Gloria – the young Polish woman from the ship – is working in a topless burlesque show. Disturbed by this, he decides to find Grünwald. Kramer finds him at his office, only to learn that he helped Gloria find her job, one she wanted because of the good pay. The subsequent conversation becomes heated; Kramer is morally opposed to Gloria’s line of work, no matter what the pay and Grünwald reprimands Kramer for not yet having a job. Grünwald’s bluntness with Kramer takes him aback, as he accuses Kramer of being a dawdler (162-66). In this exchange, we see the importance of work and earning a living over social standing as related to the image of the United States. Although this image
does not originate with the protagonist, Kramer realizes he needs to find work – if only to prove Grünwald wrong (166-68) – and in doing so he affirms this trait of the United States.

After this exchange, Kramer goes to the Catholic Aid Committee and finds his first of a series of manual jobs. He works as a janitor, factory worker, and a bus boy. While these jobs are below his pre-exile standards, he is convinced that it is the “American Way.” Although the work is tedious and tiring, he continues with Grünwald’s words in his head, as an almost constant catalyst. During this time, Karl meets Sandro. Sandro is a neighborhood bar owner and general entrepreneur. His figure is the embodiment of the American Dream and offers Kramer concrete proof that in the United States social class is less important than hard work:

An der Straßenecke begann das Reich Sandros; den nicht nur die Bar war sein Eigentum, auch die winzige Hütte davor, halb Zeitungsstand, halb Kramladen, wo er Zigaretten verkaufte, aber auch Bonbons, die teuflisch-süßen Candies, Kaugummi, Taschenspiegel, Taschenmesser, Taschenkämme…

An der anderen Straßenecke zur düsteren Third lag die dritte Provinz von Sandros Reich: Ein Shoe-parlour, eine grüngestrichene, schmale Bude mit den gewissen, einem Podium aufgeschraubten drei hohen Stühlen, die mit ihren metallenen Beschlägen wie lächerliche, in die Gosse geraten,
kurzum, herabgekommene Throne anmuteten. Ja – als Schuhputzer hatte Sandro begonnen, vor einem Menschentalter, … (217)

Working hard all his life, Sandro was able to go from being a shoe shiner on a busy NYC street to owning his own small “kingdom” and controlling his domain.

For Kramer, his path to success comes more quickly than Sandro’s. Instigated by his loss of social standing and his willingness to take any job, he ultimately has the opportunity to become a musician. While working as a housekeeper, he meets Grünwald again. This chance encounter leads to a position as a band leader in a new NYC night club (405). As we saw above, music is very important to Kramer, but the influence of family and the club, coupled by the need for order relegated it to the private sphere. Kramer was unable or unwilling to disturb his pre-exile notion of Heimat. In this regard, it is his exile and hence NYC that free him from this restriction. He is now able to make his living as a musician, something he has long desired, but never thought possible. The underlying element we recognize here is that Kramer’s lack of social standing in NYC is not a restriction, but rather it affirms his image of the United States as a land of unlimited possibilities. Where this is first represented in the figure of Sandro, it is now realized in his own life. In exile, Karl is freed from class restrictions and free to pursue his dreams.
iii. Community and Relationship: The Jazz Club and Women

Initially, Kramer appears to have no community. His one friend in the city is dead and besides Poldi, he has no other attachments. He does make acquaintances over time, but the continual flux of his life—changing jobs, moving frequently—does not allow him to form any permanent attachments. This situation eventually changes for Kramer, bringing two types of community and/or relationship that transform his image of NYC. The first one negates the negative image he has of the private sphere and the second confirms for Kramer that the United States offers limitless possibilities.

I will begin with the influence of women—and in particular the young American woman Patsy—on his image of NYC. Before Kramer arrives in NYC, we observe the character’s need for female companionship. While in Japan, he has a relationship with the young geisha Kioko and on board ship, he fantasizes about Gloria. While travelling on a train to suburban NYC, he has a chance encounter with a young woman, who fascinates him. Later, he discovers her at a lunch counter near his work where she is a waitress and their relationship begins.

As a brief aside, the representation of women in Auf und ab is primarily marked by the prevailing male perspective found in fin-de-siècle Vienna. Kramer uses diminutive nicknames like “Snowhite;” He seems to project a süßes Mädl image on Kioko that is reminiscent of the character found in Schnitzler’s Reigen. He knows that she works as a geisha, but refuses to think about it, while focusing on her “sweet and innocent” side.
Moreover, Kramer cannot reconcile Gloria’s willingness to perform burlesque in order to earn more money. While the representation of women throughout the novel is beyond the scope of this dissertation, it is important to note this tendency, as it speaks to the kind of behavior that is deemed culturally acceptable by the protagonist for women. Kramer may desire all three women, but in keeping with his moral and cultural norms, Patsy is the most suitable for marriage: she is beautiful, innocent, and needs a protector.\textsuperscript{81}

The importance of this relationship for Kramer’s image of NYC is seen in the parallels between its progression and the transformation of said image. As their relationship becomes more serious, Patsy’s influence on his image of NYC is nothing but positive and transforms the harsh, hectic city into a virtual paradise for him. First, they are reunited by a chance meeting in Central Park. Patsy has been away, attending to her sick sister and Kramer has recently been mugged and lost all his money. In this scene, Patsy’s role is twofold and while Kramer’s image of her may be one dimensional, we see that she is much more. She recognizes that he has slept in the park and suspects that he is homeless. Ignoring his protests, she takes charge of the situation and explains to him what he now has to do:

\textsuperscript{81} Kramer’s projection of his desires on Patsy can be seen repeatedly. At their first encounter and Kramer is “entzückt” by the young, beautiful woman; later Kramer finds Patsy at the lunch counter. As they flirt with one another, the reader sees the importance of this relationship for Kramer. He seems to be staking his future happiness on it, see 273-76; in this scene, we find the first signs that Kramer wants to protect Patsy and have her for himself. When a businessman makes advances at her, he is ready to fight him, ignoring the fact that Patsy has the situation under control, see 277-81.

“Jede ist mir recht, Snowhite.”

“Später darf man wählerisch werden.”

“Yes, Patsy.”


This conversation is reminiscent of the one Kramer had with Grünwald that had insulted him deeply. This time the source of the advice, or better said command, makes all the difference. Kramer believes that Patsy fulfills all his heart’s desires and she is his connection to NYC. She helps him learn the joy of life in a city that once overwhelmed him and sees it in a positive light:

Donner und Dröhnen war ihm die Stimme dieser Gegend. Stählerne Welt, dachte er, eine Welt aus Stahl! Ein Teil dieser grandiosen Stadt ist [Patsy]! Und es erfüllte ihn plötzlich mit einer Art wilden Stolzes, in dieser Stadt leben zu dürfen, eine klirrende Welt zu durchfahren, gegen die die übrige
Here one sees how Kramer’s image of Patsy is coupled with his image of NYC. Through her, he is proud to live in this grand – albeit hard as nails – city, because here people can attain personal goals and partake in the proverbial “pursuit of happiness.”

The second community that transforms Kramer’s image of NYC is found at the jazz club. While working as a housekeeper, Kramer meets Grünwald – who uses the name Greenwood in NYC – again. Despite Kramer’s frosty demeanor, Greenwood offers him a position as a secretary in a new club. Kramer hesitates, but then agrees to meet him the following day (371-73). Is this an opportunity for Kramer to rediscover his Heimat in NYC? Is his life in the public sphere finally going to have the order and security that he once enjoyed in Vienna? What follows is an opportunity that was not available to him in his former Heimat.

In Greenwood’s office, Kramer assesses the value of a violin for him. As he plays the instrument, Greenwood remembers how Kramer entertained the ship’s passengers on New Year’s Eve and received resounding applause from everyone. Impressed by his musical talent, he offers Kramer the position of conductor of the club’s jazz band. Does Kramer think he is capable? Does he understand how to entertain an audience? Kramer contains his emotions, affirms that he is capable and states: “Ja ja – man muß zu
unterhalten verstehen” (376). Kramer convinces Greenwood, but Greenwood has a partner, who is responsible for the artistic side of the business. They must make this decision together.

Greenwood then reveals to him that Gloria is his partner. Kramer is unmoved by this and together they go to her home, where Greenwood and Gloria privately discuss hiring Kramer. As he waits, Kramer assesses the situation rationally:

Er erwartete ein höfliches Nein. Der Posten im Büro bleibt…! – Er war nicht niedergedrückt. So viel Glück durfte man gar nicht beanspruchen;
Eine Jazz dirigieren – hier in dieser Stadt – in diesem Land – das die Heimat des Jazz ist! (378)

But then the offer comes from Gloria. She realizes the risk she is taking, but she too remembers New Year’s Eve and is certain Kramer has the talent for which they are looking.

With this, Karl Kramer’s story becomes the fulfillment of the American dream. Despite adversity and loss, he finds success. The owners of the club, and later his band members, contribute to this. He has the job he has always wanted, but was not previously available to him. The band members respect him, but also teach him; the club owners recognize the risk, but anticipate success. This reveals that in NYC hard work, risk, and teach-ability lead to success. These three elements give Kramer a new life and a new

---

82 By now, Karl and Patsy are married. He recognizes that the thought of Gloria has no effect on him and attributes this to the bliss he has found with his “Snowhite,” see 376.
83 The band members show Kramer the importance of improvisation for true American jazz, see 389-90.
E. The Interaction of *Heimat* and Exile, and the Influence of Memory

As we have seen in the previous sections of this chapter, there is an almost continual interaction of *Heimat* and exile in Heydenau’s novel. In this section, I review and highlight several of these interactions, by first looking at scenes where the protagonist finds elements of *Heimat*/Vienna in exile/NYC and where his Austrian perspectives interfere with his understanding of life in the United States. Then I consider conflicts that arise when his two worlds come into direct contact. Finally, I analyze the image of *Heimat* that is presented at the end of the novel.

As can be expected for an exile, Kramer compares NYC with his *Heimat* Austria repeatedly. Over the course of the novel these comparisons become less negative, as the influence of his new life increases. The elegant neighborhoods of NYC’s Fifth Avenue and Second Avenue feel familiar, as they remind him of home (140; 226-27). Still, Kramer strives to adjust despite the differences in his lifestyles in both localities and eventually makes some contentious decisions to accept the United States as his new home, for example to become more “American” in his tastes: “Auf dem Weg zum Drugstore redete er auf sich ein: Meinetwegen wieder bloß Sandwiches zum Mittagessen! Überhaupt, es ist an der Zeit, daß ich mein Essen bißchen amerikanisiere…” (272). In
these decisions, we can observe the ambiguous nature of life in exile. Kramer accepts the notion that the United States is a classless society, but he continues to assess what he sees based on his Austrian perspective (178-81; 191-96). This leads to conflicts and misinterpretations, but also to his rediscovery of Patsy, a key figure in his new Heimat.

One of these conflicts can also be observed in his relationship to women. As noted above, when encouraged to accept future invitations from a well-to-do widow, he cannot imagine her interest in a janitor. Regarding his relationship to Patsy, Kramer is very pleased, when he discovers that she is a waitress. This makes her accessible for Kramer the working man: “Jetzt war er geradezu glücklich, daß sie bloß Barmaid sei. Sie wird sich nicht herablassen müssen” (273).

While we can observe changes in Kramer’s attitude towards class and social standing, we can assert that this change has come under the influence of his new home, but is this change only valid for his image of NYC or can we discern a transformed notion of Heimat? For example, Kramer goes to a bar with a co-worker from the factory:

Vor ein paar Jahren hätte es sich der einstige Freiherr von Kramer wahrscheinlich dreimal überlegt, sich von einem Lastwagenchauffeur freihalten zu lassen, jetzt aber war er geradezu glücklich, mit diesem natürlichen Menschen beisammenzusitzen; nicht die geringste Hemmung, dieser zu folgen, hatte sich in ihm gemeldet. Nein auch jetzt kam ihm nicht zu Bewußtsein, wie sehr er schon dabei wäre, ins amerikanische Leben hineinzuwachsen… (288)
In this scene, the narrator offers the reader insight into Kramer’s transformation, as he appears unaware of the influence of his host culture and happily enjoys the company of a fellow worker. Later, when Kramer meets Greenwood as he is cleaning stairs, he reminds himself of the differences between “here and there.” There he would have been ashamed, but here the work may be dirty, but it is honest work; his dollars are as good as Greenwood’s (371). Nevertheless, this new attitude is one he has adopted solely for his image of NYC and the United States. Due to his circumstances, it is acceptable for Kramer to have menial jobs until better opportunities arise. A similar circumstance in Austria, as we saw above in his own reflection on his situation, would not be acceptable. In his former Heimat, a particular social standing was required.

We see this in an explicit manner when NYC and Austria come into direct contact. For a time, Kramer works as a busboy. One afternoon as he is clearing tables and he hears German being spoken. When his name is called, he turns and sees two former schoolmates from Vienna. This chance meeting quickly becomes uncomfortable for Kramer, as they ask him why he has taken such a menial job. Kramer stammers something about the heat outside and returns to his work, hoping they will just leave. Instead they invite him to a concert where they are performing (230-31).

Kramer accepts the invitation and the concert restores a piece of his former Heimat: “Jede Note war Heimat” (233). But it also renews the conflict he feels towards his new life and social standing:

Und ich…! Oh, einen anderen würdigeren Job…! Aus dem Kulidasein empor…! (233)

His “Kulidasein” is no longer acceptable. His former classmates and the sights and sounds at the concert remind him of his former life and he wants it back. Any satisfaction he may have felt from his hard work fades when reminded of the elegant life he led in Vienna. Any romantic notions the protagonist may have had about the United States and the working man, appear to have left him.

This is a telling statement about class and order in his image of Heimat.

Regardless of the changes we see in Kramer’s attitude and/or his definitions of order and social standing these elements remain central for his notion of Heimat as they relate to Vienna. The final scenes of the novel highlight both the importance of order and social standing for and the changes in Kramer’s notion of Heimat.

By the end of the novel, Karl Kramer has a new wife, a new job, and a new name. Through these we see that NYC has become Heimat for Kramer, but he still maintains his connection to Austria. As the jazz band conductor, he will be known as Charly de Grinzing. This new name is a combination of his new and old identities. Many people in
NYC call him Charly and he grew up in Grinzing, a **Bezirk** in Vienna. As he explains this to Patsy, Kramer states:


Forschend sah sie ihn an: “Ich dachte, daß hier – deine…”


This scene underpins the importance of Patsy for his notion of *Heimat*. Her presence makes NYC a central element of his *Heimat*. Nevertheless, Vienna maintains its formative function for Kramer and remains a permanent part of his memories.

We can also observe this in the dual function of his new career in NYC. The job provides him with security and puts an end to the “Auf und Ab” he has battled since arriving in NYC (405). Kramer no long has to struggle to earn a living, nor does he feel ashamed of his work. His new job also restores his social standing to one similar to his pre-exile days. The key difference to this career and his previous one is that it fulfills his longstanding desire to be a musician. While Kramer will never forget Vienna and Austria and all they mean to him – as he proclaims and his stage name affirms – NYC represents his new notion of *Heimat*. The reciprocal influence of Vienna and NYC remains, but here
the important elements of his pre-exile Heimat are restored, while the freedom he
discovers in NYC offers him the opportunity to realize his childhood dreams: “Alles hat
mir dein Land gegeben, Freiheit, Arbeit, dich – und eine Heimat! … Trotzdem bleibt mir
die einstige unvergessen. Niemals wird sie mir aus dem Herzen entschwinden…” (405)

F. Conclusion

In conclusion, what do the representations of Vienna and NYC tell us about the
notion of Heimat we find in Heydenau’s novel? Is it a fluid notion that is transformed
after the unexpected loss of the physical Heimat? Or is the notion represented by
characteristics that can be attached to any locality? In the case of Kramer’s notion, the
text reveals that both apply.

Similar to Ascher’s notion of Heimat in Bilderbuch, Vienna forms the cornerstone
of Kramer’s pre-exile image of Heimat and he never forgets it as such. The city, his
parents, the gambling club are all key contributors to his social and cultural norms, his
tastes and preferences. Nevertheless, for Kramer, these do not appear to require a fixed
attachment to Vienna, but rather imbue his notion with defining characteristics, such as
community, social standing, and beauty. These characteristics can be discovered or found
regardless of locality. As a result of this, NYC becomes the greater Heimat, due to the
fact that Kramer discovers aspects of Vienna there, while the restrictions he felt in
Vienna are removed.
As we saw, in Vienna, his desire to be a musician is suppressed; he is an obedient son and does not think of contradicting his father’s wishes, even after his death. Rather than pursue a career in music, he transfers his familial loyalty to the gambling club and again appears contented to serve the club members and forego his own desires, emphasizing the importance of order and community. The reader sees Kramer as one willing to make sacrifices to preserve his ordered lifestyle, a key aspect of his notion of *Heimat*.

What changes once he is in NYC? How does this new city influence and interact with the notion of *Heimat* with which he arrived? We observe that NYC is initially an anti-*Heimat*. The life that Kramer leads there is one he never could have conceived of in Vienna. Kramer must work hard at jobs that he never could have imagined prior to his exile, jobs that conflict with his Austrian notion of social standing. Nevertheless, NYC becomes his new *Heimat* and these jobs bring him the opportunity of a lifetime.

In NYC, he also makes sacrifices, but they are temporary: working bad jobs to sustain himself. In Vienna, they seemed permanent: Kramer affirms that he never would have left the club, for any reason. And herein lays the fundamental difference in the representations of both cities. In NYC, Kramer can recreate *Heimat* once the foundational elements are in place, such as discovering the elegance of 5th Avenue, finding order and community in his home life with Patsy and social standing through his engagement at the club. In Vienna, the characteristics that are a part of his notion of *Heimat* are overshadowed by the fact that he cannot fulfill his dreams. He can afford an elegant
lifestyle and enjoys many of Vienna’s fineries, but he is bound by social conventions that do not permit him to pursue the final piece of his notion of Heimat: a career in music.

In NYC, Kramer is able to fulfill all of his desires. With this recognition, Kramer declares to Patsy’s that her country is his new Heimat, “[w]enn’s auch eine geborgte ist” (405). The transformation of Kramer’s attitudes and actions throughout the novel shows that he, while desiring a certain quality of life, is no longer bound by the expectations and restrictions of his social standing in Vienna to achieve this lifestyle. While Vienna remains important and unforgettable – it still informs his tastes and standards – NYC finally fulfills his musical ambitions, which in turn affords him the quality of life he had once enjoyed. His new found freedom exemplified in his music career coupled with his marriage to Patsy is the key to NYC becoming the embodiment of Heimat for him.
Chapter IV: Elisabeth Freundlich – Heimat and Restoration

In this chapter, I investigate a notion of Heimat that – in its presentation – diverges from what we have seen in the previous two chapters. While Ascher’s Bilderbuch and Heydenau’s Auf und ab offer accounts that are frequently wrought with emotional imagery, Elisabeth Freundlich presents her autobiography in close association with the political and historical events of her lifetime. At times this approach creates the impression that one is reading an objective account similar to a history book. This notable difference is most likely the result of the distance that Freundlich had from the events she writes about and the particular structure of the autobiography.

When Die fahrenden Jahre was published in 1992, Freundlich was approaching the end of a life that had spanned almost the entire 20th Century. In the autobiography, Freundlich emphasizes the historical events of her lifetime and draws on historical sources in addition to personal documents to refresh and confirm her memories. In investigating her notion of Heimat through her representations of Vienna and NYC, I present a third notion of Heimat that reveals congruencies to those of Ascher and Heydenau, but also significant distinctions. These congruencies and distinctions will highlight the collective and personal nature of the notion of Heimat.

To the author herself, I would like to note that while Freundlich’s name is not a very common one in the works of exile scholars, she is the best known of the three and
well known among Austrian exile scholars. Since the publication of her autobiography in 1992, there has been a growing interest in her life and work.\footnote{The editor of her autobiography Susanne Alge contributed in 1993 to a book on female Austrian writers with a chapter on Freundlich. In 1996, Birgit Hasenauer wrote her master’s thesis in part on Freundlich’s autobiography. Both Viktoria Hertling and Erich Hakl published articles on Freundlich, in 1997 and 2001 respectively. Alge also contributed recently to a publication from the Österreichische Gesellschaft für Exilforschung (öge), with an article on Freundlich. In addition to these scholarly works, the öge hosted a symposium on Freundlich in April 2007.}

As in the previous chapters, I examine Freundlich’s text through the frames of public and private spaces, social class, and community. Before I do this, I offer an overview of her life, highlighting significant events. I derive my information primarily from Die fahrenden Jahre, but also from secondary sources from exile scholars who knew Freundlich and/or accessed her archives at the University of Marbach. I then present a synopsis of her autobiography, in which I pay particular attention to Freundlich’s approach to her life story, how she favors presenting historical rather than personal events and employs the voices of other members of her communities to describe events. This focus will underscore the importance of historical events and community for the author, and her understanding of their significant influence on her life. This is followed by an examination of her notion of Heimat through the aforementioned frames and the interactive qualities of Heimat and memory as observed in the author’s presentations of Vienna and NYC.
A. From Childhood to Adulthood: Family and Political Activity

Elisabeth Freundlich was born in Vienna on July 21, 1906. She was the only child of Olga (née Lanzer) and Jacques Freundlich. Her mother was a singer and her father an influential lawyer and Social Democrat in Vienna. Both of Freundlich’s parents were active in socialist circles and as a young child Freundlich heard stories their political and intellectual activities, which frequently led to late night discussions at Vienna’s Café Central. Freundlich describes this time in her parents’ lives as a “Bummelleben (Freundlich 9). In her autobiography she recalls how on mornings after late night discussions she would wait for her father to go to work and then sneak into their bed with her toys. Olga Freundlich, tired from the previous night’s activities, would tell her pre-school aged daughter, “Laß die Mami noch ein bißchen schlafen” (12-13). Her depiction of her early years reveals loving parents who integrated their precocious child into their lives.

Education was also very important to Olga and Jacques Freundlich. This influenced Elisabeth; she describes her joy and excitement on her first day of school, contrasting it with the anxiety she saw in some of her classmate who clung to their mothers’ skirts. According to Olga Freundlich, Elisabeth excelled in reading and writing (33-34). While Freundlich states that she does not remember much of what she learned, she does recall her first experience with religious instruction in school. She and her schoolmates were divided into three groups, the largest of which was Elisabeth’s group,
the “mosaische Konfession.” The child Freundlich knew she was Jewish, but she appears to have experienced the positive side of the Habsburg Monarchy’s diversity, more than the prevalent anti-Semitism, of which she became very aware as an adult (47).

After completing the Volksschule, Elisabeth attended a Realgymnasium in Vienna’s eighth district. By her own admission, she was not an outstanding student, but she managed to complete her Matura (58). In her autobiography, she describes the teachers who made lasting impressions upon her. What is notable in her descriptions is that these educators were both outstanding in their fields and outsiders. She tells of her history teacher – an apparent communist – who had her students read Lukács and taught them to not simply memorize names and dates, but to consider what effect these had on humanity. She records with open affection that she and her classmates attempted to tidy up their Latin teacher, who was avoided by his colleagues on account of his unkempt appearance, but loved by his students for his manner and pedagogical abilities (51-55).

Freundlich attended the University of Vienna from 1927 to 1931 where she studied Germanistics with an emphasis on theater (Alge, “Elisabeth Freundlich” 33). During her studies she had the opportunity to work at a theater in Vienna as dramaturge and producer. For this work, she used the name Lanzer, as her love of theater came from her mother. Freundlich explains that at this point in her life, her love of the theater blinded her to the political turmoil that was happening on the streets; premiers in Vienna, Berlin, or Paris were far more important to her (Freundlich 60-62).
After her studies, she struggled to find work. But in 1932, she went to Berlin to work as G. W. Pabst’ production assistant. Although Freundlich was disappointed with her work on Pabst’ film “L’Atlantide,” Berlin fascinated her. The city had become a metropolis and its residents revealed to her that she still possessed a certain naïveté, despite being an adult: “Berlin war ein großer Eindruck für mich. Ich selbst war ja damals schon reichlich erwachsen, aber im Grunde noch recht weltfremd” (64). Her experience was short-lived though due to her failure as a production assistant and she returned home. Shortly thereafter everything in Berlin changed, when Hitler came to power.

During the brief period before Austria’s Civil War, the Freundlichs entertained many of Germany’s refugees. But in February 1934, their lives changed drastically. Jacques Freundlich – who was also the president of the *Arbeiterbank* – was arrested. The Austro-Fascist government accused him of irregularities in his business practices at the bank (Hackl 55-56). As Elisabeth explains, her father refused to flee before his arrest, despite knowing that as a socialist he would be a target of the new government; he wanted to prove his innocence (Freundlich 68).

The government detained her father for over four months, while they unsuccessfullly tried to prove their charges. He was eventually released, but still under house arrest. As a result, his career and the family’s financial existence were ruined (“Elisabeth Freundlich” 213). This difficult time in her family’s life was also the beginning of Elisabeth’s “politisation” and of her anti-Fascist activities. She set literature and theater aside and she began working with an international peace organization
(Freundlich 68-69). Due to her father’s well-known name in Austria, Freundlich was unable to partake in any actions considered illegal by the Christian Corporate government of Austria. Because of this and other activities with the peace organization Elisabeth frequently traveled to Paris, where she met likeminded activists, many of whom the Comintern recruited to serve in the International Brigades fighting Francisco Franco’s forces in Spain. In 1937, she began working for the Spanish Aid Committee (Alge, “Elisabeth Freundlich” 33).

B. Fleeing Hitler’s Vienna

As Hitler’s troops entered Vienna, Freundlich knew her family was in grave danger. If Jacques Freundlich shared his daughter’s dire assessment of the situation in Austria that spring, it did not affect his decision to remain; he would stay in Vienna, if only to help his friends. On March 11, 1938, a heated argument between father and daughter ensued as she pleaded with him to leave (Freundlich 76-77; Hackl 57). Initially Elisabeth tried to appeal to his logic, but he remained unmoved. She also reminded him that since his arrest in 1934, the county courthouse had his file him and that once the Nazis took control they would take him away (Freundlich 77; Hackl 57). Freundlich recognized that her father was a prime target for the Nazis.

85 Freundlich states that this included any type of political activity associated with left leaning or leftwing organizations, such as the Social Democratic or Communist parties, see 69-70.
Jacques Freundlich reacted indifferently; he simply wanted to continue listening to the news from abroad on the radio. In an attempt to silence his daughter, he made a partial concession: “Wenn du durchaus willst, kannst du dich ja montags im Verkehrsbüro erkundigen, ob es überhaupt noch Züge nach dem Westen gibt, dann wollen wir weitersehen.” But Freundlich did not want to wait; suddenly, she decided to appeal to her father with a familial approach: “Du wölltest doch schon immer mal deine Schwester besuchen. Tante Josephin wird sich freuen, uns alle wieder zusehen. Und nach ein paar Tagen, wenn der ganze Rummel vorbei ist, […] können wir ja wiederkommen.” Elisabeth did not believe that they would return, but her father approved the idea (Freundlich 77).

Not knowing what awaited them, the Freundlichs – with their beloved dachshund – arrived at Vienna’s Westbahnhof. The station showed no visible signs of the new power and they boarded their train to Zurich without incident. There they saw many acquaintances, but the uncertainty of the situation and the general mood precluded any cordial conversations. No one knew if they would even be permitted to enter Switzerland (79).

After arriving safely in Zurich, Jacques Freundlich conferred with friends about the situation, but soon realized there was nothing to discuss. After a brief stay, the family traveled to Paris, which seemed to be the safer option. It was possible that Switzerland too would be overrun by the Nazis and France had a sizable Social Democratic Party, which they hoped to contact (81).
C. Life in Exile

In Paris, Elisabeth resumed her political activity, this time focusing on the injustice she saw in the annexation of Austria. She – and other Austrian exiles – registered with the French government as ex-Austrians in protest of the new potentate in the “Ostmark” (82). Freundlich quickly joined a group of Austrian exiles, which wanted to inform the French and the rest of the world of injustices happening in Austria, evoke sympathy for the situation there, and warn them about the dangers everyone was facing (82).

According to Freundlich, due to the perceived security in France many exiles saw political activity as a duty, and one they could now perform without fear of reprisal (84). For her part Freundlich cofounded two groups: Ligue pour l’Autriche Vivante/Liga des geistigen Österreich and Cercle Culturel Autrichien (Alge, “Elisabeth Freundlich” 34; “Elisabeth Freundlich” 213). As the Germans neared Paris in 1940 and the French capitulated that June, the political work of Austrian and German exiles in France came to a halt. With good reason, many now feared for their lives and began fleeing for southern France (Alge, “Elisabeth Freundlich” 34).

---

86 Freundlich apparently never used the term Anschluss, but rather Annexion, when discussing Austria’s subsumption into the Third Reich. Using this term reveals the strong sense that Freundlich had about Austria’s dissolution. It was forcefully overtaken by the Nazis and not simply reunited with the Fatherland, see Hackl 63.

87 A list of the men and women who had publically denounced Hitler was given to officials. Freundlich also notes that many who had attended a Werfel lecture organized by the Liga were deported to concentration camps in Germany, see Freundlich 84-85. Viktoria Hertling notes that this lecture was held on January 14, 1939, see 105.
After obtaining their “sauf conduites,” the Freundlichs traveled south to Montauban, where they remained until the summer of 1940. After France’s final defeat at the hands of Nazi-Germany, they traveled to Portugal via Spain in order to board a ship bound for the United States.88 This was a time of hardship and uncertainty, but they were permitted to cross the border and traveled safely to Lisbon.

From Lisbon, she sailed with her parents to the United States, arriving in NYC on November 26, 1940 (“Elisabeth Freundlich” 213). Once in NYC, Elisabeth quickly contacted the “American League of Writers.” She brought them a list of writers and publicists, who were particularly at risk. Like other exiles, she attempted to help as many as she could escape Europe. She notes that this was a difficult undertaking. There were concerns from the sides of humanitarian groups about sponsoring unknown persons with left-leaning political ideals and collecting the necessary funds proved to be difficult (Freundlich 117).

In addition to her relief work, Freundlich found various means by which she could support herself and her parents. Her doctorate provided her with guest lectureships at area colleges and universities. She also returned to the university as a student and earned a degree in library sciences, after which she began working at the Metropolitan Museum of

---

88 Due to Jacques Freundlich’s position and reputation, the family had received Emergency Visas for the United States. These visas were granted to persons that the US-government believed to be in particular danger from the Nazis. Elisabeth Freundlich tells of her father’s confusion upon learning that their visas were in Marseilles, as they had not applied for them, see Freundlich 110-11. Susanne Alge states that Joseph Buttinger (a former secretary of the Austrian Social Democratic Party and leader of the socialist underground and antifascist movement), who did not know the Freundlichs personally, placed the family on the list for Emergency Visas, see “Elisabeth Freundlich” 34.
Art, cataloging works of art (Hertling 107). This work, while boring for her, provided her family with economic stability.  

Active in the immigrant community, Freundlich also resumed her political and cultural work (Alge “Elisabeth Freundlich” 35-36; Hertling 107-10). An apparent highlight of this time was her position as the editor of the arts supplement of the *Austro-American Tribune* (AAT). The AAT began in 1942 as *Freiheit für Österreich* and was a forum for Austrian emigrant authors (Freundlich 121; Hertling 109). While the paper focused on Austrian issues, culture and literature, it also sought contributions from exiled Germans. Through her work at the AAT, Freundlich established contact to such authors as Hermann Broch, Ernst Lothar, Bertolt Brecht, Lion Feuchtwanger, as well as Heinrich and Thomas Mann (Freundlich 121-22).

Despite becoming a US-citizen in 1946, Freundlich never questioned whether or not she would return to Austria. Due to legal constraints of her new citizenship this did not occur until 1950. In the meantime, she and her colleagues at the AAT attempted to establish a relationship to the younger generation of Austrian writers. These advances were not reciprocated, as the younger generation apparently viewed the exiles with skepticism. Freundlich recounts sarcastically how these young authors showed obvious distrust of the exiled authors, viewing themselves as “alle eindeutig unbemakelt und von untadeliger Gesinnung (Freundlich 132; Walter 11). Nevertheless, Austria was still her

---

89 The Freundlichs appear to have enjoyed a relatively stable life in exile, without the predominate concerns that faced many exiles, e.g. job and financial stability, an adequate living situation, etc., see Freundlich 117-18
home and she returned there with Günther Anders, whom she had married in 1945. Freundlich’s return was coupled with the desire to rebuild her country, but marked by difficulties that she had not envisioned (Freundlich 131-33; 176-77). Back in Austria, she returned to her cultural and literary activities. She supported herself primarily as a cultural reporter for the *Mannheimer Morgen*, but also wrote short stories and two novels. Freundlich died in Vienna in 2001, six months shy of her 95th birthday.

**D. Die fahrenden Jahre: Memories of an Eventful Life**

Elisabeth Freundlich’s autobiography narrates the long and dynamic life of a woman who found great importance in improving the lives of those around her (Hackl 63). Noting that the autobiography was more similar to an account of dramatic historical events than a personal narrative, the exile scholar Viktoria Hertling states: “Ohne den Einfluß der nachfolgenden großen politischen Ereignisse wäre die Lebenslinie der Autorin zweifellos anders verlaufen” (105). Hertling may appear to be overstating the obvious, but for this work, this influence combined with Freundlich’s keen sense of belonging to larger communities are key contributors to her notion of *Heimat* and how she presents it, as such they deserve closer examination.

Not only does the content of this autobiography show that Freundlich’s life was influenced by the major historical events of the 20th Century and her various communities, but also its structure. From the very beginning of her account, Freundlich
places herself firmly in the middle of community. The autobiography does not begin with the apparent main subject – Freundlich’s life – but rather her parents’ life. It is followed by an account of her maternal grandparents. Moreover, we see repeatedly throughout the text how Freundlich fronts the lives of others who were important to her and played significant roles in her life. In the course of this synopsis, I will highlight this characteristic of the text and in particular how this is significant for her notion of Heimat.

Furthermore, while the remainder of the autobiography progresses in a primarily chronological order, Freundlich frequently implements the rhetorical device of hysteron-proterons. In her book *Dem Verlorenen nachspüren: autobiographische Verarbeitung des Exils deutschsprachiger Schriftstellerinnen*, exile scholar Ingrid Walter discusses the “typology of exile literature” by examining the specific situations of the female exiled authors Gina Kaus, Hertha Pauli, and Freundlich. She states that hysteron-proterons appears to be a common structuring method in the genre. This devise reverses the chronological order of events, anticipating the future event. As an example, Walter quotes Freundlich: “Daß der Tod damals schon mittanzte, ahnten wir zwar vielleicht, aber diese Ahnung verdrängnten wir eben” (qtd. in Walter 33).

Freundlich’s use of this device can also be understood in conjunction with her tendency to combine events of her childhood, youth, and adulthood with major historical events. For example, looking back to February 1934 the author states: “Ich war damals 28

---

90 According to the author, the general consensus in exile scholarship that exile literature exhibits specific thematic and linguistic characteristics, has not translated into specific research on the structure and language of exile autobiographies of female authors. She undertakes this task in her book, see 14.
und hätte die Zeichen schon begreifen müssen” (65). With the benefit of time, Freundlich – like many exiles – knows what the signs meant and can front them, although she had not recognized them in the actual moment.

Beginning her autobiography with her parents’ early married life, Freundlich portrays the importance of their social democratic beliefs and the influence of these on her upbringing. The social and political “Bummelleben,” which they lead meant not only spending long hours in Vienna’s famous Café Central discussing politics, but also translating their political convictions into their expectations for their only child. She recounts an episode with the family’s servant Berta that exemplifies this.

Late one morning after an evening at Café Central, Berta entered her parents’ bedroom to discuss the midday meal. Little Elisabeth listened as the women weighed the options; unexpected and without being asked Elisabeth declared to Berta: “Du darfst ja doch nicht kochen, was du willst, du mußt kochen, was Mami dir anschafft, du bist ja nur ein Dienstbot.” Freundlich explains how the word “Dienstbot” was not used in their home. Much to the little girl’s shock, her mother reacted swiftly and in a manner that neither Elisabeth nor Berta had previously experienced: she spanked her daughter hardly (15).

Despite the unexpected punishment, little Elisabeth revealed herself to be quite resilient:

Ich war zunächst so verblüff, daß ich vergaß zu schreien, zu jammern oder davonzulaufen. Dann zog ich mit einem Ruck das Hemd über meinen
brandheißen, schmerzenden Po, dreht ihn mit einem Schwung von meiner Mutter fort, warf mich in die Kissen und bekundete solcherart, daß ich zu schlafen wünschte. (15)

Freundlich explains that this was her first and last spanking.

Reflecting on this incident, she questions the magnitude of her mother’s reaction. Corporal punishment went against her parents’ principles and a lesser punishment could have had the same effect, nonetheless she states:

Dennoch bin ich heute fest davon überzeugt, daß sie mit ihrem Vorgehen etwas in mir im Keim erstickt hat, was vielleicht in jedem von uns angelegt ist: den Dünkel nämlich, das Gefühl der Überlegenheit dem gegenüber, der auf der sozialen Leiter nur ein winziges Stückchen tiefer steht, ein Machtgefühl, von dem, so meine ich, alles Übel der Welt herrührt. (17)

Freundlich asserts that she bore no grudge towards her mother and nor suffered any lasting negative effects, although she felt she was treated unfairly (17). Her mother remained one of the most important people in her life and the socialist ideals of her parents that were impressed upon her at a young age eventually became her own.

Freundlich follows the initial chapter with “Familiennachrichten,” in which she describes a portion of her heritage and how members of her family came to Vienna.91 She

---

91 Freundlich devotes this chapter to her maternal family. In the first chapter though, we learn that her father was from Gänserndorf, a town in Lower Austria near the Slovak border. Freundlich explains that it was an important train junction for the eastern corners of the Monarchy. It was here that his social
places particular emphasis on her maternal grandparents. Her grandmother was an orphan, who came to Vienna from Moravia to live with relatives,\(^\text{92}\) while her maternal grandfather – also an orphan from Moravia – came to Vienna as a *Zwölfender*\(^\text{93}\) in the Imperial and Royal Army.

Freundlich’s depiction of her maternal grandparents and her mother’s home life reveal a traditional world. But more importantly, it shows how her grandparents were industrious and hardworking. These qualities earned them the respect of others and Freundlich appeared to have inherited them. They are reflected in both her work ethic and her desire for equality and respect for all. Coupled with the emphases of the first chapter, Freundlich has presented the foundation of the character traits she strove to maintain throughout her life and as we will see later in this chapter, these are also traits that mark her notion of *Heimat*.

The next four chapters form the central focus of the autobiography as they present her exile journey. This supports Jacqueline Vansant’s contention that Freundlich wanted to highlight this portion of her life and viewed it as more formative than her childhood.\(^\text{94}\) Freundlich begins with the annexation of Austria and her flight with her parents to Paris in “Der März 1938 in Wien.” The title of the preceding chapter, “Paris: Rettung und
democratic convictions were fomented. His first playmates were the children of railroaders. Later as an attorney, he fought for the railroad union. Erich Hackl also briefly describes the origins of her father’s social convictions, see 53.  
\(^\text{92}\) According to Freundlich, her grandmother was no more than a servant in the home of her relatives, see 20.  
\(^\text{93}\) *Zwölfender* is the Austrian vernacular for a soldier who serves in the army for twelve years.  
\(^\text{94}\) Vansant also refers to the title of Freundlich’s autobiography to support this. It stems from a poem written by Günther Anders that appeared under the same title, see 32.
Hoffnung,” reveals the hopes she shared with many German-speaking exiles there: They saw Paris as the center of the resistance. Freundlich uses the words of Franz Werfel to describe the almost euphoric mood of the Austrian exiles and asserts that at this early juncture many believed they could successfully fight Hitler from the safety of France; no one imagined that within a year and a half their safety would be gone, Paris and France would have fallen, forcing them to flee again: “Das geknebelte, aber lebendige Österreich rechnet mit der tapferen Treue seiner Söhne im Exil. Wien blickt sehnsüchtig nach Frankreich” (84-85).

In quoting Werfel to describe the emotions of the exiles, we see a reoccurring technique implemented throughout the autobiography. Freundlich openly states that she uses many sources to augment her fragmentary memories, but I would assert that in this instance her reference to Werfel underpins her connection to the exile community. As we will see throughout the course of this chapter, Freundlich oriented her life around community more so than her individual needs. Moreover, she was highly cognizant of the common bonds she shared with other exiles, Austrians in particular. This awareness can be observed in her representations of Vienna and NYC and it is a predominant characteristic of her notion of Heimat.

95 Freundlich helped organize a lecture with Werfel and saw it as a great success, as it was well attended by Germans and Austrians alike, as well as prominent French authors and professors who were sympathetic towards Austria. She also points out that despite the success of this evening, it was blemished: not one Social Democrat attended. The reason she gives for this was Werfel’s friendship with Kurt Schuschnigg, which, for the SPÖ, made Werfel a friend of the Christian Corporate State. Any connection to Werfel could have damaged their credibility with other “comrades.”
In “Wege in die Neue Welt” she discusses her journey over Spain and Portugal to the United States. This chapter offers a compelling account, which supports my aforementioned assertion that Freundlich was keenly aware that she was a member of various communities. On the French border to Spain, Freundlich, her parents and the others in their group were stopped by the border police. Freundlich’s description reveals the tension that was felt by all:


Elisabeth learned that a similar incident had occurred the day before, but in that instance the group of refugees was not allowed to cross into Spain. Out of desperation one of the members of the group committed suicide. The next day the border police feared similar reactions and began allowing people to cross into Spain. Years later, Freundlich learned that it was Walter Benjamin who committed suicide that day. Despite knowing there was
an agreement between Franco and Roosevelt to allow refugees to pass through Spain, Freundlich acknowledges the desperate act of a member of her exile community for having saved her life, underscoring the important bond she has to this community (113-14).

In “Tribüne Amerika,” Freundlich presents her relatively secure life in exile. What is interesting about the title of this chapter is that it evokes the image of theater, positioning Freundlich as an observer more than an actor on the stage of NYC. This positioning reveals her attitude toward her exile city, which will be addressed below. “Tribüne Amerika” is followed by the final chapter, “Von der Rückkehr zur Heimkehr.” In it, she documents her return to Austria in 1950 and the difficulties that followed.

This final chapter offers compelling insight into her relationship to Vienna and Austria. Aside from an apparent idyllic childhood, Freundlich was keenly aware of both the political bias and anti-Semitism that eventually destroyed many of her fellow Austrians’ lives and continued to dominate mainstream thought in Austria. Nevertheless, she returned and experienced a situation that was more difficult than she could have imagined. Even so, her return became a home coming. Her experiences in exile had left a distinct impression on her life and taught her the necessity of acting in solidarity with others to enact change; this impression remained an integral part of her attitude towards others even after her exile had ended (146).

Freundlich explains that despite the attempt of many in post-war Austria to push aside the events of the Nazi-era rather than confront them, despite the fact that for many
years returning exiles felt unwanted, and despite the fact that exiles were viewed as “those who left us,” rather than “those we drove away,” she remained happy with her decision to return (142-46). Solidarity and change were her goals. Again attaching herself to a larger community – this time one of all authors, who have suffered injustice in their homeland – Freundlich uses the words of the Hungarian author Tibor Déry\(^\text{96}\) to clarify why she needed to be present in Austria, strengthening the importance and expanding the boundaries of community: “Die Wahrheit kann man nicht in Worten ausdrücken, sondern nur durch ein ganzes Menschenleben” (146).

In considering Freundlich’s autobiography I have highlighted two characteristics. First – as mentioned previously – Freundlich structures her autobiography around historic events, with her time in exile playing the central role. And second, Freundlich’s explicit placement of herself within specific communities, such as family and exiles. This is seen in her use of specific quotations and her selection of specific events. These characteristics of the autobiography are important for this work as they also speak to her notion of *Heimat*.

a. Vienna and *Heimat*

Freundlich’s representations of Vienna share a common characteristic of the entire autobiography: they are frequently coupled with the major historical events of her

---

\(^{96}\) Déry was unjustly arrested and imprisoned in Hungary following the uprising there in 1956, see Freundlich 146.
lifetime, rather than personal ones. The personal and historical are intricately linked by the author, underscoring the importance of the events and Freundlich’s cognizance of their influence on her life.

Like Ascher, Freundlich also matured in an era of great tumult in Austria. The strong influence of her parents – coupled with their political persuasions – exposed her to conflicts beyond Austria’s borders. Furthermore, as the primary influence on her worldview, they laid the foundation of her notion of Heimat. While Freundlich’s representations appear quite idyllic at times, they are tempered by her use of hysteron-proterons. Through this, she reminds the reader of the anti-Semitism in Austria and discord amongst both differing and similar political factions and these aspects influence her representation of Vienna.

i. Public and Private Spheres: Enfolding the Public With the Private

As mentioned earlier, Peter Blickle asserts that “[the German idea of Heimat] enfolds the public with the private, individual with the social, the self with nature, dream with reality, utopia with landscape;...” (12). Here, the notion of Heimat incorporates two seemingly contrasting ideas, serving as a bridge between them. We can observe the enfolding of the public with the private from the early stages of Freundlich’s life, and as a steady exchange between these two spaces it continues throughout her autobiography. Two questions arise from this, one pertaining to her notion of Heimat and the other to the
influence this has on her memories: First, can we observe this enfolding in her representation of *Heimat*, i.e. how do both spheres evoke *Heimat* for her? Second, can this explain Freundlich’s reliance on historical events to shape her autobiography?

Before her father’s career was ruined in 1934, the family maintained a large apartment, which also housed his law office. Freundlich describes this as extremely advantageous, as her father enjoyed having her and her mother close by and he could “pop in” anytime, besides his regular break at midday (12-13). Olga Freundlich also brought the public into the private sphere, holding her singing rehearsals in the music room of the family’s apartment. This proximity augmented the influence of the public on the private. The following account reveals a twofold nature of this influence. The intersection of the public and private was both disruptive and comforting.

Freundlich explains how her mother’s singing created mixed feelings for her and her father. They were both amazed by Olga Freundlich’s talent, yet jealous of the time rehearsals took from them. She relates how during rehearsals she felt slighted by her mother:

*Solang der Flügel im Musikzimmer nicht geschlossen war, konnte ich nicht hoffen, daß Mutters Proben zu Ende waren und sie für mich Zeit haben würde. Man wollte singen, sie schlug in die Tasten und intonierte. Ein Kollege setzte ein. […] Ein anderer sammelte bereits seine Noten zusammen, spürte meine Ungeduld, strich mir zerstreut übers Haar, was*
mich erst recht aufbrachte. Überflüssig, total überflüssig! Ich hätte heulen können vor Wut. (17)

In her anger and disappointment, the child Freundlich seeks solace from her father whom she describes as her “Leidensgenosse” (17). Cautiously she knocks on her father’s office door, recognizing that the work day there is nearly over. Her father’s warm welcome and his undivided attention restore her self-confidence and he quickly engages his young child in a conversation (17-18).

Despite her age, her father asks her about the Parliament, if she knows how it works and where it is located. With renewed confidence the child Freundlich describes the majestic building, situated across from the Volksgarten. She even dares to explain how “Ka-ry-a-ti-den” carry it on their backs and winged horses stand in the front (18). Obviously pleased with his child’s response, Jacques Freundlich asks Elisabeth, if she would like to go with him to the Parliament, to see firsthand how it works? This idea thrills her, even though she will have to wait two or three years, until she is old enough. Sadly, this adventure never came about, as a few years later in 1916 Jacques Freundlich was in the middle Brusilov Offensive during World War I (18-19).

We could read this account as an indictment of the public sphere’s disruption of the private, as the rehearsals97 certainly were for the child Freundlich. But the image

---

97 An examination of this relationship is also beyond the scope of this dissertation, but as Freundlich presents it, it was the rehearsals that were disruptive, not her mother’s singing. Her mother’s talent and love of the arts were a positive influence on Freundlich. As previously mentioned she attributes her own love of the arts to her mother and emphasizes this by using her mother’s maiden name as her pseudonym for her theater work.
presented here also affirms the public sphere’s positive influence. Moreover, while the positive is attached with her father and the negative with her mother in this account, this was not indicative of her relationship with her mother. It is the rehearsals that cause the disruption and led her to seek comfort and reassurance from her father. His presence and words restore the young child’s self-confidence. This role of her father as seen here – coupled with her use of primarily positive descriptors of her home life, reveal her sense of security, comfort, and belonging, all reoccurring aspects of the notion of Heimat.

The reader also encounters an idyllic image of her home life or what she calls her “goldene, problemlose Vorschulzeit” (13) in another account. Freundlich describes the family’s everyday life with an almost magic like quality revealing the innocence and naiveté of the child Freundlich. She explains the following about the workings of the Freundlich household: “Kam [Vater] mittags vom Gericht, läutete er im Erdgeschoß zweimal am Klingelbrett, und ehe er im ersten Stock die Wohnungstür aufgeschlossen hatte, stand bereits die dampfende Suppe auf dem Tisch” (13). This “reibungsloses Funktionieren” she explains, did not come from any fear of her father’s wrath as one might suspect, but rather the wish to allow Jacques Freundlich sufficient time for a nap, before returning to work (13). This one story highlights the idyllic nature of her representation of her home life, a quality that the reader can observe repeatedly.

98 Freundlich also recounts how she would sneak into her parents’ bed after her father had left for work and play while her mother slept. Although the stories she tells in Die fahrenden Jahre indicate a special bond between father and daughter, the comfort she felt in her mother’s presence is also evident.

99 For example, the Freundlich household functions “reibungslos;” it is also “bequem” and “angenehm.”
As Freundlich’s autobiography progresses into her youth and young adulthood, the influence of her private life on the public sphere can also be seen. For example, her reaction to her first day of school stands in stark contrast to those of her fellow pupils:

Vom ersten Schultag weiß ich nur noch, daß sich viele Kinder heulend an die Röcke ihrer Mütter hängten und ohne sie nicht bleiben wollten. Dafür hatte ich nicht das geringste Verständnis. Als einzige freute ich mich am Gewimmel der vielen Kinder und hatte keinen Blick mehr für meine Mutter. (33-34)

Once in Gymnasium, Freundlich displays an understanding of the interrelatedness of the public and the private. Gymnasium is the public sphere, but the socialist ideals and attitudes towards others that she has learned from and seen in her parents are reflected in her own interactions with those around her. The reader encounters a young woman who shows respect and concern for the outsider.

In these accounts, we observe a rather typical notion of Heimat. It offers solace and comfort; it is a place of security and familiarity that it is intricately linked to her parents and public spaces in Vienna. Her parents’ careers enabled the public to enter into the private, while the private also ventured out into the public. Her exchange with her father in his office exemplifies this, as does her account of her first day of school with her mother. While Olga and Jacques Freundlich were the first contributors to Elisabeth’s notion of Heimat, their place in Viennese society and their inclusion of Elisabeth in public aspects of life incorporated Vienna into her notion of Heimat. The confidence that
Freundlich exhibits on her first day of school underpins this. She ventures into a new public space with no reservation, she is secure and confident. Her knowledge of Vienna’s Parliament and her father’s obvious approval of it, reinforce the importance of this public space. The public and the private both contribute to her notion of *Heimat* and we will observe this again when she returns to post-war Austria.

**ii. Social Standing: Privilege and Responsibility**

This enfolding of the public with the private also offers an interesting perspective on the influence of Freundlich’s social standing on her notion of *Heimat*. When considering this, we must be mindful of the respect and success Jacques Freundlich had earned and of the rupture that occurred for the Freundlich family in 1934 with his arrest. Despite her father’s success and the comforts and affluence this afforded the family, their social standing was not to be taken for granted, nor used as an excuse for arrogance or the disregard of others less fortunate. Their social class brought both privilege – that was not to be misused – and responsibility.

Freundlich’s account of the *Dienstbote* story represents this well. Having a servant to assist the lady of the house with her household duties was customary in Vienna’s affluent middle class. Nevertheless, as the aforementioned story shows, her mother did not tolerate the haughty attitude her young daughter displayed. Freundlich attributes her mother’s visceral reaction towards the disrespect she showed Berta to two
things. One, her parents’ convictions and two, an incident from her mother’s youth. While at Attersee, her mother was accused of being an upstart, who was no more than the daughter of a maid (30). According to Freundlich, this incident remained with her mother and may have contributed to the force of her reaction (32).

The importance of education is another example. Thanks to the family’s standing, Freundlich has the opportunity to go to a good school and to university. As mentioned, she attends a Realgymnasium in Vienna, but struggles in her classes. One day, she cajoles her mother into allowing her to stay home. After her father learns of this, he is indignant and concerned about his daughter’s lacking sense of duty (51). Nevertheless, after she receives her Matura, she attends university, as expected. When she chooses to study Germanistics instead of law, his primary request is that she will graduate (59). A university education for his daughter was more important to Jacques Freundlich than her following in his footsteps, although he apparently would have preferred this.

What do these events tell us about Freundlich’s notion of Heimat and how do the privileges and responsibilities that stem from her social standing inform it? We can read her notion of Heimat as presented here as a place of opportunity, where one can achieve one’s goals through work and individual effort. Nevertheless, in the midst of said opportunity, the individual remains responsible to the members of the larger society or community. From this perspective, the notion of Heimat we encounter here is marked by using one’s privileges or opportunities for the greater good and linked to a deep sense of
duty. This attitude marks Freundlich’s notion of Heimat and can be observed repeatedly throughout her lifetime.

iii. Community – Political and Religious Affiliations

From Freundlich’s autobiography, we can assert that she considered herself an Austrian, who was also Jewish. In the chapter “Familiennachrichten,” we find a description of a typical bourgeois family. Her maternal grandmother runs the home, attending to her hardworking husband and hoping to find good husbands for her daughters. The family eats Mohnnuellen and the women wear Dirndl. Both maternal grandparents came to Vienna from Jewish communities in Moravia, but what Freundlich fronts here is the “Austrianness” of her mother’s family and the commonalities in Austrian Jewish and Christian bourgeois culture. Freundlich highlights this in a story about her mother, which reveals that class consciousness rules regardless of religious or ethnic background.

The Lanzer family spent several summers in Unterach am Attersee. Because of her mother’s wit, skill with a tennis racquet, and her musical talents, she was quite popular with the local young men, but not the young women. They made it abundantly clear to Olga Lanzer that her kind was not welcome; the daughter of a maid had no place seeking a husband in their circles (29-31). This story reveals the universality of class struggle. While the incident irritated Olga Freundlich for many years, it was a perfect
example to Jacques Freundlich – the staunch social democrat – for the need to fight for social justice and to abolish class privileges (31).

What I want to emphasis through these examples is the influence of political ideology on Freundlich’s notion of *Heimat* and the influence of her chosen political communities, rather than her religious affiliation. Her familial community establishes both her religious affiliation and plays the primary role in her formation as a politically and socially active adult. But her political affiliations and activities express her notion of *Heimat* in a more concrete manner than her religious affiliation does.

Her anti-fascist activities and political vigilance after her father’s arrest underscore this. She acknowledges that prior to his arrest she was simply not interested in politics, but the actions of the Austro-Fascist government have now affected her personally: “Für mich bedeuteten diese Ereignisse den Beginn meiner Politisierung und meiner antifaschistischen Aktivität” (69). The public and the private collide and with this catalyst the long influence of her parents and their political views resonate in her pursuit of a politically and socially just society.

What do her representation of her family and her emphasis on her political activities reveal about her notion of *Heimat*? First, the primary community that forms notion of *Heimat* was a typical Austrian bourgeois family. We see this in her emphasis of commonalities found in Austrian bourgeois society, rather than religious differences. Freundlich’s portrayal of her maternal grandmother highlights this. Rosa Lanzer was a woman who ran her household with fervor and sought the best possible marriage partners.
for her daughters (21). Furthermore, there is a universality in her idea of Heimat. The image she reveals of her Austrian Heimat is one that is available to all Austrians and should function as an inclusionary device, rather than the exclusionary one it became during the Nazi Era.

Freundlich also underpins her outlook in her political choices and activities, albeit reaching beyond the borders of Austria. In socialist and communist circles, Freundlich appears to have found the best expression of the inclusionary function of Heimat. She fights against all political factions that exclude people based on party affiliation. In this, we see a manifestation of her notion of Heimat in her political ideology. She includes all members of society in her realm of responsibility and desires to secure societal benefits for all. She highlights this through the words of a young American whom she met in Paris: “Aber dafür kampfen wir doch, mein Mädchen. Daß jeder Mensch zu essen hat, lesen und schreiben kann und etwas von dem genießen lernt, was uns die Dichter geben und was allen gehört soll” (73, my emphasis). Her eventual return to Vienna and her continued activities for the betterment of Viennese and Austrian society emphasize her desire to see a restoration of an all-inclusive notion of Heimat in her home.

100 Freundlich’s battle here was against Fascism; nevertheless she criticizes any organization of a political party that was unwilling to assist non-party members. And she praises the communist relief organizations, which were the most helpful, regardless of party affiliation, see 103.
b. NYC and Exile

As previously mentioned, Freundlich’s life in NYC continued in a similar fashion to the one she had lead in Austria. She was active in primarily German-speaking literary and intellectual circles and it appears that her notion of Heimat maintained its pre-exile qualities. For example, she placed the needs of her artistic and Austrian communities in the forefront: “Ich nahm sofort Kontakt mit der ‘American League of Writers’ auf, für die ich eine Liste besonders gefährdeter Schriftsteller und Publizisten mitgebracht hatte” (117) and “[f]ür mich war die wichtigste Tätigkeit in den USA die Herausgabe der literarischen Beilage der ‘Austro-American Tribune’” (121). This raises the question of the influence of a physical place – is there any for Freundlich? Or will we observe that her parents and German-speaking communities are the decisive factors that define her notion of Heimat?

Another question to consider is, was exile simply an aberration for her? Freundlich states in her autobiography that she never questioned whether or not she would return to Austria as soon as this was possible. This stands in stark contrast to the previously discussed texts. Ascher never returned to Austria to live permanently, but rather remained in the United States. As we see in Bilderbuch, she longs for her former Heimat, but her notion of Heimat changes under the influence of both the Nazi Era and NYC. Heydenau himself returned to Austria when he was unable to reestablish his literary career in the English speaking world, but the protagonist of his novel – Karl
Kramer – reinvents his life in NYC and seems to find a more complete Heimat. With Ascher and Kramer, we easily observe the reciprocal influence of Vienna and NYC on their notions of Heimat. With Freundlich this influence is more subtle.

By her account, she never seems to settle – i.e. be at home – in NYC. She lives her life, helps others, continues her education, and is able to support herself and her parents, all the while waiting for the first opportunity to return home. Her friends and acquaintances are primarily other German-speaking exiles and émigrés. Her work at the AAT does not afford her much financial remuneration, but it maintains her cultural connection to her former Heimat. With this in mind, can we expect to see any influence of NYC? If so, does this influence first manifest itself when she returns to Vienna, as we observed in Greta Hartwig’s poem?

i. Public and Private Spheres: Universities and Colleges

In light of Freundlich’s close association of her own life with historical events, it is perhaps not surprising that we find very little personal information about her life in NYC. The events she describes and the stories she tells occur primarily in public spaces. For example, she recounts her work and activities in NYC and the Northeast at universities, the AAT, with other German-speaking exiles, but only mentions her marriage to Günther Anders in a passing comment and her parents at the end of the
chapter in conjunction with the question of returning to Europe. In her autobiography, the private in NYC is relegated to an obscure corner, as if it has ceased to exist.

Given Freundlich’s emphasis on her familial community this seems unlikely. Hackl comments that Freundlich was a very discreet person regarding the relationships she presents in her autobiography (61). This could account for this gap in the text, but I would contend that what we find here is a shift in influence. I would like to refer back to Vansant’s contention that the structure and title of Freundlich’s autobiography appears “to suggest that her exile was more formative than her childhood” (32). That she fronts her activities and community in exile over accounts of her private life – one she obviously had – supports Vansant’s assertion. But what role did NYC have in this? At first glance, NYC is a location in which she continues her work to preserve her former Heimat; it is a location that only offers contrasting representations, in which differences are highlighted. Whatever similarities she finds, are found in other exiles or émigrés.

For example, Freundlich both instructs at and attends university. Her observations reveal fundamental differences in the systems and in the attitudes of both the American professors and students to their European counterparts. As a student, Freundlich experiences multiple choice tests for the first time. She describes this method of testing as completely foreign to her and the other émigrés in her program. Then she contrasts this to the reaction of her American colleagues towards them: “Aber wir schrieben alles auf, was uns für die Antwort wichtig erschien. Das wiederum kam den Amerikanern ganz merkwürdig vor” (118). While she mentions the collegiality that existed with all her
fellow students, she fronts the differences with this account of a testing method and also reminds the reader that she and the other exiles have more than just school on their minds. Many of them were still actively trying to rescue family and friends from Europe (118). Thus her contact to the American students ends outside of the university.

Freundlich’s experiences as a lecturer and professor gave her insight into the other side of American collegiate life. She lectured at Princeton University during the war and then at Wheaton College (MA) following the war. At Princeton, she observed students being disrespectful towards the professors; she connects this to the fact that most of the students came from wealthy families. This attitude is unacceptable to Freundlich – which points back to her own upbringing – and she chastises her students (129). But her assessment of this attitude may also be explained in another of her observations.

She comments that both Wheaton and Princeton allowed guest lecturers who did not have the credentials for a regular professorship. This gave them an income they otherwise would not have had.101 She also describes her colleagues at Wheaton as “aufmerksam und kontaktfreudig…Es gab unter ihnen so außergewöhnliche Menschen, die vom Typ her in Europa niemals hätten eine Universitätsstelle bekleiden können, unkonventionelle, menschlich großartige Kollegen” (131). Her praise of the humanity of her colleagues contrasts what one would find at European institutions. Here we can assert that the openness and attentiveness of her colleagues may have contributed to the casual

101 Freundlich does not state this explicitly, but she appears to be referring to other literary exiles here, who could have been particularly beneficial for her classes on the history of theater, see 131.
and disrespectful attitude she observed in the students; an attitude that the highbrowed professor at Europe’s universities would simply not have allowed.

ii. Social Standing: Less Privilege, More Responsibility

In many ways, Freundlich’s representation of NYC through the frame of social standing parallels this frame of her life in post-Civil War Austria; I would assert that it is merely an extension of it. Freundlich does not explicitly state this, but the reader can observe this in her accounts. As mentioned above, Heimat through the frame of social standing is a place of opportunity and where the individual remains responsible to the members of the larger society.

How does NYC allow her to act out of this understanding of Heimat? Upon arriving there, Freundlich first seeks opportunities to help her friends and acquaintances in Europe. She contacts relief agencies and government offices with lists of those in particular danger. After this, she contacts other Austrian exiles and becomes involved in the activities of the German-speaking community. Then she begins to look for work for herself.

Freundlich’s accounts reveal that her primary emphasis was on the needs of the larger society. Her parents and she are in safety; now she has the responsibility to help others. That she was a member of the Austro-American Association and from 1944 editor of the cultural section of the AAT show that her idea of the greater society was still
intimately connected to Austria. In her associations and activities, she attempts to maintain the continuity of Austria’s cultural heritage, in hopes that the Nazis would one day be defeated. Exile scholarship shows that this was an activity shared by the larger community of German-speaking exile authors.102

It is clear that NYC and the United States provide the opportunity she no longer had in Vienna, to work unencumbered for the betterment of society. But the societal good for which she worked, is unmistakably for Austria and Europe. NYC appears to be a means to an end; it offers opportunity. But for Freundlich, it is not the opportunity to become a part of the larger society there or rediscover her Heimat as we see with Ascher and Kramer, but rather for the preservation of Austrian culture until the eventual liberation of Austria, which remains the central locality in her notion of Heimat.

iii. Community: Exiles and Émigrés

The community she seeks in exile seems to support the abovementioned assertion. Her community in NYC and the United States is found in exile and émigré circles; with these groups she shares a common background and common goals. They could discuss aspects of their former everyday lives in Austria, as well as the far reaching cultural heritage they wished to preserve. As an illustration of this, we learn from Freundlich how important the banal became in exile; Freundlich explains how NYC’s German Quarter

102 For discussions of this, see Durzak, “Deutschsprachige Exilliteratur” 9-10; Heilbut 39; Koepke, “Probleme und Problematik” 338; Pfanner, “Austro-American Tribune” 211-12; Winckler 72-3.
had become a meeting place for the exiles and émigrés. She claims that its importance lie primarily in the culinary realm. Even if they were only visiting NYC, German-speaking exiles went there for a good meal. The Austrians among them also discussed proper Viennese *Mehlspeisen*. In this community, *Heimat* was revisited in seemingly commonplace things, such as dumplings and sauerkraut, which united an otherwise diverse group of people (119).

Her work at the AAT and with the *Aurora-Verlag* brought her into contact with many exiled German-speaking authors. By Freundlich’s account, this was a time of great activity for her. What underscores the importance of the German-speaking community is how she fronts her work and activities within it. As an editor at the AAT, she contributed to the intellectual and cultural lives of her fellow exiles. Moreover, as a representative of Austrian exiled authors, she worked with the founders of the *Aurora-Verlag*, a group of German-speaking authors who wished to return to Europe after the war and shape the literary scene.

What do her activities and connection to the larger German-speaking exile community show us about her notion of *Heimat* as it relates to NYC? They show that Freundlich’s notion is so anchored in Vienna and Austria that NYC simply plays a

---

103 She shares an anecdote along these lines about a meeting with Berthold Brecht, who supported the AAT. She came to his apartment after a long day of work to discuss the AAT with him. Brecht recognized that she was exhausted, had her rest and eat first, and then they began their work, see 124.

104 Freundlich notes that the AAT was primarily intended for Austrian exiles, but not exclusively. She also sought contributions from German writers.

105 Freundlich lists the following: Wieland Herzfelde, Bertholt Brecht, Ernst Bloch, Ferdinand Bruckner, Alfred Döblin, Lion Feuchtwanger, Oskar Maria Graf, Heinrich Mann Berthold Viertel, Ernst Waldinger, and F. C. Weiskopf, see 124-25.
supporting role or is the stage – if you will – that provides a forum for sustaining her notion of Heimat, it is a space, in which Freundlich functions as a representative of her physical and cultural Heimat, rather than a contributor to said notion. Her commitment to the preservation and restoration of her image of this Heimat mark her time in NYC, rather than NYC transforming it.

E. The Interaction of Heimat and Exile, and the Influence of Memory

Prior to the final chapter of Die fahrenden Jahre, the reader sees little interaction between Heimat and exile. It appears – almost – as if Freundlich lived isolated from the influence of the United States. NYC was not her new home, it was a temporary residence. As presented in “Tribüne Amerika,” she spent the vast majority of her energies on preserving her home culture and nurturing relationships with other like-minded exiles, intellectuals, and artists, who were also waiting to return home. Moreover, prior to the final chapter of the autobiography we find almost no sense of longing for Heimat while she is in NYC in her depictions. This impression could be the result of Freundlich’s “factual” approach to her autobiography and how the story revolves around historic events, rather than personal ones.

Nevertheless, the question remains how limited this interaction between Heimat and exile actually was? I strongly agree with Helmut Pfanner’s observation that the emigrant cannot simply return to his or her former Heimat and live in the same manner
(“In einer geborgten Heimat” 75). For this reason, I would expect to find evidence of the influence of the exile city on an exiles notion of Heimat. With Freundlich though, the interaction of Heimat and exile appears to be very limited. But the final chapter of Freundlich’s autobiography affirms Pfanner’s assertion and reveals that NYC exerts some influence. 

Freundlich’s fronting of her activities in the exile and émigré communities of NYC reveals the function of her exile home. It was a space that fostered her former Heimat, while it could not subsist in the political state that existed during her exile. NYC provided a space within a space that helped preserve Heimat in its image prior to Hitler’s occupation of Austria. Moreover, in that space the exiles could prepare for their Heimat’s release from an unjust power. 

But NYC was more than just a space and Freundlich reveals two ways in which it influenced her. Upon returning to Vienna, the city is completely foreign to her and she reacts in such a way that is reminiscent of Hartwig’s lyrical persona. This estrangement was not only caused by the bombed out and burned buildings she saw in postwar Vienna, but also the perceived smallness of the city. After her many years of living amongst skyscrapers, Vienna had shrunk (133). 

Later we see the influence of NYC on Freundlich’s cultural tastes, which bears similarities to Ascher’s tale of the Viennese music critic. Freundlich recalls how she longed for classic theater in NYC; once in Vienna she returns to its war torn theaters, but what she experiences there disappoints her:

Interestingly, Freundlich initially blames the changes in Viennese theater on the influence of the Nazis, but upon reflection recognizes the influence of her time in NYC. Like Ascher, Freundlich has grown accustomed to American theater. Back in Vienna, she reacts to a cadence and gestures that now seem exaggerated. And like Hartwig’s lyrical persona, her longing for classic theater cannot be fulfilled. The influence of NYC has become a part of her identity and sensibilities, but in such a subtle way that she first recognizes this after her return to Vienna.

This account also shows Freundlich did long for her Viennese notion of Heimat in NYC. She missed classic theater as she knew it from home, but she also longed for another element of her Heimat Vienna. Despite the fact that Vienna appears so small after years of living in NYC, she still longed for its cityscape and the natural beauty found in its midst. According to Blickle, in German-speaking cultures the concepts of nature and identity are “curiously interdependent” (114). As with the German idea of Heimat, he traces the origins of this connection to late 18th Century German philosophy. In this case,
he asserts that the rise of an idealized nature in German-speaking culture came as a reaction to emphasis on reason in Kantian philosophy. German Romanticism counteracted this emphasis by restoring the centrality of emotion and nature in an idealized form (113-14). This creates a mythification of nature and Blickle further claims that “[t]he modern idea of Heimat is another way in which this mythification of nature expresses itself” (114).

While I recognize that this understanding of nature is coupled with a rural landscape and not a cityscape, I see a connection here to Freundlich’s notion of Heimat. The mythification of nature – as seen in conjunction with the notion of Heimat – imbues it with qualities of innocence, purity, and perfection. In the following quote from Freundlich we see this. In it, she expresses her affection for the natural beauty of her physical Heimat and shows the particular power this natural beauty wields: Vienna’s natural beauty – innocent and pure in the midst of the cityscape – feeds her long felt desires to be back in Vienna.

Wie in einem Lied besungen, schäumte auf dem Heldenplatz der Flieder wie eh und je und wußte nicht, was sich hier zugetragen hatte; in der Prater-Hauptalle reckten die Kastanien die weißen und roten Kerzen in ihrer ganzen Pracht in die Luft, und das alles, wonach ich mich die ganzen Jahre gesehnt hatte, machte mich wehrlos gegen vieles andere. (133-34)

In this quote, we not only see nature’s pivotal role in her notion of Heimat, but also the extent of Freundlich’s longings for Heimat. The emotions that the lilac bushes and
chestnut trees evoke seem to remove the ugliness of the events that occurred there.\textsuperscript{106} Despite the gruesome recent history in Vienna, its natural beauty remains unchanged and is reminiscent of earlier days. Nature here can be read as one bridge that reconnects Freundlich to the city that once rejected her.

Furthermore, it appears in this instance that the notion \textit{Heimat} trumps historical memory: the idyllic characteristic of \textit{Heimat} supersedes historical evidence. But this is not the case for Freundlich. These accounts reveal her strong desire to be back in her \textit{Heimat} Vienna and her inability to resist its charms, but the autobiography – as a whole – points to Freundlich’s overarching wish to represent the events of her life in conjunction with the public and historic events that shaped it. The chestnut trees and lilac bushes make her “defenseless,” but she has not forgotten. Her reference to \textit{Heldenplatz} makes this abundantly clear. Still, cognizant of the weakness of her own memories, she uses various materials – both personal and historic – to supplement the gaps therein (22-23; 26: 34: 69).

One reoccurring way she does this is by giving voice to others. She implements their words to express not only what she feels and experiences, but also what she understands as communal. For example, she quotes Franz Werfel to describe the emotions of Austrian exiles in France prior to the Nazi takeover and uses the words of Tibor Déry to explain why it is good and right for her to return to Austria after World

\textsuperscript{106} Her reference to Vienna’s \textit{Heldenplatz} reveals the extent of the influence of its natural beauty, making it all the more poignant.
This technique bolsters her memories and connects her firmly to her communities, communities which also represent various aspects of her notion of *Heimat*.

F. Conclusion


With these words Freundlich acknowledges the difficulties – the distrust of the Austrian government and fellow Austrians; the disinterest in cooperative work and judgment of younger Austrian authors – she faced returning to Vienna. She concedes that although it was a very difficult time, the decision was the correct one for her. She belonged in Vienna, despite the fact that Vienna drove her away and did not call her back.

What is particularly striking about this is her commitment to faithfully represent both the historic events of her lifetime and her memories in *Die fahrenden Jahre*, while she openly acknowledges her longing for Vienna. Despite the city’s history, it remains the central locality for her *Heimat* image. We observe Vienna’s importance in all three
notions of *Heimat* in this dissertation; For Ascher though, it is an idealized image of pre-*Anschluß* Vienna and for Heydenau’s Kramer it is an imperfect image that informs his likes and dislikes, the moral and cultural norms to which he adheres, but it also restricts the desires of his heart, thus losing its centrality to NYC. In Freundlich’s representation of Vienna the conflict that arises between the historical events and her own longings is resolved through her deep sense of belonging to her familial, political, and artistic communities, coupled with her sense of responsibility toward Austria. Her return can be understood as the culmination of her attitude toward Vienna, which in turn cements Vienna’s centrality for her notion of *Heimat*.

This centrality did not occur by happenstance. It developed in the public and private spheres of Freundlich’s life and in her communities. It exemplifies the interaction of the individual and the collective, as well as the enfolding of the public with the private, all key contributors to the notion of *Heimat*. For Freundlich’s image, these contributions came in the form of her parents and upbringing, Vienna’s cityscape and natural beauty, historic events, and the artistic and political communities of which she was apart. They all molded her character, contributed to her memories, and shaped the course of her life.

Finally, Freundlich tells “her” story in *Die fahrenden Jahre*, while relying on her communities and their memories to confirm it. At times it seems as if she wrote her autobiography with the words of Maurice Halbwachs in mind: “We cannot properly understand [memories’] relative strength and the ways in which they combine within individual thought unless we connect the individual to the various groups of which he is
simultaneously a member” (53). In *Die fahrenden Jahre*, Freundlich makes the connection for the reader and the strength of her memories is made apparent by her commitment to the communities that contribute to them and the notion of *Heimat* she presents out of them.
Conclusion: Exile and the Notion of Heimat

As the title of this dissertation indicates, I have undertaken an examination of the notion of Heimat as it intersects with memory through the representations of Vienna and NYC in autobiographical exile literature. I contend that characteristics of NYC allow exiles to (re)discover elements of their former Heimat, as they come to terms with their new lives in the United States. To show this, I combine Heimat studies and memory theory with exile studies, and so offer an interdisciplinary approach. In recent years, such an approach has been embraced by exile scholars, stemming partially from the consensus of said scholars that many resources remain untapped. For my research, I find the combination of literary, sociological, and cultural studies beneficial, as exile studies examines texts and materials from authors, historians, sociologists, artists, etc. who were forced out of environments that many considered Heimat. Their notion of Heimat and their memories were thus brought into question; their written or artistic work became a medium through which many attempted to confront their circumstances.

This consequence of exile and my desire to investigate the notion of Heimat guided my decision to use autobiographical literature. Still, as my dissertation is not a genre study, my wish to analyze representations of Vienna and NYC determined my final text selection. Of the three, only Freundlich’s Die fahrenden Jahre is an autobiography in the traditional sense. Yet, although the text spans her lifetime, it focuses predominately on her life and family in pre-Hitler Vienna and her time in exile. Ascher’s Bilderbuch aus
der Fremde is a memoir of her experience from the eve of the Anschluß to the end of World War II and Heydenau’s Auf und ab is an exile novel with autobiographical traits that recounts the journey of a Viennese exile to NYC. It is the foci of the books, combined with their autobiographical nature that I find compelling for my analysis.

Furthermore, the use of two major cities for this undertaking is a slight departure from mainstream Heimat studies, in which the predominant locality associated with the German notion of Heimat is a rural setting away from the city. Nevertheless, as the texts examined here reveal, an urban setting can have a central function in the development of one’s notion of Heimat. The approach taken here highlights the commonalities found in the formation of memories and the notion of Heimat, while I consider the social and cultural exchange that occurs between the original and exile Heimat. In particular, I highlight the communal or collective aspect of both memories and the notion of Heimat in their formation, as I emphasize that both belong distinctly to an individual.

As chapter one shows, the United States – like many countries – played a crucial role for many exiles. It was a land of refuge, but also a land of trials. Once exiles had successfully navigated a US-bureaucracy that showed remnants the country’s isolationist tendencies, they found themselves out of harm’s way, but confronted with a new culture and language that made daily life difficult at times. The chapter illustrates how exile studies began in exile under these difficult circumstances that persisted to some extent for decades. Exile scholars had to establish the validity of the field within the larger frame of Germanistics and shake off the biases that existed towards exiles and their literature.
Moreover, the chapter fronts research trends in subsequent decades, in particular the call for an interdisciplinary approach to exile studies which influenced the approach presented here.

The latter half of the chapter establishes the connection between the notion of Heimat and memory as seen in literary texts. I emphasize three specific aspects of the notion of Heimat: fluidity – as seen in Heimat’s transformation under the influence of exile; identity – Heimat is identity; and social construction – the underlying commonality between Heimat and memory. This commonality is underscored by such aspects as the formation of self and social or cultural norms as they relate to a collective.

Chapter two presents an analysis of the notion of Heimat found in Franzi Ascher’s Bilderbuch aus der Fremde. In considering Ascher’s representations of Vienna and NYC through the frames of public and private spaces, social class, and community, I show that each frame presents a different perspective of Ascher’s notion. Through these frames, I argue that an image of Heimat with two distinct qualities emerges from the correlating representations of Vienna and NYC. One, Ascher’s notion is fluid; it undergoes a transformation during the course of her exile. And two, it is intricately linked to her identity. Moreover, both of these aspects underline the reciprocal influence of her former life and life in exile.

Ascher’s own understanding of her relationship to Vienna and NYC support this contention. She recognizes that her identity is intimately linked to both cities; both have formed and informed her as a person. Furthermore, her image of both cities undergoes a
drastic change, due to her exile. Vienna was once her only home; the city, her family, and community there all contribute to her original notion of Heimat, but the annexation of Austria and the Nazi takeover transformes Vienna into something she no longer recognizes. For Ascher, the Heimat Vienna ceases to exist after March 13, 1938.

As the Heimat Vienna ceases to exist on March 13, 1938, NYC begins to exist on December 9, 1938, initially as place of refuge, yet foreign and incomprehensible. Nevertheless, as I have shown, Ascher rediscovers her Heimat in NYC in the form of an idealized image of Vienna and in NYC’s own imprint on her life. Both this image of pre-annexation Austria and her internalization of the transformation she undergoes in NYC allow her to return to a place of security – a key characteristic of the notion of Heimat. And with this security, a hopeful outlook for the future also returns.

Beginning in a similar manner to chapter two, chapter three discusses the notion of Heimat found in Friedrich Heydenau’s exile novel Auf und ab. Viewing the representations of Vienna and NYC in the novel through the aforementioned frames, I assert that both cities again play central roles for the main protagonist’s notion of Heimat. Yet at the same time, there is a fundamental difference. Vienna is an imperfect image of Heimat as it restricts the protagonist’s desire to be a musician, while NYC represents a perfect Heimat that frees him to fulfill all his desires and maintain a lifestyle he was accustomed to in his former home.

I argue this by highlighting characteristics of his notion of Heimat that are revealed in his attitudes and sensibilities towards the following: the “finer things of life”
as they relates to Vienna, the role of women and relationship, and a new found freedom as it relates to NYC. I contend his ability to recreate the Esskultur of Austria and his discovery of the elegant hotel district in NYC, his marriage to an idealized woman, and his release from the life of a well-respected bureaucrat to that of a well-respected jazz band conductor all reveal that within the locality of NYC the protagonist has found his ideal home; his notion of Heimat is fulfilled in a way that was not possible in his restrictive image of Vienna. While the city of his birth remains a part of his identity as his stage name – Charly de Grinzing – shows, it is the life that NYC affords him with a wife, a music career, and its elegance that characterize of his notion of Heimat.

In the final chapter of this dissertation, the autobiography of Elisabeth Freundlich – Die fahrenden Jahre – provides the medium for an analysis of the author’s notion of Heimat. Following the pattern established in the previous chapters, the analysis of her notion of Heimat reveals the centrality Vienna coupled with her familial, artistic, and political communities for her notion of Heimat. Moreover, Freundlich’s notion diverges from the previous two in that – as I argue – NYC is not integrated into it. I acknowledge that we find NYC influencing Freundlich, but a close examination of her representation of both Vienna and NYC show that her notion of Heimat remains firmly imbedded within her image of Vienna and her communities.

In this chapter, I show that NYC remains the space in which she sustains her notion and support this by highlighting the importance of her connection to and work within the larger German-speaking exile community. She – like many exiles – waits for
the opportunity to return to her physical *Heimat*, in order to restore the cultural and intellectual continuity that was broken by the Nazi powers. Moreover, by emphasizing the importance of her familial, artistic, and political (Freundlich was an active socialist who sought to improve society with political activism) communities, I document the collective nature of her notion of *Heimat*.

In conclusion, the literary texts examined in this dissertation reveal both the individual and collective nature of the notion of *Heimat*. I show that each text represents a different understanding of *Heimat*, while they all share certain commonalities. For example, the centrality of Vienna for all three notions cannot be overstated; nevertheless the function of Vienna varies in each. On a similar vein, I have shown that NYC is a contributor to the notions of *Heimat* found here. On one hand, it becomes an integral part of the notions of *Heimat*: its influence informs identity and shapes perspective, and on the other hand, it is a secure, yet temporary space in which *Heimat* is sustained and preserved until it can be restored to its former space.

Furthermore, while this work reveals traditional elements of *Heimat* such as its correlation to identity or its social/communal quality, it has also departed from the traditional notion. One, we have examples of a notion of *Heimat* that is fluid. For example, rather than revealing a fixed and stable attachment to Vienna, the influence of NYC transforms the notion by altering the author’s or protagonist’s perception of Vienna and/or cultural aspects associated with it; and two, all three literary texts examined in this dissertation show the importance of cityscape over nature in the formation of *Heimat*. 
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Nature has its role, but it is seen in conjunction with its place within the city, rather than being a primary contributor the notion of Heimat.

In conclusion, this dissertation fills several notable gaps in exile studies. First, I have analyzed works of lesser known authors and shown that while an adequate representation of NYC may be lacking in the works of renowned exile authors, it is certainly present in the literary texts examined here and deserving of further research. Two, I have offered a dissertation devoted to Austrian exile literature, which has to date been a rare undertaking. This may be due to the situation in Austria; exile research is viewed by many to be negligible within the broader context of Germanistics and the reception of exile literature to date has been limited. Finally, to reiterate, my interdisciplinary approach employs elements of Heimat studies – offering a new perspective on the notion of Heimat – and collective memory theory – emphasizing memory’s commonalities with the notion of Heimat, while highlighting the reciprocal influence of locality on both. For these reasons, it is my wish that the analysis presented here will serve as a departure point for further investigations that will cross disciplinary boundaries, while benefiting both exile studies and the larger community of Germanistics.
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