

Jon Hughes

***AJR Information* in the Context of German-language Exile Journal Publication,
1933-1945**

Of the many hundreds of publications founded by exiles, emigrants and refugees from German-speaking Central Europe in the twelve years of Nazi rule in Germany, very few were able or even wished to continue after 1945. Only two are still published and read to this day. The first is *Aufbau*, founded in 1934 as the newsletter of the New York German-Jewish Club, and one of the most widely distributed and widely read German-language journals during the Second World War; the other is the journal established by the Association of Jewish Refugees, known for over fifty years as *AJR Information*, and now appearing monthly as the *AJR Journal*. Of course, in one or two important respects, *AJR Information* differs from a publication such as *Aufbau*. It was not formally established as a regular journal until 1946, though it had been appearing irregularly since 1941, and it was published from the start predominantly in English rather than in German.¹ Despite these differences, the origins of the vast majority of *AJR Information*'s readers, contributors and editors in the German-speaking areas of Germany, Austria, and Czechoslovakia justify a consideration of the journal in the broader context of the newspapers, journals and newsletters of the German-speaking 'exile' community. This is not, however, to say that I consider *AJR Information* to be an 'exile journal'; as we shall see, this was not how the journal saw itself, and the discussions in the pages of the postwar editions make very clear that the Jewish refugee community in Britain no longer looked to mainland Europe and the German language as significant markers of cultural identity.

By the time of the establishment of the Association of Jewish Refugees in 1941, German-language publication beyond the reach of the oppression, censorship and threats of Hitler's Germany already had an eight-year history, although the War had meant the closure of almost all the titles based in Europe.² Only the Soviet Union could provide enough stability to enable publication through the War. It is nevertheless appropriate, I feel, for us to acknowledge the importance of publishing in exile from the German Reich, given the close ties of many of the first members of the AJR to the broader anti-fascist exile community, many of whose members had been forced to leave Germany for political reasons as early as 1933.

First, perhaps, I should attempt a definition of what we mean by an 'exile' publication. Of course, at a basic level, any publication established by individuals forced out of Germany by Hitler's policies and actions is an 'exile' or 'refugee' journal of sorts. We can, however, be a little more specific. There were certain characteristics and functions, which might be considered typical of German exile publications, and which to some degree were common to all, despite a diversity of stated aims and political leanings. These include: the provision of a forum for exiled German-language writers, criticism of and agitation against Hitler and the National Socialists through comment or satire; warning of the threat of war, and from 1939 reporting the war; strengthening and supporting illegal, underground resistance in Germany; maintaining and continuing what was sometimes referred to as the 'cultural inheritance' ('das kulturelle Erbe') of what was perceived as the 'true' or 'other' Germany.³ One might add to this list a more practical role, which became increasingly vital towards the end of the 1930s and during the War. This was to provide emigrants with information about the necessities of everyday life such as residence permits, the acquisition of visas, and the payment of rent. For some, an engagement with the cultural and

political life of the 'host' country was also a priority. These important functions could be fulfilled more quickly and cheaply in a newspaper, newsletter, or magazine than in books, which took time, a lot of money and considerable effort to produce, and whose publishers were plagued by financial and distribution problems, as well as a diminishing market.

However, although these characteristics were shared to a greater or lesser extent by all such publications, the variety displayed within this framework and the sheer number of different publications produced provide impressive testimony to the determination and spirit of those forced out of Germany in fear for their lives, as well as to an optimistic and a desperate faith in the power of the written word to make a difference. The exiled journalist and novelist Joseph Roth, in a 1937 article for a Polish newspaper, exemplifies this attitude, distinguishing the *words* of the exiled writers from the clichéd *phrases* of Nazi propaganda:

Wir müssen uns eingestehen, daß unsere einzige Waffe das Wort ist. Es ist eine mächtige, gefährliche und sogar magische Waffe, aber sie ist weder scharf noch direkt. [...] Die vertriebenen deutschen Schriftsteller sind fremd, wie Israel in Ägypten fremd war. Überall, so weit das Auge reicht, sind neue Pharaonen zu sehen. Und nur der Glaube an ein Wunder befähigt die Schriftsteller, ihre Existenz physisch und literarisch fortzusetzen. Es ist aber ein berechtigter Glaube an ein Wunder. Denn am Anfang war das Wort – nicht die Phrase.⁴

In Paris and Prague, in New York and Mexico City, in Jerusalem and Shanghai, men and women sought to contribute to the fight against fascism and to preserve their voice as Hitler sought to silence them. These journals clearly often looked back to the great flowering of the liberal, free press during the Weimar Republic, and modelled themselves on newspapers such as the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, the *Tagebuch*, and the *Neue Rundschau*. Others were straightforwardly political, banging the drum for communism, social democracy or for trade unions. Others again represented specific interests, such as those of Christian and Jewish emigrés, or of

national groups such as Czechs and Austrians, but it is fair to say that all were united in a common belief and common cause: the belief was in the notion of a 'true' Germany and in the German language as something to be treasured and used, and the cause was the fight against fascism.

Paris provided a home for a number of important exile journals, including the liberal *Pariser Tageblatt* and *Das Neue Tage-Buch*, the latter published by the famous economic journalist and editor Leopold Schwarzschild. In Moscow the Soviet state subsidised the publication of the journal *Internationale Literatur*, edited by the communist poet Johannes R. Becher and one of the few such journals to be published continuously throughout Hitler's years in power; and in 1936, the more moderate journal *Das Wort* was launched in Moscow; in Prague the Marxist publisher Wieland Herzfelde founded the *Neue Deutsche Blätter*, and in 1936 the *Jüdische Revue* went to press in the same city. In Amsterdam, Thomas Mann's son Klaus established the ambitious literary review *Die Sammlung*, whose internationally renowned patrons included André Gide, Aldous Huxley and Heinrich Mann. In Zürich, in 1937, Thomas Mann himself founded a bi-monthly journal dedicated to 'freie deutsche Kultur', entitled programmatically *Maß und Wert*. In New York *Aufbau*, as I have already noted, started life as the internal bulletin of the German-Jewish Club and soon became one of the most important journals of its time, and certainly the most significant for German-speaking emigrants and refugees in the USA, both Jewish and non-Jewish. There were of course many others, but significantly very few in Britain until after the outbreak of War. Indeed, it took British government sponsorship to create a major German-language newspaper in this country. *Die Zeitung* was established in the same year as the AJR, 1941, and was intended as a forum to unite German-speakers in

Britain, whose potential and opinions many in the government felt had been ignored for too long.⁵

However, though I have sketched a number of the attributes exile publications had in common, I would not want to give the impression of a harmonious and friendly collaboration in a single project, or of a healthy and friendly rivalry. Far from it; in fact, the exile and refugee community, whose energies allowed these numerous publications to emerge, was anything but united and harmonious, but was fractious and divided. And indeed, why *should* it have been united? It was one of the peculiarities of the National Socialists' intolerance that they persecuted numerous different groups, including many with little sympathy for each other. Nevertheless, in retrospect, the relative pettiness of some of the disputes and divisions within the emigrant communities is depressing. In Paris, the editors of the two journals I mentioned quarrelled in the controversial period of the 'popular front', the abortive attempt to unite diverse political groups in the fight against fascism. Leopold Schwarzschild, the editor of the *Neue Tage-Buch*, was at heart an old-fashioned conservative, and his political and economic views expressed themselves increasingly in an aggressive anti-Marxist and anti-communist stance. This, naturally, infuriated and stirred up resentment amongst the many left-wingers and Marxists living in Paris, dividing the community at a time when solidarity would have served them better. The journals based in the Soviet Union, and especially Becher's *Internationale Literatur*, though they provided a significant forum for the publication of work by new talents and famous names, including many who were not themselves Marxists, were perhaps less effective than they could have been had they not been limited by the editorial espousal of communist party policies and a dislike of 'bourgeois' tendencies amongst exiled liberals. Despite this, *Das Wort* was considered to be too moderate, and its

funding dried up with the end of communist interest in promoting a 'popular front' in 1939. The downfall of Klaus Mann's *Die Sammlung*, by contrast, lay in its inclusiveness; the only 'tendency' it could be said to have represented is a broad anti-fascism and a belief in freedom of expression. Hence it published essays, articles and fiction by liberals such as Hermann Kesten, reborn conservatives such as Joseph Roth, hardline communists like Johannes Becher, and a range of other material by such significant figures as Bertolt Brecht, Leon Trotzky, Jean Cocteau, Ernst Bloch, Boris Pasternak, Aldous Huxley and Ernest Hemingway. This extraordinary range, however, did not generate profits, and without a party sponsor or willing benefactor the journal folded after twenty-four issues. High-brow quality and intellectualism, perhaps unsurprisingly, did not pay, and the journal was not helped by the reluctance of some German writers, whose books had not yet been banned in Germany, to contribute to a publication despised by the German government. Eventually, a similar fate was met by Thomas Mann's rather less polemical and ambitious literary review *Maß und Wert*, whose focus on literary, historical and aesthetic topics was criticised by some for its irrelevance to the urgent and immediate political situation in Europe. With this in mind, it is perhaps unsurprising that the most successful format for an exile publication was that exemplified by *Aufbau*, which achieved a balance between news, political and cultural commentary, practical issues and intellectually stimulating material, and after a number of false starts attracted enough revenue through advertising and sales to balance the books. A similar recipe was put into practice by the founding editors of the London-based *Zeitung* in 1941. Its government sponsorship ensured financial security, and yet it maintained a high degree of editorial freedom - it was not simply the 'Propagandablatt' which some, a little unfairly, considered it.⁶ From the start it stressed its desire to be inclusive and open to all opinion, and it

attempted to balance news, practical issues, *Feuilleton* content of type familiar from newspapers like the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, and even satire. Despite the attractive recipe it managed to create controversy and earn a good deal of contempt from idealistic left-wingers in Britain who, with the paranoia typical of dangerous times, did not trust some of its editors and contributors, and felt the newspaper to be a bourgeois irrelevance.

It was into this fractious climate that *AJR Information*, as it came to be known, was born. The Association of Jewish Refugees was in fact founded, and shortly thereafter its first bulletin to members produced, almost simultaneously with the launch of the *Zeitung* newspaper in London. This is presumably no more than a coincidence, but it is noticeable that the events were acknowledged, approvingly, in *Die Zeitung's* pages. Reflecting the AJR's agenda for its first decade or so of existence, *Die Zeitung* reported on 6 October 1941 that the AJR's bulletin, or 'Druckschrift', 'will in engster Zusammenarbeit mit den bestehenden Committees die Interessen der jüdischen Refugees auf rechtlichem, arbeitspolitischem und sozialem Gebiete wahrnehmen und an einer lebendigen Verbindung mit dem englischen Judentum arbeiten'.⁷ In the months thereafter *Die Zeitung* regularly reported on the activities of the AJR, in such detail that it is plain that the AJR's founding members were not amongst the newspaper's numerous critics. On the contrary, it is likely that the publicity the German-language newspaper provided was very welcome at a point when financial constrictions and paper shortages prevented its own publication from achieving the sort of circulation the Association would have liked.

It is interesting, with these reports in mind, to observe the attitude adopted by *Die Zeitung* towards the AJR and its publication. What is immediately apparent is that it did not consider the nascent *AJR Information*, little more than a newsletter at this

stage, to be a rival or comparable publication. If we accept that the aforementioned list of attributes of 'exile' publications after 1933, whilst not exhaustive, at least provides us with a framework for the categorisation of publications, how should we treat the young *AJR Information*?

The first attribute - the provision of a forum for German-speaking writers and journalists - of course does not really apply to *AJR Information*, for although the AJR counted numerous experienced and well-established writers and journalists amongst its ranks, many of whom became frequent contributors to the journal, its language of choice, pointedly, was not German but English. This decision, in part, must be attributed to the AJR's practical desire, expressed from the outset, for its members to be viewed by the British, both non-Jewish and Jewish, not as 'foreigners' temporarily resident here and unwilling to change their ways, but as aspirant British citizens, eager to be integrated into British society and to feel comfortable among the ranks of existing Anglo-Jewry. The government's unfair policy of interning all 'aliens', Jews included, as potential Nazi spies provided an official reminder of British hostility towards all things German. Perhaps more so than in other European countries, German-speaking newcomers had reason to feel self-conscious in a Britain which then (as now) was not quite comfortable with its European identity. Unlike in Prague, Amsterdam, Paris and many of the other chosen destinations for people leaving Germany, there existed virtually no German-speaking community. Indeed, until the escalation of events in Germany in 1938, Britain had accepted relatively few refugees from Germany, although of course this changed very quickly in the following years, with Britain accepting as many as 70,000 refugees from German-speaking Europe alone. Those exiles and refugees who had been in Britain for a longer period had rapidly learnt that the way to survive was to learn English and adopt a British lifestyle,

and this meant that, if one was accustomed to writing and publishing in German, one would have to change. In the words of Gabriele Tergit, a prominent journalist and successful novelist in Weimar Germany who was a frequent contributor to *AJR Information* until the 1970s: 'Wer in England literarisch Fuß zu fassen versuchte, mußte sich der englischen Sprache bedienen, da es ein deutsch lesendes Publikum kaum gab.'⁸ There are numerous examples of refugees and exiles doing just this in Britain: Arthur Koestler became a correspondent for the London *News Chronicle* and went on to become a significant English-language novelist; Sebastian Haffner achieved a critical and popular success with his analysis of Germany, *Germany, Jekyll and Hyde*, published in 1940, and went on to write for the *Observer*. Paul Marcus, a Viennese journalist who went by the pseudonym 'PEM' arrived in Britain and transformed his self-published journal *PEMs Private Berichte* into *PEM's Personal Bulletin* for the British market. Robert Neumann, another famous novelist, switched to English, or as he described it, 'eine Sprache, die Nichtengländer für Englisch halten'.⁹ There were of course many others who never achieved popular or financial success in the English-speaking world, for not every writer was capable of making the change successfully.

This, then, is the context of *AJR Information's* inception, and it seems quite clear that the decision to publish in English was obvious. Yet it would be a mistake to assume from this that the early years of the AJR and its accompanying publication should be viewed separately from the German-speaking exile community in Britain and across the world, for the ties were numerous and not so easily broken. Indeed, we need only examine the publishing activities of some of the most prominent early members of the AJR to establish this. We might take, for example, Gabriele Tergit. Before her emigration to London, via Czechoslovakia and Palestine, Tergit was

already noted as a crime reporter and as the author of a best-selling novel about the Berlin newspaper industry, *Käsebier erobert den Kurfürstendamm* (1929). Throughout the War, at the very moment when she, like Koestler, Neumann, Haffner and others were considering a permanent adoption of English, we find that she was a regular contributor both to the aforementioned *Zeitung* in London and also to *Aufbau* in New York. Precisely the same can be said of *AJR Information's* first editor Herbert Freedon, who under his original surname Friedenthal wrote for the same two German-language publications, and for other early contributors to *AJR Information*, including Rudolf Bienenfeld, Carl Kapralik and Walter Breslauer. A sudden break with one's native language is not at all easy, and we should not be surprised that these talented writers continued to publish in German while they could.

However, if we examine the topics covered by Tergit, as one of the more prolific members of this group of early AJR members, in her German-language articles of this period, it becomes possible to differentiate a further important distinction between the stance frequently adopted by anti-fascist exiles towards Germany, and that adopted by the AJR and its members. In accounting for the characteristics of exile journals earlier I included two important tasks, namely, anti-Nazi agitation and the preservation of what was perceived to be the 'true' German heritage. Integral to the latter, of course, was the unique contribution of Jews to German culture over the centuries. However, the purpose of these activities, from the point of view of those Germans and Austrians exiled first and foremost for political rather than racial reasons, was to prepare the ground for a return to Germany. Whatever their political colours, many German-speaking exiles retained an idealism and optimistic certainty that a return to a renewed and democratic Germany, and a resumption of their old lives, would be possible in time. The best means of achieving

this, and the role of the emigrants in particular, were endlessly discussed in the pages of exile publications from 1933 until the very end of the War. These open, passionate and intelligent debates, a characteristic of German publishing in the Weimar era which continued in many of the exile journals mentioned above, are particularly interesting in the context of our present topic.

In the spring of 1941 *Die Zeitung* published two articles analysing precisely these issues: on 19 March, Wickham Steed's 'Die deutsche Aufgabe', and, in response, on 29 March, Sebastian Haffner's 'Die Verantwortung der deutschen Emigranten'.¹⁰ The 'Wickham Steed' in question is undoubtedly Henry Wickham Steed, well known at the time as a political correspondent for the *Times*, as an expert on central European affairs, and as an outspoken opponent of Hitler's Germany. His conviction, expressed in his article, was that members of the émigré community, Jews included, should continue to view themselves, primarily, as Germans, Austrians and so on, and that they would have a crucial role to play in Germany after the War. It reiterated the opinions he had aired the previous year, in even more forceful terms, in a speech commemorating the lives of Joseph Roth and Ernst Toller, both of whom had died in May 1939. He states in his speech, addressing the émigré membership of the 'Freier Deutscher Kulturbund in England':

Versuchen Sie doch nicht vollwertige Engländer zu werden. Sie werden es niemals erreichen, denn es fehlen Ihnen die geistigen Voraussetzungen dazu. Bleiben Sie lieber gute Deutsche, denn in den kommenden Jahren wird die Welt gute Deutsche brauchen. Und wenn Sie etwas vom englischen Geiste in Ihr Deutschtum aufnehmen können, so werden Sie den beiden Völkern gute Dienste leisten.¹¹

Haffner's response as editor of the *Zeitung* reinforced Steed's position, which was to regard British national identity as insular and culturally exclusive. Like Steed, he

chose to emphasise the contribution the exiles were capable of making, indeed had the moral obligation to make in the reconstruction of a 'new' Germany:

England und Amerika brauchen keine neuen Einwanderer, seien sie im Einzelnen noch so gute wertvolle Staatsbürger. England und Amerika brauchen Deutsche, die willens und imstande sind, Deutschland wieder in die gesittete Völkergemeinschaft der Welt zurückzuführen – und denen sie trauen können.¹²

The articles do not distinguish exiled Jews from other Germans, despite the fact that the 'vast majority' of German-speaking exiles in Britain were Jewish. Consequently they triggered a lively and critical response. The nature of this debate, in the focus upon determining the true 'task' for those in exile and the correct attitude for German Jews, is reminiscent of others which had been conducted in the pages of the exile press. One such was provoked by Joseph Roth, who in 1934 had published an article in the Prague-based journal *Die Wahrheit* in which he accused Jews from Germany of a unique and in his view misplaced patriotism and love for their country, even in the face of hatred and persecution.¹³ One can imagine the outrage felt by many at Roth's accusation, evident in the published replies, and Haffner's and Steed's moral appeal to exiled Germans received an equally vociferous response.

Those on the left, for example, were critical of what they perceived as Haffner's bourgeois arrogance in assuming that the middle-class emigrants had the right to return to Germany and dictate the future, for they, a little idealistically, viewed the German proletariat as innocent victims of Hitler who had the right to decide Germany's future. More interesting in this context, however, is Gabriele Tergit's response in a letter published in *Die Zeitung* on 10 April 1941, in which she takes issue with the assumption that Jews too should continue to see themselves as German and should be willing to return after the War. This, one should bear in mind, was

before the Holocaust in all its horror had reached its peak; yet Tergit is quite clear - there can be no return for Jewish refugees to Germany.

Ist sich Wickham Steed darüber klar, daß die Mehrzahl dieser Emigranten aus Juden besteht! Diese Juden können auf keinen Fall, unter keinem Regime zurückkehren. Vielleicht Einzelne, vielleicht der oder jener aus privaten Gründen. Aber keinesfalls als Gesamtheit. [...]¹⁴

She concludes the letter pessimistically, with the assertion: 'So wie das deutsche Volk heute belehrt worden ist, kann das Eintreten von Juden für Freiheit und Demokratie innerhalb eines besiegten Deutschlands nur zur Diffamierung, zur erneuten Diffamierung von Freiheit und Demokratie führen.'¹⁵ Tergit takes it upon herself here to speak for the majority of Jewish refugees in Britain, if not actually for the Association of Jewish Refugees. Five years later, with the full extent of the Holocaust apparent, one finds in the pages of *AJR Information* its distinguished contributors reaching precisely the same conclusion: there can be no return. And the facts speak for themselves - the vast majority of refugee emigrants to Britain remained. Of those who did not, most moved on to the United States or to the new state of Israel. The numbers who returned to Germany and Austria were very small indeed.

It is important, then, to stress this important distinction between the stance of those publications specifically representing Jewish interests, in particular *Aufbau*, the *Jüdische Revue*, and *AJR Information*, and those journals, such as *Das Wort*, *Die Sammlung* or *Das Neue-Tagebuch*, which counted numerous German Jews amongst their editors and contributors, and covered topics of interest to Jewish readers, but which conceived of themselves more militantly as a bulwark against Germany's barbarism and as important tools in the fight against Hitler. The chief aims of the former lay in defending the interests of refugees and preserving and celebrating German-Jewish culture in a new country; the latter type of journal clearly conceived of

itself, in contrast, as a temporary guardian of German ideas and culture, whose integrity it hoped to maintain abroad until such a time as the exiles could return to rebuild Germany.

To illustrate this we might compare the first issue of Klaus Mann's *Die Sammlung*, which appeared in September 1933, with the first of *Aufbau*, which was published in New York in December 1934. Both present lengthy editorials and couch their 'missions' in rather grand phrases. Klaus Mann writes the following of German 'Geist', which he clearly views as embodied in the activities of the exile community:

Dieser Geist darf sich in den Ländern, die ihm Gastfreundschaft gewähren, nicht nur dadurch manifestieren, daß er das Hassenswürdige immer wieder, immer noch einmal analysiert und anklagt [...]; er muß sich auch [...] wieder als das bewähren, was zu sein er behauptet: als jenes kostbarste Element; das fortfährt produktiv zu sein, während es kämpft.¹⁶

What we find in *Aufbau* resembles Mann's words superficially, in that Edward W. Jelenko, its editor, also speaks of a 'fight' to defend the values and culture shared by German Jews:

Wenn aber unsere Menschenwürde, unsere Ethik von hemmungs- und bedenkenlosen Gegnern geschmäht, beschimpft und getreten wird, so sollen und müssen wir den Kampf um Ehre, Freiheit und Leben aufnehmen und im Lichte der Wahrheit den Nachweis führen, [...] daß alle unsere Gesetze und Grundsätze vor jedem unbefangenen Richterstuhl mit Ehren bestehen können.¹⁷

However, the same paragraph also makes clear where the journal's and the New York German-Jewish Club's loyalties lie:

Wir haben bei jeder Gelegenheit in inniger Dankbarkeit feierlich manifestiert, daß wir nie und nimmer vergessen werden, was uns dieses große Land der Freiheit gegeben, nachdem man uns in Deutschland alles genommen.¹⁸

Like the future members of the AJR in London, the German Jews who arrived in New York and became readers of *Aufbau* could rightly feel proud of their heritage and indeed language - for *Aufbau* publishes in German to this day - but no longer associated Germany, the geographical place, with the future. The future, clearly, lay in

'free' America, just as it lay in democratic Great Britain for thousands of refugees in this country.

This commitment to the host country, as we have seen, seems to have been self-evident for many Jews leaving, I imagine with both relief and anxiety, the brutality and oppression of the Third Reich, at least for those from middle-class backgrounds and with no strong left-wing leanings. These, of course, made up a high proportion of the readership of both *Aufbau* and *AJR Information*. And it is of course this commitment, in the case of *AJR Information* to Great Britain and of *Aufbau* to the United States, which has ensured their longevity. At the end of the War, the London *Zeitung's* government funding was promptly cut - it had, in their eyes, served its purpose. With the War with Germany over, the assumption was that there was no longer a need for a German newspaper in Britain. Much the same fate met the remaining German-language newspapers and journals around the world - in Moscow, Mexico, Buenos Aires and other far-flung places, the final copies went to press in 1945 or 1946, in most cases satisfied that the fight against fascism had been won and hence their reason for existence over. For *AJR Information*, this fight had of course been of tremendous importance, but its real work - which did not consist in a spurious attempt to make 'vollwertige Engländer' of immigrants, as Steed seems to have assumed would be the goal of anyone choosing to remain in Britain, but in helping with the integration of many thousands of Jewish refugees from around Europe whilst commemorating and celebrating their culture, heritage and achievements - had only just begun.

-
- ¹ See Anthony Grenville, 'The Integration of Aliens: The Early Years of the *Association of Jewish Refugees Information*, 1946-1950', *Yearbook of the Research Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies: German-Speaking Exiles in Great Britain*, 1 (1999), pp. 1-23.
- ² For a comprehensive survey of the journals published in exile, see Hans-Albert Walter, *Deutsche Exilliteratur 1933-1950*, 4 vols (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1978), IV: *Exilpresse*; Lieselotte Maas, *Handbuch der deutschen Exilpresse 1933-1945*, ed. by Eberhard Lämmert, 4 vols (Munich: Hanser, 1976).
- ³ Compare Alexander Stephan, *Die deutsche Exilliteratur 1933-1945: eine Einführung* (Munich: Beck, 1979), p. 96.
- ⁴ Joseph Roth, 'Die vertriebene deutsche Literatur', in Roth, *Werke*, ed. by Klaus Westermann and Fritz Hackert, 6 vols (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1989-91), III, pp. 709-712 (p. 712).
- ⁵ For more on *Die Zeitung* and the circumstances of its foundation see: Charmian Brinson and Marian Malet, 'Die Zeitung', in *Between Two Languages: German-Speaking Exiles in Great Britain 1933-1945*, ed. by William Abbey et al (Stuttgart: Heinz, 1995), pp. 215-243.
- ⁶ Gabriele Tergit uses the phrase in her essay 'Die Exilsituation in England', in *Die deutsche Exilliteratur 1933-1945*, ed. by Manfred Durzak (Stuttgart: Reclam, 1973), pp. 135-144 (p. 141).
- ⁷ Anonymous report, *Die Zeitung*, 178, 6 October 1941, p. 3.
- ⁸ See Tergit, 'Die Exilsituation in England', p. 134. The peculiarity of the exile situation in Great Britain is apparent in much of the research on the subject.
- ⁹ Quoted by Tergit, 'Die Exilsituation in England', p. 137.
- ¹⁰ Wickham Steed, 'Die deutsche Aufgabe', *Die Zeitung*, 7, 19 March 1941, pp. 1-2; Sebastian Haffner, 'Die Verantwortung der deutschen Emigranten', *Die Zeitung*, 16, 29 March 1941, pp. 1-2.
- ¹¹ Quoted in *Freie Deutsche Kultur*, the 'Monthly News and Diary of the Free German League of Culture in Great Britain', 2, February 1940, p. 1.
- ¹² Haffner, 'Die Verantwortung...', 2.
- ¹³ Joseph Roth, 'Der Segen des ewigen Juden: Zur Diskussion', *Die Wahrheit*, 30 August 1934; reprinted in Roth, *Werke*, ed. by Klaus Westermann and Fritz Hackert, 6 vols (Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 1989-91), III, pp. 527-532.
- ¹⁴ Gabriele Tergit, open letter published under the title 'Rückwanderung der jüdischen Emigranten?', *Die Zeitung*, 26, 10 April 1941, p. 4.
- ¹⁵ Tergit, 'Rückwanderung der jüdischen Emigranten?', p. 4.
- ¹⁶ Quoted in Stephan, p. 109.
- ¹⁷ Edward W. Jelenko, 'Zehn Jahre', *Aufbau*, 1, 1 December 1934, pp. 1, 4, 10 (p. 4).
- ¹⁸ Jelenko, p. 4.