

**Original citation:**

Wright, Chantal . (2014) Before Chamisso : the role of the Munich DAF writing competitions and anthologies in the promotion of a 'Deutsche Literatur Von Auben',1979-1987. Oxford German Studies, 43 (1). pp. 20-36.

**Permanent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/74868>

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Oxford German Studies on 19 February 2014, available online:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1179/0078719113Z.00000000046>

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)

# Before Chamisso: The role of the Munich *DaF* writing competitions and anthologies in the promotion of a 'deutsche Literatur von außen', 1979-1987<sup>1</sup>

Chantal Wright

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

## Introduction

Between 1979 and 1986, the recently founded *Institut für Deutsch als Fremdsprache* at the *Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität* in Munich organized four German-language writing competitions for foreigners. The Munich institute also edited four anthologies of writing by foreigners, drawing on work that had either been entered for the competitions or had been solicited in their wake. These anthologies were all published by *Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag*. The years between 1979, when the first competition was announced, and 1987, when the final dtv anthology, *Über Grenzen*, was published, were pivotal in terms of the development of a literature for which descriptive nomenclature has been variously debated, embraced, rejected, imposed from without and appropriated from within.<sup>2</sup> October 1980 saw the founding of *PoLiKunst* [*Polynationaler Literatur- und Kunstverein*], a collective of foreign artists resident in Germany. This was accompanied in the same year by the launch of a book series initially bearing the title *Südwind gastarbeiterdeutsch* but subsequently changed, in 1983, to *Südwind Literatur*. The early 1980s also saw the genesis of several magazines and journals, among them *Anadil*, *Fremdworte*, *Die Brücke*, and *WTR ausländischen Mitbürger*, which were dedicated to the political and socio-cultural situation of foreigners in the Federal Republic. By 1985, when the final Munich writing competition was launched, Harald Weinrich, Ordinarius at the institute, had secured the financial support of the *Robert Bosch Stiftung* for the inaugural Adelbert von Chamisso Prize, which was to be awarded for literary work 'die von Autoren nichtdeutscher Muttersprache in deutscher Sprache geschrieben oder in unmittelbarem Zusammenhang mit ihrem Entstehungsprozeß ins Deutsche übertragen worden sind'.<sup>3</sup> With the establishment of the Chamisso Prize, the institute's efforts to promote what Weinrich famously labelled 'eine deutsche Literatur von außen'<sup>4</sup> appeared to have come to fruition, and the competitions were discontinued. At around the same time, in 1986, *Südwind* published its final title; *PoLiKunst* officially dissolved shortly thereafter, in May 1987.

The involvement of the Munich institute in the staging and promotion of what I will refer to in this article as exophonic literature – literature written in a language which is not the author's

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank the staff of the *Deutsches Literaturarchiv* in Marbach am Neckar for their help in accessing the relevant materials within the *Adelbert-von-Chamisso-Sammlung*. I would also like to thank the *Robert Bosch Stiftung* for giving me permission to access the collection.

<sup>2</sup> For an overview of the various terms see Carmine Chiellino, 'Interkulturalität und Literaturwissenschaft', in *Interkulturelle Literatur in Deutschland: Ein Handbuch*, ed. by Carmine Chiellino (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2007), pp. 387-398 (pp. 389-392).

<sup>3</sup> Harald Weinrich, 'Der Adelbert-von-Chamisso-Preis', in *Chamissos Enkel*, ed. by Heinz Friedrich (München: dtv, 1986), pp. 11-13 (p. 12). The criteria for the prize have been altered since 1985, most recently in 2012.

<sup>4</sup> Harald Weinrich, 'Um eine deutsche Literatur von außen bittend', *Merkur*, 37 (1983), 911-20.

mother tongue<sup>5</sup> – has elicited diverging responses. A critical reading views the institute's efforts as 'imperialistic': the institute presumed, with its competitions and anthologies, to be tending a new literary garden for which it had also planted the seeds, ignoring or downplaying the pre-existing, autonomous efforts of non-native-speaker writers to promote their own literature. By funnelling this literature in a particular direction, the institute diffused, deliberately or inadvertently, the socio-political impact of a significant part of this literature.<sup>6</sup> The more positive interpretation, and one that the institute claimed for itself, is that its efforts had 'Förderungscharakter':<sup>7</sup> Irmgard Ackermann and Harald Weinrich functioned as literary gatekeepers who helped exophonic writing reach a German audience, culminating in institutional recognition in the form of the Chamisso Prize. This article will suggest a more nuanced reading of the institute's activities and argue that they should be understood as a part of a dialogic process in which the institute was as much reactive as proactive with regard to the goals of its own initiatives, their shape, and the manner in which they were received. I will trace, through the available archival material and the anthologies themselves, the development of those activities that aimed to promote a German 'Gastliteratur'<sup>8</sup> between 1979 and 1987. Regardless of whether one takes a critical view of the institute's activities or not, its efforts laid the groundwork for the Chamisso Prize; it was able to harness the resources of governmental (e.g. the *Auswärtiges Amt*) and non-governmental institutions (e.g. the *Robert Bosch Stiftung*) to institutionalize a 'deutsche Literatur von außen'. At the same time it shaped and was shaped by grassroots organisations such as *PoLiKunst*, which was itself – in response to the *Ausländergesetz*'s rules of assembly for foreigners in Germany – an *eingetragener Verein*, i.e. a quasi-institutional body.

## 1979 - 1980 Deutschland, fremdes Land

The first of the writing competitions organized by the Munich institute took place in 1979; its winners were announced in 1980. The competition was financed by a grant of DM 2000 from the *Auswärtiges Amt*, and was modest in scope, attracting forty-seven participants, of whom the majority (twenty-eight) were from Munich.<sup>9</sup> Only ten participants came from other German towns and cities, probably because advertising for the competition, which had been focussed on *Ausländerämter*, institutes of language learning, universities and community centres, had been

---

<sup>5</sup> The term 'exophonic' captures the 'Fremdsprachigkeit des Deutschen [als] conditio sine qua non' for entry into the competitions. Peter Seibert, 'Zur "Rettung" der Zungen', *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, 56 (1984), 40-61 (p. 57). On the emergence and application of the term *exophony* see Susan Arndt, Dirk Naguschewski and Robert Stockhammer, 'Die Unselbstverständlichkeit der Sprache', in *Exophonie*, ed. by Susan Arndt, Dirk Naguschewski and Robert Stockhammer (Berlin: Kadmos, 2007), pp. 7-27; and Chantal Wright, 'Writing in the "grey zone": Exophonic literature in contemporary Germany', *GfL*, 3 (2008), 26-42 (pp. 38-40).

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, Peter Seibert, 'Zur "Rettung"'; Arlene Akiko Teraoka, 'Gastarbeiterliteratur: The Other Speaks Back', *Cultural Critique*, 7 (1987), 77-101; and Carmine Chiellino, *Am Ufer der Fremde: Literatur und Arbeitsmigration 1870-1991* (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1995), pp. 294-96.

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, Franco Biondi, 'Einige Betrachtungen zur "Gastarbeiterliteratur"', *Fremdworte*, 1 (1985), 13-15 (p. 15).

<sup>8</sup> Harald Weinrich, 'Vorwort', in *Als Fremder in Deutschland: Berichte, Erzählungen, Gedichte von Ausländern*, ed. by Irmgard Ackermann (München: dtv, 1982), pp. 9-11 (p. 9).

<sup>9</sup> Marbach, *Deutsches Literaturarchiv, Adelbert-von-Chamisso-Sammlung*, Ordner 1. All information pertaining to the first competition can be found in this file.

largely local.<sup>10</sup> Interestingly, those areas of Germany which had seen the largest increases in their foreign-born populations since labour migration began in the 1950s – West Berlin, Stuttgart, Frankfurt and environs, and the Ruhr valley – were underrepresented among the participants.<sup>11</sup> Nine of the forty-seven entries came from eight foreign countries in Europe and beyond. Writers and Munich residents SAID and Alev Tekinay, who would be awarded the Chamisso Prize in 1990 and 2002 respectively, were among this first batch of entrants.<sup>12</sup> The national backgrounds of the winners also show that the competition had not attracted a *Gastarbeiter* constituency: the first, second and third prizes of DM 500, DM 300 and DM 200 were awarded to Munich residents Kim Lan Thai (Vietnam), Chris Burton (nationality undetermined, but presumably Anglophone), and Bernadette Martial (France) respectively.

The only eligibility requirements for the competition were that the entrant be a non-native speaker of German – he or she had to include a statement on how long, and where, he or she had studied German – and that the entry be literary in nature. These continued to be the only criteria for entry in the three competitions that followed, reflecting the fact that the rationale for the competitions originated with the then-young academic subject of *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, which encompassed ‘die durchaus heteronomen Disziplinen Linguistik und Literaturwissenschaft sowie den wissenschaftstheoretisch entweder gar nicht oder nur multidisziplinär greifbaren Bereich der Landeskunde’.<sup>13</sup> In this respect the writing samples furnished by the competitions presented a convenient textual corpus for the purposes of studying contrastive linguistics and linguistic norms, two of the seven areas that Weinrich had identified as constituting the pillars of the discipline. The organizers perhaps also hoped that the samples would provide an opportunity to study another of the seven: ‘Gastarbeiter-Linguistik’. Most crucially, however, the competitions helped fill in the vaguely formulated research area of ‘Deutsche Literatur als fremde Literatur’, by providing the necessary link with the other, more linguistic subject areas of this hybrid discipline, a link that Weinrich had argued it was necessary to forge.<sup>14</sup> Writing in German by non-native speakers was perhaps not what he had in mind when he stressed the importance of observing German literature ‘aus der Außenperspektive’,<sup>15</sup> but this is what this area would come to constitute.

The dictates of *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* had a clear influence on the judging process. The competition was judged by an entirely German jury, comprised of two academics – Harald Weinrich and Dietrich Krusche, who became *Professor für Interkulturelle Literarische Hermeneutik* at the institute in 1982 – and writer and journalist Hans Schwab-Felisch, editor of the journal *Merkur*. Handwritten notes on each of the forty-seven entries, which were assigned numbers and underwent an anonymous judging process, show that entries were evaluated above all for

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Weinrich, ‘Vorwort’, p. 10.

<sup>11</sup> Three entries each came from areas of Bavaria outside Munich, Baden-Württemberg and Nordrhein-Westfalen; one entry came from Berlin.

<sup>12</sup> Neither writer was well-known at the time.

<sup>13</sup> Harald Weinrich, ‘Deutsch als Fremdsprache – Konturen eines neuen Faches’, in *Jahrbuch Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 5 (1979), 1-13 (p. 1).

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 10.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 9.

linguistic accuracy and literary sophistication.<sup>16</sup> Comments on the German ranged, at the positive end of the scale, from ‘sehr sicheres Deutsch’ (I), ‘perfektes Deutsch’ (V), ‘ausgezeichnetes Deutsch’ (XXIII), to ‘unbeholfenes Deutsch, aber suggestiv’ (VII), and ‘anfängerhaft’ (XLVI) at the negative end. The notes also summarized, sometimes with commentary, the theme of the entry, e.g. ‘Polen, Fußball, Warschauer Pakt’ (XLIV), ‘Klage über mangelnde Integration’ (XLI), ‘Hausgemachte Metaphysik’ (XXIX), and ‘eindrucksvolle Gedichte, die an die Todesfuge erinnern’ (XVIII). Where an entry addressed the theme of the competition particularly well or failed to address it at all, this was also noted: ‘Fremdheit x 2 thematisiert’ (I) or ‘Thema nicht behandelt’ (IV and V). The criteria for success appear to have been a muddle of linguistic competence and literary verve, alongside the ability to address the competition theme. The notes on SAID’s entry ‘Zirndorfer Anhörung’ (II) read: ‘Perser: pol. Asyl, und aus der Schah-Zeit, Dialog mit einem Beamten, etwas verkrampfte Chronik’. For Tekinay’s entry (XLIII), which consisted of sixty-eight pages of prose, the notes read: ‘Student türkisch, 4 Tage, sentimental, platt geschrieben, kenntnisreich, im Detail richtig’. SAID and Tekinay’s entries were both unsuccessful. Weinrich’s comments suggest that their work did not display the necessary literary flair: in SAID’s case narrative inadequacies and in Tekinay’s case sentimentality and flatness of expression were disadvantageous.

The 1979 competition was, above all, a modest and local affair, but in his report to the *Auswärtiges Amt*, Harald Weinrich judged it a success and announced his intention of applying for funds to finance a second competition ‘mit einem vergrößerten Radius’ in 1980.<sup>17</sup> The criteria by which entries were judged mirrored the confusion about the nature of *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, a discipline that was still taking shape. Countries with which Germany had signed *Anwerbeabkommen* were not represented among the main prizewinners, with only one Portuguese entrant among the runners-up, showing that *Gastarbeiter* and *Gastarbeiterliteratur* barely featured. A handwritten ‘I’ next to Turkish names suggests, however, that the competition organisers were monitoring the number of Turkish entrants, and were surprised and perhaps disappointed at the small number of Turkish entries.

## 1980 - 1981 Als Fremder in Deutschland

Although the eligibility criteria remained unchanged, there were two important shifts in the framing of the second competition. Firstly, the institute decided to target the *Gastarbeiter* population more directly by sending out letters and posters to various Munich companies, e.g. Siemens, Messerschmitt-Bölkow-Blohm, Agfa-Gevaert.<sup>18</sup> There was obviously an awareness at the institute that certain constituencies, chiefly the Turkish population, were not being reached. Secondly, the new theme, ‘Als Fremder in Deutschland’, was a subtle yet important move away from emphasising the strangeness of Germany (‘Deutschland, fremdes Land’) towards an emphasis on the strangeness of the other in relation to Germany, and thus a move away from the temporary point of view of a visitor towards the more permanent point of view of a resident.

<sup>16</sup> Although the majority of the archival materials are Ackermann’s, it seems likely that these handwritten notes are Weinrich’s.

<sup>17</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 1. Letter dated 20 February 1980.

<sup>18</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2.

Together these changes amounted to an attempt to solicit the voice of Germany's population of economic migrants.

The changes were not, however, particularly successful in bringing about their desired effect. Of the 164 submissions, only thirty-three were from nationals of countries with which the Federal Republic had signed labour agreements between 1955 and 1968: Turkey and Yugoslavia had eight entries each, Italy and Spain five each, Greece three, Portugal three and Morocco one; Tunisia did not feature at all. Dominant among the nationalities represented were in fact America and China, with nineteen entries apiece, and there was an almost equal balance between German residents (eighty) and those living abroad (seventy-eight).<sup>19</sup> The organisers also collected information on the entrants' employment status: almost a third (forty-eight) gave no information, teachers of German numbered twenty-one, with schoolchildren and students forming the majority of entrants (eight-four). None of the entrants identified themselves as blue-collar workers. Of the three main winners, all had studied at university. Luisa Hölzl-Bravo, a housewife from Portugal who had done her university studies in Germany and was resident in Munich, took the first prize for her 'Bilanz zu fünf Jahre Deutschland'. Franco Biondi, an Italian resident of Mainz who had gone to Germany as a *Gastarbeiter* but subsequently studied to be a psychologist, took the second prize for his short story 'Die Heimfahrt' and for several poems. Kathrin Smits, a *Germanistin* at the University of Auckland in New Zealand, was awarded the third prize for her 'Freiburger Episoden'.

Although the second competition was not successful in attracting entries from *Gastarbeiter*, it did attract the attention of several members of *PoLiKunst* and other culturally active figures: Franco Biondi had been one of *PoLiKunst's* founders, as had Jusuf Naoum and Suleman Taufiq, who each received runner-up prizes. Rafik Schami and José Oliver, *PoLiKunst* members who were to go on to win the Chamisso Prize in 1985 and 1997 respectively, also entered the competition. Other notable entrants included Şinasi Dikmen, a cabaret artist, actor and writer who was already establishing a career for himself, and Akif Pirinçci, now the bestselling author of the *Felidae* detective series. Rafik Schami's correspondence with Ackermann reveals that the networks among exophonic writers were responsible for the strong presence of this group: 'die meisten unter uns [haben] sowohl die Adresse als auch die Teilhabebedingungen vom Erzählen der anderen erfahren'.<sup>20</sup>

The muddled judging criteria of the first competition were still in evidence. Notes on the prizewinners reveal a pedagogue's approval for mastery of (literary) language.<sup>21</sup> For Biondi's story 'Die Heimfahrt', the notes state 'kann sogar deutsche V-Sprache' and his poems displays 'makellose[s] Deutsch'; Kathrin Smits 'beherrscht Redewiedergabe'. The fact that runners-up received dictionaries donated by Langenscheidt Verlag was evidence of the continued pedagogical impulse behind the competition. However, Hölzl's and Biondi's entries also met with approval because of their experiential basis and appeal to the (German) reader. 'Bilanz zu 5 Jahre Deutschland' is described as a 'Bericht, ohne lit. Glanz' but which shows 'viel Humanität'.

<sup>19</sup> Six entrants did not list their place of residence. DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2.

<sup>20</sup> Schami wrote to Ackermann to complain that he had not received notification of the competition's result (letter dated 6 February 1981); this was due to confusion created by his use of a pseudonym. DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2.

<sup>21</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 6.

Biondi's short story 'Und nun schieben sie ab' has a 'hoher Appellwert' but the language in his poems is 'etwas klischeehaft'.

Of the various criteria by which the winning entries were selected, a new one that had previously only been implicit was now ascendant: the judges settled on 'authenticity' as the key factor in their decision-making. This was a departure from the earlier weighting towards literacy in German and literariness and would be the spin given to the competition in press releases, also determining the character of the resulting eponymous anthology. The emphasis on authenticity may have grown out of Ackermann and Weinrich's genuine surprise and disquiet at the criticism levelled at Germany and the Germans in the competition entries, a criticism that came not from the most disenfranchised, least educated and arguably most poorly treated foreign residents of Germany, but from an educated class with an able command of German. In the letter sent out to all entrants announcing the winners, the organisers reflected on what the texts they had read implied for them, as Germans: 'die Lektüre [war] eine interessante Entdeckungsreise [...] Herausforderung [...] Anstoß zum Nachdenken und oft auch als Spiegel [zu] verstehen'.<sup>22</sup>

The desire to channel these criticisms into something productive led Ackermann and Weinrich to highlight the contribution of these texts to an anthropology of Germany. The planned publication of select entries in an anthology would give the German public access to the 'witness statements' of the foreigners living in their midst, '[d]amit [...] die Zeugnisse von Ausländern, die unter uns leben, auch weiteren Interessenten zugänglich werden'.<sup>23</sup> One cannot help but note that the anthropological accent was placed squarely on Germany, deflecting attention away from the foreigners in its midst.<sup>24</sup>

One important development in the reception of the competition was that it 'fand ein lebhaftes Echo in den Medien',<sup>25</sup> pointing to a widespread interest in migrants' perceptions of Germany. The editor of *Rind & Schlegel: Zeitschrift für Poesie*, wrote to Irmgard Ackermann requesting material for a special issue to be entitled *Ausländer schreiben Deutsche Gedichte*.<sup>26</sup> The Munich-based *Kassettenprogramme für ausländische Mitbürger* requested access to competition entries written by Turks for potential inclusion on a cassette, *Türkische Autoren in Deutschland*.<sup>27</sup> *Deutschlandfunk* in Cologne was interested in featuring the eight prize-winners in a special radio programme.<sup>28</sup> The institute played a part in attracting this media interest by sending out writing samples with its announcement of the competition results. The first of the dtv anthologies would cement this media interest in the activities of the institute.

<sup>22</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2. Letter dated 27 January 1981.

<sup>23</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2. Press release dated 6 February 1981.

<sup>24</sup> 'Diese ethnozentrische Sichtweise zielte darauf ab, den Dialog mit den Minderheiten zu pflegen, das Zentrum der Aufmerksamkeit aber nach wie vor selbst zu belegen, um dadurch Akzeptanz bei den ausländerfreundlichen Leser/innen zu erwecken.' Chiellino, 'Interkulturalität', p. 390.

<sup>25</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2. Verwendungsnachweis.

<sup>26</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2. Letter dated 18 April 1981.

<sup>27</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2. Letter dated 11 February 1981.

<sup>28</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 2. Letter dated 9 February 1981. Ackermann replied that some of the winners lived abroad and would therefore not be available to participate in such a programme. (Letter dated 16 February 1981.) This raises the question of whether the institute realized that there were distinct advantages, on a publicity level, to shifting the emphasis of the competition to foreigners living within Germany.

### *Als Fremder in Deutschland: The Anthology*

From the very first competition, the institute had announced its intention of publishing selected entries in an anthology. After Ackermann and Weinrich had unsuccessfully tried to secure a contract with Hanser and then Suhrkamp,<sup>29</sup> dtv expressed an interest and went on to publish all four of the anthologies that resulted from the Munich competitions. *Als Fremder in Deutschland: Berichte, Erzählungen, Gedichte von Ausländern*, was published in April 1982. By August, Andrea Wörle at dtv could report that the anthology had been widely reviewed, that sales were good, and that booksellers had re-ordered almost 700 copies of the anthology in June 1982 alone.<sup>30</sup> There would be a second print run in February 1983.

What motivated the institute to publish competition entries and other texts by exophonic writers in an anthology? A key reason was the need for *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* course materials. Both Dieter Krusche and Ackermann were planning seminars for the 1981 winter semester entitled, respectively, 'Das Deutschlandbild in ausländischer Literatur' and 'Deutschsprachige Literatur von Ausländern'. Publisher Klett was also interested in borrowing materials from the competitions for a new textbook.<sup>31</sup>

The anthology was also an attempt to stake out disciplinary territory. The Munich institute was in its infancy in 1981, and *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* was also still establishing itself as a subject of academic enquiry: 'Möglicherweise hat diese literarische Produktion den ausstehenden Legitimationsbeweis für das Fach DaF geliefert'.<sup>32</sup> The institute's ownership of exophonic writing was threatened by the forthcoming *Werkkreis Literatur der Arbeitswelt* anthology *Sehnsucht im Koffer* with Fischer, and by the recent publication, in Frankfurt, of the first issue of an 'Ausländerzeitschrift'.<sup>33</sup> Publication of the Munich anthology had been delayed because of the initial difficulty of finding a publisher, and even once dtv had taken on the project, the publication process was slow. In a letter to dtv dated a year before the book's eventual publication, Ackermann laid out several reasons for the urgency of the anthology, mentioning these two rival publications: 'Da wir mit unseren Preisausschreiben 1979 und 1980 "Vorreiter" für solche Initiativen waren, wäre es schade, wenn wir jetzt hinterherhinken würden'.<sup>34</sup> Ackermann's statement is interesting because the competing publications that she names are all partially or entirely non-German initiatives.<sup>35</sup> Despite Ackermann's claim, the emerging generation of German exophonic writers were themselves the 'Vorreiter': their decision to write had not been prompted by the Munich competitions but preceded them. Nonetheless,

<sup>29</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 8.

<sup>30</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 8. Letter dated 2 February 1982.

<sup>31</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 8. Letter dated 28 February 1981.

<sup>32</sup> Chiellino, 'Interkulturalität', p. 387.

<sup>33</sup> It is likely that Ackermann is referring to *WIR ausländischen Mitbürger*. DLA, AvCS, Ordner 8. Letter dated 28 March 1981.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Although *Werkkreis Literatur der Arbeitswelt* was a German organization, Franco Biondi was a member and co-edited *Sehnsucht im Koffer* in that capacity, as did Jusuf Naoum in his capacity as a *Polikunst* member. Although *WIR ausländischen Mitbürger* was initially financed by a German politician, Erich Nitzling, the editorial team was composed of various *Ausländervereine* in Frankfurt. Cf. Ateff Salama, *Ausländer schreiben: Deutschsprachige kulturpolitische Ausländerzeitschriften in der BRD am Beispiel der Zeitschriften Die Brücke, Fremdworte und WIR ausländischen Mitbürger* (Münster: Medien & Kommunikation, 1990), pp. 99-101.



Weinrich's foreword to the first anthology makes it clear that the institute was keen to position itself as the patron of this 'nicht geflegt[e] [...] deutsche Gastliteratur'.<sup>36</sup>

The institute was also motivated by the need to respond to the critique of Germany explicit or implicit in the competition entries and to make this 'new' writing acceptable to a German audience. Although the nature of the texts could not be altered, in an anthology they could be given an appropriate frame, sandwiched between Weinrich's foreword – his use of the third person plural, 'wir Deutschen',<sup>37</sup> clearly identifies his addressees – and Krusche's afterword, 'Zu einem durch fremde Augen "gebrochenen" Deutschlandbild'.<sup>38</sup> Weinrich strengthens the anthropological accent of the endeavour by referring to the texts as a 'Dokumentensammlung' that would be of importance 'für alle landeskundlichen Studien zu dem, was von außen gesehen immer noch Deutschland heißt'.<sup>39</sup> This is a two-edged observation: on the one hand, it concedes that the demography of Germany has undeniably increased in complexity, on the other, Weinrich is clearly addressing himself to the ethnically German reader, thus reaffirming this as the dominant viewpoint. The polycultural potential of the institute's project is thus undermined to the advantage of the monocultural.<sup>40</sup>

If the institute viewed the anthologies largely as promotional materials for the academic discipline of *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* and for their own Munich fiefdom, and as an anthropological endeavour, the involvement of the professional or professionalizing writers has to be explained differently. By now exophonic writers had organized themselves into collectives and networks: *PolLiKunst* was founded in the same year as the second competition; the *Werkkreis Literatur der Arbeitswelt* anthology was in preparation and would be published in 1981, a year before the first of the dtv anthologies; it showcased the work of several of the writers who entered the 1980 Munich competition. The editors' afterword to the *Sehnsucht* anthology makes it very clear that credit for the increased public interest in 'Gastarbeiterkultur' is owed to the 'Aktivitäten der betroffenen Ausländer selbst'.<sup>41</sup> Nonetheless, exophonic writers seized upon the opportunity furnished by the Munich competitions and the interest shown by Ackermann and Weinrich 'to put their work before the public' and to profit from their access to a literary

---

<sup>36</sup> Weinrich, 'Vorwort', p. 9. The term 'Gastliteratur' carefully avoids the term 'Gastarbeiter' and stresses the openness and hospitality of the host nation. It also serves, however, to protect the integrity of German literature in the face of an alien body of texts by according these texts a position on the margins. Weinrich's choice of terminology reveals that he is operating firmly from within a 'monolingual paradigm' and that exophonic writing, a feature of the postmonolingual condition, represents a threat to this position. On the postmonolingual condition, see Yasemin Yildiz, *Beyond the Mother Tongue: The Postmonolingual Condition* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2012).

<sup>37</sup> Weinrich, 'Vorwort', p. 9.

<sup>38</sup> Dieter Krusche, 'Zu einem durch fremde Augen "gebrochenen" Deutschlandbild', in *Als Fremder in Deutschland*, pp. 189-202.

<sup>39</sup> Weinrich, 'Vorwort', p. 11.

<sup>40</sup> In correspondence with Ackermann, Franco Biondi was to describe Weinrich's foreword as an 'etwas zurückhaltende und (aber nur) stellenweise unglücklich ausgefallene Stellungnahme'. DLA, AvCS, Ordner 20. Letter dated 25 April 1983.

<sup>41</sup> Die Herausgeber, 'Nachwort', in *Sehnsucht im Koffer*, ed. by Werkkreis Literatur der Arbeitswelt (Frankfurt am. Main: Fischer, 1981), pp. 170-1 (p. 170). This sentiment was echoed by Suleman Taufiq in 1985: '[Die meisten ausländischen Schriftsteller] haben sich selbst aufgebaut.' Suleman Taufiq, 'Plädoyer für eine Literatur von innen', *Fremdworte*, 1 (1985), 5-6 (p. 5).

gatekeeper,<sup>42</sup> because the German literary establishment continued to exclude them. *Südwind* had been established precisely to furnish a publishing forum for ‘diese zerstreute, vernachlässigte und unterdrückte Literatur’.<sup>43</sup> Those writers who managed to find a publisher were often disappointed. Rafik Schami has referred to his first publisher as ‘schäbig’: ‘[er] hat wirklich alles verhunzt’.<sup>44</sup> In correspondence with Ackermann, Franco Biondi confessed that ‘ich bin mit Atelier nicht zufrieden’.<sup>45</sup> Gino Chiellino wrote: ‘Sie wissen ja, wie es schwierig und wichtig ist, auch bei etablierten Verlage [sic] zu veröffentlichen. Insbesondere für mich, da ich bis jetzt nur bei Alternative- und Kleinpresse [sic] veröffentlicht habe’.<sup>46</sup> The desire to publish, and to publish well, has to be viewed as a key element in any assessment of exophonic writers’ involvement with the Munich institute.<sup>47</sup> Exophonic writers in Germany clearly recognized what the institute could do for them. Irmgard Ackermann in particular took on an agent-like function: between 1979 and 1985, several writers wrote to request her help with finding a publisher.

The involvement of *PoLiKunst* members in the Munich competitions and anthologies, and their ‘acceptance’ of the fact that Ackermann and Weinrich had made ‘die Fremdsprachigkeit des Deutschen zur conditio sine qua non’ of the competition has been viewed as problematic. Reeg, for instance, argues that the emphasis on mastery of *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* distracted from the socio-political situation of Germany’s foreign population with which *Gastarbeiterliteratur* was preoccupied, and she implies that the writers were displaying bad faith by colluding with the institute in this endeavour.<sup>48</sup> This criticism ignores the well-documented publishing difficulties encountered by exophonic writers as well as their unwavering political stance. The latter can be illustrated by reference to the little-known Hanser incident. Hanser editor Michael Krüger had joined the competition jury in 1980, which appears to have made Hanser the natural choice as publisher of the anthology. Krüger persuaded the Hanser board to take on the anthology (‘zu meiner eigenen Verwunderung’)<sup>49</sup> but did not anticipate the book selling particularly well. Hanser’s conditions were that each author would receive no fee for the first print run, only for

<sup>42</sup> Rita Chin, *The Guest Worker Question in Postwar Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 136.

<sup>43</sup> Franco Biondi and Rafik Schami, ‘Literatur der Betroffenheit’, in *Zu Hause in der Fremde: Ein bundesdeutsches Ausländer-Lesebuch*, ed. by C. Schaffernicht (Fischerhude: Atelier im Bauernhaus, 1981), pp. 124-36 (p. 133).

<sup>44</sup> Rafik Schami, ‘Der offene Garten der Literatur’, in *Damals dort und heute hier*, ed. by E. Jooß (Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1998), pp. 84-93 (p. 84).

<sup>45</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 20. Letter dated 2 Dec. 1982. Biondi is referring to *Die Tarantel*, his collection of stories published by Verlag Atelier im Bauernhaus in 1982.

<sup>46</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 20. Letter dated 26 May 1981. This may be incorrectly dated, since it is filed with correspondence from 1983, and since Chiellino did not enter the Munich competition until 1982. As an academic and expert on intercultural literature, Carmine (Gino) Chiellino has been fiercely critical of the attitude of the German literary and academic establishment towards exophonic and intercultural literature. As a writer struggling for recognition in the 1980s, he entered one of the Munich competitions and was in the same position of dependency as other writers.

<sup>47</sup> It may also help mitigate criticism of the ‘collective statement’ approach of the dtv anthologies, and indeed of the anthologies produced under the editorship of non-Germans, which has been viewed as holding back the individuation of exophonic authors, both on a publishing and on a reception level. Ülker Gökberk, ‘Understanding Alterity: Ausländerliteratur between Relativism and Universalism’, in *Theoretical Issues in Literary History*, ed. by D. Perkins (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), pp. 143-72 (p. 158).

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Ulrike Reeg, *Schreiben in der Fremde* (Essen: Klartext, 1988), pp. 136-7. Reeg borrows Seibert’s formulation, see footnote 5.

<sup>49</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 8. Letter dated 22 January 1981.

subsequent ones. Given the low expectations for sales, it seemed unlikely that any payment would be forthcoming. On February 27, Franco Biondi wrote to Ackermann to reject these terms:

Trotz der Anerkennung, die Sie aufgrund Ihrer Tätigkeit im Bereich Deutsch als Fremdsprache meinerseits genießen, und trotz der leisen Freude, daß nun auch der Hanser Verlag sich dazu entschlossen hat, diese nie geförderte Literatur zu veröffentlichen, sehe ich mich gezwungen, meine Teilnahme an Ihrem Projekt in Frage zu stellen. Gründe hierfür sind die Bedingungen des Verlags. Es ist von mir keine Überheblichkeit, im Gegenteil; ohne Honorar kann meinerseits kein Einverständnis erfolgen. Ich kann nämlich nicht einsehen, daß der Verlag, der nach kapitalistischen Marktregeln und also aus Autorenprodukten Gewinne macht, die Entgeltung von geleisteter Arbeit verweigert.<sup>50</sup>

In a further letter, after the collaboration with Hanser had been rejected in favour of a contract with Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, Biondi elaborates on his earlier objections: ‘so ein namhafter Verlag sollte sich schämen, koloniale Bedingungen durchsetzen zu wollen’.<sup>51</sup> The dtv contract stipulated that for the initial print run, authors would receive a fee of DM 50 for the first page of text, and DM 5 for each subsequent page, with the agreement that any further print runs would also be compensated.<sup>52</sup>

Biondi’s confident and outraged stance is perfectly in line with the principles that had informed the founding of *PoLiKunst* and its publishing wing *Südwind*: solidarity among members, the promotion of a neglected culture and literature, and awareness-raising among the population at large with the aim of improving the situation of foreigners in Germany.<sup>53</sup> Wider dissemination of exophonic writing was therefore not to be achieved at all costs. In this respect, criticism of *PoLiKunst*’s uncritical participation in the Munich competitions is unjustified. The Hanser incident is an indication that exophonic authors might work with the literary establishment for their own literary ends, but would not sacrifice their political principles.

The success of the dtv anthology, which was to be repeated with *In zwei Sprachen leben*, shows that Hanser seriously underestimated the German public’s interest in exophonic writing. Chin argues that the institute’s efforts were successful precisely because it had ‘constructed a category of *Ausländerliteratur* that operated squarely within the terms of public debate during the late 1970s’.<sup>54</sup> The anthropological slant of the anthology surely played a significant part.

<sup>50</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 8. Letter dated 27 February 1981.

<sup>51</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 8. Letter dated 21 April 1981. Franco Biondi relates that some of his fellow authors argued they should be grateful such a reputable publisher was willing to take on the project. Biondi recalls that Ackermann phoned him to discuss the matter, and in all likelihood to check if his protest was genuine (personal correspondence, 19 March 2013).

<sup>52</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 8. Letter dated 16 July 1981.

<sup>53</sup> Biondi’s invocation of colonialism is also nothing new. In ‘Literatur der Betroffenheit’, the quasi-manifesto of *PoLiKunst* principles published in 1981, he and Rafik Schami had compared the situation of Germany’s foreign-born population to that of a colonized people. Cf. Biondi/Schami, p. 124.

<sup>54</sup> Chin, p. 135.

## 1982 - 1983 In zwei Sprachen leben

Fuelled by the media interest in the domestic, socio-political dimension of the second competition, and by the success of the *Als Fremder in Deutschland* anthology, the third competition was once again intent on giving German readers access to the experience of the foreigners living in their midst and hence to an anthropology of German-ness. The *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* impetus for the competition lingered, however. The theme of the third competition marked a move away from an implied sense of alienation, lack of belonging and exclusion, towards an acceptance of a permanent presence and hence to an emphasis on the importance of being able to use the German language.<sup>55</sup> The desire for literariness was also made very explicit: 'die eingesandten Texte [sollten] als *literarische* Beiträge verstanden werden [...] womit zum Beispiel linguistische Abhandlungen zum Thema ausgeschlossen waren'.<sup>56</sup> In the foreword to *Als Fremder in Deutschland*, Weinrich had argued that the foreign writer's distance to the German language promoted a certain literariness (p.10), citing Chamisso and Canetti as examples. Ackermann repeated Weinrich's assertion in her afterword to *In zwei Sprachen leben*: 'Ausdrucksfähigkeit und Ausdruckskraft [müssen] durch die Fremdsprache nicht eingeengt sein, sondern [können] im Gegenteil eine neue Qualität und Intensität erreichen'.<sup>57</sup> What emerged over the course of the competition and the editorial process for a further two anthologies, however, was that the assumed link between linguistic competence and literary ability was problematic. The tension between pedagogy and anthropology that had motivated the first two competitions and determined the criteria by which entries were judged was still unresolved. It was joined by a tension between literariness and linguistic competence, which were no longer seen as necessarily coinciding.

The emphasis on literariness and the command of language that it implied was particularly at odds with the institute's desire to promote writing in German by Turks. For the first time in the competition's history, Turkish nationals constituted the largest national group, with 116 of the 340 entries. Despite this numerical dominance, Turks were still not represented among the three main prizewinners – Michel Boiron from France, Nelly Ma from China, and *PoLiKunst* member Gino Chiellino from Italy – and took only one of the runner-up prizes with Barin Ertunç's entry. It is worth noting that Ertunç was a translator and teacher, not a *Gastarbeiter*, and that the three main winners were once again all university-trained.<sup>58</sup>

This result, which was at odds with the organizers' intentions, motivated two initiatives that grew out of the 1982-3 competition. The first was the institute's announcement that it would devote an additional anthology, beyond *In zwei Sprachen leben*, to the writing of the many Turkish entrants; this would be entitled *Türken deutscher Sprache*. The institute wrote to all the Turkish participants of the competition to inform them about the special anthology,<sup>59</sup> but also to non-

<sup>55</sup> The initial suggestion for the theme of the third competition was 'Unter Deutschen', but this was not adopted. DLA, AvCS, Ordner 11. *Antrag auf Finanzierung* dated 16 February 1982.

<sup>56</sup> Irmgard Ackermann, 'Nachwort', in *In zwei Sprachen leben* (München: dtv, 1983), pp. 247-57 (p. 248).

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., p. 247. Chiellino views this as a further example of the 'eigennützige Absicht' that characterized the reception of this literature – not only could the Germans learn about themselves through the eyes of foreign writers, but their literary language was also being enriched by the foreign presence. Cf. Chiellino, 'Interkulturalität und Literaturwissenschaft', p. 387.

<sup>58</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 11.

<sup>59</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 17. Letter dated 10 February 1983.

entrants such as established writer Yüksel Pazarkaya,<sup>60</sup> to request additional texts for potential inclusion in the book. Ackermann's correspondence with Servet Aksakal, a Turkish metal worker from the Düsseldorf area who had entered the competition, reveals the tensions in the institute's approach:

Ihr Text [...] hat uns durch seine Ausdruckskraft trotz seiner sprachlichen Mängel sehr beeindruckt, und wir möchten ihn gern in unser Buch türkischer Autoren aufnehmen. Dabei stellt sich jedoch ein Problem: normalerweise korrigiere ich sprachliche Fehler. In Ihrem Text würde das jedoch eine vollständige Bearbeitung bedeuten, bei der Ihr eigener Ausdruck verlorengehen würde. Deswegen würde ich, wenn Sie einverstanden wären, Ihren Text lieber außer einer kleinen Einführung unbearbeitet mit seinen Fehlern und seiner eigenen Ausdrucksweise abdrucken, da er, wie mir scheint, so viel stärker und direkter anspricht. Es wäre auch ein gutes Beispiel dafür, daß es sinnvoll ist, sich in einer anderen Sprache auszudrücken, auch wenn man diese Sprache nicht mit all ihren Regeln beherrscht.<sup>61</sup>

The circumstances of those writers, chief among them Turks, who had learned German auto-didactically combined infelicitously with the institute's emphasis on linguistic sophistication to effectively exclude an entire constituency from success in the competitions. Yet, as Ackermann was slowly coming to realize: 'sprachliche Meisterschaft [ist] nicht das Hauptkriterium für die Intensität der Aussage',<sup>62</sup> an admission of the fact that authenticity could trump literary expression, and that linguistic inadequacies might even strengthen the impression of lived experience.<sup>63</sup> Ackermann's letter to Aksakal, whose entry was eventually published without any introduction, shows her dogged promotion of the importance of learning German. However, this focus on pedagogy contradicts her admission elsewhere, in *In zwei Sprachen leben*, that the texts in the anthology 'kaum Anregungen oder Modelle zum Spracherwerb [geben]', because of the negativity of so many of the experiences described in them.<sup>64</sup> Ironically, of the thirty-four Turkish writers whose work was included in *Türken deutscher Sprache*, only a handful identify themselves as *Gastarbeiter* or indicate that they once worked in a blue-collar position; the majority are educated professionals or students. The implication is that the truly disadvantaged minorities in German society did not have the linguistic tools or did not exist in a social framework that would permit them to write literary works in German and hence participate in the Munich competitions. They had no access to institutional *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, and the institute's competitions could not accommodate literary expression in the mother tongue.

The second initiative that sought to encourage Turkish participation in the competitions was a special reading and homestay in Munich devoted to junior entrants, from whom the institute had received forty pieces of work. Part of the intention behind the reading and the trip seems to have been to take the children out of their normal environment and expose them to German culture.

---

<sup>60</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 19. Letter dated 21 April 1983.

<sup>61</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 23. Undated letter.

<sup>62</sup> Ackermann, 'Nachwort', p. 249.

<sup>63</sup> At this juncture it is worth noting that Weinrich's notes on Biondi's (unsuccessful) entry for the 1982 competition, which included the poem 'nicht nur gastarbeiterdeutsch', state: 'Gedichte in Gastarbeiterdeutsch, falsch? (wohl nicht)' (DLA, AvCS, Ordner 18).

<sup>64</sup> Ackermann, 'Nachwort', p. 257.

This endeavour was very much in keeping with ‘Gastarbeiter-Linguistik’ as an area of enquiry within *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, as laid down by Harald Weinrich in his 1979 programmatic essay.<sup>65</sup>

As the activities surrounding the third competition and second and third anthologies came to a close, the writers whose work had featured in *In zwei Sprachen leben* were asked to weigh in on the potential theme of a subsequent competition announced for 1985. This was a new feature in the history of the competitions: the first time since 1979 that the institute had indicated a willingness to relinquish some control of its ‘ownership’ of exophonic writing. The theme for the competition would eventually become ‘Über Grenzen’, and result in an anthology of the same name.

### 1985 - 1986 Über Grenzen

The move to involve exophonic writers in shaping the direction of the competition was followed by another attempt to share the stage with them. On 17 and 18 May 1985, a symposium entitled *Eine nicht nur deutsche Literatur* took place in Bad Homburg; the proceedings were later published in a collection of the same name. The eighteen exophonic writers who had been invited spoke on one of four themes: ‘Meine Motivationen zum Schreiben’; ‘Zum Schreiben in fremder Sprache’; ‘Zum Stellenwert der “Ausländer-Literatur” im Rahmen der deutschen Literatur’; and ‘Unsere Erwartungen an die deutschen Kulturträger und –vermittler’. In their speeches, many exophonic writers openly expressed their frustration with the German literary establishment, and by implication with Ackermann and Weinrich’s efforts.<sup>66</sup> The symposium was an official acknowledgement of ‘den viel differenzierteren Charakter dieser Literatur’,<sup>67</sup> which had clearly now outgrown the boundaries of the themed competitions (if it had ever really fit within them in the first place). It was also an attempt to promote its academic study. In Weinrich’s application to the Reimers Stiftung for financial support of the symposium, he stressed: ‘Es wäre [...] dringend an der Zeit, sich dieser Entwicklung systematisch und methodisch anzunehmen, Bedingungen und Erscheinungsformen zu erforschen’.<sup>68</sup> In this respect, Ackermann and Weinrich were returning to the *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* roots of their initiative.

Only with the fourth Munich competition did the make-up of the entries and the winners truly come to resemble the demographics of Germany’s non-German population. Turkey and Italy were the numerically dominant nations, with ninety-two and twenty-six of the 334 entries respectively. Ertunç Barin from Turkey took the first prize of DM 1000, and there were three Turks among the five runners-up. All four Turkish winners were university-educated.<sup>69</sup>

In the anthology that resulted, *Über Grenzen*, Karl Esselborn’s afterword notes several trends in the nature of the competition entries: teachers and students were heavily represented, whereas *Angestellte* and labour migrants were not; an increased interest in professionalization was apparent

<sup>65</sup> Weinrich, ‘Deutsch als Fremdsprache’, pp. 8-9.

<sup>67</sup> Harald Weinrich, ‘Ein vorläufiges Schlußwort’, in *Eine nicht nur deutsche Literatur*, p. 98.

<sup>68</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 33. *Antrag auf Finanzierung* dated 8 November 1984.

<sup>69</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 32.

among the writers.<sup>70</sup> He also makes the institute's contribution to the promotion of *Ausländerliteratur* quite clear: 'diese Veröffentlichungen konnten zur Bekanntheit der Ausländerliteratur und nicht zuletzt auch zu einer Verbreitung ihres Spektrums beitragen, da eine ganze Reihe von Autoren hier zum ersten Mal gedruckt vorgestellt wurden'.<sup>71</sup> The afterword finishes on a surprisingly political note, calling for a more nuanced *Ausländerpolitik* that recognizes a spectrum of options between the two poles of integration and exclusion.<sup>72</sup>

By the time of this final competition, the Adelbert von Chamisso Prize, sponsored by the *Robert Bosch Stiftung*, had already been inaugurated; Harald Weinrich was instrumental in the prize's establishment. Thus, in February 1985, long before the competition's October deadline, Weinrich was able to announce, in a letter inviting exophonic authors to the Bad Homburg symposium, that the winner of the inaugural Chamisso prize would be Aras Ören, with the Förderpreis going to Rafik Schami.<sup>73</sup> Ören had never entered the Munich competitions, and Schami had entered but been unsuccessful; neither had ever published in the dtv anthologies.<sup>74</sup> The establishment of the Chamisso Prize was clearly a watershed in the development and status of exophonic literature in Germany, and it is perhaps not a surprise that it heralded an end to the Munich competitions.

## Conclusion

At their inception, the Munich competitions were an undertaking informed by the academic discipline of *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. They clarified the hazy contours of that discipline and did much to consolidate the position of the Munich institute as one of its preeminent centres. The insistence on exophony and literariness, however, meant that the institute did not receive entries from constituencies they would like to have encountered: Turks and *Gastarbeiter*. Instead they received entries from well-educated foreigners, some of them long-term residents of Germany, others who had paid short visits and/or lived abroad, and from members of *PoLiKunst*, a cultural organization with a socio-political agenda that had long since embarked on an endeavour similar to that of Ackermann and Weinrich. The institute's encounter with Germany's others and their critique of the host nation resulted in the development of an anthropological facet to the competitions and anthologies. There was little change in the social background of the competitions' winners, and only in the final competition did Turks achieve an appropriate level of representation on the podium. Threads of *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* can be observed running through the entire period, with the children's reading and homestay project constituting a more obvious manifestation, and the Bad Homburg symposium an attempt at the *Interkulturelle Germanistik* that emerged from DaF.

---

<sup>70</sup> Karl Esselborn, 'Nachwort', in *Über Grenzen*, ed. by K. Esselborn (München: dtv, 1987), pp. 262-70 (pp. 263-4).

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., p. 262.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid., p. 270.

<sup>73</sup> DLA, AvCS, Ordner 33. Letter dated 4 February 1985.

<sup>74</sup> Chiellino points out that the 'begriffliche Unmöglichkeit' of the Munich competitions – the insistence that deutsche *Gastliteratur* had to be written in German and the fact that one could enter the Munich competitions without being resident in Germany – is perfectly illustrated by the fact that Aras Ören, the first winner of the Chamisso prize, wrote only in Turkish. Cf. Chiellino, *Am Ufer der Fremde*, pp. 295-6.

Ultimately the Munich competitions and anthologies have to be judged in terms of their success in promoting exophonic literature in Germany. Did they help exophonic authors access what was by all accounts a hard-hearted German literary establishment?<sup>75</sup> What was the effect of their efforts on the autonomous initiatives of exophonic authors, initiatives such as *PoLiKunst*? In a 1984 essay, Harald Weinrich somewhat bizarrely argued that many of Germany's foreign residents had adopted writing as a form of creative expression, because "[das Schreiben ist] auf professionelle Vermittler aus der deutschen Bevölkerung nicht so stark angewiesen",<sup>76</sup> but went on to contradict himself by stating:

neuerdings [haben sich] auch einige größere Verlage und Taschenbuchverlage bereits dieser Literatur angenommen [...] Daraus kann man entnehmen, dass die ausländischen Autoren den gelegentlichen katalysatorischen Beistand einzelner deutscher Personen oder Institutionen nicht verschmähen.<sup>77</sup>

It is true that by the mid-1980s, Franco Biondi was being published by dtv – although this publishing relationship was not to last<sup>78</sup> – and that by the second half of the 1980s Rafik Schami's children's books had found their way to Beltz & Gelberg, although his relationship with Hanser would not begin until the 1990s. On the other hand, Schami never had any success in the Munich competitions, although one might argue that their promotional effect applied even to those authors who were not directly involved. To borrow a concept from translation theory, if one views the Munich anthologies as offering a domesticated *Ausländerliteratur* acceptable to the German palate, and the publications put out by *PoLiKunst* and *Südwind* as containing a foreignized and more aggressively political *Gastarbeiterliteratur*, then it is clear that economic success swung to the domesticating half of the binary. *Als Fremder in Deutschland* and *In zwei Sprachen leben* both sold their first print runs of 10,000 copies and went into second printings. The three *PoLiKunst* yearbooks, on the other hand, published and financed by *PoLiKunst* members, sold only around a 1000 copies each. There is no doubt that the *Institut für Deutsch als Fremdsprache* saw itself as being in competition with other purveyors of *Ausländerliteratur*, and took every opportunity to stake its claim as this literature's first champion. This may have been motivated by another kind of competition – a need to defend and carve out academic territory –, but the result appears to have been substantial damage to the autonomous efforts of exophonic authors to promote their own literature and in the process to draw attention to the socio-political issues affecting the lives of Germany's foreign-born population. Finally, as Gino Chiellino points out,

<sup>75</sup> At the Bad Homburg symposium in 1985, Suleman Taufiq complained: 'Es gibt uns gegenüber eine bestimmte Form der Nachlässigkeit und sogar Arroganz, die dazu geführt hat, daß sich die Medien und die großen Verlage bis jetzt kaum die Mühe gemacht haben, sich mit unserer literarischen Produktion auseinanderzusetzen.' Suleman Taufiq, 'Natürlich: Kritik', in *Eine nicht nur deutsche Literatur*, p. 75.

<sup>76</sup> Harald Weinrich, 'Gastarbeiterliteratur in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland', *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, 56 (1984), 12-22 (p. 12).

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>78</sup> If one takes a longer view of publishing success, Franco Biondi has returned to the autonomy of his roots – his first book was self-published in 1979 – and is utilizing the services of Book on Demand for his most recent publication, *Kostas' Stille Jahre* (2012).



throughout this “promotional” period “die Kernfrage nach der Authentizität eines literarischen Phänomens, das auf dialogische Sprachen angewiesen ist, [ist] nirgendwo gestellt worden”.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Chiellino, ‘Interkulturalität’, p. 390.