

February 1976

## Thomas Mann and 'The Jewish Question': Perhaps the Last Word

Sol Gittleman  
*Tufts University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr>



Part of the [Modern Literature Commons](#), and the [Philosophy Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Gittleman, Sol (1976) "Thomas Mann and 'The Jewish Question': Perhaps the Last Word," *University of Dayton Review*. Vol. 12: No. 2, Article 10.

Available at: <https://ecommons.udayton.edu/udr/vol12/iss2/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Dayton Review by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact [mschlange1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlange1@udayton.edu), [ecommons@udayton.edu](mailto:ecommons@udayton.edu).

## **Thomas Mann and 'The Jewish Question': Perhaps the Last Word**

Sol Gittleman

Perhaps the least discussed—and for that reason least understood—of the multitudinous facets of Thomas Mann's writings has been that which concerns his image of the Jew. Generally, the subject is not mentioned even in the more comprehensive studies of Mann's works. The story which deals most directly with a Jewish theme, *The Blood of the Volsungs* (*Wälsungenblut*, 1905), has attracted relatively little critical attention. This is remarkable for two reasons. Artistically, it is a minor masterpiece; and biographically, the story became the center of a storm of outrage within Mann's own family and precipitated a domestic protest which led to the suppression of its publication.

What discussion there has been on the subject of Thomas Mann and the Jews has been partisan. There are those critics who have felt compelled to defend Mann against those few who have suggested that he did not take a particularly charitable view of the Jew in his writings. The most thorough and balanced of Mann's supporters has been Martin Flinker, who in 1959 published "Thomas Mann und der Antisemitismus," in his volume on *Thomas Manns politische Betrachtungen im Lichte der heutigen Zeit*. In an extensive chapter of his book, Flinker explores Mann's profound and genuine hatred of National Socialism, as well as his disgust at the emergence of anti-Semitism in Germany. Flinker finds considerable evidence in letters and speeches to demonstrate that Mann was totally committed to fighting racism on all fronts and in all forms. He admonishes those who remain unconvinced and pre-occupied: "Thomas Mann auch nur im Zusammenhang mit Antisemitismus zu nennen, heisst, ihn überhaupt nicht verstanden haben, ihn gar nicht kennen, den Wert seines Schaffens leugnen."<sup>1</sup> Indeed, a look at Mann's activities in behalf of Jews and Jewish causes from the time of his exile until his death, but particularly during the Nazi terror, confirms his own assessment, which he made in a letter written September 1, 1935: Ich habe gegen das, was in Deutschland seit Jahren heraufkam und nun zur absoluten Gewalt gelangt ist, fast allein unter den deutschen Schriftstellern mit allen Kräften angekämpft, und mein heutiges Exil, halb freiwillig, halb unfreiwillig, wie es ist, stellt eben die Konsequenz dieses Kampfes dar."<sup>2</sup> Thomas Mann was fully and unequivocally engaged in aiding both Jewish and non-Jewish refugees to escape Hitler's grasp. His commitment was total, his humanism universal, and his help was given unstintingly to people of all political persuasions as well as religious beliefs: Jews, gentiles, socialists, communists, anarchists, all benefited from Mann's assistance. Parenthetically, Mann became so identified with liberal causes in

the United States that he was mentioned by several congressional committees investigating communist activities in America, as a possible fellow traveler! The Nazis for their part had identified both the Mann brothers as Jews as early as the 1920s.

Thomas Mann's record in this respect is unimpeachable, and it is from this viewpoint that Flinker writes: "So notorisch ist Thomas Manns Einstellung gegen den Antisemitismus wie gegen jede Art von Diskriminierung anderer Rassen und Völker, so durchdrungen war dieser grosse Menschenfreund von der Idee, das die Menschen, alle und ohne Ausnahme, nur nach ihren moralischen und geistigen Qualitäten zu beurteilen sind, dass man wohl Unterscheidungen machen dürfe, 'keinesfalls aber im Sinne der Geburt', mit solcher Geringschätzung hat Thomas Mann immer und vom Anfang an über den Antisemitismus gedacht und gesprochen, dass es mir fast widersinnig erscheint, dieses Thema zu einem Kapitel dieser meiner Abhandlung zu machen."<sup>3</sup>

But, our concern here is not with Mann's humanitarian commitment, which was considerable, consistent, and well documented. What we are confronting is the image of the Jew as he emerges in Thomas Mann's writings, an image which leads a sensible critic such as Erich Brock to state: "Man weiss aus Manns Werk, dass er die Juden nie besonders geliebt hat."<sup>4</sup> Is it possible that both Flinker and Brock could be correct in their judgments? Do we find ourselves once again confronting the paradox of Thomas Mann?

The earliest references to Jews in Mann's works were incidental and of modest prominence. In *Buddenbrooks*, the Hagenstroems are the artful newcomers who precipitate the decline of the tragic Buddenbrooks family. In *Tonio Kröger*, Irwin Jimmerthal is a friend of both Tonio and Hans Hansen, a Gymnasium comrade, a hail-fellow-well-met type, totally assimilated. Similarly, the Jewish characters in *Königliche Hoheit* are not unattractive. It was Mann's authorship of *Wälsungenblut* in 1905 which involved him in a family crisis quite specifically related to his depiction of the world of German Jewry. T. J. Reed refers to the incident as "a near scandal."<sup>5</sup> Mann's story concerns a decadent and vulgar German-Jewish *nouveauriche* family and focuses particularly on the twins Sieglinde and Siegmund, whose corrupting cynicism climaxes in a mock-Wagnerian incestuous relationship which cockolds Sieglinde's dull and upright fiancé. The story was to appear in the January edition of *Die Neue Rundschau*. However, Oskar Bie, the *Rundschau's* prestigious editor and a well-known music critic in his own right, objected to Mann's ending of the story; as the sibling lovers discussed the fate of Sieglinde's husband-to-be, Siegmund noted: "'Nun', sagte er, und einen Augenblick traten die Merkmale seiner Art sehr scharf auf seinem Gesichte hervor, 'was wird mit ihm sein? Beganft haben wir ihn,—den Goy!'"<sup>6</sup> Mann accepted Bie's criticism and altered the ending to read as follows: "'Dankbar soll er uns sein. Er wird ein minder triviales Desein führen, von nun an.'" <sup>7</sup> What could Mann have possibly been thinking of when he created the patently offensive original text, with its vulgar use of Yiddishisms such as "beganft" and "Goy"? Was his separation of art from reality so total that he did not realize how shocking this story would be to his new bride, Katja, whose father Alfred



Pringsheim was a notable member of a prominent German-Jewish family? And what of Klaus Pringsheim, Katja's twin brother?

The family reaction was swift. Mann was asked to retrieve the already type-set story, and he had the plates destroyed. Thus, began a remarkable literary journey of a story which Henry Hatfield has quite rightly called "one of the most consistently worked out products of European decadence."<sup>8</sup> The original German version did not appear in a public edition of Mann's works until the Stockholmer edition of 1966, some years after Mann's death. However, soon after World War I, Mann permitted a limited private edition to be printed by Phantasmus Verlag of Munich, with illustrations by his old *Simplizissimus* friend Thomas Theodor Heine. In 1931, a pirated French version entitled *Sang Réservé* appeared in Paris; and each time, Mann was reminded of his indiscretion. In 1921 he was sufficiently identified with the entire Jewish question to be asked by Ephraim Frisch, editor of *Der Neue Merkur*, to submit an article to a *Sonderheft über die Judenfrage*. Mann's tone in this letter-article clearly suggests that he was asked to write for the purpose of settling any ambiguities in respect to his attitude toward the Jewish question. Astonishingly, once again Mann found himself caught in an embarrassing situation. The tone and character of the piece he wrote proved unacceptable to Mann himself. After sending it to Frisch, Mann asked that the article be returned. It never appeared in *Der Neue Merkur* or in any other journal and was published in the 1968 volume *Autobiographisches* of Mann's writings edited by Erika Mann. In a letter to Frisch dated October 18, 1921, Mann gave his reasons for withdrawing the essay: "Er ist einerseits leichtfertig und andererseits von jenem autobiographischen Radikalismus, zu dem ich neige und der manchmal meine Stärke sein mag, in so einem Aufsatz aber fehl am Ort ist und Anstoss erregen möchte." One need only read the piece to discover for oneself what seemed even to Mann to be a kind of back-handed *apologia*. "Ich denke zurück", writes Mann, reflecting back on his schooldays:

In Quarta sass neben mir eine Weile ein Knäbchen Carlebach, Rabbinersöhnchen, quick, wenn auch eben sehr reinlich nicht . . . Ein andermal in der Kindheit hielt ich es angelegentlich mit einem Knaben namens Fehér, Ungar von Geburt, einem Typus, prononciert bis zur Hässlichkeit, mit platter Nase und früh dunkelnden Schnurrbartschatten . . . Später dann, in Tertia, war einer, mit dem der Schulhof mich ebenfalls oftmals kordial verbunden sah,—eines koscheren Schlachters Sohn und der lustigste Bursch von der Welt, ohne jegliche Spur des melancholischen Zuges, der diesem Volk durch seine Geschichte eingeprägt worden und der auch bei Carlebach und Fehér deutlich genug hervorgetreten war . . . Sein Bild ist mir geblieben, weil in ihm mir zuerst der Typus des durchaus vergnügten Juden entgegentrat, der mir später noch öfter begegnet ist.<sup>10</sup>

Mann reveals a typical irony of what seems to be Judeaophile flattery: when praising the Jew, you cut him out from the normal: "Sie zeigen überhaupt in der Regel mehr gefällige Aufmerksamkeit und schmeichelnde Teilnahme als ein Nationaldeutscher,

und ihre schnelle Fassungs-gabe, ihr penetranter Verstand, ihr eigentümlicher Witz machen sie zu einem sensibeln Publikum, als leider unter den zuweilen etwas langsam und schwer begreifenden Echt- und Ur-Deutschen angetroffen wird."<sup>11</sup> Here we have it, the exhilarating cliché of the clever, witty, intellectually more gifted German Jew, somehow in Mann's mind (and in the minds of so many others!) associated with awareness and taste. It is to this stereotype that the American social historian Peter Gay spoke in a recent article in *Midstream*:

There were German Jews in the avant-garde of high culture, but they were in the rear guard and in the center as well. Far fewer cultural revolutionaries and far more cultural reactionaries were Jews than historians have recognized. To invoke in ritualistic rebuttal the magic names of Marx, Freud, and Einstein is gravely to oversimplify a very complicated matter . . . There was nothing in the Jewish cultural heritage, and little in their particular social situation, that would make them into cultural rebels, into principled Modernists.<sup>12</sup>

Mann's almost compulsory reaction is that there is a certain kind of Jew, a generalized image of a superior type, more cultured, more literate than the average German. Gay takes note of these endless gentle references during the Wilhelminian and Weimar epochs to the "ready wit" and "intellectual acuteness" of the Jews and suggests a proper antidote: "There is a historical and sociological study that desperately needs to be undertaken: that of stupid Jews. The material would be abundant, and the results would correct the widespread and untenable notion that Jews are by endowment more intelligent than other people."<sup>13</sup>

But, toward the end of Mann's piece we discover that the flattery cloaked more than just positive stereotyping: "Es ist im Laufe der Jahre zwischen meiner Natur und der jüdischen zu schlimmen Konflikten gekommen und musste wohl dazu kommen. Wir haben einander böses Blut gemacht. Die boshaftesten Stilisierungen meines Wesens gingen von Juden aus; die giftig-witzigste Negation einer Existenz kam mir von dort."<sup>14</sup> No doubt he considered the conclusion a ringing endorsement: "Ihr typischer Charakter hat seine Unannehmlichkeiten, er hat sogar seine Gefährlichkeit —welcher Volkscharakter wiese übrigens nicht dergleichen auf? Jedes einzelne der europäischen Völker ist auf seine besonders Art dem Erdteil zum Verhängnis geworden. Die Juden aber zeichnet eines aus, was sie, man muss es sagen, unter Deutschen 'artfremder' erscheinen lässt, als ihre Nase; Es ist ihre eingeborene Liebe zum Geist . . ."<sup>15</sup> Finally, a smoldering defensiveness bursts out in the conclusion, and Mann reveals his annoyance at what he perceives as the necessity to prove himself not an anti-Semite: "Da habe ich wieder 'Rede und Antwort' gestanden. Darf ich mich setzen? Ihr sehr ergebener Thomas Mann."<sup>16</sup>

In his response to the appearance of the French edition of *Wälsungenblut*, the same defensiveness is apparent. Mann is almost apologetic about the work: "Es ist kein Meisterstück," he says of the story and its author, "was er zustande bringt, aber ein künstlerisch präsentables Stück Arbeit mit gelungenen Partien."<sup>17</sup> He even attempts



to suggest that whatever indiscretion appears could be attributable to the youth of the author: "Ein junger Autor . . . Das Erscheinen also einer novellistischen Jugendarbeit von mir . . ." <sup>18</sup> But, essentially, in this short piece entitled "Noch einmal Wälsungenblut" Mann is saying "What have I done now?" There is no suggestion that, in 1931, he was aware of any flagrant anti-Semitic overtones in this story. Such an idea did not and could not occur to him. Art had no particular relevance to reality, as far as Mann was concerned. That there might be a politically sensitive repercussion at the appearance of this story in the midst of the Nazi upsurge seems not to have crossed his mind. Thomas Mann's son Golo suggests that both Thomas and Heinrich had a difficult time relating their artistic world to the world around them. "What the two brothers had in common," he writes, "was that no matter how much they felt committed to intervene in politics for the sake of clarification they worked only with the products of their own minds and barely came to grips with reality." <sup>19</sup>

In his political writings, we encounter the same blind spot, the inability to realize that he might be offending. In the work which signalled Thomas Mann's political maturity, *Von deutscher Republik*, Mann comes forward in 1922 as an outspoken supporter of Weimar Republicanism. He denounced the forces of reactionary thinking and urges his student audience to join him: "Ich bitte nochmals: erwehrt euch der Kopfscheu! Es ist in aller Welt kein Grund, die Republik als eine Angelegenheit scharfer Judenjungen zu empfinden. Überlasst sie ihnen nicht! Nehmt ihnen, wie die beliebte politische Redensart lautet, 'den Wind aus den Segeln'—den republikanischen Wind!" <sup>20</sup> Granted, Mann's audience—a group of Berlin students gathered together to celebrate Gerhart Hauptmann's sixtieth birthday—was conservative, and for them perhaps the tone of "scharfe Judenjungen" might have been quite appropriate. For that matter, the tone might also have been singularly appropriate for Mann, as well. One has to fully understand what it must have meant for Thomas Mann to embrace the Weimar Republic and all that it stood for. He was rejecting a conservative, non-democratic past, a past which only a few years earlier, in the massive *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*, he laboriously attempted to justify.

The *Betrachtungen* provides us a clearer view of Mann's difficulty with his Jewish problem. Erich Heller has called this rambling, often confused ideological confession a kind of folly on the part of Thomas Mann. But, it represented for Mann an essential purging of his genuine attitudes which had been part of his past, part of his tradition. His fundamental honesty forced him to confront his values and his prejudices, which included his brother Heinrich, who represented everything that Thomas at the time of the writing of this work had come to reject. Thomas Mann distilled this conflict into a brief paragraph from this essay of nearly six hundred pages:

Der Unterschied von Geist und Politik enthält den von Kultur und Zivilisation, von Seele und Gesellschaft, von Freiheit und Stimmrecht, von Kunst und Literatur; und Deutschtum, das ist Kultur, Seele, Freiheit, Kunst und nicht Zivilisation, Gesellschaft, Stimmrecht, Literatur. Der Unterschied von Geist und Politik ist, zum weiteren Beispiel, der von kosmopolitisch und international; jener Begriff entstammt der kulturellen Sphäre und ist

deutsch; dieser entstammt der Sphäre der Zivilisation und Demokratie und ist—etwas ganz anderes.<sup>21</sup>

This “etwas ganz anderes” is finally spelled out in a letter Mann wrote to Hanns Johst in 1920, congratulating Johst on his recently written play *Der König*:

Lieber Herr Johst:

Mit dankbarer Bewegung habe ich Ihr Buch im Schmuck seiner schönen Widmung entgegengenommen, deren einzelnen Ausdruck ich als lebenswürdig-überschwänglich zurückweisen muss, die mich aber als Merkmal der Sympathie aufseiten eines bestimmten, und, wie ich gottlob glauben darf, heute schon wieder führenden Jugend-Typus beglückt. Ich liebe Sie sehr, Herr Hanns Johst, und freue mich Ihres Daseins. Sie stellen Jugend dar, Kühnheit, Radikalismus, stärkste Gegenwart—ohne irgend etwas mit gallo-jüdisch-internationalistischer Geistigkeit zu schaffen zu haben, von der das deutsche Geistesleben sich eine Weile tyrannisieren lassen zu müssen glaubte.<sup>22</sup>

We begin to see here how far Thomas Mann had to come to reach the humanistic plateau where Flinker places him, and places him with justification. But, one must admit that there are certainly grounds at least to discuss Thomas Mann in connection with an almost instinctive attitude toward Jews which was certainly part of the tradition in which Thomas Mann grew up. After 1922, without question Thomas Mann was a bulwark against National Socialism, and when Anti-Semitism reared up in Germany, Mann attacked it with vigor. At the same time, he was part of a cultural heritage which produced his close friendship with people such as Ernst Bertram, the philosopher and popularizer of Nietzsche, the author Josef Ponten, and the composer Hans Pfitzner, all of whom—along with the previously mentioned Johst—made an enthusiastic transition to National Socialism. They read and enjoyed the same authors—André Gide, Gustav Frenssen, and Hans Blüher, whose book *Die Rolle der Erotik in der männlichen Gesellschaft* was an astonishing proto-fascist offshoot of early Freudian thinking gone astray, a study which applied the concept of Eros to the male Bund and to the development of the state. Thomas Mann took this bizarre book very seriously.

It seems almost miraculous that Mann managed to escape the fate of his contemporaries. The influence of Ernst Bertram in these pre-Republic days was particularly strong. His study of Nietzsche, written in 1918, Mann called the most important book he had read in the previous five years. Bertram managed to convert Nietzsche effectively into the heroic manifestation of the Bergsonian vitalistic myth which served Nazi Germany so well. Bertram has been placed by numerous intellectual historians of Germany very near the center of proto-Nazi ideology.<sup>23</sup> Mann accepted this Bertram interpretation as gospel truth.

Yet, eventually, Thomas Mann came to reject all of this. The Mann-Bertram correspondence, along with the letters from Mann to both Ponten and Pfitzner, demonstrate the intellectual and humanistic growth of Mann, while at the same time



chronicling the moral disintegration and degradation of his friends. One by one, Mann turned sadly away from these former influences, as he found their virulent racism increasingly offensive.

But, a mark was left. In spite of Mann's clear and unequivocal rejection of anti-Semitism and racist thinking, he possessed certain ingrained attitudes which a person of his times simply could not shake off. He was a German brought up in an epoch when "race" was on everyone's mind, and for the German, the question of race meant for the most part the question of the Jew. For a remarkably large number of German and non-German intellectuals, this was simply the way of the world. Treitschke, Jacob Burckhardt, Fontane, Gide, George and his circle, G. K. Chesterton, Hillaire Belloc and others too numerous to mention representing all the nations of Europe, all were in various degrees pre-occupied with the question of "Jewishness." A letter from the Expressionist poet Georg Heym can serve as a somewhat representative attitude: "Meine Stellung zum Judentum ist folgende: Ich stehe ihm auf Grund des Rasse-instinktes a priori feindlich gegenüber; Dafür kann ich nicht."<sup>24</sup> But, he goes on to say, he is willing to take the Jews one at a time, since some of them are quite decent.

One might imagine that the mature Thomas Mann would reject Heym's position as downright racist. Yet, his own conception of the Jew, even toward the end of his career as a writer, bore some of the traces, some of the memories of his earlier period. Mann never really understood the nature of the German's relationship to the question of the Jew, so that when his children objected to the two Jewish characters in *Dr. Faustus*, Mann was just as perplexed as he had been forty years earlier. Mann had read parts of the manuscript to his family, and there was the suggestion made that the Jewish characters were described with stereotyped, racist overtones. Mann began thinking the matter through, and he personally found the character of Saul Fitelberg somewhat charming, but admitted that others might conceivably take offense: "Und das Schlimme ist, dass das Judentum auch in seinem anderen Vertreter, dem Faschisten Breisacher, so schlecht wekommt. Aber das ist nicht zu ändern. Das Buch hat es so gewollt." (author's emphasis)<sup>25</sup> As one might have expected—with the exception of Mann himself—numerous critics pointed out the unattractive characterizations of the novel's two Jews. Again, Mann was frustrated, hurt, and puzzled.

Thomas Mann was a consummate humanitarian, a fighter for man's dignity. He was also a *Jahrhundertwende* German profoundly influenced by racial thinking. For Thomas Mann, perhaps unconsciously, the Jew would always be—*etwas anderes*. This fact was one which he indeed could not even control. "Das Buch hat es so gewollt."

Tufts University

## NOTES

1. (The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton), p. 151. "To consider Thomas Mann only in light of a connection with anti-Semitism is not to have understood him, not to know him, and to deny the worth of his work."



2. To Harry Slochower, in *Briefe, 1889-1936* (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Verlag, 1962), p. 398. "Among German writers, I have been almost all alone in fighting with all my strength against that which for years has been rising up in Germany and now has come to complete power, and my present exile—half voluntary and half involuntary as it is—represents the consequences of this struggle."
3. Flinker, p. 151. "So notorious is Mann's position against anti-Semitism and against any kind of discrimination of race or people, so thoroughly ingrained was this great humanitarian with the idea that human beings, without exception, were to be judged only by their moral and spiritual qualities (distinctions could be made, of course, but never in terms of birth), so contemptuous was Thomas Mann right from the very beginning of anti-Semitism, that it seems to me almost absurd to make this theme a chapter of my study."
4. Quoted in Flinker, pp. 151-152. "One sees from Mann's works that he never particularly loved the Jews."
5. *The Uses of Tradition in Thomas Mann* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1974), p. 89.
6. Quoted in *Thomas Mann-Heinrich Mann Briefwechsel* (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Verlag, 1968), p. 265. "'Well', he said, and for a moment the features of his race became very pronounced in his expression, 'We've ganeffed him—the goy!'"
7. *Die Erzählungen* (Frankfurt/Main, Fischer Verlag, 1966), p. 410. "'He should be grateful to us. From now on his existence will have a less trivial meaning.'"
8. *Thomas Mann* (New Directions Book, Norfolk, Connecticut: James Laughlin, 1951), p. 28.
9. (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Verlag), pp. 357-358. "On the one hand the piece is frivolous and on the other hand it is out of place, inclined as it is to that kind of auto-biographical radicalism which often may be my strength, but in such an essay as this may be offensive."
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 95-97. "In the fourth form there sat next to me for a while a young boy named Carlebach, son of a rabbi, lively, if not particularly clean . . . At another time in my childhood I was close with a young fellow named Fehér, a Hungarian by birth, of a type bordering on the ugly, with flat nose and prematurely dark traces of a beard . . . Later then, in the third form, there was one fellow whom everyone recognized as having cordial relations with me, son of a kosher butcher, and the most joyous chap in the world, without any trace of that melancholy streak which history has imprinted on this melancholy folk and which characteristically was apparent in Carlebach and Fehér . . . I remember him well, because it was my first encounter with a type of thoroughly lighthearted Jew, a type which I later encountered quite often."
11. *Ibid.*, p. 98. "They generally demonstrate a more agreeable attentiveness and flattering participation than the average German, and their quick power of comprehension, their penetrating reason, their peculiar humor make them a more sensible public than one is apt to find among the intellectually cumbersome native German."
12. "Encounter with Modernism: German Jews in German Culture, 1888-1914" (February, 1975), pp. 23-65.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 25.
14. *Autobiographisches*, p. 98. "Through the course of the years there have been serious conflicts between my temperament and that of the Jews; indeed, it was inevitable. There has been bad blood between us. The most malicious characterizations of my work came from Jews. The most poisonously witty negation of existence came from that quarter."
15. *Ibid.*, p. 103. "Their typical characteristics have their unpleasant sides; there may even be some danger in this—but what European folk character does not demonstrate the same

- potential and have the same potential fate? The Jews, however, demonstrate one characteristic which, one has to admit, makes them appear more alien among Germans than just having a different nose: and that is their inherent love of intellect."
16. Ibid. "Well now, I have given my accounting. May I be permitted to sit down now? Yours truly, Thomas Mann."
  17. *Reden und Aufsätze*, I (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Verlag, 1965), p. 722. "It is no masterpiece that the author has created, but an artistically respectable piece of work with some successful passages."
  18. Ibid. "A young author . . . The appearance of a youthful novella of mine . . ."
  19. *The History of Germany since 1789*, translated from the German by Marian Jackson (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1968), p. 371.
  20. *Reden und Aufsätze*, II, p. 26. "I ask you once again, defend yourselves from fear. There is no reason in the world to perceive the Republic as a concern of sharp Jew-boys. Don't concede to them! Take—as the current political phrase has it—the wind out of their sails—the republican wind!"
  21. (Frankfurt/Main: Fischer Verlag, 1956), p. 23. "The difference between intellect and politics corresponds to that between culture and civilization, between soul and society, between freedom and suffrage, between art and literature; and Germanness, that is culture, soul, freedom, art, and *not* civilization, society, suffrage, literature. The difference between intellect and politics is, for a further example, that between cosmopolitan and international. The former concept originates in the cultural realm and is German; the latter originates in the sphere of civilization and democracy and is—something completely different."
  22. Quoted in Ernst Keller, *Nationalismus und Literatur* (Berne & München: Francke Verlag, 1970), p. 242. "Dear Mr. Johst, I am with thankful appreciation in receipt of your book and the beautiful dedication, whose kind excess is not really deserving on my part, which nonetheless gives me great pleasure as a sign of sympathy on the side of the new generation of youth whom I hope, God willing, will take the leadership. I love you very much, Hanns Johst, and rejoice in your work. You represent youth, boldness, radicalism, the strongest sense of the presence, without having to concern yourself with that gallic-Jewish-internationalistic intellectualism, by which the German spiritual life believes that it must allow itself to be tyrannized for a while."
  23. See George Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1964); Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the German Ideology* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1963); and Hans Kohn, *The Mind of Germany: The Education of a Nation* (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).
  24. Quoted in Keller, *Nationalismus und Literatur*, p. 240. "My position to Jewry is as follows. On the basis of my racial instincts, I am a priori opposed to it. I cannot help it."
  25. Dated September 7, 1948, in *Letters of Thomas Mann, 1889-1955*, selected and translated by Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971), p. 560. The letter is addressed to Agnes Meyer. "And the bad thing about it is that the Jews come off badly with the other representative in the book, the fascist Breisacher. But that is not to be changed. *The book wanted it that way* (author's emphasis)."

