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THE STUDY'S PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION

In the lives of great men there are often periods which are little known to the public. Usually, these gaps exist because the particular periods are considered of little consequence. However, a singular lack of precise information has existed about an important aspect in the life of Thomas Mann: his relationship with Czechoslovakia.

The purpose of this research was to shed light on this period by determining what motivated his quest for Czechoslovak citizenship; where and when he visited that country; what his feelings were toward the people of Czechoslovakia; how he was received by the public, press, literary critics; and the nature of his friendship with Karel Čapek, the foremost Czechoslovak literary figure.

In the course of assembling the information and material relevant to Thomas Mann's relationships with Czechoslovakia and its literary, governmental, and political figures, it became quickly evident that several courses could be pursued in its organization. Consideration was given to the many organizational paths open to me. Chosen, finally, however was the chronicle form of narrative as the major framework. In this decision I relied heavily on the perceptive advice of my professor at Ohio State University.

It was felt that only through the chronicle form could a critical in-depth assessment by Czechoslovak circles of Mann and his work over the years be presented with the merit and order both warranted. Therefore,
this narrative first sets the stage of Thomas Mann's involuntary journey into exile, how he arrived at that turning point, and why haven was extended by Czechoslovakia. From there, it relates in chronological order Mann's first impact, in the pre-World War I years, on the Czech intelligentsia and public and thence through the post World War II years—a period of approximately 35 years.
The period of research and writing of the Thomas Mann manuscript encompassed almost seven years. Innumerable obstacles, made the more formidable by both geographic distance and changing political situations, had to be overcome and, consequently, added to the length of time in the gathering of material by whatever avenue was possible under differing circumstances. The magnitude of these obstacles was scarcely anticipated when research was begun in 1964.

During the "Novotný era" in Czechoslovakia, for instance, little cooperation was received from officials of Czech Archives and libraries. As the political atmosphere began to change, the official attitude became more liberal and cooperation became more willing. This spirit of cooperation began in the latter part of 1967, and the flow of communication between author and sources in Czechoslovakia reached its height in 1968. During the latter part of 1968, there was a return to the former conservative political situation and cooperation dwindled. Personal contact in Czechoslovakia itself was out of the question; I therefore had to rely on the friendship and good-will of Czech visitors to the United States. Thus I gained access to private sources necessary for the research who, upon their return, provided me with most valuable information.

Bibliographical data may not be as explicit as it would have been under ordinary circumstances. Indeed, existing bibliographies of the pre-World War II era were found to be incomplete, both in Czechoslovakia
and the United States.

Extensive research for this study was conducted in the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C., and other capital libraries and by visits to the libraries in other cities; through personal interviews of Czech visitors and residents in the United States; written communication with persons in Germany, Great Britain, and other countries; and from information supplied to me from persons who at my behest made personal visits to Prague and Bratislava to collect data.

**Library Research**

A systematic search was conducted of documents such as daily newspapers, periodicals, journals, and other written materials available in the Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, the University of Chicago Library, and the Library of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. In addition, the Archives in Washington, D.C., were searched.

For the period before the first World War, little essential material was available. The period of the late 1920s was somewhat better represented. Thomas Mann's visits to Czechoslovakia in the 1930s were generously covered in the news sections of the Czech and German daily press. The number of daily newspapers, periodicals, and journals which reported on Mann's activities grew larger in the immediate pre-World War II era. It has been possible to locate nearly all secondary literature on Thomas Mann published in the post war period.
Interviews

People who either knew Thomas Mann or were familiar with the political and cultural life of Czechoslovakia encompassing the period of this study were interviewed. Of these, to whom I owe a great debt of gratitude, I wish to mention:

Professor René Wellek of Yale University.

Johannes Urzidil, author, now living in New York City.

Professor George Pistorius, Williams College, Massachusetts.

Professor William E. Harkins, Chairman of Slavic Languages, Columbia University, New York City.

Professor Zdenek David, Curator, Slavic Collection, Princeton University, New Jersey.

Dr. Ladislav K. Feierabend, Washington, D.C., formerly Minister of Economics of Czechoslovakia, now Editor, Radio Free Europe.

Dr. P. L. Horecky, Assistant Chief and East European Specialist, Slavic and Central European Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Professor Antonin Hruby, Department of German, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Dr. Matej Josko, formerly Czechoslovak Minister of Finance, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Vaclav Laska, Librarian, University of Chicago.

Dr. Vladimir Palic, Librarian, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Jan Papánek, formerly Czechoslovak Representative to the United Nations, now retired, New York City.

Dr. Miloslav Rechcigl, National Institute of Health, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Juraj Slávik, formerly Secretary of Agriculture and Czechoslovak Ambassador to the United States of America, now retired, Washington, D.C.
Josef Anderle, Associate Professor, Department of History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Dr. Peter Zenkl, formerly Vice President of Czechoslovakia, now retired, Washington, D.C.

Direct Contact with Czechoslovakia

Written contact was established with the University libraries in Prague and Bratislava. This was done directly and also through the good services of the President of the Special Libraries, Dr. Karl Baer, in Washington, D.C. Direct contact was made with the publishing house Artia, Prague, Статні knihovna Československé Socialistické Republiky (State Library of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic), Prague, Čstredná Knihovna Slovenskej Akadémie Vied (Central Library of the Slovak Academy of Sciences), Bratislava, and Komenského University Library, Bratislava.

Information was received from the former secretary to Karel Čapek, Dr. Miroslav Halík, Prague. Photocopies, notes, and information were received from Mr. Rudolf Fleischmann's daughter, Mrs. Milena Bains, who now lives in Preston, England.

Personal Visits of Others to Prague

A number of people who visited Prague or Bratislava while I was doing this research were asked to search archives and libraries for material pertinent to this topic. Most were natives of Czechoslovakia visiting the United States, and were asked to check some missing parts of materials or documents. Because of the political situation, their names are not being mentioned. However, they provided a part of the documentation needed to complete this study.
Among materials gathered by these processes are interviews with
Thomas Mann which were published in Czechoslovak publications\(^1\) on the
occasion of Thomas Mann's visits; documents pertaining to Thomas Mann's
naturalization as a Czechoslovak citizen and clarifying the roles of
President Beneš and Rudolf Fleischmann in these proceedings; certain
materials casting light on Thomas Mann's personal relationship with
Karel Čapek; fuller documentation of Mann's visits to Prague, some of
it correcting mistakes in previously published materials; Thomas Mann's
contributions to Czech publications; a bibliography of his works
translated into Czech or Slovak, and a review of the reception of
Thomas Mann by Czech writers and critics.

\(^1\)By "Czechoslovak publications" are meant periodicals and
newspapers published either in the Czech or German languages in the
Republic of Czechoslovakia. So the denigration "German Press" often
refers, as will be clear from the context, to German-language
publications in Czechoslovakia.
VITA

June 21, 1931 . . . . Born - Warsaw, Poland

1959 . . . . . . . . B.A. and M.A., The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1960-1961 . . . . . Teaching Assistant, Department of German, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1962 . . . . . . . . Teaching Assistant, Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
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NOTE ON TRANSLITERATION

Thomas Mann's name has been spelled by various authors with h (Thomas) or without it (Tomas). Throughout the text when a publication refers to Mann in Czech as Thomas, Thomase, Thomsa, Thomasovi, no Czech spelling was used. In the Czech language for instance Thomase would have to be spelled either Tomáš or Tomášě. In cases in which the first name was spelled without h, Czech or Slovak spelling was used, Tomáš. When Mann's name was used with the Czech ending, e.g., Mannove, Mannovi, Czech spelling was used: Mannvé, Mannuv.

Masaryk's full name was Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk. In both English and German, however, his first name is normally spelled with h (Thomas) and without ř. When used as a part of the German text his first name is left as it was found in the text, with h and without ř: Thomas.

The Czech and Slovak languages have two distinct grammars. Therefore some of the words have the same meaning but are spelled differently, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>Slovak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pohledy</td>
<td>Pohlady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Pre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderní</td>
<td>Moderné</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Románů</td>
<td>Románov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the first names could be spelled differently in Czech, Slovak, and German. For instance:

CHAPTER I

HOW THOMAS MANN BECAME A CZECHOSLOVAK CITIZEN

Thomas Mann, accompanied by his wife Katja, left Munich on February 11, 1933, for a lecture tour of Amsterdam, Brussels, and Paris. He was 58 years of age, world renowned, and what troubling thoughts he may have had over political events in Germany, which had seen Adolf Hitler become Reichschancellor scarcely two weeks earlier, were undoubtedly thrust to the back of his mind by his reception the day before in the Auditorium Maximum of the University of Munich. Still ringing in his ears was the applause which had greeted his lecture on Richard Wagner,\(^1\) drowning out the low, ominous rumblings of thunder created by Hitler's assumption of power.

At the moment, however, Mann would have been appalled by any suggestion that his departure signalled the start of a journey into exile. But that it was, and he was not to see his homeland again for 16 years—16 years in which he would become both a Czechoslovak and United States citizen and would live in Switzerland and the United States. Mann, a staunch supporter of the Weimar Republic who had warned the world against Hitler, misjudged the swiftness with which the Hitler regime was to act against all who had opposed it. The first in the Mann family to feel the effects of Hitler's victory was Thomas' brother

Heinrich who, fortunately forewarned by friends who feared for his safety, prudently left Germany as early as February 21, 1933.

Thomas Mann had been away from Munich two weeks when he too received warnings not to return to his homeland. His agonizing final decision to remain abroad was reached only after weeks of deliberations, and only after he had become convinced by a telephone call from his two eldest children, Erika and Klaus, who had returned to Munich warning him of "bad weather" in Germany. Their appraisal of the situation seemed well founded, for within days of his departure from Munich, a smear campaign had been launched against him by the Nazi-dominated wing of the German press. The charges were serious. He was accused of "pacifist excesses" and of "spiritual treason." In an effort to humiliate him publicly, the Protest der Richard Wagner Stadt München, attacking his Wagner lecture, appeared on April 16/17, 1933. It was signed by the important personages of Munich, and was given wide distribution over

---


3Erika and Klaus had called their father on March 11, 1933, warning him to stay away because of the adverse political climate in Germany. In order to veil their message they spoke of "bad weather" conditions. (Erika Mann, Escape to Life, p. 6).

4"... denn die Siegerpresse hat nach Kräften gegen mich gehetzt, und ich stehe auf der Liste derer, die sich 'pazifistischer Exzesse' schuldig gemacht haben, des 'geistigen Landesverrates'..." (Briefe 1889-1936, p. 328).

5"Fall Wagner: Von oben dirigierter Protest der Wagnerstadt München, ... der in der Presse erschien und auszugsweise auch vom Rundfunk übertragen wurde, war von allen unterschrieben, was in München Rang und Namen besass." (Ibid., p. 518).
press and radio. Within weeks of his departure from Munich his house and inventory were confiscated, and payments of his book royalties were stopped. Although he complied with the request of the Politische Polizei to pay the Reichsfluchtssteuer, Mann was unable to reverse the confiscation.\(^6\)

But there seemed to be a lack of coordination in the official actions directed against Mann and his family. In a surprise move toward the end of 1933 the German authorities allowed the release of payments of royalties which they had initially confiscated. Furthermore, Mann was invited to join the newly formed Reichsverband deutscher Schriftsteller.\(^7\) This invitation was remarkable since it was issued despite Mann's rejection of the Nazi regime, clearly demonstrated by his failure to return to Germany, his withdrawal from the Preussische Akademie der Künste, and his resignation from the Schutzverband deutscher Schriftsteller in March, 1933.\(^8\) Asked to sign the entry blanks of the Reichsverband, Mann declined, and in a letter to A. M. Frey angrily vowed: "Ich werde die Eintrittsformulare der Berliner Zwangsorganisation auf keinen Fall unterzeichnen."\(^9\)

Despite his refusal to have anything to do with the

---


\(^7\)Ibid., p. 342.

\(^8\)Hans Bürgin and Hans-Otto Mayer, Thomas Mann, eine Chronik seines Lebens, pp. 102-103.

\(^9\)Briefe 1889-1936, p. 342.
Reichsverband, the German government refrained from placing Thomas Mann's name on the Index. Consequently his books, unlike those of many other German authors, remained accessible to the German public. Among the reasons behind this apparently contradictory policy were the following: the Nazis wanted, if possible, to avoid a complete break with an author who was considered one of the most representative men all over the world; also they wanted to prevent his becoming a spokesman of the émigré cause, which needed such a morale booster. As long as Mann remained neutralized (whatever he might have claimed, privately, to the contrary), his political position could be questioned, as indeed it was. This apparent leniency toward Mann resulted in his being increasingly placed on the defensive. Mann resented this, but he refrained from taking a public stand against the Nazi government in Germany for several reasons.  

For Mann, the very thought of being cut off from Germany meant mental suffering. As he pointed out again and again, his life work was intended primarily for the German people. Furthermore, as an author he felt responsible to those German readers who were opposed to the Hitler regime. Also, the unlawful requisitioning of his property outraged

---

10 A letter addressed to Harry Slochower bears witness to Mann's irritation at being criticized for his "indecisiveness:" "Ein Element freilich Ihrer Charakteristik meiner Lebensarbeit hat mich befremdet und, dass ich es gestehe, auch betrügt. Das ist die Vorstellung einer gewissen liberalen Entschluss-und Entscheidungslosigkeit meines geistigen Wesens, die Sie hervorrufen... Ich habe zwei Drittel meiner irdischen Habe geopfert, um ausserhalb der deutschen Grenzen in Freiheit leben zu können und demonstiere durch dieses Aussensein, auch ohne polemisich gegen das Dritte Reich zu wüten, unaufhörlich gegen das, was heute in Deutschland und an Deutschland geschieht." (Ibid., pp. 397-399).

11 "Ich habe Wert darauf gelegt, mich mit meinem deutschen Publikum, das sich seiner Natur und Bildung nach heute in Opposition
him and filled him with determination to regain it. Finally, there was the question of his passport which he wished to retain, especially since in 1934 he had been invited to go to the United States. On April 2, 1934, he petitioned the Reichsinneministerium, Berlin, as well as the police authorities in Munich, for an extension of his passport.

While still being able to travel on his current passport, he made a successful trip to the United States where he was warmly received in the late Spring of 1934. During these months his resentment of the Third

befindet und aus dem eines Tages die Gegenbewegung gegen das heute herrschende System hervorgehen kann, in Kontakt zu halten, und dieser Kontakt wäre sofort zerstört, das heisst meine Bücher, die bis jetzt gelesen werden können, wären sofort verboten worden, wenn ich in deutlicherer Weise, als es immerhin in manchen Ausserungen der letzten Jahre geschehen ist, vom Leder gezogen hätte." (Ibid., p. 399).


13Ibid. In footnote 12, the reference to the passport proves that the passport was about to, or had already lapsed. Dr. Wysling (Thomas Mann Archives, Zürich) could not furnish me with precise information as the document had been lost.

Reich grew and so did his desire to take a firm public stand.\textsuperscript{15} Alarmed, his publisher Gottfried Bermann Fischer tried to persuade him to remain silent.\textsuperscript{16} Apparently he succeeded because in 1935 Thomas Mann's collection of essays \textit{Leiden und Größe der Meister} was published in Berlin, and to his satisfaction the first edition of 4,000 copies sold out quickly.\textsuperscript{17} On the occasion of his 60th birthday in 1935, Mann received from Germany a considerable amount of mail which conveyed the admiration and affection of many Germans.\textsuperscript{18}

A second trip to the United States in 1935 proved to be even more successful than the first, but dissonant voices debating and questioning his political attitude were on the increase, and in September 1935, a very irritated Thomas Mann was trying to justify his position

\textsuperscript{15}Ein Mensch und Schriftsteller kann nur tun, was ihm auf den Nägeln brennt; und dass die Krise der Welt auch mir zur Lebens- und Arbeitskrise wird, ist in der Ordnung und ich sollte ein Zeichen meiner Lebendigkeit darin sehen. Die Zeit scheint mir reif für eine Äußerung wie ich sie vorehbe, und der Augenblick könnte bald kommen, wo ich bereuen würde, mein abwartendes Schweigen über die dafür gegebene Frist hinaus fortgesetzt zu haben." (Ibid., p. 371.) "Die Tagesereignisse, die Vorgänge in Deutschland üben beständig einen so scharfen Reiz auf mein moralisches, kritisches Gewissen aus, dass die Arbeit an meinem 3. Bande (of the \textit{Joseph} tetralogy) völlig stockt und ich im Begriffe bin, sie hinzuzugeben." (Ibid., p. 371.)

\textsuperscript{16}"Bermann . . ., meldete neulich telephonisch seinen Besuch bei uns an. Er will nach dem Rechten sehen, weil er fühlt, dass ich Lust habe, auszubrechen. Dann aber liess er uns wissen, das Befinden Fischers erlaube seine Abreise nicht." (Ibid., p. 372.)

\textsuperscript{17}"... aber im Augenblick ist mein Vorrat zu Ende, und ich muss warten, bis neu gedruckt ist; denn auch in Berlin ist er zu Ende, - die erste Auflage ist sehr rasch verkauft worden; ich hab' es, offen gestanden, erwartet." (Ibid., p. 386.)

\textsuperscript{18}"Aber die Hunderte von Briefen aus Deutschland, ja, ja, aus Deutschland, sogar aus Arbeitsdienstlagern, - ich leugne nicht, dass sie meinem Herzen wohlgetan haben." (Ibid., p. 392.)
and to refute criticism of his conduct. Finally the pressure became too much to bear. The explosion—he chose to call it a "Temperaments-Handlung"—occurred in the form of an open letter dated February 2, 1936, to Eduard Korrodi, literary critic of the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, in which Mann openly declared his solidarity with the émigrés, thus publicly breaking with the Third Reich. The consequences of his action appeared to have been clear to him, because the action meant the irrevocable loss of his property, the cancellation of his passport, the prohibition of his books, and finally expatriation. He now had to consider his future.

Almost from the beginning of his voluntary exile from Germany he had exclusively considered Zürich for residence because of its language and German cultural tradition and its proximity to his beloved Germany:


Mann was apparently confident of obtaining Swiss citizenship without having to satisfy the residency requirements: "Ich hoffe im abgekürzten Verfahren Schweizer zu werden, und will in der Schweiz begraben

---

19 Ibid., pp. 397-399.
20 "Es war zum guten Teil eine Temperaments-Handlung" ... (Ibid., p. 415.)
21 Thomas Mann protested against Eduard Korrodi's article: "Deutsche Literatur im Emigrantenspiegel," Neue Zürcher Zeitung, January 26, 1936, where Korrodi had equalized émigré and Jewish literature.
22 Briefe 1889-1936, pp. 415-416.
23 Ibid., p. 340.
However, weeks later his hopes seem to have collapsed, as Swiss authorities were not willing to make an exception in his case. Mann sounded upset as he wrote to Rudolf Kayser who had asked for Mann's advice concerning the possibility of his obtaining residence in Switzerland:

Es ist nicht leicht zu raten. Zu diesem Lande hier woge ich nicht, Ihnen Mut zu machen. Es ist vielleicht das "autarkischste," auf sich und die Seigen am meisten bedachte, den Ausländern abholdeste von allen.29

Although he complained about the cost of living in Switzerland, and toyed with the idea of moving to Austria,26 he stayed on in Zürich, especially as the political situation in Austria grew progressively unstable because of Nazi agitation.27

Meanwhile, his brother Heinrich, who had been expatriated by the German government on August 23, 1933, had become a Czechoslovak citizen. In his novel Ein Zeitalter wird besichtigt, Heinrich briefly described the events which lead to his obtaining Czechoslovak citizenship.28 It

24 Ibid., p. 347.
25 Ibid., p. 351.
26 "Aber wenn die Umstände es erlauben, kommen wir Ihnen am Ende zuvor und lassen uns in Österreich nieder, denn dies Land hier, bei allen seinen Vorzügen, ist wirklich auf die Dauer zu teuer. (Ibid., p. 401.)
27 "Ein wenig besser ist der klerikale Muff ja wohl als die national-sozialistische Pest, aber wer weiss denn, wie lange das doch überhaupt noch hält?" (Ibid., p. 407.)
28 "1934, Deutschland hatte den 30. Juni seines Führers mit Glück bestanden, besuchte ich Prag, konnte meinen kranken Freund (he is referring to Tomáš G. Masaryk) nicht sehen, aber sein Kanzler übermittelte mir seine Zusage, mich einzubürgern. Eine tschechische Ortschaft nahe der deutschen Grenze gewährte mir gern die Zugehörigkeit, dann nahm die Republik mich auf. Es beduante keiner gesetzlichen Frist, nicht einmal eines besonderen Aufenthaltes im Lande. Der Tag des Jahres 1936 (he is referring to April 24, 1936, the date he swore his oath of allegiance to Czechoslovakia) ist unter meinen feierlichen ...." (Heinrich Mann, Ein Zeitalter wird besichtigt, p. 473).
has since become clear that the circumstances surrounding his efforts were somewhat more complicated than he made them appear in his reminiscences. While Heinrich did receive Masaryk's promise of naturalization implying waiver of residency requirements as early as June 1934, almost two years elapsed before the final decree. The reason for the delay was that Liberec (Reichenberg), where Heinrich had applied for the Certificate of Domicile (mandatory for the Czechoslovak citizenship) was in no hurry to grant it. The application drifted for eight months, because of a strong Henlein-dominated Sudeten-German faction which had no intention of complying with the wishes of Prague. Angered, Heinrich withdrew the application. The incident aroused much debate in the press, Czechoslovak and German alike.

29 Czechoslovakia required ten years of residency.


31 Gertrúda Albrechtová, "Zásluhy obce Proseče o německou literaturu," Časopis pro moderní filologii, Prague, 1957, pp. 63-64. This is a brief but informative article, which except for a few minor mistakes due to the absence of the now available correspondence of Mann, sheds some light on the quest of Czechoslovak citizenship by both Heinrich and Thomas Mann.

32 Listed herewith are the articles and press releases available to me; they do not necessarily comprise the entire secondary literature pertaining to the debate in the Czechoslovak press.

"Heinrich Mann will Reichenberger werden?" Bohemia, Prague, June 6, 1935.
"Wird Heinrich Mann Reichenberger Bürger?" Prager Montagsblatt, Prague, June 10, 1935.
"Heinrich Mann und Reichenberg," Prager Tagblatt, Prague, June 28, 1935.
"Liberec poslouchá pouze Hitlera," Národní listy, Prague, June 29, 1935.
"Heinrich Mann verzichtet," Prager Presse, Prague, July 6, 1935.
"Heinrich Mann und die Stadt Reichenberg," Freigeist, Prague, July 11, 1935.
"Komotauer Stadtrat für und gegen Heinrich Mann," Prager Tagblatt, Prague, July 11, 1935.
This controversy drew the attention of the members of the town council of a small Czechoslovak town Proseč u Skutče, in the county of Litomyšl (Leitomyschl), who sent a letter to Heinrich inviting him to apply for the Certificate of Domicile in their town. Despite some minor local intrigues, his application was accepted by the town council on August 21, 1935, with nine of the fifteen members voting to grant him the Certificate of Domicile. Heinrich took the Czechoslovak citizenship oath on April 24, 1936. Now, he not only had a valid passport, but he also had protection of a sovereign state without leaving France, where he had established residence, for he even swore his oath of allegiance at the Czechoslovak consulate in Marseilles. President Masaryk, who was an admirer of Heinrich, even managed to extricate his books and manuscripts which the Gestapo had confiscated shortly after his departure. Heinrich, undoubtedly, had set a precedent for his brother.

At any rate these developments must have encouraged Thomas Mann. During his visit to Czechoslovakia in May 1936, he was warmly welcomed by press and public alike. He was for the first time invited to the Hradčany castle for what was later described as a lengthy visit with

"Heinrich Mann," Prager Tagblatt, Prague, July 23, 1935.
"Turn nimmt Heinrich Mann auf," Bohemia, Prague, July 25, 1935.
"Českoličný Henleinovci odpovídají," Severočeský deník (Liberec), August 2, 1935.
"Jindřich Mann a naši Nemci," Severočeský deník, Liberec, August 2, 1935.
"Abgewiesene Beschwerde gegen Heinrich Mann," Bohemia, Prague, August 9, 1935.
"Dostane Heinrich Mann naší příslušnost?" České Slovo, Prague, August 20, 1935.
"Kein Heimatrecht für Heinrich Mann," Die Zeit, Prague, January 24, 1936.

Gertruda Albrechtová, "Náš Thomas Mann," Kultúrný život (Bratislava), June 9, 1956, and Gertruda Albrechtová, "K jednej kapitole československo-nemeckých vztahov."
President Beneš. \(^{34}\) In a subsequent press interview, though being reserved about the topic of conversation between himself and Beneš, Mann made a special point of saying complimentary things about the President. But when asked whether he intended to move to Prague or Vienna, Mann was noncommittal: "Možná ře se přestěhuji do Vídně nebo do Prahy. Nemohu ještě nic určitého říci." (It is possible that I may move to Vienna or Prague. I am unable to say anything definite yet.)\(^{35}\) He made no other remark, saying nothing that would indicate he might have discussed the possibilities of his future Czechoslovak citizenship with Beneš.

But this interview was the first occasion in which he mentioned publicly the possibility of moving to Prague. To be sure, he had not volunteered the information but had replied to a specific question, which the interviewer claimed was based on "rumors." In his published correspondence through the summer of 1936, there was no indication that he intended such a move. The first sign, in fact, that he had given the matter some thought can be traced to a postscript in a letter addressed to his brother Heinrich dated July 20, 1936.

In this letter Thomas informed Heinrich that he had completely dismissed any further thought of moving to Vienna. He expressed his intention of remaining in Switzerland, and the hope of becoming a Swiss citizen although this would require another three years in order to satisfy the residency requirements. He left no doubt that he favored this solution. However, he ended his postscript with a significant note.


\(^{35}\) Ibid.
which showed the brothers had indeed discussed the possibility of Czechoslovak citizenship and perhaps even a move to Prague for Thomas and family. The sentence would have made little sense to an outsider because it read, disconnected from the rest of the letter as it was, like a hieroglyph: "Aber Fleischmann wird uns nächstens besuchen."  

Who was Fleischmann and what was his connection with the Mann brothers? As stated before, Heinrich Mann was approached by the town of Proseč after his unsuccessful attempt to obtain his Certificate of Domicile in the town of Reichenberg. Rudolf Fleischmann resided in Proseč and earned a living as a manufacturer of hand embroidered linen. Although only a young man, he had become a member of the town council, and was involved in arranging Heinrich's application for the Certificate of Domicile for which, as he reminisced years later, Heinrich had singled him out with special letters of appreciation: "... I knew from Heinrich Mann's letter to me how happy he had been to have his Czech passport."  


37 The information about Rudolf Fleischmann's background, a number of photostats of documents revealing various data and processes of Thomas Mann's citizenship endeavor, as well as Fleischmann's own rendition of the circumstances under which he was delegated to offer the Czechoslovak citizenship were kindly put at my disposal by his surviving daughter Mrs. Milena Baines, née Fleischmann, of Preston, England.  

In the case of Thomas Mann it was again Fleischmann who was instrumental in helping him to obtain the citizenship. As a member of a group of councilmen, Fleischmann had gone to see President Beneš concerning some other matter. Beneš took Fleischmann aside and suggested that a similar offer of Domicile be extended to Thomas as had been to Heinrich; Beneš also asked Fleischmann to become an unofficial go-between in the matter. Fleischmann, according to his own words, agreed enthusiastically, and after an exchange of letters, he visited Thomas Mann in Zürich on August 6, 1936.

There were political reasons for Beneš's decision to keep out of the limelight. The Czechoslovak government was at this time trying not to irritate the "Führer," but it quietly offered refuge to many who were fleeing for their lives from the dubious "benefits" of the Nazi regime, and it extended passports to a number of exiles like the Mann brothers and members of their families, Lion Feuchtwanger, Johannes Becher, and many others.

For Thomas Mann it was more advantageous to become the citizen of another country before being officially expatriated from Germany as he expected. A new citizenship would have made the expatriation a futile gesture. Also, he had a better chance of reclaiming his property as the citizen of another country prior to the eventual expatriation.

39 From personal notes by Mrs. Baines.

40 Carl Seelig, "Die tschechische Episode in Thomas Mann's Leben." Tagesanzeiger, Bern, No. 54, March 4, 1961, p. 20; Seelig, who claims having received information from Fleischmann personally, states that Thomas Mann paid Fleischmann's airplane ticket since Fleischmann did not possess enough money.

41 Albrechtová, "K jednej kapitole československo-nemeckých vztáhov," pp. 139-140.
order. These then were the reasons behind the relative secrecy and the great emphasis upon a speedy execution of the application.

As there are no personal accounts by Thomas Mann concerning the citizenship proceedings, we have to rely upon the documents available and on Fleischmann's personal comments. As he described the matter when Mann received him during their first visit, it becomes obvious that Mann had already made up his mind prior to August 6 to apply for Czechoslovak citizenship, and was thoroughly informed on the matter:

... I saw ... a tall, slim man of about 60, a face stern and ascetic. It was Thomas Mann. He stretched out both hands, he helped me off with my overcoat and led me into a large room. I gave him President Benes's message. I soon realized that Thomas Mann knew all about Prosec from his brother. ... Fleischmann, evidently well aware of the importance of his mission, displayed considerable power of observation. He described Mann's tension as the German novelist prepared to take the step which must have been as painful as his decision some four years ago not to return to Germany: "I could sense my host's excitement and nervousness as I explained to him that he must make formal application and that I must also have from him a power of attorney to be able to act on his behalf." 42

The town council of Prosec voted on the Certificate of Domicile during a meeting on August 18, 1936, with the result that twelve out of sixteen (two councilmen were absent) voices affirmed Thomas Mann's application for the Certificate of Domicile. 44 Although they were not

---

42 From personal notes of Rudolf Fleischmann, also in his report: Fleischmann, "The Man from Prosec, p. 7.
43 Ibid.
44 "18k5pfiger Gemeinderat bestand aus zehn Katholiken und
formally mentioned in Mann's application, the Certificates of Domicile included his wife Katja (née Pringsheim), and their two minor children, Elisabeth and Michael. It had also been granted to Gottfried (Golo) Mann. On the next day, August 19, Fleischmann sent a formal application to the State Office in Prague asking on Thomas Mann's behalf for Czechoslovak citizenship. His wife Katja and the minors Elisabeth and Michael were automatically included in the application. The application follows:


Klaus Mann's application was accepted and the Certificate of Domicile in Proseč granted on June 2, 1936, hence G. Albrechtová's claim that Klaus had received the Certificate of Domicile on August 3, 1936 is incorrect.
Rudolf Fleischmann
Prosec u Skutce

To the State Office of Prague.

Square Stamp
value 20 kcs. (Czechoslovak kronas)

Round Stamp: State Office, Prague

The undersigned Rudolf Fleischmann, considers it an honor to submit to the State office the application of the honorary professor of Harvard University, U.S.A., the receiver of the Nobel prize Prof. Dr. Th. Mann a request for the Czechoslovak citizenship.

In regard to the unusual importance of the petitioner, I beg that his application be executed as promptly as possible. For this reason I am including:

1. Power of attorney
2. Application for the Certificate of Domicile
3. The excerpt from the minutes of the municipal office
4. Birth Certificate
5. Marriage Certificate
6. Birth Certificate of Elisabeth Veronica Mann
7. Birth Certificate of Michael Thomas Mann

Since the highest representatives of our nation expressed interest in the matter, I am certain that this application will be complied with in the affirmative according to their wishes.

(Signature:) Fleischmann.

For the photostat of the original and the German translation see Appendix.
From the confident tone of the application as well as from the allusion to the "highest representatives," it is obvious that Fleischmann expected speedy compliance.

The final dispatch of the documents necessary for citizenship was made to the State Office on November 4, 1936. This time the accompanying letter was signed by the Representative of the Czechoslovak National Assembly, Professor Dr. J. B. Kozáč. From the contents of the letter it appears that the documents of Thomas Mann and his family (included were Mrs. Mann, Elisabeth, Michael) and his son Gottfried (Golo) Mann were complete save for those of Klaus Mann whose application was not being processed with the rest of the family. Klaus Mann, who had received his Right of Domicile in June at Proseč, had failed to submit the complete set of documents, and was just then absent traveling in the United States on a temporary Dutch passport. Having taken the matter in hand, Kozáč now requested the State Office to approve the application of both Thomas Mann and his son Gottfried (Golo), and urged that it be granted soon. Like Fleischmann, he concluded pointedly that the highest officials in the country had taken a personal interest in the case, and in order to drive the point home he enumerated them: the President, the Prime Minister, and the Minister of the Interior.  

The letter achieved the desired result. It had been received by the State Office in Prague on November 7, 1936. From a letter signed by the Czechoslovak Consul Jan Laska in Zürich, dated November 23, sent to the State Office certifying that Thomas Mann and his wife Katja,  

47 For photostat of the original and the translation of the document see Appendix.
had taken the oath and paid the fee of Kčs. 2000, we also learn that
the State Office had reacted speedily to Kozák's letter. The Consulate
mentioned the request from the State Office Prague on November 9, 1936,
to have Mann take the oath. The ceremony took place on November 19,
1936. 48

Thus the small town of Proseč with its 1200 inhabitants had
furnished Thomas Mann, and those members of his family who so desired,
with the vital document of the Certificate of Domicile. 49 The Oath of
Allegiance sworn before the Czechoslovak Consul on November 19, 1936,
completed the process of Czechoslovak citizenship. The documents of
Naturalization were dispatched to Prague on the same day, and Thomas
Mann was once again in possession of a valid passport. Gottfried Mann,
whose papers had been processed separately from those of the rest of
the family, as were Klaus Mann's, received his Naturalization Decree on
January 22, 1936, at the Municipal Office in Prague. Klaus Mann swore
his Oath of Allegiance on March 25, 1937, and received the Naturaliza­
tion Decree on March 31, 1937, at the Czechoslovak Consulate in
Zürich. 50

In a letter to Stefan Zweig, Mann spoke of his new citizen
status and expressed his gratification at being a subject of a govern­
ment which he respected. 51 He also admitted his relief in having once

48 For photostat and the translation of the document see Appendix.
49 Erika Mann, who had been expatriated in June 1935, married
that same month the British poet Wynstan A. Auden, and had thereby
become a British citizen. The status of Monica Mann is not clear,
although she too had been expatriated; she evidently had not applied
for Czechoslovak citizenship.
50 For photostat of original documents see Appendix.
51 Briefe 1889 - 1936, p. 430.
again the protection of a sovereign state. Indeed, the Czechoslovak government did not let him down. Almost immediately after he had become a Czechoslovak citizen, it sought—unsuccessfully—to intervene on his behalf in the matter of his confiscated Munich property.  

As will be recalled, Thomas Mann had taken a firm public stand against the Third Reich in his open letter to Korrodi, in which he sided with the émigrés. He reaffirmed his conviction on several occasions thereafter. He was quoted in the essay "Von der souveränen Bescheidenheit. Sigmund Freud - Thomas Mann," which was published in the German language anti-fascist weekly Die Wahrheit in Prague. In it he exposed the attempt made by the German government to isolate him from the other émigrés, and to create as much confusion as possible:

Es waren in Deutschland Bestrebungen im Gange, mich von der übrigen Emigration abzutrennen. Bestrebungen, die den Fall Thomas Mann zu einem Sonderfall machen wollten, der mit der übrigen Emigration, von der man in Deutschland nur in Ausdrücken barbarischer Form redet, nichts zu tun haben solle. Das soll und darf nicht sein. Ich fühle mich als zu jener Emigration gehörig, die für ein besseres Deutschland kämpft. Ich gehöre dazu.

On the 2nd of December 1936, the German Reich finally retaliated and Thomas Mann's name was placed on the Ausbürgerungliste No. 7. Der Völkische Beobachter busily recording the event came up with:

52 "Die tschechische Regierung versucht eine Intervention wegen meiner Münchener Habe. Ich zweifle am Erfolg..." (Ibid., pp. 430. 431).

53 Thomas Mann, "Von der souveränen Bescheidenheit - Sigmund Freud - Thomas Mann." Die Wahrheit (Prague), May 15, 1936.

54 Ibid.

55 The Bekanntmachung read:
"Zuname: Mann
Vorname: Thomas
Geboren: in Lübeck
Thus two weeks following his acceptance of Czechoslovak citizenship, Mann's exile was no longer voluntary.

The Völkische Beobachter tried hard to label Mann guilty of anti-German activities such as his decision to side with the émigrés. Although the newspaper implied that it was the open letter to Korrodi which was the final straw, it neglected to bring up the important fact that Thomas Mann had chosen to become the citizen of another country. Thomas Mann's decision to apply for Czechoslovak citizenship was not mentioned nor was the fact that at the actual date of expatriation he no longer was a German citizen. Was it a political trick to keep the German citizens in ignorance, or was it a serious breakdown of German intelligence?

Beruf: Schriftsteller
Letzter inländ. Wohnsitz: München
Der deutschen Staatsangehörigkeit für verlustig erklärt

The copy of the Bekanntmachung was placed kindly at my disposal by Dr. Wysling, Thomas Mann Archives, Zürich.

Völkischer Beobachter, München, December 3, 1936.
There must have been several red faces between Berlin and Munich when Thomas Mann in a letter addressed to the "Deutsche Informationen," Berner Tagwacht dated December 10, 1936, publicly put the matter straight. He declared that depriving him of his German citizenship was senseless, from a judicial point of view, because he had become a Czechoslovak citizen fourteen days earlier, on November 19th, 1936. He also pointed out with biting irony that spiritually this act had no meaning: he still was part of German life and culture and had been for a considerable time before the Nazi regime. The regime, he prophesied, would be of short duration.

Thomas Mann's expatriation resulted in a flood of letters from friends and acquaintances alike, who tried their best to console and/or congratulate him. The American Secretary of State was notified formally of Mann's expatriation on December 17, 1936, by the Embassy of the United States of America in Berlin. In "Embassy dispatch no. 3192/4 - Proscription of Additional Enemies of the Regime" one may find the following report and analysis which offers further proof of Mann's claim that the Third Reich had voluntarily sought to isolate him from his German public. The text read:


58 Briefe 1889-1936, p. 430.
The morning press of December 4, announced the contents of a decree signed by the Ministers of the Interior and Foreign Affairs depriving 39 more opponents of the regime of their German nationality and confiscating what property they have remaining in Germany.

As had been the case with previous proscriptions all the persons affected are political exiles. This particular list is of interest because it includes several German writers of prominence, notably Thomas Mann and a number of anti-Nazi agitators active in the Saar at the time of the plebiscite.

The proscription of Thomas Mann has caused some surprise in as much as it was understood that the authorities about a year ago were endeavoring to facilitate his return in order that he might assume his rightful position as an ornament to German literature.

Herr Mann has never been a violent opponent of the Nazis and in a letter published in the Neue Züricher Zeitung at the beginning of this year he refused to associate himself with the rabid German emigré press. In view of the affront suffered by Germany in the bestowal of the Nobel Peace prize for 1935 upon von Ossietzky, Mann's status as the holder of the Nobel Prize for Literature for 1929 may possibly have counted against him. His brother Heinrich Mann and all the latter's family were outlawed in a similar fashion over a year ago.

Issue must be taken with the signatory of the letter, Ambassador William E. Dodd, who evidently misinterpreted Mann's letter to Korrodi, and whose "facts" of Heinrich Mann's expatriation were incorrect, as his citizenship was withdrawn as early as 1933. However, the rest of the dispatch illuminates the double game German authorities played in making Thomas Mann a special case on one hand, while quietly violating his property and viciously attacking him in literary columns on the other.

On January 11, 1937, accompanied by his wife Katja, Mann came to Czechoslovakia, travelling for the first time on a Czechoslovak

---

59 The original dispatch is filed at the National Archives, Washington, D.C.
passport. He was on a lecture tour which took him to Prague, Budapest, and Vienna. The daily Lidové noviny reported details of the visit, among them his public appearance in Prague on Monday night, January 11, 1937, when he spoke at the Urania. This time, however, he did not lecture on Goethe, Wagner, or Freud, but introduced and interpreted his own writing, which enjoyed a great reception:

Byl to vzácny večer, plný radostných pohod, když Mann přečetl úvodní kapitolu ze své nejnovější práce goetheovské novely Lotte in Weimar. (It was a rare evening full of joyful accord when Mann read the introductory chapter from his latest novel, Lotte in Weimar. 60

This was one appreciative comment of many which spoke of an evening that proved to be an emotional experience. It was significant because of Mann's moving introductory speech in which he emphasized that for the first time he was standing in front of the Prague audience as their fellow citizen, a citizen of the Czechoslovak Republic. The paper further quoted this excerpt from his speech:

Náležím k německé kultuře pravil Thomas Mann a na tom nic nemohou změnit různá politická dobrodružství poslední doby. že jsem se tak snadno přenesl přes změnu svého státního občanství, je mi jen důkazem pravého německého kultury, které vždy stavělo věci ducha a kultury nad politiku. Chci od nynějska sloužit za příklad, že je možno být dobrým Němcem a zaroven dobrým příslušníkem československé republiky. (I belong to German culture and recent political adventures cannot change anything about that fact. The fact that I have been able to change my citizenship so easily, is to me proof of real German patriotism, which always put matters of the spirit and of culture above politics. From now on I wish to serve as a living example that one can be a good German and, at the same time, a good citizen of the Czechoslovak Republic.)61

60 (Hanus Bonn) "Mannův projev o jeho příslušnosti k ČSR," Lidové noviny, Prague, January 12, 1937.
61 Ibid.
Lidové noviny concluded describing the scene:

Tato slova, i opětné ukázky s poslední Mannovy tvorby odměnil přeplněný sál bourlivým potleskem. (These words as well as the several excerpts from his latest work were received by the overflowing auditorium with thundering ovations.)

This statement about his change of citizenship summed up Thomas Mann's view that culture had necessarily to be placed above politics and that in culture and tradition there was a common ground for all people of good will who were otherwise kept apart by politics. In a narrower sense, it was meant as a much-needed admonition to unity addressed specifically to the ethnic problem within Czechoslovakia, where Czechs, Slovaks, and Germans lived side by side. Patriotism was seen as different from narrow nationalism because patriotism referred not to a country and a state but to a spiritual community proudly conscious of its origin while at the time respecting others.

But the response of the audience was due not only to the political statements but also to a special glow and magic which surrounded Mann that night. To his admirers he always had been an attractive personality, but judging from two accounts he mesmerized his audience with his delivery which he himself seemed to enjoy thoroughly. It is all the more remarkable that the account of Bonn, a Czech writer and journalist who the next day put down his impressions of Mann's lecture, and O. W. Cisek, a Rumanian novelist, who happened to be present and reminisced on the event some 17 years later, agreed

---


as to the excellence of the presentation.

The next morning, January 12, Thomas Mann and his wife accompanied by their son Golo left Prague for Prosec to receive their Certificate of Domicile. The wire service reported from Pardubice about their arrival in Prosec:

Dnes odpoledne přijel do Proseče na Českomoravské vysočině laureát Nobelovy ceny spisovatel Thomas Mann s choť a synem. Jak známo, nabídla Prosec Thomasu Mannovi a jeho rodině domovské právo udělením občanství, když tento vynikající spisovatel pozbyl občanské příslušnosti říšskoněmecké. (This afternoon Thomas Mann, the writer and Nobel prize winner, accompanied by his wife and son, arrived in Prosec in the Czech-Moravian Highlands. As is generally known, the town of Prosec offered the Certificate of Domicile to Thomas Mann and his family, after this outstanding writer-novelist lost his German citizenship.)

From newspaper accounts, written and spoken testimony of former citizens of Prosec, the day proved to be a memorable one. Thomas Mann was welcomed at the Prosec Town Hall by the Mayor and the Deputy Mayor, as well as the city councilmen and invited guests. There the documents of the Certificate of Domicile were presented to Thomas Mann and his family. According to Fleischmann the visit had been pre-arranged by the Czech Foreign office, and the ceremony was recorded on

CTK-Pardubice 12. ledna 1937. - "Mann v domovské obci Proseči," Lidové noviny, Prague, January 13, 1937. The last sentence of the report is, of course, incorrect, as Mann had been offered the Certificate of Domicile prior to having been deprived of German citizenship.

These testimonies included Fleischmann's notes on the subject, also the various articles by Albrechtová, Mazal, newspaper reports. A lot of information was given to me by an eyewitness Miss A. Kucéra, formerly of Prosec, now residing in Washington, D.C. She showed me as one of her most treasured belongings a Czech translation of Buddenbrooks with Thomas Mann's handwritten inscription dated 12.1.1937 - "V upomínku první návštěvy v novém domově." ("Thomas Mann on the occasion of his first visit to his new home.") With regard to the Czech text of this dedication cf. p.28.
It was something of a public holiday. Even factory workers came to greet Mann:

The film has survived and shows many factory workers who came to the town hall to greet him, their leaders addressing him in German, French, and English, which in those days in such a small town was something to be proud of.67

Thomas Mann made a generous gesture by contributing a large sum of money to the poor. However, those in charge of the distribution, including Fleischmann, decided to set up a "Thomas Mann Garden" where fruit trees would be planted and the intake of the money from the yearly crop distributed annually amongst the poor of the community at Christmas time.

Thomas Mann also paid a special call at the local Catholic Church where he signed the parish register.68 This visit was intended

67 Fleischmann, "The Man from Prosec," and Fleischmann's notes; also Fleischmann, How Rudolf Fleischmann from Prosec met Thomas Mann, p. 8.

68 Ibid.: The fact that the parish register carries the personal signatures of Thomas Mann, Katja Mann, and Golo Mann, with the date inscribed by Thomas Mann as 12. I. 1937, is important. There are a number of publications Czech and German which give either the wrong date, the wrong month or both: e.g. Mazal, "Bratrů Mannové v ČSR:" "... v únoru 1937 přijel Thomas Mann do Proseče i s manželkou aby tu osobně prevzal domovský líst." (In February 1937 Thomas Mann and his wife came personally to Prosec in order to collect the Certificate of Domicile.) Albrechtová, "Náš Thomas Mann:" "V fobruári 1937 prišiel so svojou ženou do Proseča, aby osobne prevzal domovský líst pre seba a pre svoju rodinu." (In February 1937 he came with his wife to Prosec, in order to personally receive the Certificate of Domicile for himself and his family. Albrechtová, "Zásluby obce Proseče o nemeckou literatúru," "V únoru 1937 si osobne domovské listy odvezl." (In February 1937 he personally collected the Certificates of Domicile) p. 63-4, Bürgin and Mayer, Thomas Mann, eine Chronik seines Lebens, p. 125: here the date of January 7, is given. This is obviously wrong, as documented by the newspaper dispatch, as well as Mann's signature in the church parish register. Thomas Mann arrived in Prague on Monday, January 11, lectured at the Urania that night, and on Tuesday, January 12 came to Prosec leaving that very night for Budapest. The Czech writers committed the errors because they relied on an official record issued by the national general council (Nationalausschuss) of Polická issued on December 8,
as a gesture of appreciation toward Father Jerabek, who had used the pulpit of his church to acquaint the worshipers with Mann's work and to persuade them in favor of extending the offer of Domicile to Mann and his family. This action on the priest's part was significant, for ten out of eighteen councilmen were Catholics, as was the mayor Jan Herynek. Mann was a Protestant, and the Konrad Henlein party supporters, having done their best to torpedo Heinrich's application in Reichenberg, were again busy agitating against Thomas. Still, they lost in the end due to a coalition of anti-fascist forces. Years later Fleischmann was to pay a warm tribute to the priest:

But in Proseč Mann's supporters knew that it would still not be easy to carry the matter through the council, not only for Thomas Mann but for his sons Klaus and Golo. The attacks on our town had not ceased. The Nazis had not forgiven us for what we did for Heinrich Mann. I was even more worried about failure, because the application was the wish of President Beneš and because, too, I had assured Thomas Mann that everything would go smoothly. In my despair I told one of the most noble and heroic of priests, Father Jeřabek, about my worries. He comforted me and asked me to come to church next Sunday at 2 p.m. to hear the Benediction. I could hardly believe my eyes when I attended. Along the edge of the pulpit were Mann's books. And Father Jeřabek in his sermon quoted from Joseph and his Brethren. From that moment I knew our battle was won.  

Father Jerabek received from Thomas Mann a copy of Joseph und

1955. It is a well known fact that the pre war newspapers, literary magazines which are at the archives and libraries in Prague were not accessible to journalists, writers, teachers, let alone to the general public in the 1950's. The situation improved slightly in the latter part of the 1960's.


70Seelig, "Die tschechische Episode in Thomas Mann's Leben."

71Fleischmann, "The Man from Proseč," p. 7. This is a direct quotation from Manchester Guardian as written by Fleischmann.
sein Brüder with Mann's dedication. As Fleischmann notes: "Our beloved priest was quite overcome and unashamedly he let the tears run down his cheeks; then slowly leaving the assembly he walked away towards his church, looking in the book as he went." As the ceremony drew to a close, Mann thanked all those present for the warm reception accorded to him and declared that his first visit to Czechoslovakia after Prague belonged to Proseč, his new home town.

In the copies of his various novels, which he presented to dignitaries and those who had been chiefly responsible for his being received into the township, he wrote the following inscription, which, as he did not know Czech, he asked to be translated:

Thomas Mann - v upomínce prvnl návštěvy svého nového domova. (Thomas Mann - on the occasion of his first visit to his new home.)

Thomas Mann left Proseč that night for Budapest as the wire services reported:

V noci odjíždí Thomas Mann přes Pardubice do Peští. (This evening Thomas Mann is leaving via Pardubice for Pest.)

On their arrival in Budapest Thomas Mann and his wife were the guests of Ludwik Hatvány, at whose house they also received the press. Mann was in unusually high spirits, and when a reporter asked the

72 *Ibid.* Father Jeřábek was ultimately martyred on the doorstep of his church by German soldiers.

73 "Ve vrelfcm proslovu podekoval Thomas Mann za srdečné přijetí a prohlásil, že prvnl jeho návštěva v Československu plati po Praze Proseči." (In a heartfelt speech Thomas Mann thanked them for the warm reception and declared that the first stop after Prague belonged to Proseč.) (ČTK, "Mann v domovské obci Proseči," p. 2.)

74 Fleischmann, "The Man from Proseč," p. 7. Also additional remarks and the dedication in Miss Kučera's book.

75 ČTK - "Mann v domovské obci Proseči," p. 2.
reason for his joviality. Mann allegedly displayed the yellow
Czechoslovak passport and said:

Podívejte se, 'pravil,' představte si, mám pas: A všechno
šlo scela hladce. Tedy už nemusím ukazovat žádné jiné doklady,
když chci obdržet některé vizum. Tady je důkaz, že se jmenuji
Thomas Mann, že jsem spisovatel, že jsem spatřil světlo světa 6.
cervna 1875 v Lübecku. Vidíte: Postava vysoká, obličej
podlouhlý, vlasy sedé štětiny, sedý anglický knířek, oči modré.
Tedy jsem československým státním občanem. A za tento pas
vlastně děkuji panu Rudolfu Fleischmannovi z Proseče, který
vyrobil kapesníky. Je to dobrý, vzdělaný a hlavně soucitný
člověk. Bůh mu zehnej. (Look at this, he said, Can you imagine,
I have a passport! And everything went smoothly. Now I don't
have to show all kinds of documents to get a visa. Here is
proof that my name is Thomas Mann; I am a writer, I saw the
light of day on the 6th of June 1875 in Lübeck. You can see:
I am tall, with a longish face, gray hair, a gray English
moustache, blue eyes. Now I am a Czechoslovak citizen. And
for this passport I owe my gratitude to Mr. Rudolf Fleischmann
from Proseč, who is a handkerchief manufacturer. He is a kind,
educated, and, most importantly, a compassionate man!)  

Unable to be in Czechoslovakia in December 1937 to accept per-
sonally the Herder Award for exiled authors, he intended to return in
May 1938 for the PEN-Club Congress.  On February 10, 1938, he left
for his fourth trip to the United States.  Again, as in 1933, he had
no intention of remaining there, but the annexation of Austria changed
his mind. Mann vented his bitterness and disgust over the inactivity
of the Western powers and their desire to appease Hitler, in which he
also announced his decision to remain permanently in the United States. 

Mann’s voluntary exile from Europe was as unexpected as his exile from

76 Endre Sos, “Thomas Mann a pán Fleischmann z Proseče.”
Věstník židovských náboženských obcí v Československu, Prague, 1966, p. 4.

77 Briefe 1937-1947, p. 34.

78 Bürgin and Mayer, Thomas Mann — Eine Chronik seines Lebens,
p. 34.

Germany had been. He had approached his American benefactress, Agnes E. Meyer, about a possible move to the United States on March 21, ten days after the Nazi take-over of Austria, and re-entered the States formally from Canada on May 5. The correspondence, especially his letter to Erich von Kahler of May 1938, reveals his concern with Europe in general and Czechoslovakia in particular, as he agonized over the pressures the Third Reich was applying: "Unser kleines Land im Osten hält sich wundervoll. Die Gefühle, die das deutsche Gebaren mir einflössst, mag ich nicht ausdrücken." As to his decision to remain in America, he did feel guilty for removing himself from the pressures and even dangers confronting others, and was anxious not to be misunderstood: "Nicht wahr, Sie verstehen unseren Entschluss, - wir müssen sehr wünschen und hoffen, dass man in Zürich überhaupt und auch in Prag ihn versteht."

The Munich agreement of September 29, 1938, which mutilated Czechoslovakia's borders, included orders to demobilize Czechoslovak military units. Gottfried (Golo) Mann, who as a Czechoslovak citizen was to have been drafted, thus avoided military service. Thomas Mann informing Erich von Kahler of his son's expected arrival in the United States, sarcastically commented on Chamberlain's appeasement policy:


Seeing further ahead than many, he knew there was no appeasement possible, for all the concessions and agreements would be of a strictly

---

80 Ibid., p. 47.
81 Ibid.
82 Ibid., p. 59.
temporary nature. He was well informed of what was happening in
Czechoslovakia through his daughter Erika, who had visited the Sudeten
region and Prague as a British journalist. As the political situation
was getting worse, he was besieged by many letters and telegrams from
former German citizens and others desperate to escape from Czechoslo-
vakia, in order to save their lives from the Nazis whose power and
influence grew daily. How all this affected Mann is revealed in a
letter to Ida Herz, in which he expressed his anguish:

... verzeihen Sie mein langes Schweigen, ich war einige
tage komplett gesünder durch die infamen Ereignisse in
Europa... Wenn ich ihm (Mr. Coyle) meinerseits noch nicht
schrieb, so unter anderem darum, weil ich unendliche Briefe und
Telegramme im Zusammenhang mit den Prager Entsetzlichkeiten zu
redigieren hatte... Erika ist jetzt bei uns, auch Klaus und
die Jungsten. Sie war als englische Journalistin in den
sudetendeutschen Gebieten und in Prag, und ihre Erzählungen
sind herzzerreissend.83

But instead of burying himself in grief and despair over political
developments, he did his best to help. His main concern was for the
refugees from Nazi persecution who had found asylum in Czechoslovakia,
as well as for those who were helping them. One of the reasons he felt
so much involved was that his name had been given to an international
organization founded in Czechoslovakia to assist refugees. The plan for
the formation of a Thomas Mann Foundation (Thomas Mann Fond) was con-
ceived around Christmas 1935: Mann's appeal was signed by a number of
international figures from the fields of Arts and Sciences.84 The
initial intent was to establish a cultural and political organization

83 Ibid., pp. 59-60.
84 Gertruda Albrechtová, "Zur Frage der deutschen antifaschistischen
Emigrationsliteratur im tschechoslowakischen Asyl," Historica
VIII, pp. 177-233.
that would support exiled German-speaking authors by providing the means to enable them to continue their creative endeavors as well as to arrange some means of publishing their works. In 1937 the Thomas Mann Foundation was changed into the Thomas Mann Society. The general assembly meeting was held on November 9, 1937, in the Prague city library. From various sources it appears that the Society was able to provide help for refugees thanks to financial contributions from Thomas Mann, other leading political personalities, university professors, writers, critics, journalists, scientists, and many private citizens. The society was acknowledged abroad by the English Home Office, and a number of British passports were supplied for the use of the refugees when the need for them arose. These passports saved the lives of many antifascist writers who had fled from Germany to Czechoslovakia and were caught there after the Nazis took over Czechoslovakia.

---

One of the last meetings of the Society was held on March 4, 1938. Pavel Eisner, professor of German literature at Charles University, Prague, was the main speaker of the event. He was introduced by the chairman of the Society Prof. J. B. Kozák, who, speaking of the meaning of the Society declared: "Hrůza umění, hrůza ducha je nad národy, nad rasami." (The realm of the arts and the spirit is above nations and races.) He then went on to explain that it was the goal of the Society to care for the realm of the spirit even where its borders do not necessarily coincide with political ones. Pavel Eisner spoke about the work and personality of Thomas Mann, presenting him not merely as a novelist but as a teacher, an example for all decent people to follow: "Není to autor, který pouze dobře psíše, je to autor, který své čtenáře vede; je prostoupen mravní myšlenkou jako žádný jiný z německých spisovatelů, jeho dílo znamená pro Němce jasnozřivou diagnózu, terapii a profilaxi jejich největších chyb, jejich 'welt- erobernder Todesbetrunkenheit toho temného, rozpýtavého v krvi sládnoucího romantického bolu, který je odcizuje životu. Na dne tohoto poctu je strach, a nenávist a její exploze jsou výrazy tohoto strachu. Mann proti tomuto poctu bojuje celým svým dílem, které brzy překračuje zájem o básníka a jeho místo ve společnosti (tolik pěstný jestě v Buddenbrooci) a vede k zájmu o národ, o Evropu. Ne uz rádění besú, rádění jeskynního člověka v lidech, ale skromnost jako základní ladení světa budoucnosti." (He is not only an author who writes well, he is an author who leads his readers; he is permeated with moral education though in a manner no other German author ever
Though Mann himself did not make the expected appearance at the May, 1938, meeting of the PEN-Club there was an appeal handed out amongst the participants asking for support for the Thomas Mann Society so that it might continue to help German émigré authors. The appeal was signed by Heinrich and Thomas Mann and many other scientists and writers.

It can be readily understood that the people involved in the activities of the Society were in danger, and were turning in increasing numbers to Thomas Mann for financial help and advice in the hope that he might also help arrange their entry into the United States. Recognizing that emigration to the United States was becoming almost impossible, Mann wrote a letter to Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, asking for a more understanding attitude on the part of the American consulate in Prague, which inflexibly demanded that visa applicants show all their

was, his work for the German nation is a penetrating diagnosis, therapy, and prophylaxis of their greatest fault, their welterobernder Todesbetrunkenerheit, this dark, disintegrating sweetly blood-drenched ache of Romanticism, which alienates them from life. On the bottom of this feeling there is fear, hatred, and the explosions resulting from it are the manifestations of this fear. Mann fights these feelings through his entire work, which soon overcomes the interest in the poet and his place in society (so obvious in Buddenbrooks), and leads towards an interest in people, in Europe. The antics of the diabolical furies of the cave man in people disappear, and humility as the basic tenor of the future world remains.)

Pavel Eisner concluded his speech by reminding the audience that Thomas Mann was travelling in the United States with a Czech passport, and, as a Czech citizen was lecturing on the principles of democracy. (jsp.-"0 evropském významu Tomáše Manna," Rozhledy, Prague, April 7, 1938.)

The dates of the final version of the appeal could not be established either in the Thomas Mann Archives, Zürich, where the original draft is kept, nor at the Thomas Mann Archives, Academy of Sciences, Berlin. The appeal as well as the document signed by Thomas Mann has been declared lost.
documents. The fulfillment of this requirement was, in many cases, impossible.

Mann carefully explained to Hull the purpose of the Thomas Mann Society: it was not a literary organization but primarily served to help and support German intellectuals who had migrated or fled from Germany after the rise of Hitler. He pointed out that the Society had been supported by the highest authorities of the country, and President Beneš had personally looked upon it very favorably. Indeed he made it clear how responsible he felt for the members of the Society as well as for those whom it had attempted to help. He included a list of the most endangered people asking for their entry permits into the United States.

To Thomas Mann's ill-disguised disappointment, Hull replied with what Mann considered no more than an acknowledgement letter. Hull also sent a copy to the American consul in Prague. Still, however, disappointed he was, Mann hoped for some results from it. Actually, the persons listed on Thomas Mann's emergency list escaped—with two exceptions—to England. Leo Kestenberg made it to Palestine. Alexander Bessmertny who had escaped from Germany in 1933 and lived first in France then in Czechoslovakia was captured by the Gestapo and executed in Berlin in 1943. The president of the Thomas Mann Society, Dr. Jan Kozák, professor of philosophy at the Charles University,

88 "Lieber Herr Graf, die Antwort Hulls wollte ich Ihnen doch zeigen. Viel ist es nicht damit, aber dass sie auch an den Consul in Prag gegangen ist, ist immerhin etwas." (Ibid., p. 65.)
89 Ibid., p. 61. The following names are listed: "Professor Leo Kestenberg und Frau; Joachim Werner Cohn, Soziologe, mit Frau und zwei kleinen Kindern; Dr. Wilhelm Necker mit Frau und Kind; Dr. Alexander Bessmertny; Egon Lehrburger; Ursula Hönig; Wilhelm Sternfeld; Friedrich Burschell, Frau Fritta Brod (Burschell's wife)."
Prague, who in his capacity as a member of Parliament had been close to both Masaryk and Beneš and helped to speed Thomas Mann's citizenship proceedings, narrowly escaped the Gestapo. He eventually reached the United States where he taught at Oberlin College, Ohio. After the war he returned to Czechoslovakia.  

Rudolf Fleischmann from Proseč, who had been the initiator of Heinrich and Thomas Mann's citizenship proceedings also managed to escape to England. He had become involved in the Thomas Mann Society after moving from Proseč to Prague in 1937, where he remained until his escape in March, 1939.  

In a character reference for Fleischmann, written in Princeton, New Jersey, dated January 7, 1939, Thomas Mann expressed his gratitude and appreciation to Fleischmann for what he had done. The date of Fleischmann's escape was March 13, 1939. Leaving wife and children behind, he carried with him only a British passport and Mann's reference, a document which to this day is treasured by the Fleischmann family.  

While on a lecture tour in California in April 1939, Mann

---


\(^91\) Fleischmann, "The Man from Proseč," p. 7.

\(^92\) Since the document is very worn, to the point where it is impossible to present it word for word, a summary has to suffice. Thomas Mann stated having known Fleischmann for years, and stressed his great contribution to the Thomas Mann Society, because of his unusual tact and activity: "... durch seine Umsicht und Aktivität grosse Verdienste erworben ..." The reference also contained Mann's conviction that Fleischmann could fulfill any task, especially such which demanded character, skill, and responsibility and expressed his hope that Fleischmann may soon find an appropriate position. Shortly after Fleischmann received the document he had to flee his homeland having been ordered to do so by the chairman of the Main Committee of the Ministry of Social Welfare and the State Attorney (who one year later was executed).
learned of Fleischmann's escape. Fleischmann who had arrived in England penniless, evidently had asked Mann for financial support. Mann almost apologetically explained that he was unable to supply the amount asked, although he did send him an unspecified sum of money. Without going into details he implied that he was subject to many urgent demands. Cursing the Nazis for all the misfortune they had caused, Mann wrote about his anxiety for the safety of Prof. Kozák and "others."

It was only after the war in 1947 that Fleischmann again received a letter from Thomas Mann, in which Mann paid him the following tribute:

Ich werde nie vergessen, dass Sie seinerzeit die Anregung zu meiner und meines Bruders Einbürgerung in die Tschechoslowakei gegeben haben und ebenso wenig unseren an freundlichsten Eindrücken so reichen Besuch in Prosek.  

The last time Thomas Mann traveled using his Czechoslovak passport was on June 6, 1939, when he left his Princeton residence, to go to Europe, in order to settle some private affairs, and to attend the PEN-Club meeting in Stockholm at which he presented his essay, Das Problem der Freiheit. But apparently he encountered difficulties with his Czechoslovak passport, for Czechoslovakia had ceased to exist formally as a free country, and holders of passports abroad were suspect of being potential émigrés, whom not every nation was willing to accept. An example of these difficulties was Mann's experience in the Netherlands, about which he reported to his brother Heinrich:

---

93 *Briefe 1937-1947*, p. 89.
94 This letter of July 19, 1947, is in the possession of the Fleischmann family. Rudolf Fleischmann died on January 6, 1966, in England.
95 Bürgin and Mayer, *Thomas Mann, Eine Chronik seines Lebens*, pp. 140-141.
...Ubrigens war es trotz unseres amerikanischen Hintergrundes gar nicht leicht, auf unsere tschechischen Pässe hierher zu gelangen. Aber ein Besuch beim niederländischen Gesandten und ein Empfehlungsbrief von ihm haben Wunder gewirkt und uns nicht nur das belgische Transit-Visum verschafft, sondern uns auch an der Grenze die größten Erleichterungen und Ehren eingetragen.

From another letter addressed to Heinrich it is obvious that Thomas, although he had every intention to keep his itinerary and to go on to Stockholm was aware that should war break out he would have to return to the U.S.A. There might be one exception, he observed, in reference to Allied appeasement policy:

...für den Fall nämlich, dass alles "gut" geht, d. h., dass wir ein schönes, faules appeasement haben. Sieht es garzu anders aus, so müssen wir freilich Hals über Kopf nach Princeton zurück.97

He also informed Heinrich about a message he had received from Melantrich, owner of Prague's largest pre-war publishing house, which had published most of the translations of the Mann brothers. Melantrich had advised Thomas (and this message probably also extended to Heinrich), that henceforth he would be unable to deliver any royalties on the books published. Resigned to another loss of royalties, Thomas concluded: "Da ist also leider nichts zu machen."98
CHAPTER II

THOMAS MANN'S CRITICAL RECEPTION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA
BEFORE WORLD WAR II.

That Thomas Mann, forced out of Germany by the rise of Hitler, would at one point of his exile become a citizen of Czechoslovakia must, from the perspective of this day, seem not as remote a possibility as it might seem now. But even then both the pen and voice of Mann were known to millions of Czechs—the pen for a quarter of a century since the first translation of his work, and the voice from two memorable broadcasts in 1935 and 1936.

Thomas Mann's first literary effort translated into the Czech language was not the novel Buddenbrooks (1901), as one might have expected because of its reception in Germany, but the novel Königliche Hoheit.¹ The novel was published in 1909, and its Czech translation followed in 1910. The next translation of Thomas Mann's work seems to have been Der kleine Herr Friedemann in 1911. From bibliographical entries it appears that it was not the translation of the individual novella which had been published in the original in 1897, but the collection of novellas appearing under the same title (Der kleine Herr Friedemann) in 1898. The German selection contained: Der kleine Herr Friedemann, Der Tod, Der Wille zum Glück, Enttäuschung, Der Bajazzo, and Tobias Mindernickel;

¹Thomas Mann, Královská Vysost, translated by J. Hanousek, 438 pp.
it numbered 198 pages. The Czech translation *Malý pan Friedemann*, however, contains only 100 pages.\(^2\) Judging from this discrepancy it appears that not all of the short stories had been translated. Unfortunately bibliographical entries do not specify the contents. The case is different with a subsequent translation of Mann's novellas, which appeared in 1912 under the title *Novely*.\(^3\) This collection of Mann's short stories parallels the German publication of *Tristan* (1903), except that the novellas *Gladius Dei* and *Tonio Kröger* had been dropped in favor of *Die Hungernden*.

The last pre-World War I translation was the novel *Buddenbrooks*. The novel had been divided into two volumes, following the example of the German original's first publication: Volume I appeared in 1913, and Volume II in 1914.

There were no translations attempted during the First World War, and for nearly ten years thereafter. Only in the late 1920's was there an increased translating activity noticeable, which accelerated toward the end of the 1930's to such a degree that all the major novels and novellas had been published as well as the collection of essays *Leiden und Grösse der Meister*, the essay *Freud und die Zukunft*, and *Ein Briefwechsel*. In addition the novels *Buddenbrooks* and *Königliche Hoheit* were translated for a second time into Czech.\(^4\) The first novel translated into Slovak was again *Königliche Hoheit* in 1933.

No satisfactory reason can be offered for the post-World War I


\(^4\) For data on the publications of translations in the 1930's see Appendix.
lull. The translation of Der Tod in Venedig (1912) did not appear before 1927, followed by a collection of novellas under the title Tonio Kröger a jiné novely in 1928. It contained Tonio Kröger, Beim Propheten, Das Wunderkind, Schwere Stunde, and Gladius Dei.

In the 1920's Thomas Mann established himself as the major German writer with the novel Der Zauberberg (1924), and had become a spokesman for those who believed in Democracy and European unity. The Nobel prize award assured his fame. As shall be seen shortly, all these developments did have an influence upon the secondary literature on Thomas Mann.

There is strong reason to believe that there were very few reviews or essays written in the pre-World War I era. Ilková, with the assistance of Hugo Siebenschein, published a brief review of the existing secondary literature on Thomas Mann, but seemed unable (although Czechoslovak libraries and archives were accessible to her) to find any pre-World War I publications. Nor did the bibliographies assembled in America (Jonas I and II) and Czechoslovakia (V. Kafka) show any pre-war entries. In fact the situation showed little improvement in the 1920's. But almost parallel to the increase in translating activity,

5 Thomas Mann, Smrt v Benátkách, transl. by R. Pazderník, 96 pp. and Thomas Mann, Tonio Kröger a jiné novely, transl. by Zdenka Hostinska, 93 pp.


7 Klaus W. Jonas, Fifty Years of Thomas Mann Studies, Vol. I and Klaus W. Jonas and Ilseidore Jonas, Thomas Mann Studies, Vol. II.

8 Vladimír Kafka, Thomas Mann 1875-1955, pp. 23.
there occurred a change in the field of secondary literature on Thomas Mann at the close of the 1920's. The volume of secondary literature increased steadily during the 1930's only to be halted by the German invasion and subsequent establishment of the Protektorat Böhmen und Mähren. Slovakia, due to its fascist-dominated government, automatically followed the dictates of the Third Reich.

In her study, Ilková stated that Thomas Mann had been rated one of the most popular European authors in Czechoslovakia, and that his literary work had met with "great" response. She further claimed that it had been almost completely translated into Czech. This, of course, was an overstatement. Her next statement on the quantity of secondary literature was even more misleading. She claimed that "Nasť literatura o Tomáši Mannovi je však celkem chudá." (Our secondary literature on Thomas Mann is, however, quite insignificant.) She mentioned very casually "some announcements of Czechoslovak publications of Thomas Mann’s work, short reviews by Czech translators" which she failed to identify, apparently dismissing them as of no value. The only study she deemed worthy of mention was Arne Novák’s "Introduction" to the second translation of Buddenbrooks. The rest of the list had been published during the post-World War II period. Kafka, obviously following the pattern she had set, also concentrated primarily on the post-war period. While the American bibliography (Jonas I and II) had managed to compile more data, it, too, fell short of the actual amount available.

---

9 Ilková, "České poznámky a studie k životu a dílu Tomáše Mannů," p. 39.
10 Thomas Mann, Buddenbrookové, transl. by Jaroslav Skalický, introd. by Arne Novák, pp. vii-xxxii.
To be sure, there were no books devoted to the exclusive study of Thomas Mann and his creative work. There were, similarly, no large scholarly studies or essay-publications coming from the Departments of German at Charles University in Prague, or Masaryk University in Brno.

But there was, and this should have been of some significance to Ilková and other bibliographers, a number of small essays, reviews, and informative articles written not by some unknown journalists or occasional newspaper reviewers, as Ilková in particular would have us believe, but by Czechoslovak scholars, university professors, leading literary critics, and authors. After all, names like F. X. Šalda, Arne Novák, Pavel Eisner, Otokar Fischer, Oskar Baum, and Helena Malířová, were synonymous with Czechoslovak literary life during the period of the First Republic. While one cannot speak of a great wealth of secondary material, there was enough of it available to give indication of the acceptance and understanding of Mann's work by Czechoslovak literary critics.¹¹

When we approach the question of quality of those essays,

¹¹The material presented here for examination was assembled through a systematic search of Czechoslovak newspapers and literary magazines available here in the United States. Also the Bibliographie Československých práci filologických, published by the Czechoslovak Academy of Arts and Sciences, was helpful in listing some essays, which could eventually be obtained from Czechoslovakia. Unfortunately, the Academy published its Bibliography of secondary literary contributions only twice: in 1930, containing the material collected for the year 1929, and in 1937, containing entries of 1935. Even so the literary section did not appear independently, but as a part of the main body composed of entries about linguistic and philological studies. No pre-World War I material could be found, and the post-war era was found to be disappointing until about 1929.
articles, and reviews, it would be absurd to attempt an evaluation using as a yardstick the quality of literary criticism appearing in literary periodicals or professional papers, which permit the writers a more thorough and profound examination of an individual novel or novella. The material examined here is simply not of that kind. What is available is interesting, for it does not only speak of the reception of Thomas Mann in Czechoslovakia, but to some degree it reflects the literary level of criticism, the state of mind of the critics, the atmosphere in Czechoslovakia primarily in the 1930's, and, above all, what Thomas Mann symbolized to the Czechs.

The earliest literary criticism dealing with Thomas Mann's work was a review of the first translation of Mann's novel Könige Hoheit.¹² F. X. Šalda, considered to be one of the best Czech literary critics prior to World War II, responded negatively. The title of the review read: "Zase zbytečný překlad." (Another wasteful translation.) Šalda grudgingly granted the novel some literary merit (which he did not specify), but rejected it as not having been worth translating. In fairness to Šalda it should be pointed out that he was more concerned in defining what was worth translating, rather than making an analysis of Könige Hoheit. According to him the novel was of a cosmopolitan value, and could easily be read in the original. Addressing future translators, he argued that it was much more valuable to translate those

¹²The publisher of Šalda's critical essays does not indicate the date when the review was written, but it is clear that since Šalda referred to the publishing house Hajn, which published the first translation of the novel in 1910, the review had been written that same year, or, at the latest, in 1911. (F. X. Šalda, "Zase zbytečný překlad," Kritické projevy, vol. 8, pp. 80-81.)
works from German which were typically national in character, style, and expression. Although this, as he sarcastically remarked, was a far more challenging and difficult undertaking, it was of definite contribution to literary life:

But in translating slick cosmopolitan German books like Mann's Highness, there is neither artistic nor national gain, because there are no artistic difficulties and problems, and all that is required is a trade-like routine. 13

Except for two other brief references to Thomas Mann, Šalda did not review any of the author's work. 14

Otto Stoessl, a literary critic for the Prager Presse, reviewed Die Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull and Der Zauberberg. 15

Thomas Mann's novel Königliche Hoheit did not fare too well with most critics. Generally they seemed to view the novel as an embarrassment, and preferred to by-pass it without much comment, if they mentioned it at all. Only Liskutin ventured to suggest what he felt reflected Mann's recognition of the needs and fears of the times, which he interpreted as a "desire for love, democracy, the crisis of individualism." (Ivo Liskutin, "Thomas Mann," Rozhledy, Prague, April 15, 1935, pp. 41-42.)

Giving examples of the novel "de moeurs," or what he also described as "the novel of social biology" (biology of a social class) he mentioned Thomas Mann without specifying which novel he had in mind. The allusion, however, is to Buddenbrooks. (F. X. Šalda, Šaldův Zápisník I, p. 132). The only other reference is made specifically about Der Zauberberg which he describes to be not only a novel of "formalistic quality," but also programmatic literature. This "ideova programovost"—programmatization of ideas—can become a real danger and the author can succumb to artificiality. He does not imply that this is the case with Mann; on the contrary, it is a warning to those who want to attempt an imitation. (F. X. Šalda, Šaldův Zápisník, IV, p. 210.)

In his judgment, Krull was a complete novella, not a fragment:

Ich wüsste indessen kaum was - von der äusseren Handlung und Entwicklung abgesehen - das nicht schon in diesem Anfang enthalten wäre, das eine innere, aesthetische oder moralische Steigerung überhaupt zulässt, und so - als Bruchstück, eigentlich zugespitzt und abgeschlossen erscheint, als eine Novelle wider Willen.¹⁶

What he purposely called "ein unscheinbares Fragment" was to him almost a hidden "Totentanzvision," due to a "geheimes Schuldgefühl aller Künstlerschaft," which was both presented as "Weltbetrug und geistige Verführung." This judgment unfortunately made him immune to both the humor and the graciousness of the prose, for in the use of irony Stoessl perceived only the devilish and destructive element akin to nihilism, and feared that it would only increase the "Zeituntergangsstimmung" already prevalent in literature. Hence Der Zauberberg drove Stoessl literally to distraction:

Einsam grossen (sic) Menschentum, dem klassischen Goetheschen Humanismus oder der Brüderlichkeit der gewaltigen Russen wäre eine solche Kunst an sich, ohne Wille und ohne Folgen, schlechthin undenkbar: das Böse selbst.¹⁷

Stoessl saw the very crisis of Europe and Western civilization in general embodied in the "Vervollkommung der Technik als Selbstzweck" especially in the macabre situation of Der Zauberberg with its slogan "Freiheit als Krankheit." The dilemma was too much for Stoessl:

Welch ein Hinab zu den Schatten seit Goethe's Wilhelm Meister bis zu diesem kranken Zögling der Zeit, der seine Freiheit dem Fieber, seine Einsicht der Auflösung verdankt, und ohne Willen widerspruchlos ausgebildet, verzaubert, ohne Folgen, ohne Inhalt, ohne Erfüllung im Krieg aller gegen alle untertaucht.¹⁸

¹⁶"Thomas Mann's Hochstaplergeschichte."

¹⁷"Thomas Mann: Der Zauberberg."

¹⁸ Ibid.
Actually, in Stoessl's negative assessment, the originality and excellence of Mann's novel were underlined. For *Der Zauberberg* was a twentieth-century "Bildungsroman" which reflected the doubts and uncertainties of the modern era, so that even the critics could not agree on its final meaning.

In 1929 Thomas Mann was awarded the Nobel prize in literature. In Czechoslovakia, judging from two short essay articles, the news received a mixed reception. F. Krejčí, a literary critic of some repute, appeared disappointed at the selection of Thomas Mann.\(^ {19} \) He made it plain that it had not been to his liking that Mann had been nominated and complained that yet another German had won the award. Although he described the novel *Buddenbrooks* as an outpouring of "youthful revelry" (and thereby missed the point of the novel completely), he had to concede in the end that Mann had subjected himself to the strictest self-discipline and artistic concentration when writing it. As can be expected, Krejčí pointed to the *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*, and angrily castigated Mann's "defense of German militarism," his sense of German history seen as a heroic tragedy, his cult of music coupled with the "grandeur of death"—in short his tendency toward pure decadence. Krejčí seemed to prefer Heinrich Mann, whom he praised for his "liberal" attitude which brought him early to the side of the Allies. Thomas took considerably longer, in Krejčí's opinion, to discover democracy. But Krejčí conceded that Thomas Mann, once history had proved Heinrich right, became one of the early and most

\(^ {19} \) F. Krejčí, "Nobelová literární cena Thomas Mann," *Právo lidu*, Prague, November 14, 1929.
vocal advocates of the Weimar republic, and even coined the expression "Vater Ebert."\textsuperscript{20} His decision to join in support of the Weimar republic was decisive in the eyes of many German intellectuals who had hesitated to throw their support behind the Republic. Krejčí noted that Mann wrote without a political motive, that he wanted primarily to be an artist, and that, as far as themes or material of his novels were concerned, he could not be regarded "že by se vyznačoval velikostí myšlenek nebo sociálním dosahem" (as having excelled in profound, great thought or social essence).\textsuperscript{21} It ought to be stressed that such attack on Thomas Mann was rare indeed in Czechoslovak criticism.

Eisner disagreed with Krejčí to a considerable extent.\textsuperscript{22} Although at the time he, too, saw in Mann a poet who had undergone a transformation, he was more concerned and impressed with the novelist's growth than with his limitations. He conceived Mann's chief merit to be his will to overcome narrow regional confines, which, as Eisner erroneously remarked, his Lübeck contemporary Herman Bang had been trapped into;\textsuperscript{23} Mann's will power and his dedication to his work and mastery, in Eisner's judgment, not only placed him alongside Hofmannsthal as the author of the most accomplished post-Goethe prose style, but also as a representative of European self-confidence and consciousness. Mann, then, in Eisner's essay, was the one literary writer who had breathed new life into European spiritual thought, and

\textsuperscript{20}"Von deutscher Republik," vol. XI, p. 827.

\textsuperscript{21}F. Krejčí, "Nobelová literární cena Thomas Mann."

\textsuperscript{22}Pavel Eisner, "Thomas Mann," Literární revue, Prague, 1929.

\textsuperscript{23}Herman Bang (1857-1912) was a Danish novelist who had no connection with Lübeck.
thus had become in a way a counter-voice to the pessimistic vision of Oswald Spengler. This was not an easy task, and Mann had to undergo many a spiritual crisis which led him from early conservatism towards democracy:

šlechtic německé prósy - jak se mu říká již dávno, je dnes nespoutající jenž velice nebyl snadný, srdcem jenž bije vztríc novému řádu vecí. (The artistocrat of German prose, as he has been called for some time past, is today, after a development which was not easy, the heart which beats towards a new order of things.)

Eisner concluded that it was this reception of new currents of thought which was decisive: "to je to nejduležitejiši na letočni ceně Nobelové." (This is the most important thing about this year's Nobel prize award.)

In 1930 the second translation of Buddenbrooks in Czech came out with an introduction written by Arne Novák. The essay concerned itself not only with the novel but with Thomas Mann's entire literary production. Novák manifested a thorough understanding of Mann's work, including his essays concerned with literary and political subjects. He seemed to know a good deal about Mann's private life, judging from his accurate biographical comments. His criticism was concrete and positive without being adulatory.

Novák pointed out that the year 1901 was to be remembered as a date of vital importance for the German novel because of the publication of Buddenbrooks. He demonstrated how Mann had established a link with the past after a long pause in novelistic production in Germany, in fact how he had been able to satisfy the demands of the critics, who

\[24\]Eisner, "Thomas Mann."

\[25\]Ibid.
had long demanded a perfect naturalistic novel. But, and this Novák stressed, the novel exceeded those demands: while following the tradition of the German novel, it clearly was influenced by and reached the format of the Scandinavian, Russian, and French novel and established itself independently on an all-European level. The biological realities so important to naturalism were joined by a moral interest contemporary to the reader. The indication that Mann would not, however, become entrapped in naturalism or decadence was his "strong talent for irony, satire, and especially his humor" which is so apparent in Buddenbrooks, an essentially tragic novel. Novák explained how Mann's knowledge of music—manifested in his Leitmotivik and compositional style and language--set his novel immediately apart.

Novák traced Mann's creative development as an author of the "perfect novella." For instance, he saw Der Tod in Venedig as the highest possible accomplishment, both psychologically and stylistically, and demonstrated how Mann had gained complete objective distance from the artist Aschenbach in contrast to the autobiographical tendencies evident in Tonio Kröger, Der Bajazzo, and Buddenbrooks.

In addition, Novák called the novel Der Zauberberg an all-European cultural event, which could be "safely" compared to Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre. His analysis of the novel was both thorough and sensitive. Stylistically and intellectually, the novel left little to be desired for Novák. He avoided discussing it in political terms, save for an objective interpretation of the two "intellectual mentors" of Hans Castorp, Naphta and Settembrini. The central European problem of culture versus civilization had been examined by Mann before (in Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen), as Novák pointed out, in which Mann
had sided with "culture and tradition." Here, however, Mann had deliberately chosen the center position for Germany and Democracy.

Novák's criticism of Königliche Hoheit was also positive; unlike other critics, he saw in it the "moral fairytale" stylized into perfection by an author who was in full control of the material. Novák's only regret was that Mann's work had not been translated sufficiently into the Czech language and predicted that his "serious responsibility towards life, understanding of man, infectious humor, and faithfulness to artistic ideals" would ultimately find a "great reception" in Czechoslovakia.

Novák's admiration for Thomas Mann was not shared by a small group of critics, who, however, frequently seemed to hide behind anonymity. Their complaint was that he was too "decadent." Representative of this attitude was Maria Štechová's review of the second translation of Buddenbrooks. She reported feeling thoroughly depressed as a consequence of reading the novel: "... celý román lähne na nás ako tärcha." (... the whole novel affects us like a heavy burden.) She wondered why such an "obviously talented writer" would create figures so vividly and imaginatively that the reader developed a personal relationship towards them as though they were "acquaintances" alive and real, only "to butcher them off" in a "collection" of "horrible" deaths. Her concern was more social than literary, for while she conceded that the novel might have been a documentary (dielo dokumentárne) of the fin-de-siècle atmosphere, she
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all but rejected it for the contemporary reader as "amoral and undesirable" because of its pessimism.

A similar reference to a decadent Weltanschauung in Mann's early work was made by Hugo Siebenschein. In 1932 the Staatliche Verlagsanstalt (Prague) published the novella Tonio Kröger in the German original. Siebenschein, a member of the German Department at Charles University, wrote the "Introduction." However, instead of discussing the novella, which he summed up briefly, Siebenschein reviewed the novel Der Zauberberg. Unlike Stoessl, who had shuddered at what he described as an almost apocalyptic vision in Mann's novel, Siebenschein saw in Der Zauberberg "... einen Entwicklungsroman von einem solchen Ausmasse, dass er den Vergleich nur mit Werken wie Goethe's Wilhelm Meister zulässt!" He thus echoed Novák, but disagreed with him where the novel Buddenbrooks was concerned, stressing its decadence, like Stechová. However, he did so in an attempt to describe the change in Mann. To Siebenschein the novel Der Zauberberg symbolized a move away from "L'art pour l'art" and "decadence" towards a "im höchsten Grade positiven schöpferischen Einstellung zum Leben." He described this "change" as follows:

Die grosse Bedeutung des Romans ist darin zu suchen, dass hier Thomas Mann, der unter dem Einfluss der pessimistischen Lehren Schopenhauers und Wagners gross geworden ist, ein für allemal von der lebensabgewandten Romantik Abschied nimmt, dass die höchste Pflicht darin besteht sich in den Dienst des Lebens zu stellen.  

---


This development, in Siebenschein's opinion, was even more evident in Mann's essays discussing important contemporary problems. It should be noted that Siebenschein, writing in 1932, insisted on regarding Mann as the intellectual leader of Germany who could show the way to a new spiritual community based on humanitarian principles.

Many critics and reviewers were now beginning to regard Thomas Mann not only as an author but as a representative of German intellectuals. Frequently several paragraphs were devoted to the description of his appearance, his behavior at public functions, his manner of speech, and since certain observations were repetitive they imparted a rather accurate portrait of Mann as the public saw him on his lecture tours. The overall impression the critics conveyed was that of a man who was not only a person of extraordinary intelligence, but also of great humility, modesty, and basic kindness. The earliest such "description" is to be found in an introduction to an interview as it was recorded by a representative of the Prager Presse during Thomas Mann's visit in Prague in 1932. The reporter expressed his surprise at being received "graciously" in spite of a heavy schedule by Mann. He dwelt in particular on Mann's Weltoffenheit and his Weltbürgertum, the willingness to speak on a variety of topics "without hesitation." He was described as an author "beyond the narrowness of bourgeois society with its national confines," not only a representative of Germany, but a man of the world, open and receptive, without being overwhelmed by his own importance. The latter conclusion was reached by others, again apparently much to their surprise.

Jan Münzer, who also interviewed Mann, described the atmosphere during their meeting and the author's appearance, noting the same absence of self-importance:

... jeho vystupování je, na rozdíl, od tolika jiných proslulých spisovatelů, prostě nemá snahu vystupovat důležité, mluví otevřeně a bezprostředně. ... (... he has a pleasant manner, and compared to so many other famous writers, he is modest, he does not attempt to appear important, and speaks openly and directly.)

Münzer reported about the "great" interest Prague showed in Mann's visit, an interest which manifested itself in frequent interruptions of the interview, by the arrival of press photographers, journalists, and telephone calls. Throughout this confusion Mann concentrated on the questions put to him, returning to the interrupted conversation without losing the context. Münzer thought him to be remarkably "even tempered" and "self possessed."

Karel Vach in "Thomas Mann mluví" (Thomas Mann speaks), 33 compared the two Mann brothers. He stressed the modesty of Thomas' manners, his scholarly appearance, youthfulness, and shyness. He contrasted it with Heinrich's "ruddy self-confidence," and bitingly noted that much of the latter's fame rested on politics, especially his personal conflict with Hitler, whereas Thomas was valued for his work alone.

Some insight into Mann's presentation of his lectures was


33 Karel Vach, "Thomas Mann mluví," Rozhledy, Prague, May 28, 1936. (Vach was wrong in saying that Thomas Mann was evaluated as an author only. Mann's political views aroused great interest even at the expense of his literary work.
offered by Bonn, who called Mann's reading of excerpts from his novels an "unforgettable esthetic experience," because his complete harmony of voice control and gesture gave Mann's rhythmical prose a closeness to music which held the attention of the audience. 34 After the lecture, he exhibited graciousness and consideration which charmed all present. Like Münzer, Bonn observed a total lack of conceit.

Many years later in the eyes of Czech critics, Mann had not changed; for after the Second World War those that met him were again moved by his modesty and simplicity of manner. Describing the Schiller festivities in Weimar, with all its decorum and important personalities present, Siebenschein wrote:

Teprve po chvíli bylo všem jasno, že Thomas Mann, z houfu lidí byl ten nejprostší, nejskromnější. Byl-li cím nápadný tedy nenápadnosti. (Only after a while did it become apparent to everyone that Thomas Mann was the simplest, the most polite, and the most modest. If he attracted attention, it was because of his inconspicuousness.) 35

The pre war admiration for the artist and man was expressed in the resentment felt toward the attacks on Mann by the Third Reich. There was nearly always a negative remark directed at the Nazis even in scholarly essays dealing with purely literary criticism of his work. It is interesting to note that considerable attention was paid to the conflict brewing between Thomas Mann and Hitler, caused not only by Mann's remarks in the Prague PEN-Club in March 1932, but also by strong disagreement with a segment of German literary criticism. 36 Thus


36 Thomas Mann had been invited as a guest of honor to a festive luncheon at the PEN-Club, Prague, which was then under the chairmanship
Liskutin, in a study of Mann's novels spoke of Mann as the "inheritor of Goethe's mantle," and raised the question whether such an artist could be found in contemporary Germany, which was so removed from the individualism of Goethe. Then, summing up Mann's life story, he noted the great respect and admiration paid to Mann's work by foreign countries—a respect which far exceeded Mann's stature among officialdom in Hitler's Germany.

Mann's visit to Prague in 1935 in connection with his lecture on Wagner resulted in a flood of essays and articles. Almost all writers rose in the defense of Mann, or used the injustice towards him as a means to vent their own animosities toward the German regime. A typical personal reaction was evident in a brief article summing up the Wagner lecture. Describing the overflowing hall of the Urania, Anna Jandová-Patzková reported:

"... posluchačství je napjato; co rekne dnes o Richardu Wagnerovi, tento německý liberál a básník, exulant, jak prožívá Wagnera dnes a v zrcadle domácích událostí? (... the audience is tense; what will he say today about Richard Wagner, this German liberal and poet-in-exile, how is he experiencing Wagner today in view of the domestic situation?)"

She deliberately contrasted Thomas Mann's status as an exile with the affection and understanding which surrounded him in Prague: "...

of Karel Čapek. In a toast Mann publicly expressed his relief at Hitler's defeat, for although the Nazis had gained in votes (from just under six and a half millions in September 1930 to just under eleven and a half millions on March 13, 1932, an increase of eighty-six percent), they were still more than seven million votes behind Hindenburg. Goebbels was reportedly in despair.

Liskutin made an error by stating that Thomas Mann and his family were at that time still residing in Munich.

Anna Jandová-Patzková, "Thomas Mann o Richardu Wagnerovi," Národní osvobožení, Prague, January 24, 1935.
prichází do Prahy jako místa své duchovní atmosféry a svých literárních přátel." (... he is coming to Prague as the place of his spiritual atmosphere and his literary friends.)

She ridiculed Richard Strauss's protest against the lecture, and praised Mann's analysis of Wagner's work as being of uncommon sensitivity and understanding.

Other critics were also unanimous in their praise of the lecture, and quite outspoken in their rejection of the vicious criticism which the lecture had received in Nazi Germany. Oskar Baum, the novelist, invited his readers to regard Mann as a "valuable treasure" for German literature. Contemptuously, he attacked German intellectuals for having allowed themselves to be drawn into unsavory political intrigue:

"Nichts ist bezeichnender für die Haltung der "Geistigen" im heutigen Deutschland, als der Protest der führenden Musiker an der Spitze Richard Strausss - gegen diese von fruchtbarer Leidenschaft bewundertem und hingerissener Betrachtung eingegebene Analyse des Werks und der Erscheinung des Gesamtkünstlers Richard Wagners. ... Schon die Schaffensverbundenheit des grossen Epikers mit dem Wagner-Stil - das Leitmotivische der Mannschen Sprache hätte jenen Herrn zu denken geben müssen."

Baum's main thrust was to rebuke the German intelligentsia for their total lack of appreciation of Mann's ability to shed "new light" on

39 Ibid.

40 Jandová-Patzková as well as subsequent critics, some of whom are mentioned in this chapter, sharply denounced Richard Strauss for having signed the infamous open letter "Protest der Richard Wagnerstadt München." It was particularly unpalatable to them that a composer of Strauss' caliber would have stooped to attack a fellow artist-author.

41 The negative criticism of Mann was triggered in German newspapers by the open letter "Protest der Richard Wagnerstadt München" which was widely distributed to the German press.

42 Oskar Baum, "Thomas Mann," Prager Presse, Prague, January 24, 1935.
the nineteenth century. Baum called Mann a "posthume und vollkommendste Blüte des 19. Jahrhunderts," and stated that his lecture was an esthetic, musical experience.

Otokar Fischer, esteemed scholar of German literature at Charles University in Prague, wrote a short, angry essay chiding Mann's critics, challenging them to reveal the real purpose behind the attack on Mann. He accused Richard Strauss of taking part in an outburst of hysteria. After all, Fischer pointed out, Mann emphasized his and Wagner's Germandom throughout the essay. While Fischer challenged German critics to find anti-German thoughts in Mann's work, he pointed out that both Wagner and Mann, though great Germans, were also Europeans. Thus Fischer emphasized the point made by Mann--that a good German was simultaneously a good European.

From Brno, Arne Novák, Professor of German at Masaryk University, reviewed the lecture analytically in Literárni noviny under the title: "Epik z ducha hudby" (the poet-novelist born from the Spirit of Music). With this title he indicated the thesis of his essay, namely that Mann was qualified more than anyone else to speak on Wagner because of his "profound understanding" of the musician:

Zve-li nás tvůrce Příběhů Josefových k přednášce o utrpení a velikosti Richarda Wagnera, vezme, že jako básník vyznavač bude mluvit především o problémech své lidské a tvůrčí osobnosti. (If the creator of the Joseph novel invites us to the lecture on the suffering and greatness of Richard Wagner, let us know, that as a poet, he will speak primarily about the problems of his own human and creative personality.)

---


44 Arne Novák, "Epik z ducha hudby," Lidové noviny, Prague, January 24, 1935.
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Novák had announced Mann's arrival with: "Nejdokonalejší žijící mistr německé prózy, Thomáš Mann, přijíždí do Prahy a do Brna ke dvěma přednáškám." (The most accomplished living master of German prose, Thomas Mann, is coming to Prague and Brünn to deliver two lectures.) Not only did Novák praise Mann, but he also indirectly defended Mann against political attacks, asking, what was all the noise about? Novák in effect pointed out that Thomas Mann came as a great poet not as an agitator. But, at the same time he admonished those who would come to the lecture to listen carefully, for here was a poet speaking what he felt was the truth:

In the daily Literární noviny, critic Vladislav Zima did not heed Novák's suggestion that Thomas Mann should be regarded as a literary figure, and politics should not enter the picture. In a vitriolic attack on Nazism, Zima committed a number of errors which showed that he was not very well acquainted with German history.

---

46 Ibid.

47 Vladislav Zima, "Pozdrav Tomáši Mannovi," Literární noviny, Prague, January 25, 1935. (Zima, in a wild outburst against "Prussianism," claimed, for instance, that the Grimm brothers had been persecuted by "Prussia." To be sure the Grimm brothers belonged to the "Göttinger Sieben," who protested against the violation of the constitution by the King of Hanover in 1837 and were expelled from the
Furthermore, he allowed personal bias to enter the picture. In his clumsy zeal to defend Mann, he accused the "Prussians" of "persecuting their greatest people," obviously oblivious of the fact that the most vicious attack against the author was committed by the elite of the city of Munich, Bavaria. However, and this should be kept in mind, Zima showed considerable reverence and admiration for Thomas Mann. He noted that it was Mann's profoundly humanistic spirit which had brought him in conflict with contemporary Germany. In contrast to Hitler, Mann wished Germany to be a part of the European community, stressing the importance of the European tradition, and the need for unity and cooperation amongst nations.

Zima defined Mann's troubles with the Nazis as those of a cultured and civilized man, a patrician with "an inborn skepticism" which "se dobře nesnáší a řevem filistru." (which does not agree too well with rowdy Philistines.) Zima angrily pointed out that although Mann's books were allowed to be published within Germany, no one was permitted to praise them. To Zima this made no sense, for Thomas Mann was a "dobrý a svou vlast milující Němc" (a good and homeland-loving German). Then he called upon all to honor Mann's resolve not to speak out at the time under discussion against the German government, so that he might speak more easily to the German nation as a whole. He

University of Göttingen as a result, only to be invited in 1840 by no other than Friedrich Wilhelm IV of Prussia to join the University in Berlin).

48 Erika Mann gives the following details: "Der 'Protest,' der in der Presse erschien und auszugsweise auch vom Rundfunk übertragen wurde, war von allem unterschrieben, was in München Rang und Namen besass." (Briefe 1889-1936, p. 518.)
cautioned his readers not to demand the impossible of Mann: "Bylo by nesmyslné, chtít od tak ušlechtilého spisovatele boj a mučedníctví." (It would be nonsense to demand from such a noble author a struggle and martyrdom.)

These lines were written as if Zima were trying to exculpate Mann's silence which the author preserved until his open break with the Nazis in 1936. For Zima added: "Tomáš Mann přiznává se i v exilu k republikanismu a humanitě." (Thomas Mann in his exile too confesses to Republicanism and humanity.) Zima concluded by expressing his confidence in the lasting value of Mann's creative work. Like Goethe, whose work had survived periods of adverse criticism, he believed that Mann, too, would eventually overcome the lack of understanding and hostile political currents; he would emerge all the greater because of the inner strength and integrity of his work.

As the above-mentioned essays and articles clearly show, literary evaluation of the Wagner essay suffered, because of the political implications which had been attached to it. Emotionally the reviewers succumbed to an inner need to vent anti-fascist feelings, and rushed to the defense of Mann, who had been attacked by the Nazis. This emotionalism which surrounded the personality of Mann persisted and is evident in the many essays and articles published in celebration of his 60th birthday. The following two short essays are reactions of the extreme right and left, while subsequent essays are more objective.

An anonymous critic -"rk," charged Thomas Mann with spreading

---

49 Zima, "Pozdrav Tomáši Mannovi."
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gloom and despair through his novels and novellas (Tonio Kröger, Der Tod in Venedig, Buddenbrooks, Der Zauberberg) in the "best tradition of Schopenhauer and Spengler." Suffering did not bring about messianic strength or heroic salvation, revolt and struggle, the critic argued, but lead to irony, passivity, and self-dissection. All Mann was able to do, in this critic's opinion, was to portray clearly the decline of the bourgeoisie. Will ill-concealed satisfaction -"rk" noted that now Mann was a refugee and exile, having been "chased out" of a country whose culture he helped to shape with his work and his Weimar ideal of Germandom. 51

Now the political left had its say. Karel Polák, whose article showed a lack of analytical depth of Mann's work and an ill-concealed lack of sympathy for the writer, felt it to be his duty to settle the "racial question" of Thomas Mann. 52 Polák stated that Mann, though an émigré, could not possibly be accused of either Marxism or Judaism. Thus he was settling the questions and rumors, current in Europe of Mann's alleged Judaism and leftism, which had been circulated by Mann's antagonists on the extreme right in order to explain why Mann had left Germany. On the contrary, Polák wrote, Mann as a traditionalist "přissát k německé minulosti" (stuck to the German past) was out of step with the progressive social programs. Polák, writing for the leftist daily Právo lidu, obviously would have liked Mann committed to the left, like his brother Heinrich. Finally, as if consoling himself and his readers, Polák concluded that Mann had no connection with the Third Reich.

51(-rk.), "Thomas Mann," Národní listy, Prague, June 6, 1935.

52Karel Polák, "Thomas Mann Šedesátiletý," Právo lidu, Prague, June 6, 1935.
Mann's emergence from early conservatism to his firm support of democracy and "support of leftist causes" was discussed by Vojtech Jirát. He defended Mann's Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen against critics who had labeled it as a war mongering publication and termed this verdict a gross injustice to Mann. As Jirát pointed out, Mann reviewed and reconsidered his political ideas after the war and, seeing the political, social, and cultural majority on the side of democracy, joined in. This change, was not from "spinelessness or opportunism," but merely indicated that "the great European writer" was a symptom of the spiritual development of the modern era. Jirát discussed at some length the influence of Goethe's classicism on Mann. He noted Mann's dislike in Mario und der Zauberer for Southern bellezza, and, in political life, Italian fascism.

Reviewing Mann's novels and novellas, Jirát described him as an "auditive" personality in his responses toward nature. He compared the irony in Mann's work with that of Ariosto, but noted that Ariosto's roots were in harmony; Mann's disharmony was rooted in the conflict between his bourgeois conservatism and his role as an artist. Although Jirát made other literary comparisons he regrettably did not develop them sufficiently. Mann was seen primarily as a symbolic figure, reflecting the changes of the times.

54 Note that Thomas Mann's aversion to Italian bellezza does not find expression in Mario und der Zauberer but in Tonio Kröger!
One might speak of a similar attitude towards Mann as evident in František Götz's essay "Thomas Mann, tragický humanista a dobrý Evropan. K šedesátým narozeninám." (Thomas Mann, the Tragic Humanist and Good European: - For his sixtieth birthday.)\(^{55}\) The essay was written with devotion and explained Mann's uniqueness among his contemporaries: instead of discussing solely the quality of Mann's literary work, Mann was again seen as a symbolic figure, in whom there was hope of finding a way out of contemporary dilemmas. Götz saw Mann as a basically tragic figure, the last synthesis of genuine Europeanism, of classic Weimar humanity, and of German democracy pitted against racism, anarchy, and totalitarianism. Mann's great personal achievement was that he had managed to overcome anarchy within himself and, through self-discipline, had conquered a dark side of human nature. Mann was the patrician whose humanism was too refined to meet the new primitive and anarchic forces:

\begin{quote}
Umělec v jehož krvi je touha po dokonalosti, po tichém zření do hlubin života, v jehož základní koncepci života je i umění schopenhauerovským rosplyváním se vůle k životu, jenž dospívá až k pocitu radosti z nihilismu a rozkladu, tento umělec není schopen zápasu s čerstvými živy. Pro humanismus zápasí humanně, - ale jaký je to slabý zápas v době násilí a zloby. (The artist in whose very blood is a longing for perfection, for a tranquil probing into the depths of existence, in whose basic concept of life art serves as a Schopenhauer-like disintegration of the will to live, who reaches almost a feeling of joy over nihilism and decay, this artist is unable to fight with fresh elements. For humanism he fights in a humanistic manner— but what feeble fight is it in a time of violence and evil.)\(^{56}\)
\end{quote}

Moreover Mann, Götz thought, was fighting a battle that was almost lost:

Götz rallied from the depths of his own pessimism, so pronounced

\(^{55}\)Národní osvobození, Prague, June 6, 1935.
\(^{56}\)Ibid.
throughout the entire essay, to cling to the ideal of humanity which to him Mann embodied.

In the end, Mann personified European culture and tradition against the tide of "mechanical civilization" and "Americanism" on the one hand and the onslaught of "Asiatic mysticism" on the other, by continuing certain European values:

A přece Thomas Mann je jednou z postav, které dávají dnešnímu člověku víru v život a lidstvo. Je jedním z těch, kdo mohou mluvit ke svědomí světa, jako kdysi mluvil Goethe a nebo Tolstoj, či dnes R. Rolland. Je v něm dobrý Evropan v nejcistším smyslu slova. (Thomas Mann is one of the figures who give contemporary man confidence in life and humanity. He is one of those who can speak to world conscience, as once Goethe or Tolstoy spoke, and today R. Rolland speaks. He is a good European in the purest sense of the word.)

Götz hoped that Mann's efforts and his faith in humanism might yet save Europe.

The most detached essay in celebration of Mann's birthday was written by Arne Novák. Even though Novák concentrated on the interpretation of Mann's novels, he too remarked pointedly that Mann lived in involuntary exile in Switzerland. In Mann, Novák celebrated a great essayist, but advanced the opinion that Mann's talent as a novelist was also singular:

Vložil do něho nejlepší síly své dvojdomé bytosti, zároveň epický tvůrčí i myšlenkově analytické. Povíkal se opetovými prožitky výškoleného vnitřního kritika a kulturního kritika o všech jeho možnostech. (He put into it (the novel) the best of his dual nature, both epically creative and spiritually analytic. He learned from repeated experience of a well trained observer and cultural critic about all its possibilities.)

---
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Hence Mann's novels were not only to be understood as chronicles of the times, but reflected the conscience of the times as well. The influence and temptation of Wagner and Schopenhauer evident in Mann's early work, which made life appear in such tragic dimensions, was rejected in favor of the more positive outlook which characterized both *Der Zauberberg* and the *Joseph* novel. Like Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, Novák contended, Hans Castorp and Joseph (as well as their readers) were led by Mann towards positive values in life.

Where Jiráň called Mann's novels "elegies of bourgeois existence," Novák saw in them an educational principle. For one thing, Novák spoke of a dedication to form which contradicted the formlessness of naturalism. Novák described Mann's figures as "unforgettable and frequently already historical." Though Thomas and Toni Buddenbrook, as well as Joachim Ziensm and Hans Castorp from *Der Zauberberg*, were linked to a certain time and place, Settembrini and Naphtha were reflections of European prewar civilization, and Jacob and Joseph the all-human types of the Old Testament and the Nibelungen.

In comparing Mann to other novelists, Novák wrote of Mann's humor and irony. Where Jiráň had seen Mann's irony rooted in an inner disharmony, Novák saw it as an educational device which he found lacking in both Flaubert and Tolstoy. At the conclusion of the essay Novák summed up Mann's novels as belonging to "nejmohutnějším uměleckým organizmum našeho věku" (the greatest artistic organisms of our times.

---

60 "Ba jsou více, než organismy umělecké uprostřed rozvráceného věku bez težiska, vychovává člověka k plněmu, svetlému a činorodnému lidstvu." (As a matter of fact they are even more than artistic organisms in the midst of an uprooted age without an anchor, they raise the human being towards a full, illuminated, and creative humanity.) (Ibid.)
Novák's concluding remarks reflected the tendency of the critics to pass over formalistic excellence in favor of Mann's value as a spiritual guide. Therefore, it does not come as a surprise to read Paul Eisner's essay which began: "Wir grüssen Thomas Mann, den Humanisten deutscher Prosa." Eisner went on to draw a parallel between the teachings of T. G. Masaryk and Mann's attitude toward life and faith in humanism. From the Czech point of view the comparison was highly complimentary, for Masaryk was revered by the Czechs, not so much as a politician, but primarily as a man of ethics with a humane outlook on life.

Mann's humanistic outlook on life (seine humanistische Weltanschauung—as Eisner put it) was most pronounced in his Joseph novel. In times of great tensions the loss of identity, the collapse of traditions, and the distrust of culture and civilization are not uncommon. It is precisely for these reasons that the Joseph novel received great acclaim: it was reassuring. It took the reader back to the beginnings of Western culture, humanized religious mythos, and, as Helena Malířová wrote it, it proved that human nature did not undergo change. From the Czech critics, this message, in the midst of a

61 Paul Eisner, "Gruss an Thomas Mann zum 60. Geburtstag," Prager Presse, Prague, June 6, 1935.

62 Helena Malířová, "Thomas Mann: Josef a bratři jeho," Čin, Prague, July 1935. (Malířová translated this essay into German and sent it to Thomas Mann. On September 18, 1935, Mann sent Malířová a note of thanks. To summarize briefly the contents of the letter: Mann apologized for the delay in replying to her letter due to the festivities surrounding his sixtieth birthday, which as well as his trip to America took up much of his time. He thanked Malířová for her thoughtfulness in translating her article into German for him. He admitted of being touched by her "liebevolle" engagement in it. He found it to be a rare occasion that an analysis and critique would in itself possess esthetic value. He rejoiced in her faith in the novel,
changing world, met with considerable response. They praised the "Heiterkeit," which permeated the novel, and often likened it to "a burst of sunshine," making the mood of depression and gloom bearable for the contemporary reader.

Maliřová, who was largely responsible for translating the first volume of the tetralogy, Die Geschichten Jaakobs, pointed out in her essay that the "great contemporary feeling" the novel conveyed was a result of its life-giving qualities. Her comment was: "Josef a bratři jeho je dílo, které přetrvá svůj věk." (Joseph and his brethren is a novel which will survive its era.) But while Mann was able to speak to contemporary man with the voice of the past, and underline the urgency of all questions, according to Maliřová, he had no desire to solve them. Maliřová believed that to ask questions was perhaps of primary importance, and those seeking instant solutions for mankind would have to find the answers elsewhere. For Maliřová, the value of the novel was not only in the aesthetic realm but in the educational as well. For the psychological insights of Mann were of social value in that they helped the reader to understand the early beginnings of society and its basic problems.

In contrast to the unfavorable reception which the translation of the novel Königliche Hoheit had met, the translation of the Joseph and expressed his deep gratitude to her and her fellow translator Ivan Olbracht for the quality of their translating efforts, which as he had been advised, were very well received. A typed copy of the original was supplied to me by Dr. M. Halk, Prague.)

63 It will be remembered that F. X. Šalda felt the translation of Königliche Hoheit had been superfluous. In 1934, when the Slovak translation of the novel appeared, an anonymous critic "A. M." reviewed it. In his opinion it was "wasteful" to translate novels of such "operetta-like" content, which featured the arrival of an American
novel was hailed by the critics. Karel Polák spoke of the "rapidity" with which the novel had been translated into Czech, and commented on the acceptance of Mann's work in Czechoslovakia:

Thomas Mann nebyl ani před válkou našimi překladateli zanedbán, ale po válce, od té doby, kdy se ustáli mýnění, že jest největším ze žijících německých romanopisců, a kdy mu byla udělena Nobelová cena, zvítězil rozhodně i v naší překladové produkci z němčiny. (Thomas Mann had not been neglected by our translators before or after the war, but since the time when the opinion that he was the greatest living German novelist took root, and he was awarded the Nobel prize, he definitely gained by our translation activity from the German language.)

The speed, although it did not impede the quality of the translation, resulted from a feeling that this was to be the "most important work" of Thomas Mann: "... jde o dílo životní, dílo vrcholné, zda vítězství či ztroskotání, to není ještě jisté." (... this is the culmination of his life work; whether this is victory or disaster, is not yet certain.)

Polák's doubts regarding the Joseph novel were founded on the question whether the excellence of the first two volumes could be sustained. He welcomed the novel, however, because Mann had turned away from his early "negativism." The "death-oriented" child Hanno and the "undecided" youth Hans Castorp were finally eclipsed by the figure of Joseph.

Joseph, wrote Polák, overcame his original artistic inclination which millionaire's daughter to assure a "happy-end." He complained further that Thomas Mann, "a competent and talented author," would spend his time on such "tales." Of course, what he did not realize was that Mann had quite intentionally recreated a "fairytale" in a modern setting, and endowed it with social, moral, and pedagogic values. The young prince developed in the course of the story towards responsibility and maturity in a manner which can be hardly found in scripts of operettas. (A. M. "Thomas Mann: Královská výsost," in Slovenské pohľady, Bratislava, June 1934.)

64 K. P. (Karel Polák), "Román o počátcích naší kultúry," Právo lidu, Prague, January 6, 1935.
almost led him to tire early of life. He became a man and a statesman, a man of purpose, with positive goals and eventually an exemplary, almost mythical, figure. Polák, in particular, emphasized the beneficial aspect of the hero, who in the tradition of the classic Bildungsroman became a moral man of action.

It can be readily understood that the novel was welcome because of the contemporary concern about the decline of religion and culture. It humanized a religious mythos, brought it closer, and made it more acceptable to modern man. Most important, it was seen especially by Polák as an answer to Hitler and German racism with its mythos of the strong, pure race; these Nazi myths were being ridiculed in the portrayal of the first-born primitive brutes. The blessing was bestowed, however, on the late-born, handsome but somewhat weak, even cowardly, yet somehow above-average, sensitive, and cultured. Finally, explained Polák, it was not the "heroic bullies" but Joseph, who, though he had suffered envy and Jealousy, led his people to culture, higher health, and national power.

Polák's racial interpretation of Mann's novel was of course decidedly one-sided. Mann did not write the novel against racism, nor to glorify or to offer moral support to Judaism. He saw in this Biblical story a chain in the development of humanity and a part of the mythical past which he wished to re-create and to humanize.

J. R. Marek found the Joseph novel "overwhelming" though not in a positive sense. He complained that the various figures in the novel were like "gigantic shadows," with gestures reminiscent of a pathetic...

---

drama which took place somewhere between "heaven and earth;" there were no "plain" feelings, everything was "melodramatic." This was an exaggeration on Marek's part, for it was because of the Biblical original that the figures were larger than life. What Mann did was to endow them with feelings, made them human, some more primitive and primeval, others more noble and cultured. But he had to stay within the atmosphere and the tone of the times which was more emotional and dramatic. It would have been unthinkable, in fact it would have been a parody, if he had used the language and mentality of the 20th century urbanite. Yet Mann's psychological penetration of each figure brought out certain common denominators which are constants throughout the centuries, because they are part of human nature from time immemorial.

F. Křelina's critical comment was diametrically opposed to Marek, and it is probable that, although not indicating it, it was written as a rebuttal. Křelina praised the translating efforts of Malířová and Olbracht, and pointed out the difficulties involved in following the German original for even those readers with an above-average knowledge of the German language. As he put it, the novel had "no equal" in world literature, and it was not likely that it would be surpassed in the near future by contemporary authors. The novel, he contended, was something of a "modern Talmud," except that the figures were stripped of the saintly religious aura which Moses attached to them. They were people devoid of the "grand magic" of the Bible. The early animal primitivism was overcome in favor of humanity and feeling, for example, in Jacob's love for Rachel, which showed the humanization process with greatest

---

depth. Otherwise the novel was called an "encyclopedia of knowledge" in history, religion—and even early textile production.

J. B. Čapek, affecting a very scholarly tone, raised the question whether Mann, particularly in the eyes of theologians and historians, picked the "right people and place" to recreate a mythos. He suggested that the Hindus, Chinese, or Chaldeans might have offered more appropriate material. However, he answered his own question when he claimed to have detected the influence of the Biblical readings of the young Mann, namely, the Erklärte Deutsche Volksbibel, where a happening in the Old Testament (such as Isaac carrying wood for the sacrifice) was an anticipation of the New Testament (Jesus Christ carrying his cross).

There can be no question that Mann chose a subject already familiar to him and if he chose to extend and embellish it, he did so because he was a poet not a religious historian. This is where Čapek misunderstood the novel. He accused the author of insufficient understanding of the personality and spirit of the people of Israel and the uniqueness of their monotheism which set them apart from their Oriental surroundings. He reported with ill-concealed glee that Mann, having assumed the Song of Song's being of Mesopotamian origin, had placed it in the mouth of Laban's relatives. Finally, though Čapek conceded that Mann had initiated a new form for the European historical novel and had employed great intellectual effort and dedication in finding the truth, he had somehow found the effort "unconvincing:"

67 J. B. Čapek, "Thomas Mann: Příběhy Jakobove," Naše doba, Prague, October, 1935. (J. B. Čapek is no relation to the Čapek brothers, Josef and Karel.)
Z obou dosavadních svazků však již vyniká, že Th. Mann se vyhýbá určitéjší ideové odpovědi na problémy, které staví, zdá se, že se autor častěji oddává opojivé závratí bezèdných pohledů do dění světa a do duse člověka, a že se ukobalává mystickou představu o naprosté nepochopitelnosti a nemeritelnosti žitova. (From both current volumes it is already clear, that Thomas Mann is avoiding more definite replies to problems which he introduces. It seems that the author succumbs to the intoxicating dizziness of infinite insights into the course of the world and the soul of man, and that he satisfies himself with a mystical image of the complete impossibility of understanding or measuring life.)

Čapek's criticism was based on a lack of understanding of Mann's intention: to demonstrate the ever present and recurring in life, and yet the impossibility of understanding the vastness and meaning of existence; in addition, Mann wished to cancel time by reaching into the past making the mythos contemporary.

Willy Haas, who two years later reviewed *Joseph in Egypten*, recognized Mann's attempt to create an atmosphere of timelessness, or to remove the limits of time and space: "Všechno v tomto eposu se odehrává souèasně dnes a před tisíciletmi, vznásí se v nekoneènu, ale také v dnešní duši čtenáře." (Everything in this work is happening simultaneously today and thousands of years ago and seems to be suspended in eternity, and at the same time in the soul of contemporary man.)

Haas concentrated especially on the two figures, Joseph and Potiphar, so polar and yet so alike. The difference was between Joseph, the chosen one, in an exemplary eternal fashion, and Potiphar chosen, but earth and time bound. Haas considered it to be Mann's "great ability" to put himself and the reader between two possibilities of existence.

---

Ibid.

He praised the third volume for the confrontation of these two figures, particularly as to psychological insight and differentiation. Haas' final evaluation was in complete accord with another reviewer, Hanuš Bonn, namely that the novel presented a great challenge to the reader, intellectually as well as emotionally, and demanded total participation which in the end resulted in complete absorption. The novel was especially commended for its "incredible" richness and diversity which surpassed Der Zauberberg. To summarize the critical response to the Joseph novel it can be said that it aroused interest and admiration which surpassed the reception of previous works.

The last essay to appear in the latter part of the 1930's, dealing with a work by Mann, was a commemorative piece by Eisner on Schopenhauer's 150th birthday. Eisner wrote more on Thomas Mann than on Schopenhauer. He pointed out that the greatest memorial to the philosopher was to be found in Mann's novel Buddenbrooks when Thomas Buddenbrook accidentally discovered Schopenhauer. According to Eisner the next stage of Mann's development was the Wagner-Schopenhauer influence which reached its peak in Der Tod in Venedig in a prose style which Eisner considered "unsurpassable." But Eisner failed to recognize that Wagner's presence was already obvious in Buddenbrooks, not only in the text, but in Mann's usage of the Leitmotiv throughout the novel. Eisner suggested that Mann turned away from that influence in the novel Der Zauberberg, which he called a classic against escape, illness, and

---

70 Hanuš Bonn, "Třetí část biblického eposu Thomase Manna," Rozhledy, Prague, May 27, 1937.

a fear of life, towards more positive goals. However, when Eisner spoke of a development towards life and man, he had undoubtedly misinterpreted Mann's ultimate irony of Hans Castorp's departure for participation in World War I. Eisner also spoke of Mann's great popularity amongst the Czechoslovak intellectuals, and mentioned that he was one author who was being looked up to for moral and spiritual leadership.

A comparative study of the essays of Valéry and Mann by Miloš Hlavka was not only evaluative, but it also criticized the authors for lack of decisive intellectual direction which would provide spiritual leadership and guidance. From a literary point of view Hlavka recommended the essays of both authors as essential reading. He cited Thomas Mann, in particular, as an example, for the author had manifested the ability for an original approach to literary topics—a welcome change from the staleness and repetitiveness of his contemporaries, not only in Czechoslovakia but universally. In Hlavka's opinion, Valéry's rationalistic approach to the contemporary spiritual crisis of the world subjected everything to merciless criticism without, however, offering advice on how to improve society and contemporary life. Valéry's function as a "guardian of the pure spirit" irritated Hlavka. But he was equally dissatisfied with Mann, who, he claimed, was no longer the representative of the bourgeoisie but, especially, after his letter exchange with the Dean of the University of Bonn, had to be considered a liberal. The bourgeoisie, whose interests he had guarded, was responsible for electing the new rulers in Germany. Hence he represented the mentality of the nineteenth century rather than the
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72 Miloš Hlavka, "Valéry a Mann, dva strážci ducha," Literární noviny, Prague, May 3, 1937.
Mann had failed to remain in touch with and influence the German bourgeoisie, yet had remained faithful to that class although it had betrayed his and its own mission. Hlavka declared that in a crisis of liberalism it was not sufficient just to insist on liberalism. For Hlavka, Mann's anti-fascist stand was not enough, he demanded to know in whose name he was doing it and for what kind of future generation he was writing. Behind this request to two obviously respected authors, whom he called "strážce ducha" (guardians of the spirit), was Hlavka's ill-concealed fear of the results if leading intellectuals were unable to provide spiritual guidance to contemporary problems: "... že se věci ujímají poté lidé, kteří sice mají tu vůli, ale nemají nazbyt ducha!" (. . . and then these matters are taken over by those who have the will, but who are poor in spirit!) 73

In contrast to Hlavka, and as an immediate result of Mann's reply to the Dean of the University of Bonn, Jan Ort saw Mann providing this spiritual leadership which people were awaiting for:

Thomas Mann není asfaltník, není bolševík, není převratník, není levicák. Je to duch zachovnosti, duch až do zbožnosti prosycený pietou ke každé tradici rodové, státní, státní. (Thomas Mann is not an "asphaltic," (a derogatory term used by fascist "blood and soil" literature) bolshevik, revolutionary or leftist. He embodies the spirit of preservation, a spirit of almost religious piety towards tradition be it heritage, class, nation, or state.) 74

There is no question that Mann respected tradition for its positive values for people and institutions and rejected rash claims for social justice and progress, which in reality so often were ill-concealed aggression. This Hlavka did not understand, but Ort did. To Ort, in

73 Ibid.

times of anarchy, men like Thomas Mann provided a moral support necessary against the negative forces within society which desired to do away with the past in order to remake the future on their terms.

Mann's cultural mission as an upholder of European tradition was recognized by Ort, Eisner, and many others. Eisner, in particular, in his last address to the Thomas Mann Society, spoke of Mann as an author with a pedagogic and moral mission. As he put it, Mann was not only the teacher and moral leader of his nation, but an "example" for all who shared a humane outlook on life, believed in peace and good-will among nations.  

75(jsp.) "O evropském významu Tomáše Mannu," Rozhledy, Prague, April 7, 1938. (jsp., apparently a reporter, quotes extensively from Pavel Eisner's presentation, making it possible to reconstruct Eisner's speech to some extent. Cf. 85, p. 32 for a more detailed account.)
CHAPTER III

THOMAS MANN IN INTERVIEWS AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

While in the preceding chapter we dealt with critical reactions to Thomas Mann's literary work, we are now turning to his personal contact with the country consisting mainly of lecture engagements and interviews given to Czech newspaper men on the occasion of these engagements.

Thomas Mann began to go on international lecture tours only after World War I, and visited Czechoslovakia for this purpose in the 1920's and 1930's. In 1922 he came to Prague and Brno for the first time to present his lecture Goethe und Tolstoi. He returned in 1923 with the lecture Okkulte Erlebnisse. The latter in particular was successful, so that he was pleased to inform Hans Bodmer of its splendid reception by the audiences.\(^1\) How these lectures were received by the critics and how the press covered his visits is impossible to determine because of lack of secondary material, as the available bibliographies have shown.\(^2\) After these initial contacts with Czechoslovakia, he did not return to Czechoslovakia until 1932.

\(^1\)Briefe 1889-1936, p. 209.

Vladimir Kafka, Thomas Mann (1875-1955), Posmrtná bibliografie spisovatelova díla, 23 pp.
It has been generally known that he had the reputation of an excellent novelist, but his fame was established with the Nobel Prize award of 1929. Because of that award and due to his political role he aroused public interest so that his visits (1932, 1935, 1936, 1937), especially those in the middle thirties, became front page news or top stories of interest in influential Czech and German dailies and weeklies rather than simply news in literary or cultural events sections.

There can be no question that with each visit the interest in Mann grew. At first in the 1920's he spoke to an exclusively German speaking audience, because he had come at the invitation of German minority literary clubs. Although this pattern continued in the 1930's, the participation of Czech audiences increased.

There are several reasons for this increase in interest among Czech audiences quite apart from his reputation as one of the leading German novelists of the times. The translation of Mann's works was slow, and this is a very important factor to remember. Most people living in Czechoslovakia were bi-lingual. The German minority spoke some Czech; the Czechs to a larger, and the Slovaks to a lesser degree, spoke German; this was true especially of the older generation raised in the old Astro Hungarian empire. But an average knowledge of German did not suffice to appreciate Mann fully, because Thomas Mann's works are no easy fare. He was one of the undisputed masters of the German language, and one had to be thoroughly acquainted with that language to be capable of following him. Thus most Czechs had to wait for proper translations. Unfortunately, some of the early translations left something to be desired. Only in the late 1920's did work on former translations improve, and the translating activity increased in general.
Another reason for an increase in interest among Czechs was that Mann, particularly in the late 1920's and increasingly so in the early 1930's, began to emerge as a firm supporter of democracy: he was not afraid to take an outspoken stand against fascism. To the Czechs in particular his attitude was important because they were afraid of the growing German threat. They wished to cling to the hope that rationality might prevail in the end, as long as there were enough people like Mann in Germany, or speaking for Germany. As a thoroughly bourgeois society they were inclined to listen to what he had to say about that class, especially about his warnings of an incipient decline, warnings which terrified them.

It is only natural that both the Czech and the German press in Czechoslovakia were anxious to contact him and whenever possible to interview him. Thus there were seven interviews and one written communication (a questionnaire in place of an interview) submitted to Mann, in the years 1932, 1935, 1936 and 1937, and they give a brief summary of the thoughts he wished to make public on the arts, the tendencies of the times, the state of European culture, the task of the bourgeoisie, his politics and his fears and hopes for the future.
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3 "Beim Dichter des bürgerlichen Zeitalters, Gespräch mit Thomas Mann," Prager Presse, Prague, March 15, 1932.
Bedřich Fučík, "Rozhovor s Thomasem Mannem," Literární noviny, Prague, June 1932. (Thomas Mann replies to this questionnaire are to be found only in Briefe 1889-1936, pp. 312-316. The quotations in this dissertation are based on this text.)
In 1932, for instance, a self-confident Mann boldly discussed politics, commenting on matters of social concern, yet, in 1935 he devoted himself almost exclusively to literary comments and avoided political comments. By 1936 he guardedly dodged queries of his future intentions regarding changes in his private life, but boldly declared his faith and allegiance to democracy and his identification with the émigrés. Finally in 1937, he proudly declared his new citizenship: he tried his best to sound cheerful and confident in the face of insurmountable political problems which were threatening Europe, and sought to reconcile the division within the Czechoslovak nation. A look at these interviews will reveal Mann's attitudes during this period.

Mann arrived in Prague on March 14, 1932, at the invitation of the Prague Theatrical Society and the Volksbildungsverein Urania. He had been invited to be the main speaker at the Neues Deutsches Theater at a commemorative evening of the 100th anniversary of Goethe's death, followed by a reception in his honor at the Urania. Earlier in the day there had been a banquet arranged by the Prague PEN-Club in Thomas Mann's honor. Both events were attended by government representatives

"Thomas Mann und die Emigration," Prager Presse, Prague, May 17, 1936. (Excerpt from an interview in Die Wahrheit, a weekly which could not be located, according to the State Library of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Prague.)
Hanus Bonn, "Rozhovor s Thomase Mannem--Víra v česko-německou součinnost," Lidové noviny, Prague, January 13, 1937. Bibliographers of Thomas Mann, such as Jonas 1, and Jonas and Jonas II, Vladimír Kafka, as well as Z. Ilková in "České poznámky a studie k životu a dílu T.M.," Časopis pro moderní filologii, Prague, November 1950, have never been able to come up with more than four of the above mentioned interviews, although it is certain that the material could be located at the Archives in Prague.
and ambassadors, as well as Czech and German representatives of the Arts and Sciences.

In spite of this heavy schedule Mann managed to give two interviews. One was with Alfred Fuchs, professor and lecturer, the other was with the unidentified representative of the Prager Presse. Their main questions concerned points of interest which they wished to clarify for their readers. They both reacted particularly strongly towards Mann's statement at the PEN-Club. Mann had been greeted warmly by Karel Čapek, then chairman of the Prague PEN-Club. Čapek said in his welcoming speech that not only because of his creative work of rare excellence, but also because of his sincere faith in peace, Thomas Mann had all the rights of a native. Čapek made a special point of saying he welcomed in Mann a representative of the "other Germany," implying of course that he meant the "German" of the nonaggressive, democratic Weimar Republic. Mann thanked Čapek for having been given the opportunity to meet for the first time the intellectuals of Prague, and then at what must have been a memorable moment, he toasted Hitler's defeat in the elections for the German presidency. The reporter stated: "... zdůraznil ve svém příspěvku, že mu Hitlerovým neuspěchem spadl kámen ze srdce." (... he emphasized in his toast that with Hitler's failure a load had fallen off his chest.) Both interviewers used this comment of Mann's as the take-off point for their questions. He apparently freely repeated his statement during both interviews and added that Hitler's failure was of universal
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4 Fuchs, "Epik městanskstva." also "Beim Dichter des Bürgerlichen Zeitalters," Prager Presse.

5 Fuchs, "Epik městanskstva."
importance, and that it would have a broad effect on the destiny of mankind as well as of Germany. In an optimistic mood Mann expressed the hope that it would eventually lead to greater understanding among the nations of Europe, even to a "rebirth of European culture and spirit."

Obviously the future of the German people and the unity of Europe were very much on his mind as he saw the threat of nationalism and racism promoting internal discord and unrest among nations. On his mind was also the social question of the survival of the bourgeoisie, which had been the carrier of democratic ideals and the guardian of European culture. As he feared its decline, he foresaw a rise of a chauvinist proletariat without ties to the cultural past. For this reason he tried to rally the bourgeoisie to devote its attention to the present and future social and political issues.

In his essay lecture *Goethe als Repräsentant des bürgerlichen Zeitalters*, he had dealt with Goethe as the great product of the bourgeois era, the son and heir of a traditional way of life and thought, yet at the same time as a man far transcending narrow traditional boundaries and opening the way for the development of new liberal thoughts which influenced all of Europe. Goethe was not a revolutionary, for he was too firmly grounded in a tradition which for the most part he respected: Mann pointed out, however, that Goethe grasped the essence of the changing future, welcomed it, and sought positive evolutionary progress.

The main objective of Mann's essay had not been only a description of Goethe's character, personality, and philosophy of life, but an

---

analysis of the development and growth of the bourgeoisie. Addressing himself to the bourgeoisie, Mann had issued a stern warning that unless they followed Goethe’s great example and moved with the changing times, the spiritual leadership, which since the dawn of the modern era had been theirs, might easily be lost forever. This heritage would be forfeited if they persisted in ignoring the challenges of mass media, mechanization, and urbanization, all of which were leading to a communal society. Thus apart from offering insight into the complexities of Goethe’s character, Mann traced the development of an era and dissected the component forces within the bourgeoisie--forces which bore in them a great potential for new spiritual heights and growth.

The essay was a challenge to bourgeois society to measure up to this heritage and to fight for its survival by making democracy a system of flexibility adaptable to future demands of the times as well as trends of thought. For he saw bourgeois democracy not only as an economic and social power but as a spiritual one as well.

However, judging from what he said to Fuchs in the interview, he did not hold out much hope for the bourgeoisie in its present state. Looking toward the future, Mann saw Europe’s destiny no longer determined by either capitalism or the bourgeoisie, not to mention communism of the Moscow variety, but rather the replacement of bourgeois civilization by a spiritually oriented national kind of communism, by which he meant the incorporation of extreme individualism into the communal life.

As he had done in his lecture, he continued to address the German people especially. For instance, when asked about the future of the intellectual in politics, he sounded extremely pessimistic. He branded what he called “kult násilf” (the cult of violence), resulting
from compulsory military service to which young people had to submit, as alarming and destructive of spiritual qualities. At the same time he defended the German people and blamed their military defeat in World War I for being such a traumatic experience that they lost many an illusion as a result:

"U německého národa který byl porážkou připraven o tolik ilusí nesmíme se divit že nevedomost a nedostatek tradice jsou často přímo chváleny jakoby přednosti. (It therefore must not surprise us that in the German nation which has been deprived of so many illusions the current lack of knowledge and tradition are praised as if they were preferential qualities.)"

This experience resulted in a lack of faith in knowledge and tradition, and left the Germans open to half truths. He brought up the misunderstanding about Goethe which Germans, especially German youth, had: they failed to understand Goethe's refusal to take a stand on the events of the day. As he explained it, Goethe had been afraid for the Germans whom he considered humane, spiritual, apolitical, and consequently very vulnerable.

In the interviews Mann displayed confidence not only in Hitler's failure, but also in the victory of the German Center Party. He ascribed this party's political influence to Catholic universalism. This, he said, could be best noted in Bavaria where the influence of the high clergy, notably Cardinal Faulhaber, had much to do with the radical weakening of the Nazis, whom he called "stoupenců zlomeného kříže" (the followers of the broken cross). Thus he was putting his faith in an international religious movement in the hope of stemming
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the narrow nationalism which threatened Germany, and for this reason he also found it hard to forgive the Protestant churches. Though a Protestant himself, he pointed to that religion as representative of a German spirit which was failing Germany. He attacked it for helping narrow-minded nationalism during World War I and afterwards.

Dwelling on the link between religion and politics, and the strange bed fellows they made at times he remarked with irony pointing out the paradox:

. . . že katolíkism v Německu je dnes vůdcem levice, je právě tak paradoxní, jako že musila politická levice vyzvednout na svůj stůn Hindenburka (. . . that Catholicism in contemporary Germany was the leader of the German left, is as paradox as the fact that the German left had to claim and elevate Hindenburg.)

It was in the course of an interview with Willy Haas in 1936 that Mann spoke of the reasons why he felt drawn towards the ideals of democracy and away from his early conservatism. Haas had suggested to him that after the death of Stefan George, Mann was the only leading spiritual representative of a patrician past, the values of which were inner discipline, tight bonds, authority, and strong ethics.

Mann acknowledged that indeed he had taken a conservative view in politics, but pointed out he had completely changed his outlook years ago. To Mann, democracy presented a challenge. Its free forms represented more discipline than any other political form of government. Therefore, it seemed quite natural that because of his inclination towards responsible self-government of each individual, he would choose this form of political self-expression. He did take a very firm stand
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against the accusations that democracy was a dilapidating influence, and said the reverse was true:

V demokraci pozná se muž skutečně vnitřní kázné a disciplíny. Násilnické diktatury korumpují a depravují—nikoliv demokracie. (In a democracy only one can recognize the man (person) of inner self control and discipline. Tyrannical dictatorships corrupt and deprecate—democracy does not.)

To Mann, the moral value of democracy was infinitely higher and therefore more desirable than the regimentation of thought and action, which was so imperative for fascism and other totalitarian forms of government.

As a second reason for his decision in favor of democracy, Mann claimed that Europe could survive only by embracing that system of government. He sharply rejected the hegemony of the state in the pattern which Napoleon had envisioned for Europe. For him the spiritually oriented modern man needed European unification and solidarity. He emphasized twice that this was thinkable only on the political base of a federal democracy.

Obviously he was deeply distressed by the unrest within Czechoslovakia, especially among the German minority which increasingly became dominated by the fascist Henlein party in the Sudeten region of Czechoslovakia. In his last interview (1937) he appealed to that minority to cooperate with the rest of the nation. He reminded them that they were part of a nation which gave them chances to develop economically as well as culturally. He spoke of true "Deutschtum" which manifested itself in the ability to pursue spiritual goals and

12 Ibid.
13 Bonn, "Rozhovor s Thomasem Mannem."
accept other cultures and nations to the benefit of all. Finally he offered his hope that all would be well in time, and that the spirit of cooperation would be the eventual salvation for Europe.

All Mann's hopes and admonitions were directed to the bourgeoisie, for he did not like the broad masses, and expected very little if anything of them. For this reason he feared that they might some day challenge the bourgeoisie for world leadership. This is why he expressed skepticism about the use of Freud's research in the psychology of the masses. When Willy Haas asked Thomas Mann whether Freud's findings could be useful Mann responded pessimistically "the world shall not be improved by scientific knowledge."\(^{14}\)

Naturally Mann spoke on literature and the arts in general. He expressed himself as to the perennial question whether or not art had a social and topical mission. This mission Mann deplored, because he felt that the arts could well be used for unsavory purposes such as propaganda. He was defending the right of the artist to be himself and to project what he felt was right without outside interference:

"Im Wesen der wahren Kunst liegt vor allem der Begriff der Freiheit und Wahrheit."\(^{15}\) Although he admitted that the trend towards involvement with social problems of the times was followed by many writers and

\(^{14}\)Willy Haas: "Don't you think that Freud's research in the psychology and psychosis of the masses and his cultural analysis could be most useful today?" Thomas Mann: "I do not believe it. Knowledge is always given to but a few. The world shall not be improved by scientific knowledge. Fanatic masses are not influenced by knowledge or are not influenced sufficiently by it." (Willy Haas, "Prazská rozmluva s Thomasem Mannem.") This, of course, does not mean that Thomas Mann rejected Freud's research, he merely stated that he doesn't think such research (or any research for that matter) is capable of having a palpable influence upon the conduct of the masses, or upon the possibility of directing them into certain desirable frames of mind.

\(^{15}\)"Beim Dichter des bürgerlichen Zeitalters," \textit{Prager Presse}. 
demanded by the public, he differentiated among the strength of these
demands present in the various nations. To illustrate his point, he
chose to compare Germany and France. Contemporary literature in
Germany was so profoundly concerned with the problems of the day
because of the pressing political and social upheaval. He worriedly
spoke about the lack of stability in Germany, and declared that art
could not properly develop in such a turmoil. Almost with envy he
pointed out the tranquil cultural and artistic development the French
enjoyed because of a fundamental equilibrium within the political life
and the governmental system in France, and sadly said: "... wie es
bei den Deutschen nie der Fall gewesen ist."\(^\text{16}\)

There was no question, however, in Mann's mind that the artist
had a mission in life which not even contemporary society, utilitarian-
ized and mechanized as it was becoming, could diminish, and which no
amount of alteration of the social structure could change. For him art
was an "Urphänomen" existing from time immemorial, something which the
human being needed. Thus, of course, the function of the artist was
indispensable and immortal:

Ich halte die Kunst für ein Urphänomen, das unter keinen
Umständen aus der Welt kommen kann, und die Lebensform des
Künstlers für unsterblich.\(^\text{17}\)

Art was therapeutic: in art man recognized himself, and became
revivified. Therefore art as a basic need for humanity should not be
allowed to wither, even in the most thoroughly mechanized society.

Mann also explained the meaning of the "daemonic" in litera-
ture, which he felt was the ingredient of artistic creativity. The

\(^{16}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{17}\text{Briefe 1889-1936, p. 314.}\)
daemonic was the reproduction of the world as digested and reproduced through the eyes and the inner being of the author, so that the writer became in turn a creator of a world—his own world. Although he did not mention it in this particular context, his explanation of how he came to write *Mario und der Zauberer* is an example. While he acknowledged degrees in tone and ethical concept he maintained that creative writing was impossible without the daemonic factor.

He also explained the interconnection of individual works within the total range of the productions of the artist and how a work grows out of certain realities and thoughts present in his mind at the time of artistic creation. The artist does discern in a completed work the seed of his next creation and thereby imparts his whole life's work with a certain consistency.

When asked about the various art forms, Mann uttered strong convictions. On the question of the quality of the contemporary theater he expressed himself negatively. He did not consider contemporary theater production to be of high quality. In his opinion the peril of the modern theater was the result of a lack of tranquility and general balance, which resulted in productions which were neither unique nor representative: "Das Drama braucht einen festen, 

---

18 "Beim Dichter des bürgerlichen Zeitalters," *Prager Presse*.

19 Mann informed Hoerth how he had conceived the material for *Mario und der Zauberer*. It had been based on a real life experience, except that it had been intensified, and the fatal shooting at the end had been drawn from an off-hand remark made by his daughter. While not critical of Italy, his subconscious was reflected: "Etwas Kritisch-Ideelles, Moralisch-Politisches ist mir freilich im Lauf der Erzählung aus dem Privaten und zunächst Unbedeutenden erwachsen..." (*Briefe 1889-1936*, pp. 299-300.)

gesicherten Kulturboden, eine sichere Kultureinheit."\(^{21}\) Because of his criticism of other forms, he felt that the novel was the contemporary means of expression. Yet in another interview he expressed his confidence in the future of the novella as literary form, which, in its compactness, had many advantages over the loose and drawn out form of the novel.\(^{22}\)

Mann's views on cinematography as a new form of art were not positive either. While he had apparently learned to tolerate and even accept this medium, he still could not be reconciled to what he believed was its lack of artistic value and its absence of serious content. As he put it plaintively: "Es ist ja wohl das meiste, was man zu sehen bekommt kärlich, und man geht mit einem Katzenjammer aus dem Kino."\(^{23}\) It was the intellectual's typical complaint over time wasted looking at a make believe world without essence and depth. The only thing, which consoled him apart from a rare good film, was the technical strides being made in photography. He admitted that the filming of *Buddenbrooks* had been a disaster. What had been produced, in his words, was "ein kleiner Kaufmannsrroman." No wonder he was galled by the movie industry. Still he did express hope for a successful film version of his *Joseph und seine Brüder*, for which a London film firm had taken out an option. He believed this novel in particular was suitable for filming.

---

\(^{21}\)"Prag als Symbol," *Prager Presse*.

\(^{22}\)"... weil ich vermute, dass die geschlossene und prägnante Form der Novelle mehr Aussicht auf Bestand hat als die lockere und gedehnte des Romanes." (Briefe 1889-1936, p. 315.)

\(^{23}\)"Prag als Symbol," *Prager Presse*. 
Thus the main reason why Mann did not feel the theater to be threatened by the movie industry was its inability for the most part to create something meaningful and of ethic and esthetic value. Furthermore, movies were in essence not dramatic but epic, evoking images which made a novelistic technique necessary. He especially praised the Russian movie industry in this respect: "... deshalb auch die Spezialbegabung der Russen im Film, da die Russen stets grosse Epiker waren."24

In nearly all the interviews the topic of conversation eventually turned to his own creative work. In 1932 Mann was questioned on his preference regarding his own novellas. He had, according to Fučík, at an earlier interview professed his preference for Der Tod in Venedig and Tonio Kröger, but had not mentioned Mario und der Zaubere.25 This novella had aroused controversy. While it was praised as one of Mann's most masterful narratives generally, and Fučík especially wrote about it with admiration, it was also regarded as a veiled political satire. Hence Fučík demanded clarification. Mann was glad to discuss the novella, for he obviously was anxious to correct the assumption that he had indeed intended a satire. Although he did admit that the novella possessed what he called "kleine politische Glanzlichter," he stressed he did not wish those overemphasized at the expense of the ethical meaning.26

Still when he spoke of his work, and in spite of the faith he

---

24 Ibid.

25 Fučík, "Rozhovor s Thomasem Mannem."

26 Briefe 1889-1936, p. 315.
expressed in the future of the novella, he spoke almost exclusively about his novels. Judging from his remarks, it is obvious that he followed the reception of his individual works very closely, and was concerned with their evaluation in the future. He remarked about his first novel Buddenbrooks, for which he had been awarded the Nobel prize, that in Germany in particular it enjoyed its greatest popularity and that he would in all probability always be best known there in connection with this novel. He contrasted this with the reception his novel Der Zauberberg had received in America, where it was far more popular. He believed this was because of its "contemporary" ideas.  

It is interesting, however, that he did not dwell on the finished novels. Once completed he put them out of his mind, for in the 1930's he had new challenges to meet. As evident from the interviews, his mind was preoccupied with the Joseph novel. Conversation or written communication turned in that direction, and yet in the back of his mind there was at least one other topic taking form. In 1932 although busy with the Joseph novel, he expressed his desire to complete Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull, which had remained a fragment.  

His remarks on Felix Krull give valuable insight into what constituted his own artistic temperament. He explained the great attraction, even temptation, exerted upon him by newly conceived poetic material. He said it had its own style which prompted him, even seduced him, to slip into a different role. Thus in the midst of recreating the Biblical mythos, there was already a new inner call for a stylistic

---


28 "Beim Dichter des bürgerlichen Zeitalters," *Prager Presse.*
change of pace. The challenge and temptation at this time were the possibilities of a parody on great biographies and the stylistic problems accompanying such an attempt. It carried with it great artistic challenges surely, and he spoke of it as "einen stilistischen Tanz auf des Messers Schneide."\(^{29}\) His remark recalls the dangerous tensions or "daemonic forces" within the artist.

When asked which of his writings he considered to be his best creative effort, he declared: "Ze svých děl považuji tedy za nejdůležitější své poslední dílo Josef a bratři jeho." (Of my works I consider Joseph und seine Brüder to be the most significant one.)\(^{30}\) His determination to complete the tetralogy was awesome, and it is probable that he felt fatigued by it.

He had conceived the first impulse for the Joseph novel in 1923 as a result of seeing the graphic work by Hermann Ebers depicting the biblical story of Joseph. In March 1925 he even undertook a trip to Egypt to familiarize himself with the physical aspects of the country, and hinted at some "schattenhafte Pläne."\(^{31}\) Not until August 1, 1926, did he inform Bertaux of a "kleinen, schwierigen, aber durchaus reizvollen Roman Joseph in Aegypten."\(^{32}\)

Subsequently the material gained the better of him to a degree which seemed to surprise him. It is interesting that at the same time he seemed to know instinctively it would grow beyond the scope intended.

\(^{29}\) Ibid.

\(^{30}\) Münzer, "Thomas Mann v Praze," České Slovo.

\(^{31}\) Bürgin and Mayer, Thomas Mann, eine Chronik seines Lebens, p. 68.

\(^{32}\) Ibid., p. 75.
He informed Fucík: "Die neue Arbeit, die mich schon seit Jahren beschäftigt und noch geraume Zeit in Anspruch nehmen wird, ..." He confessed his astonishment at the fascination the material had for him: "Ich hatte nicht gedacht, dass das Religionsgeschichtliche und selbst Theologische ein solches Interesse für mich gewinnen könne."

He appears to have been considering the novel his "Alterswerk," for he remarked with a certain candor: "Diese Neigung scheint ein Produkt der Jahre zu sein, und ich überlasse mich ihr mit der Bereitwilligkeit, die allem gebührt, was das Leben organisch mit sich bringt."

Indeed for Mann, the novel presented a milestone in his life. He had in his younger years been chiefly concerned with topics from bourgeois life, primarily individual problems. With Joseph, his interest turned, as he explained it, to the humane and the mythical, to the basic questions of life and death. He claimed to have been forced away from earlier individualism into this direction by the events of the times. There seemed to have been an early interest on his part in the Orient. He mentioned that this interest, arising in early boyhood, later manifested itself in a distinctive preference for Oriental art and Egyptian sculpture. But apart from the early boyhood fascination and eventual hobby, which resulted in painstaking study, there were basic questions of human existence on which he felt forced to take a stand:

Vznikal ve mně nový zájem o člověka, o otázky, které byly a budou otázky věčné. Ke všemu tomu jsem zaujímal stanovisko,

---

33 Briefe, 1889-1936, p. 316.
34 Haas, "Pražská rozmluva s Thomasem Mannem."
35 Ibid.
During an interview in 1936 the conversation centered mainly around his relationship with Sigmund Freud. He was asked whether he had consciously been influenced by psychoanalytical findings while conceiving the *Joseph* novel. The implication of the question was that Freud had just started dedicating research to questions of religion and mythography, and Mann's *Joseph* novel was evolving in that same field.

While he paid tribute to Freud, he admitted that he had known Freud's work only for a relatively short time. When he had systematically gone through Freud's collective works, his interest and admiration for Freud had been aroused. Mann's main interest lay in the general anthropological insights in their widest sense, rather than in psychiatric or neurological discoveries, Freud's research into ethnology, primitive cultures, and cultural analysis fascinated him. He found himself in accord with Freud's early interest in mythography and religious research which had been the mainspring of Mann's own psychological probings.

He seemed anxious to make it clear that he had not gone out of his way to study psychoanalysis, but rather pointed out: "Bylo by snad lépe říci, že psychoanalýsa přišla ke mně." (It would be more appropriate to say that psychoanalysis came to me.)

---

36 Münzer, "Thomas Mann v Praze."
37 Haas, "Pražská rozmluva s Thomasem Mannem."
38 Ibid.
his work had been subject to psychoanalytical studies for some time. He was also quite definite about rejecting the suggestion that he had made conscious use of psychoanalysis in connection with the Joseph novel: "... školsky jsem psychoanalýsy nikdy neuzil!" (... I never used psychoanalysis intentionally—bookishly!)\textsuperscript{39} To illustrate the different (that is, conscious) effort to use psychoanalytical insight, he called attention to novels by Leonhard Frank (\textit{Die Ursache}) and Hermann Hesse (\textit{Narziss und Goldmund}) where within a literary framework there was a Freudian core. He conceded finally that everything a writer knows enters subconsciously into the poetic conception of his work. About the development of Joseph's personality, he said that at the beginning Joseph is shown as the embodiment of Freudian narcissism but that he undergoes a radical change: "Potom však vyrůstá v socialismus, stává se sociální osobností." (Later, however, he grows into socialism, he becomes a socially oriented personality.)\textsuperscript{40}

During the same interview Mann announced that his third volume \textit{Joseph in Ägypten} would appear shortly. He also prepared his readers for yet another volume to come, complaining that the growth of the third volume was beyond all expectations. He was driven to complete what he had set out to do, discussing his outline for the fourth volume and even Joseph's death: ". . . umírá jako mytická postava—jeho postava splývá s mytickou představou boha Nilu, který živí zemi . . ." (... he dies as a mythical figure, and merges with the mythical conception of

\textsuperscript{39}\textit{Ibid.}
\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Ibid.}
the river Nile, who nurtures the earth...\textsuperscript{1} He nevertheless seemed exhausted by the effort.

It seems that the *Joseph* novel is a perfect example indicative of the growth-process of his work, which he had described as "organic," that is, there was indeed an inner call for change and renewal via submergence into new material. In *Thomas Mann, eine Chronik seines Lebens* Bürgin and Mayer point out that he planned to interrupt work on the tetralogy and to insert a novella between the third and fourth volume of *Joseph* at the beginning of October 1936.\textsuperscript{42} From the interview with Haas, it is obvious that Mann already had the concept. He spoke of a "small novella," which was to be linguistically and generally of a very different nature, in length about the size of *Mario und der Zauberer*. He described it as "... povídka z Výmaru, episoda o starém Goethovi." (... a story from Weimar, an episode about the old Goethe.)\textsuperscript{43}

Mann carried out his intention as the material of the Goethe novel began to exert its demands upon him. As soon as he finished *Joseph in Ägypten* on August 23, 1936, he apparently began work on the Goethe novel.\textsuperscript{44} On January 11, 1937, he read to an overflowing hall at the Urania what was described, erroneously, as the "central chapter" from *Lotte in Weimar*, and an excerpt from the *Joseph* novel.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid. Of course, Thomas Mann did not actually carry Joseph's story to this end. It ends with Jaakob's death and the reconciliation of the brothers.

\textsuperscript{42}Bürgin and Mayer, *Thomas Mann, eine Chronik seines Lebens*, p. 122.

\textsuperscript{43}Haas, "Pražská rozmluva s Thomase Mannem."

\textsuperscript{44}Briefe 1889-1936, p. 423.

\textsuperscript{45}Bonn, "Rozhovor s Thomase Mannem." This statement does not
Mann disclosed in an interview with Hanuš Bonn in Prague that, as in *Mario und der Zauberer*, where an actual experience was recreated and given deeper meaning and the drama heightened by a fictitious ending, the material for *Lotte in Weimar* underwent a similar metamorphosis. While certain historic facts were used for the basic outline (for instance, that Charlotte Buff actually arrived in Weimar 42 years after the appearance of Goethe's *Werther*), much of the rest was Mann's invention. This should surprise a great many who misinterpreted the novel, thinking that Mann had used authentic data to a considerably larger degree than he actually did. Indeed, it speaks for the great subtlety and imagination of Mann that he was able to make fiction completely natural and acceptable. Mann himself seemed to have been rather satisfied with his inventiveness as he explained the major points:

> Ale jinak jsem všechno sám vymyslil, její lístek, který píše Goethovi, i to, že byla oblecena v šaty podobné tem které nosila ve Wertherovi, i její setkání s Goethem jemuž tyto šaty už vůbec nic nezpomínají, protože dávno myslel na scela jiné věci. Ale konec příběhu bude smírlivý. (But otherwise I invented the rest, her note, which she writes to Goethe, also that she wore a dress similar to that in Werther, also her meeting with Goethe whom this dress does not remind of anything any more, because he had been thinking of other matters for long. But the end shall be conciliatory.)

At the same time he also made certain disclosures about the *Joseph* novel. While he dismissed his earlier remarks about the appear to be correct. Bonn, in "Mannův projev o jeho příslušnosti k ČSR," *Lidové noviny*, Prague, January 12, 1937, wrote of an "introductory" chapter. So far it has not been possible to determine precisely what part of the Lotte novel Mann read.

difficulties and hard research work which had gone into the preparation
for the Joseph novel and the long periods of uncertainty before he
had found the right tone, he revealed that in this work, too, he made
abundant use of his imagination. The main difference was that the
mythical, Biblical world was endowed with a fairy-tale-like quality
which gave the imagination free rein: "Spoustu drobnosti, které
vypadají tak věrchně jsem si prostě vymyslil!" (A great many details
which look so very authentic are simply my own inventions!)  

As can be expected Mann was invariably questioned about the
influence of other writers or literatures. Unquestionably the greatest
influence was exerted by Goethe and German literature. For this reason
he was hurt when attacked for a rootless cosmopolitanism and disloyalty.
Answering these attacks indirectly he wrote to Fučík rejecting such
accusations. While feeling deep gratitude to his German heritage, he
simultaneously felt and thought on a broader basis. He was a German,
but he also was an European. He had faith in a higher unity, namely
that of Western culture, the basic formative elements of which were
antiquity and Christianity. To support his viewpoint he quoted Ortega
y Gasset's statement that four-fifths of European cultural heritage
issued from a common well-spring from which all nations partook: Mann
concluded that Europeans, no matter what their nationality, felt
instant kinship as soon as they met on foreign soil.

European Romance culture attracted Mann because of its
dedication to form, which he appreciated increasingly with the years.

\[47\text{Ibid.}\]
\[48\text{Briefe 1889-1936, p. 313.}\]
Analyzing this attraction, as the result of a conscious intellectual effort, he also believed that it was based on a biological factor: his mother's Latin origin. He also scoffed at those prophets of the decline of Western culture, pointing out that one could hardly talk of decline if the West was able to produce a writer of such literary excellence as Marcel Proust.

Although he mentioned twice that in his youth he had felt attracted to Scandinavian literature, he did not elaborate on this point. The case was different when he began to enlarge upon the influence of Slavic, specifically Russian, literature. It is understandable that those who interviewed him were particularly interested in what the creator of Mme. Chauchat had to say. In Der Zauberberg, Mme. Chauchat represented the quintessence of the Slavic character. If, broadly speaking, Western culture meant form, self-discipline, clarity and precision, the East was described (and not only by Thomas Mann) as formless, elemental, undisciplined, mystical, unpredictable—in short potentially dangerous. It was Fučík in particular who inquired whether in Mann's conception the "Slavic element" had "disintegrating capacities."

The basis for Fučík's question must be viewed in proper perspective. The Czechs were geographically and culturally the most Western oriented of the Slavs, and were somewhat torn by their in-between existence: ethnically, they felt for their Slavic brethren in the East a kinship which Pan Slav extremists always tried to keep alive. But, while Cyrill and Methodius had brought Christianity to them from the East, they had been culturally influenced by the West. Romance literature, particularly the works of French writers, was widely
read and imitated, especially in the post-World War I era. In government, philosophy, and sociology, the strongest influence emanated from England, America, and France. Masaryk himself had no patience with Pan Slavism. He saw his nation as a part of Europe and told the Czechs firmly on many occasions that they belonged to the Western cultural orbit. "Jsme svou historii i náтурou určeni pro demokracii. Kultůrně náležíme k evropskému západu. . . ." (By virtue of our history and nature, we are destined for democracy. Culturally we belong to Western Europe. . . .)  

Thomas Mann's reply was a rejection of any generalization about the disintegrating forces of the "Slavic element." By labeling the term "disintegration" as a product of bourgeois anxiety, he was striking at the bourgeois pathological fear of change or experimentation with the unknown. Disintegration, as he saw it, could be a force both positive and negative. He considered it positive if it brought controlled change in the sense of regenerating a pattern of existence that had become stale. As such it was a force inherently existing in any person or race. He cited Goethe as an example of one who could master those undermining forces of decomposition within himself through sheer willpower.

Speaking specifically about Russian literature, Mann revealed that in his youth Tolstoy and Turgenev had been of decisive interest to him, but he was also quick to point out that these were writers who themselves had been influenced by the West. It is interesting that

---


51 *Briefe 1889-1936*, p. 314.
though he had made this statement in 1932, he seemed to have changed his mind to some degree in 1935. He then spoke with great warmth about Gogol, whom he called the synthesis of Tolstoy and Dostoyevski. In fact, he said: "Vedle německé literatůry působila na mně nejvíce literatůra ruská, a to především Gogol. (Next to German literature I have been influenced most by Russian literature, and above all Gogol.)" The reason he valued Gogol so highly was the latter's ability to equal Tolstoy and Dostoyevski as novelists, even according to Mann surpass them, "... takže ho stavím nad oba tyto autory..." (... so that I place him above those two authors ...) But above all he seemed to treasure Gogol's grotesquely humorous characteristics, which both Tolstoy and Dostoyevski lacked.

His favorite Gogol story was The Overcoat: Mann quoted Turgenev's belief that all Russian writers had been influenced by it, Gogol's Dead Souls, also a standard work in Thomas Mann's opinion. In comparison, he judged contemporary European literature to have fared less well. He dismissed it as of a lesser mold, and added that he valued most Proust, Gide, and Huxley. As an after-thought, he said, without mentioning names, that he found some American authors noteworthy. However, he reversed himself somewhat in a letter which he wrote to an anonymous addressee in 1937 and which found its way into print. Here Mann paid high tribute to Pushkin. In effect, he said

52 Münzer, "Thomas Mann v Praze."
53 Ibid.
54 Thomas Mann, "Über Puschkin," Prager Presse, Prague, February 10, 1937. This letter is discussed in Chapter V.
that should he be allowed to choose only four authors from the entire
world literature, he would not hesitate to select Pushkin as one of them.

Mann's attitude towards Czech literature was different. First
of all he did not know the Czech language, and since there was a
shortage of good German translations he could not evaluate that litera­
ture satisfactorily. Naturally he was always asked to discuss Czech
literature. He seemed to be aware of the great influence French
literature had over Czech writers, and felt that this was due to the
greater political stability of both countries which permitted them to
grow and develop in peace and without undue attention to contemporary
social upheavals. This shows, of course, that he was indeed unfamiliar
with Czechoslovak literature, which especially amongst the better
writers was very much concerned with social problems. At any rate he
did advise against any move towards further "Aktualisierung" of
contemporary Czechoslovak literature.

His additional remarks in that interview of 1932 were not
particularly positive: "Als Spezifikum der ihm bekannten
tschechischen Literatur erscheint Thomas Mann nicht das Artistische,
sondern eine natürliche Volksverbundenheit." Thus Czech literature
did not appear intellectually attractive because in his opinion it
lacked artistic form and was too naturalistic, smacking of "Heimat­
literatur." While he mentioned Čapek as the only writer known in
German territory as "der moderne Repräsentant des tschechischen
Schrifttums," he seemed to have some reservations about him. Čapek, as

55 "Beim Dichter des bürgerlichen Zeitalters," Frager Presse.
56 Ibid.
well as František Langer, whose *Periferie* (*Periphery*) he had seen performed on the Munich stage, were in his opinion representative of a type of literature aiming at the general public rather than at the literary connoisseur, "die Vertreter einer für das Volk, für die Allgemeinheit nicht aber lediglich für literarische Feinschmecker bestimmten Produktion." But he hastened to add that no one ought to tell authors what to write: "Es müsse wohl den Dichtern anheimgestellt bleiben, die Welt zu schildern, wie sie sich in ihrem Hirn und Herzen spiegelt."  

Brief as these comments were, and probably based on the play *Periferie*, and perhaps a few others, they seemed to be quite apt as far as Langer was concerned. Langer's play, while it had been one of the greater theatrical successes of the Czech stage, did not receive artistic acclaim. Basically a study of the "Crime and Punishment" theme, it presented a small world of gutter types at the periphery of society.

Langer and, to some extent, Čapek relied more on the imagination of their audiences than on their power to create their own imagery. This was truer of Langer than of Čapek, and as the literary critic Arne Novák said, was the consequence of "democratization." In essence, it was realism carried too far to the denigration of spiritual values. In Čapek's case, it had much to do with his attempt to bring the theater

---

57 Ibid.  
58 Ibid.  
59 Arne Novák, *Dějiny českého písemnictví*, p. 270.
and with it, culture, to the masses whom he felt had to be educated step by step.

Mann sounded different two months later when he replied to Fučik's questions concerning his knowledge of Czechoslovak literature. He mentioned as those best known to him Hašek, for his Švejk; Čapek; and Langer. It is interesting that Mann did not speak of Čapek's plays, but only of his prose, which he said he valued highly. But he acknowledged that "... aber leider bildet die Sprache eine zu starke Schranke, als dass ich der tschechischen kulturellen Leistung hätte näher kommen können." Mann felt much more at ease when discussing the Prague German writers, and praised particularly Rilke highly. He also spoke of the writers Werfel, Kafka, Brod, Unger, and Winder who always had had, as he claimed, a special attraction for him, in addition to having a significant influence upon modern literature.

In 1935 and 1936 the various statements Mann made were most cordial. He went out of his way to assure everyone that he felt "at home" in Prague, and in both his radio speech and interview of 1935 he wooed the Czech public with statements such as: "Ich komme also gerne nach Prag. Ich fühlte mich hier wohl, wie zu Hause" and "Čím častěji sem přijíždí--a to je v posledních letech dosti často--tím se zde cítím více doma." (The more frequently I come here, and this has been rather often in the last years, the more I feel at home.) The reason he felt so comfortable was the reception he received everywhere: "Jsem

---
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dojat porozměním a úpržností, kterou zde všude nalézám." I am touched by the understanding and sincerity which I find everywhere.)

In 1936 he took the opportunity during an interview to extend special greetings to Czech authors, and regretted that lack of linguistic talent prevented him from learning Czech, and that he was therefore barred from getting to know "your beautiful homeland." In 1937 he had high praise for the Czech readers. Expressing his joy over the popularity of his books, he disclosed that he was following their reception closely. The judgment of the Czech readers in so far as they read his books was high: "Je mi důkazem vysoké kultivanosti i vkusu českého čtenáře a utvrzuje mně v přesvědčení že československý národ nade vše staví ducha a úšlechtilé věci." (It is proof of high cultivation and taste of the Czech reader, and it supports my contention that the Czechoslovak nation places spirit and refinement above all else.)

In the late 1930's he had formed literary connections to which he pointed to demonstrate his affiliation with Prague and specifically with the Czech intelligentsia: "Und auch die literarischen Beziehungen datieren ja weit zurück, waren von jeher sehr intim. Allerdings verhindert die Unkenntnis der tschechischen Sprache manches, um tschechische Literatur ganz aufnehmen zu können." The city of Prague in particular had made a deep impression upon him: "Für

---
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Prag hatte ich immer ein grosses Faible, bin ja auch nicht das erstemal da." He admired Prague from the esthetic viewpoint calling it "die Barockstadt par excellence an reinem und Frühbarock," and in effect claimed that it could be placed architecturally above that of Italy. But it also was the city's atmosphere, a combination of old and modern, darkly romantic and starkly modern architecture, reminding him of America, which he found attractive. From his description of his walks through the city it was evident that he had indeed explored Prague: "... diese ganz wundervolle Kombination zwischen der Atmosphäre des spukhaften Elements, des Romantischen, mit der geradezu amerikanisch anmutenden modernen Architektur. Elemente, die immer auf mich den grössten Eindruck gemacht haben, und die Meyrinck in seinem Golem so unwirklich hervorzauberte."  

---
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CHAPTER IV

TWO RADIO BROADCASTS

Thomas Mann at the invitation of Czechoslovak government officials, twice broadcast over Radio Prague in 1935 and 1936, both times within the framework of its German language program. In these broadcasts Mann primarily sought to woo Czech audiences and to help further the understanding between the German minority within the nation and the Czechs, a delicate task for an outsider, since at that time Mann was not yet a Czechoslovak citizen. His political outlook was subject to some debate and speculation.

In the first broadcast, "Gruss an Prag," Mann was highly complimentary to Prague. In the past, he had captured the atmosphere of other cities, such as Lübeck (his native city), Munich (his adopted city), Venice, and Vienna, but in this radio address, his range of thought, and the vivid description of the city's culture amounted to a courtship of its citizens, and beyond that, the nation.

Mann made a special point of mentioning the time element (ten minutes on the air) to indicate the insufficiency of the time allotted

---


2 Prager Presse reprinted the broadcast "Gruss an Prag" verbatim and spoke of it as a prelude to his lecture on Wagner which was to follow the next day. "Gruss an Prag" was presented on January 21, 1935, at 6:45 p.m., on the German language "Radiojournal" program over Radio Prague.
to express his sentiments. He used the phrase: "... um zu sagen, was mir am Herzen liegt..." rather symbolically to underline the emotional tone of his speech. Though he had been in most of his essays and articles a master of reserve and understatement, his opening sentences reverberated with the joy he felt at being back in Prague. He did his best to convey this to his audience:

... und so muss ich Haus halten mit meiner Zeit und nach meinen Worten sehen, dass ich das Wichtigste nicht vergesse. Was ist das Wichtigste, Natürlichste und Nächstliegende? Es ist dies, dass ich meiner Freude Ausdruck gebe, wieder in Prag zu sein..." He described Prague as "herrlich," and "tief charaktervoll," and spoke of the deep impression the city's uniqueness had made upon him. He also expressed regrets at having been absent from Prague for such a long period and mentioned he had come at the invitation of the Urania. Complimenting the Urania by calling it "das verdienstvolle deutsche Bildungsinstitut" which had been responsible for arranging the Goethe commemoration in 1932, Mann announced that under the same auspices he would present a lecture on Wagner the next day, January 22.

Obviously Mann had done two things: shown his appreciation to the Urania and announced his coming lecture. But he also regarded the broadcast as an occasion to address Czech audiences which he felt had eluded him. Hence the remark: "Morgen heisst mein Thema 'Richard Wagner,' and naturgemäss wird sich meine Zuhörerschaft ganz vorwiegend aus deutschen Bürgern Prags zusammensetzen." Then he admitted that he

3."Gruss an Prag," Prager Presse.
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wished to establish a rapport with the Czech public.

From newspaper reports and reviews in Czech papers it is obvious that he did indeed achieve this rapport. However, it would be a mistake to assume that he flattered the Czechs because of his desire to cultivate and enlarge an audience outside Germany; his concern was larger. While not derogatory of the Third Reich, those aware of what was happening across the border in Germany, sensed his underlying political fears.

Mann made a point of speaking as a German "... aus meinem deutschen Kulturgefühl heraus ..." And, when voicing regret over the increasing separation of nations and his desire to help pull the nations of Europe together: "... die Aufgabe derer, die an die Notwendigkeit eines einträchtig zusammenwirkenden Europas glauben, diesen Gedanken hoch zu halten und für ihn einzustehen."8

Hence he saw his lecture tour not merely as of a spiritual, artistic, and literary character, but also having a higher purpose—to further understanding between nations and to bring various cultures together. Thus Mann, the artist, using his creative talents, was no longer a stranger, apart from the course of life like Tonio Kröger and Gustav von Aschenbach. Art was not the danger and temptation which undid the Buddenbrooks. Through art, Mann believed one could build bridges between nations, and this was what he intended to do: "... eine Berührung der Kultursphären herbeiführen und damit zwar auf eine leise und indirekte, aber keineswegs unwirksame Weise die Annäherung der Völker und Volksgeister zu fördern."9

---

7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
As an example of a community of nationalities living peacefully and in goodwill side by side, Mann cited Switzerland, where he had been living for some time. He did not specify, nor did he say anything incriminating about Nazi Germany, but his message was clear: "Sie wissen, vielleicht, dass ich seit einiger Zeit in der Schweiz lebe, aus Sympathie für den friedliebend-freien Charakter dieses Landes."\(^{10}\) Subtly, he emphasized the peacefulness and freedom that Switzerland offered in contrast to Germany. Even here fears beset him for the future of that democracy: "... den es sich hoffentlich unter dem Druck und Ansturm einer verworrenen Zeit wird bewahren können."\(^{11}\)

Mann then compared Switzerland and Czechoslovakia. It is fairly certain that he did this intentionally to help bridge the gap between the Czechs and Sudeten Germans, who were increasingly developing hostilities fostered by the Third Reich. He spoke of the essentially peaceful character of the two nations, where a multitude of nationalities lived under one governmental system: "... in dem verschiedenen Volksteile friedlich unter demselben staatlichen Dach zusammenwohnen."\(^{12}\) Czechoslovakia he called "ein Pfeiler der demokratisch-europäischen Staats-und Weltgesinnung,"\(^{13}\) a phrase which revealed his high regard for that country's governmental system. Mann also paid the highest tribute to Masaryk, the founder of Czechoslovak democracy:

\[\ldots\] unter ihrem ehrwürdigen Präsidenten, dessen Gestalt in

\(^{10}\)Ibid.

\(^{11}\)Ibid.

\(^{12}\)Ibid.

\(^{13}\)Ibid.
der Tat das Ideal eines modernen Staatsoberhauptes erfüllt und nicht nur eines modernen, denn das Ideal, das sie verkörpert, kann man ja zurückführen auf die platonische Forderung, dass Weise und Philosophen die Staaten regieren sollen.¹⁴

Masaryk, to him, seemed to symbolize the ideal ruler.

But Mann was not speaking solely as a poet seeking to establish rapport and goodwill. He also wished to express personally his gratitude to the intelligentsia for their interest in his work. What appealed to him and satisfied him as an artist was the seriousness with which his work was read: "... Dank für eine Anteilnahme an meiner Arbeit, wie sie mir so freundlich, ernst und intelligent nicht leicht aus einem anderen Land entgegengekommen ist."¹⁵ He spoke of letters and words of affection, and mentioned that Melantrich, the largest publishing house in Prague, had published with delicate care the translation of his work. In fact, according to Mann, Melantrich must have done far better than the publishing houses in other countries: "... dankbar muss ich feststellen dass kaum eine zweite so vollständige und sorgfältig betreute Übersetzungsausgabe meines bisherigen Lebenswerkes besteht wie die, die der Verlag Melantrich im Laufe der Jahre herausgebracht hat."¹⁶

This attention to his work gratified Mann, inducing him to talk in a warm, very personal tone. He said that he had many early and profound impressions of the intellectual life of Prague. As an example, he related one of his early encounters with Prague, when as a boy he

¹⁴Ibid.
¹⁵Ibid.
¹⁶Ibid.
read for the first time Schiller's Wallenstein Tod, especially the fifth scene of Act I. Mann referred to it as "die Szene zwischen Wallenstein und Wrangel" in which Wrangel demands Wallenstein's surrender of Prague. Mann quoted the lines: "Viel gefordert. Sei's um Eger, aber Prag geht nicht." Mann said this line made upon him "einen eigentümlichen Eindruck von der Wichtigkeit dieser Stadt." His youthful imagination was further excited by Stifter's Witiko, especially by the chapter on the siege of the city. Mann expressed his great admiration for Stifter: "... der mich durch seine Reinheit und den Adel seiner Originalität so tief berührt hat..." What he said revealed the depth of a literary experience in his youth, which once and for all would connect Stifter and Prague in his mind.

Overall, however, it was the atmosphere and the spirit of Prague that fascinated Mann. He again reproached himself for his lack of familiarity with the Czech language which prevented more intimate absorption of Czech literature, as he did in the Prager Presse interview and in his letter to Fučík. Nevertheless, since then he had read Fráňa Šrámek and Durych's Bloudění, which he called "... den auserordentlich starken Friedland Roman..." He mentioned the

17Friedrich Schiller, Wallenstein's Tod, Aufzug I, Fünfter Auftritt. (Thomas Mann's quote is not quite accurate. The lines read: "Viel gefordert! Prag! Sei's um Eger! Aber Prag? Geht nicht.")

18"Gruss an Prag," Prager Presse.
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20"Prag als Symbol," Prager Presse, Prague, January 22, 1935.

21Bedřich Fučík, "Rozhovor s Thomase Mannel," Literární noviny, Prague, June, 1931.

22"Gruss an Prag," Prager Presse.
works of Karel Čapek again, added some novels by Olbracht, and dramas by Langer. He made special mention of Olbracht as the translator of his Biblical work.

He told his audience that since he was unfamiliar "mit der schönen aber schwierigen tschechischen Sprache," and was thus unable to gain thorough familiarity with Czechoslovak national literature, he had tried to familiarize himself with musical compositions. He mentioned Dvořák and Smetana, whose "hinreissende Melancholie" and "zu aller Welt sprechende Temperamente" had deeply affected him. Although their compositions were based on local folklore themes, they had universal appeal. Among the new composers, he singled out Janáček and Weinberger as having impressed him.

But obviously it was the German authors of Czechoslovakia who had influenced his understanding of Czechoslovakia, especially of Prague, and he spoke of them with greater familiarity and ease. He made the observation that the atmosphere of Prague "... der eigentümlichen, aus Modernität und fast spukhafter Romantik seltsam gemischten Atmosphäre Prags ..." had influenced the creative work of the authors. He praised their contribution to German literature as unique, naming Rilke, Werfel, Brod, Winder, Hedda Sauer and added that he could mention many more. Of Kafka he said: "... und schon heute wird Franz Kafka's Gottsucher-Werk in seiner peniblen Traumhaftigkeit in Paris mit ebensoviel Bewunderung gelesen wie in Deutschland."
In connection with these writers, Mann paid high praise to the city where this astonishing literary productivity could flourish. He singled out Gustav Meyrinck as the one whose best-known works distinctly bore the mark of the city, and in turn best reflected the components which made it such fruitful soil for literary development:

Es muss etwas dichterisch Anreizendes und Produktives in der Luft sein, in dem alten Boden der Stadt liegen, dass sie so vieles an literarischer Merkwürdigkeit, Besonderheit und pittoresker Phantastik hervorgebracht hat, und an dem modernen deutschen Schrifttum einen Anteil hat, wie sie in diesem Umfang und in dieser besonderen Ausprägung selten ist. 26

Thus Prague was seen as offering inspiration and stimulation for the creative artist because of its beauty and special atmosphere. Furthermore, it is interesting that the genuineness and what he termed "charaktervolle Bodenständigkeit" seemed to meet his approval, so that he compared it favorably with the more cosmopolitan of European cities. He hastened to add that both Kafka and Rilke, especially, though specifically of that particular "Prague" background, had great international appeal and attraction. So the international atmosphere of Prague had managed to produce a brand of writers who contributed greatly to German literature, and Mann pointed to the many fruitful connections "zwischen Ihrem Lande und dem meinen." 27

In closing Mann, once again expressed his joy over being in Prague: "Ich bin glücklich, wieder hier zu sein, in dieser Stadt, deren architektonischer Zauber unter den Städten der Welt fast einzig ist...," and thanked the people for the generous reception extended to him. 28

26 Ibid.
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Apart from his literary observations and flattering remarks about Prague he made it clear that he wished to see art serve the highest humanitarian purpose, to foster understanding among nationalities, to demonstrate that common ground existed between them, and that the European cultural tradition was an inheritance shared by all.

In his second broadcast of May 20, 1936, he expressed much the same sentiments. First he complimented the representatives of the Urania, for the ability to present a lively educational program, but then began to lecture them firmly on the benefits of living within the Czechoslovak Republic. The message sounded something like "count your blessings." While being flattering, he added in the same breath that the Urania owed its development to the generous spirit and rapport of the Czechoslovak broadcasting organization. He praised the Urania for its wisdom and loyalty with which it had ably incorporated itself into the cultural life of the Republic, but also added that it stood under the protection and help of the Republic and its leaders. He spoke about Czechoslovakia as a state "... in dem noch Demokratie eines edlen und echten Sinnes herrscht..." In Mann's opinion this was the result of the leadership and benevolence of Masaryk and Beneš.

To Mann the very existence of an educational institution like

29"Thomas Mann in der Prager deutschen Sendung," Prager Tagblatt.

30The Urania was the cultural center of the German minority; such centers existed in all major towns in Czechoslovakia, e.g. Deutsches Haus, Brünn.
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the Urania was ample proof of the freedom given to the minority, and he made an effort to convince that minority that German culture was best served within that framework of a democracy, for thus it could link up with the humane and European spirit, while retaining its uniqueness.

There can be no question that Mann's address performed a valuable service. On one hand the Czech majority was led to see the Urania as a loyal cultural institution which was an asset to the nation. On the other hand the cultural efforts of the German minority were praised for their high standards. But, as Mann said, this resulted from the freedom and support they enjoyed as citizens of Czechoslovakia, which allowed them to develop and further their talents.

Existenz und Wirksamkeit der Prager Urania beweisen, dass im Rahmen eines solchen Staates die deutsche Kultur besonders glücklich mit dem humanen, dem europäischen Geist sich verbinden und ihm als eine seiner wichtigsten Abschattungen und in ungebrochener nationaler Art dienen kann.32

32 Ibid.
CHAPTER V

THOMAS MANN'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO CZECH PUBLICATIONS

The study of Thomas Mann in Czechoslovakia would not be complete if the essays he contributed to Czechoslovak newspapers were not examined. Over the years, a number of his essays were published in the Prague German language press: Prager Presse and Prager Tagblatt. Many of those also were published elsewhere, in German, Austrian, or Swiss papers, and are to be found in Reden und Aufsätze. Some, however, were apparently exclusively contributed to Czechoslovak newspapers but were omitted from the published essay collections. First it seems necessary to correct some confusion about these essays, which stems from synopsis of their content by Hans Burgin. Burgin's summaries reveal at best a hasty reading of the text. In addition, the essay "Die neue Humanität," is not entered in the bibliography of Thomas Mann at all.

1Reden und Aufsätze, Vols. IX, X, XI, XII, contain essays by Thomas Mann on a variety of subjects.


3Thomas Mann, "Die neue Humanität," Prager Tagblatt, Prague, January 1, 1935, No. 21. (Presented by Thomas Mann during a press reception in Brno (Brünn), Czechoslovakia.)
"Po soumraku svítání."

Bürgin summarized this essay as an "Originalbeitrag allgemein politischen Inhalts für die Prager Zeitschrift." This is actually not the case, unless one is prepared to call everything political. In this essay Mann addressed himself to a subject which had increasingly pre-occupied him, namely, the crisis of European culture. He, more than many other authors, realized that a cultural crisis preceded a political crisis and might ultimately affect every level of society.

The central thesis of the essay was an attack against pessimism, the decline of cultural interests, and an all too eager acceptance of faddish overseas influences; he expressed concern over the growth and negative influence of the masses who grasped radical slogans and he suggested that salvation might be found in pacifism. Thus we might find the essay to have more social than political content. The final statement on pacifism comes as a surprise. From its last paragraph Bürgin may have concluded that it had a "politischen Inhalt."

Mann opened his essay with an attack against conservative elements in society who refuse to keep up with the times and exclude themselves from life. He rejected their ultrapessimistic approach to urgent issues and especially the contention that the crises of the bourgeoisie marked also a decline in culture. Without mentioning the name, he castigated Spengler for his influence in strengthening the idea of a rapid decline and general crisis of the West. Mann cautioned against making "mountains out of molehills," and suggested a critical

---

examination of the issues at hand before declaring Europe lost:

Je treba miti trochu skepticism o takovychto tvrzenich ba je nutno zaroven byti alespon ponekud optimistou, aby se již předem male poklesky nezvětšovaly, a aby se naslo východisko z potízi, v nichž se ocitla poválečná Evropa. (It is necessary to be a little skeptical regarding such assertions; it is imperative to be at least a bit of an optimist, so that small shortcomings do not become exaggerated, and some means might be found to escape the difficulties which postwar Europe has found herself in.)

He conceded that there was cause for alarm over the state of affairs in Europe, but it seemed to him largely a decline in esthetics. As an author he spoke first of what was closest to him, reviewing the state of literature and the arts in the postwar years. He deplored the shallowness of literary efforts, and also examined theatrical productions, as well as the scientific literature of the postwar era. He sarcastically noted that the recent vogue for the biographical novel was due to being "fashionable."

Čtena byla širokou veřejností, ale ne z důvodu vnitřní potřeby, ale jako díla módy. Všichni o nich mluvili, tedy treba bylo je čisti. (They were read by the broad public, not out of an inner need, but because they were "in." Everyone talked about them; therefore it was necessary to read them.)

Another reason for the decline in literary tastes was the request for easy reading, "pour passer temps" as Mann put it, a state which placed little intellectual demand upon the individual. The reader was entertained without being challenged. He was kept from thinking about serious problems. Mann's harsh criticism becomes worse as he ridicules the use of books for purposes of interior decoration, thus holding up a mirror to fashionable society with cultural
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pretensions, while in reality art shows are empty, as are book stores. After deriding society for its superficiality, Mann writes depressingly:

Všechny kultúrní instituce jsou před úpadkem. Je zle. Absolutně zle. (All the cultural institutions are facing decline. It is bad, absolutely bad.)

but Mann adopted a more cheerful tone in giving his personal assurance that all was not lost. While society as he had painted it seemed intellectually decaying it was not past redemption: "... není důvodu a příznaku uplného a biologického úpadku západní kultúry." (... there is no reason or sign of a total and biological decline of Western culture.)

Like a doctor who had given the prognosis that a patient's brain was softening, Mann still hoped for a cure. Accordingly, the salvation of Europe lay in its peoples' basic curiosity, that is the ability to absorb what was useful and uplifting in other cultures.

Mann's pride in the European heritage was to be found in a stern warning to those who might think adaptability was a display of weakness. He proffered the diagnosis that intellectual shallowness among the intelligentsia was the reason for a spiritual decline, and pointed to the uncritical acceptance of new ideas by the majority—the masses—as another point for grave concern:

A přes to, že massa, dav, bezkriticky přijal to, co vanulo k nám z druhých břehů oceanů směle tvrdím, že nakonec přece jen s této skousky kultúra evropská vyjde vítězné. (And in spite of the fact that the masses, the uncritical throngs, accepted what wafted across the oceans to them, I dare to insist, that in the end Europe will emerge victoriously from this trial.)

---
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While he did not state it outright, he was attacking American mass culture and mass entertainment which influenced Europe after World War I.

At this point the essay's flow was interrupted as Mann abruptly turned to a definition of what he meant by "masses." He pointed out that by "masses" he meant not the citizens of democracy, nor a social class—the proletariat—but the stupid and vulgar people.

Massa tot' dav bez ohledu s kterým dnes možno setkáti se ve všech zemích evropských. Proti její křiklvé bravuré, proti bezstarostné hlouposti jejího ducha treba na obranu budovat hráze. (A mass is a throng without consideration, with which one may meet in all the countries of Europe. Against their piercing shouts, against the careless stupidity of their spirit, it is necessary to build dams.)\(^{10}\)

They were a threat because even in their radicalism they were shallow and without content, advancing only pseudo-free-thinking views.

Mann cautioned against an uncritical view of the 19th century which claimed that all the ills of society were born in that century:

Když se proto mluví o úpadku idee tohoto věku, je třeba dbátí toho, aby zároveň s plevami nevyhodila se i žrma. (If one, therefore, speaks about the decline of ideas of that century, one ought to pay heed as not to throw out the seeds with the weeds.)\(^{11}\)

He pointed out that the 19th century did produce progress, which could not be annulled without causing regression. While the individual ought to bow to the collective "podřízení zájmu jednotlivce zájmu celku—dnešní to heslo, není věci špatnou . . . ( . . . the deference of the individual to the interest of the majority—the slogan of the times—is not a bad thing as such. . . .)\(^{12}\)

\(^{10}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{11}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{12}\text{Ibid.}\)
tendency to overemphasize the collective interest. This tendency, he warned, was a danger to personal freedom and the rights of the individual. Stressing the argument that it was necessary to stand guard against the masses, Mann, nevertheless, pointed out that this conservative "guard" had too long blocked change. Now the human spirit at long last had been liberated, there should not be a return to primeval forms of life.

After thus examining the ills of European society and the dangers it might face, Mann seemed to advance his solution which might enlighten the prevailing "dusk" with the "dawn" of new hope. He spoke of pacifism as a rationally constructive and cheerful force of the future and defended it against those who called it "určitým druhem duševního vegetarismu (a certain kind of spiritual vegetarianism)."  

The essay ended with Mann's vote of confidence in European culture, which he believed would, in spite of all the challenges due to foreign influence, the neglect of the intelligentsia, or the growing strength of the "masses," emerge and hold its own:

Evropská kultúra, utlačená, přiškrtnutá, povznese ještě hlavu.V to věrím. (European culture, oppressed, half choked, will yet raise its head. This I believe.)

"Po soumraku svítání" addressed itself to a contradiction facing European culture: on the one hand there existed temptation to see art as entertainment and to succumb to fads and sensationalism, instead of serious thought, which demanded education, concentration, and effort; on the other hand, there was the clear recognition of the impact of the demands of the new masses. The danger lay in the demands

\[13\text{Ibid.}\
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of a "collective" mass which would stifle the individual and have a regressive influence upon culture. Mann's final statement on pacifism, although it does not fit neatly into the essay, presents a hopeful vision of a society which would devote itself primarily to cultural tasks.

"Alter und Jugend"

"Alter und Jugend," summarized by Bürgin as "Über die Situation der Jugend nach dem ersten Weltkrieg," manifested as much concern for European culture as "Po soumraku svitání." Here, however, Mann spoke as a mature man, who viewed the younger generation with loving concern, but refused to sympathize with its self pity and sought to summon it toward responsibility and maturity.

Mann spoke as a sage—"im Beginn des siebenten Jahrzehnts"—with the authority and wisdom of his long years of experience. He addressed himself to the question of the inability of older people to understand the problems of the young, pointing out that certain problems were common to young and old alike. These problems involved not only one generation but concerned the future of Europe.

It was the European cultural and spiritual state of mind for which Mann expressed his fears:

Dennoch werde ich nicht auf viel Widerspruch stossen bei der Behauptung, dass man nicht unbedingt sechzig sein muss, um die gegenwärtige Verfassung Europas grauenhaft zu finden.16

Mann addressed himself primarily to those among the young who were alert

15 Mann, "Alter und Jugend."
16 Ibid.
and critically inclined toward the contemporary world. He vented his contempt on those who were "dumm und fröhlich." Equally he took the postwar generation to task with an attack on their self-pity which stemmed from postwar struggles and hardships. He categorically refused to give them his sympathy on the grounds that those years had not been any easier on the older generation. He acknowledged there was some truth in the lament over the uncertainty of the times, but he also suggested what recent changes had meant to the older generation: the transition "aus satter Behabigkeit ins schäbig Heroische" which "wir Söhne der Vorzeit uns ja noch auf unsere alten Tage gewöhnen müssen." Mann did not glorify the older generation as heroic. On the contrary he showed it as having been too complacent for its own good, and as having to spend its declining days dwelling on past memories of glory.

Thus both generations, one living on past memories, the other full of self-pity, saw their weaknesses laid bare. The only decisive difference between them, in Mann's view, was "Bildung" the concept which represents the relentless development of the individual through responsibility and self-discipline. It was precisely this concern for "Bildung" which the older generation possessed, but which the younger generation simply rejected; therein lay the danger. To the older generation this reliance on the development of self was an inner supply of strength which helped them to survive.

Yet Mann also showed an understanding of youth in general. He felt that there were tendencies, present in every generation, which might prove destructive in the end. He aptly portrayed the tendency of youth to reach out, to merge, with the same emotionality which had made
the young *Sturm und Drang* Schiller cry, "Seid umschlungen Millionen!"

Mann spoke of an "Aufgehen im Massenhaften um seiner selbst willen."

Mann did not consider the tendency to merge into a collective as dangerous in itself: rather it was the lack of goals, the lack of ability to concretize and fulfill a task which bothered him most. The result would be an abdication of responsibility and a tendency to grasp at slogans and cheap ideologies.

Der vom Ich und seiner Last befreie Massenrausch ist ein Selbstzweck, damit verbundene Ideologien wie "Staat" "Sozialismus" "Größe des Vaterlandes" sind mehr oder weniger unterlegt, sekundär und eigentlich überflüssig.\(^{17}\)

The point was that those concepts had been stripped of their meaning. They were used but did not express a serious intent.

The young people, as a result of self-indulgence, found themselves in what Mann termed "Rausch—die Befreiung des Ich vom Denken, genau genommen vom Sittlichen und Vernünftigen überhaupt." In the description of this state of near euphoria, Thomas Mann seemed to invoke both the portrait of Thomas Buddenbrook reading Schopenhauer and also the feeling of merging and giving which precipitated the decline of the Buddenbrook family. At that particular moment, Mann warned, the individual, though freed from his fears and doubts, happily becomes part of something else—at a price. This "Glückserfahrung," or collective experience as Mann sarcastically called it, was the foundation of one of the greatest horrors of all, namely, war. Mann ridiculed this salvation in togetherness: "... sich kollektivistisch zusammendrücken, es menschenwarm zu haben und recht laut zu singen."\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{17}\) *Ibid.*

If the individual took part in such a collective effort as war self pity usually set in, either because of his direct participation or as a result of the hardships of the postwar era. Although Mann commiserated with such complaints of the "Nachkriegseuropäer," his attitude was ironic: the war was a horrible means of bringing out symptoms of cultural decline; it may have even hurried this cultural decline, but it alone was not the sole cause.

Yet to some extent the problems of the 20th century were rooted in the developments of the 19th. The great productivity of that era, both in terms of scientific discoveries and social welfare, while admirable and praiseworthy, carried in it seeds of such future problems as the population explosion. As Mann pointed out, European population tripled during the course of the 19th century. The 20th century was left to cope with a situation it was not ready for, and, as Mann feared "... dass die ungeheure Gutwilligkeit dieses Jahrhunderts Schul ist an aller Ratlosigkeit unserer Gegenwart, dass diese Krise, die uns in Barbarei zurückzuschleudern droht, ihre Wurzeln in seiner kurzsichtigen Grossmut hat." The 19th century also heralded the emergence of the masses—Mann spoke of "das Heraufkommen und die Machtergreifung des Massenmenschen," whom he both distrusted and feared. He believed they lacked primarily the understanding of the purpose of civilized institutions, and thus, for instance, had no understanding of liberal democracy. It was tragic that the masses showed a total lack of respect for those same institutions which had helped them to come to the fore. But then, not even technology
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or science were safe, for the masses admired both "mit aller kindischen Primitiven Liebe." They were unable to discern that science was the result of free, independent research and were thus capable of destroying it, "weil sie den Idealismus and alles, was mit ihm zu tun hat, alle Freiheit and Wahrheit verachten."  

However, Mann did not put the blame exclusively on the 19th century institutions or the lack of awareness in the 20th century to meet problems of the age. He also blamed technology for having created the mass media which vulgarized everything, from triumphs to catastrophies, and had let themselves be channeled to please the mass rather than the individual, whether it was through the sensationalism of competitive sports or star attractions. Thus he suggested to the young generation that the lack of willpower necessary for self-improvement, and the willingness to lose identity and individuality would ultimately result in a general regression. The herd instinct would ultimately trample social, intellectual, and cultural advances, ushering in an era of barbarism.

"Die neue Humanität"

The difficulties of the modern author living in the 20th century and particularly in the 1930's were examined by Thomas Mann in his short essay, "Die neue Humanität," which he read as a "Tischrede" on the occasion of his press reception in Brno, Czechoslovakia, in January 1935.  

Mann discussed to what degree an author ought to get

---
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21 Mann, "Die neue Humanität."
involved in the political developments of the times: "Für den Schriftsteller ist es heute unumgänglich, auf irgendeine Weise in die politische Diskussion einzугreifen, da die Zeit sich des Menschen in einer neuen, verhängnisvollen Weise bemächtigt hat." He justified involvement of the author as unavoidable, because the times demanded that the individual respond to political issues. The chief problem was, of course, the complexity of every human being: "Der Mensch ist ein aus vielen verschiedenen Elementen zusammengesetztes Wesen," which made it impossible to draw lines or clear distinctions between all the elements and components of his person. This was the gist of the problem: the human being must be seen as a totality, but his individual aspects must not be denied because of this totality.

Mann's explanation of "totality" is not the same as the contemporary concept of totalitarianism.

Gerade durch die schweren Erlebnisse der jüngsten Vergangenheit haben wir ein neues Gefühl für das Problem des Menschen in seiner Totalität gewonnen, für das humane Problem in seiner Gesamtheit.

The concept of totalitarianism played an unhappy part in contemporary existence, because it encompassed everything: while it was true that the human being was a sum total of many elements (i.e. a totality), none of which could or should be specialized, it was the criminal attempt of certain parties to isolate and politicize not only the state but every aspect of human existence: "Der Begriff der Totalität spielt heute eine grosse Rolle—eine unglückliche Rolle." Isolating and politicizing in this manner would be totalitarianism:

Denn das wahre Problem der Totalität ist das Problem des Menschen: es umfasst alles, man soll und kann nichts dabei

\[22\] Ibid.
Such control of human individuality was sharply attacked by Mann who declared that he had indeed fought for freedom and was not about to give up:

Ich habe im Namen dessen, was man Freiheit nennt Front dagegen gemacht, aus der Überzeugung heraus, dass ein solches Vorgehen nicht human ist.  

He fought because it was against all the principles of humanity to subject man to such total control, to direct his thoughts and very being to a conceived political end. To give an example of the absurdity of elevating the totality over the individual, Mann asked what would happen if the purely esthetic were "totalisiert" and concluded: "... man würde dabei zu absurden Ergebnissen kommen."

Mann's alternative was to define the idea and concept of humanism in the contemporary world, advancing his belief that despite the "Wirrsal moralischer und politischer Art" of the times there was a movement toward a better world. He expressed his faith in the quiet labor of many towards a new ideal:

Das Ergebnis dieser Arbeit wird ein neuer Humanismus sein, der heute in undeutlichen Umrissen nur sichtbar ist... 

This movement existed in the West: "Alle höheren und feineren und tieferen Geister des Abendlandes arbeiten daran." It was a movement of

23 Ibid.  
24 Ibid.  
25 Ibid.  
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intellectuals, the men of the spirit. It was not to be the humanism which was based on literary effort and well composed speeches, "nicht die schönrednerische Färbung;" because it was the result of great suffering and recognition of the past decades, it was to be "von dunklerer, von tragischer Färbung." But out of this inner torment something better would be born. Mann believed that in the scientific research of human subconsciousness and in serious spiritual thought "tiefenbewusster Geistigkeit," he saw signs that a new beginning was made toward new belief in the concept of man. He expressed his belief in the inclusion of a new religious love for man "... für das tiefe, heilige Problem des Menschen." Accordingly man would stand again elevated and free, a subject rather than an object. The base would be "eine neue religiöse Liebe für die Idee des Menschen." Only when this respect for man and "diese neue Liebe" had become universal, could the world become a better place. Not with an emphasis on "totality," but on the individual, would a new concept of humanity be sustained.

"Über Puschkin"

In 1937 Thomas Mann sent to an unknown party a letter, part of which was later published in Prager Presse. The beginning of the letter indicates Mann had been informed of a special anniversary edition of the collected works by Pushkin which was to be published by the house

27 Ibid.
28 Thomas Mann, "Über Puschkin," Prager Presse, 10. II. 1937. The contents are examined here, because of the Czechoslovak connection.
of Melantrich in Prague. Mann's reply expressed his pleasure at the
publication of the anniversary edition. "Ich beneide Ihr Land um eine
solche Ausgabe, die in deutscher Sprache noch fehlt." He also revealed
his love and respect for Pushkin:

Nach den dichterischen Genien meiner Liebe und Wahl befragt
und sollten es nur sechs sein, nur vier, würde ich Puschkin's
Namen nie vergessen.29

Mann spoke of his agreement with Tolstoy who had urged everyone to read
Tales of Belkin by Pushkin. In Mann's opinion they were imperative
reading and study matter for every author: "Jeder Schriftsteller muss
sie studieren und immer wieder studieren."30 Evidently Mann was writing
under the influence of a recent esthetic experience, for he referred to
it as "wohlätigten Eindruck."

Mann stressed the word "wohlätig" to express the feeling of
harmony which emanated from Pushkin's work. He called Pushkin a
"grosse Apolliniker" whose life had known triumph and happiness as well
as moments of dejection. The result was "eine lebensgesegnete
Vollkommenheit," perfection which had been achieved not by withdrawing
from life, but by valiantly accepting what life had to offer. Thus
Pushkin had become the example and the inspiration of Russian literature.
But Mann did not pay homage to Pushkin as a Russian author; he claimed
him for Europe. He saw him as the classic equal to the best Europe had
to offer, such as Goethe and Mozart. Pushkin, like Goethe and Mozart
"volksrecht," was a truly Russian poet who reflected the culture of his
country, and yet "Europäisch," drawing on the rich well of European
literary tradition and culture.

29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
Mann spoke of Pushkin's background in order to expose the silliness of claims regarding racial purity. Calling Pushkin a "slavische Lateiner"—a phrase summarizing Pushkin's national origin and his literary bent toward classicism—he reminded the reader that the founder of Russian literature was the grandson of a Black,"eine Tatsache die des aktuellen Witzes nicht entbehrt." He saw in Pushkin a symbol of future political integration. Pushkin was of Slavic background yet had been influenced by the West, producing literature classic in form and content. Hence he was to Mann the symbol of the happy possibility of fruitful cooperation and co-existence between East and West. Mann's hope for such cooperation was founded on the Soviet Union's entry into the League of Nations in September 1934, and on the Seventh Congress of the Comintern which met in Moscow in mid-summer, 1935. In an attempt to win friends in the West, the Seventh Congress voted to halt Communist revolutionary agitation. This Soviet move was effective, since Nazi Germany was daily more belligerent: many welcomed a peaceful and friendly voice from Moscow as a counter balance.\footnote{\textit{Melvin C. Wren, The Course of Russian History,} 725 pp.} Mann's reaction can be explained as an expression of hope that some kind of mutual respect and intellectual cooperation would ensue, bringing Russia closer to Western humanism. Thus Pushkin served in Mann's mind as an example which kindled hope of a better future:

\begin{quote}
Eine höhere Aktualität aber gewinnt seine Gestalt, gewinnt der Europäismus seiner Form, seine Klassizität in diesem Augenblick, wo Russland als Völkerbundsmacht sich den Friedensmächten des Westens gesellt, und im Geistigen neue Beziehungen der Duldung, der Aufmerksamkeit und Freundschaft sich herstellen zwischen dem Sozialismus der Sowjetwelt und dem Humanismus des noch bürgerlichen Europa.
\end{quote}
Although the topics of the essays mentioned above differ from one another, they also have several points in common. They reflect Mann's concern for contemporary culture and civilization and his acute sensitivity for the dangers which lay ahead, not only for his beloved Europe, but for mankind. They also reflect Mann's humanism in his yearning for peace and cooperation among men.

\[32\] Mann, "Über Puschkin."
In previous chapters we have discussed Thomas Mann's problem of citizenship, his prewar reception by Czech critics, as well as his interviews, radiobroadcasts and contributions to Czech publications. Another important aspect of his connection with Czechoslovakia centers on his personal relationship with Karel Čapek.

Thomas Mann and Karel Čapek first met in Geneva in July 1931 and subsequently in Prague during Thomas Mann's various visits (1932, 1936, 1937). Documentation of their relationship is scant, yet what there is testifies to a sense of communication, mutual interest, and devotion to common ideals. There emanates a feeling of mutual understanding, respect, admiration, and even affection. What attracted them to each other was not only their keen intellect but also their genuine humanitarian concern which transcended national boundaries.

They were the leading literary representatives of their respective countries. They shared a profound patriotic love of their nations without any traces of chauvinism, for they saw their nations firmly imbedded in European cultural tradition. Politically, they were attracted to the democratic system, loathing totalitarianism.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in their roles as leading citizens and literary representatives of their countries they were invited to Geneva to become members of the Comité Permanent des Lettres et des Arts which had been formed in 1930 as a sub-branch of the League
Nations. The purpose of the Comité was to offer free exchange of thought among the intellectual elite of various European nationalities who addressed themselves to the cultural problems of the times.

During the second session of this group, Thomas Mann and Karel Čapek met for the first time. Their impressions of the meeting and of each other are to be found in what might be called their "report" to the public. Karl Čapek submitted his first report on the subject "Ženeva pro literatúru a umění" (Geneva for Literature and the Arts) on July 19, 1931. Thomas Mann did not relate his experiences of the Conference in any of his letters or other writings of that year. But in 1932 he published an essay, "Der Geist in Gesellschaft, Das Comité Permanent des Lettres et des Arts," with the purpose of offering the public an insight into the hopes and the goals the Comité wished to realize.

Comparing the two essays one cannot help being surprised at the similarities of tone and manner of approach. In both there is at times a touch of irony directed toward their new roles—the artist in seclusion, suddenly transported into the public and political arena. There is present in both the total lack of conceit, the genuine concern for the success of the goals set by the Comité, the realization of the difficulties arising when a group of strong individualists meets, and finally the recognition of the plight of poetry and art confronted with a climate of growing materialism.

First, both tried to explain to the public the reason for the
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1 Karel Čapek, "Geneva pro literatúru a umění," Lidové noviny, Prague, July 19, 1931.

establishment of the Comité and its current and future function. Mann chose a more formal tone as he introduced the various members of the Comité, emphasizing their dedication, and his own growing hope for the success of their discussions. He stated he was proud to identify with the group of his famous colleagues who asked: "Wer sind wir?" He enumerated first the nationalities of those present, and admitted it was Paul Valéry whose acquaintance he had been most anxious to make:

Paul Valéry sodann, um zunächst denjenigen zu nennen, auf dessen Bekanntschaft ich mich vielleicht am meisten gefreut hatte.3

Interestingly, the same sentiment, perhaps not as explicit, was voiced by Čapek. He, too, was fascinated by Valéry's extemporaneous speech on poetry. They clearly admired a third party, but how did they—Thomas Mann and Karel Čapek—feel about one another? Mann described Čapek as:

Karel Čapek, der tschechische Dichter, Dramatiker und Erzähler, dessen Name seit mehreren Jahren Weltgeltung gewonnen hat.4

This was more a statement of fact than giving any sign of a warm personal contact such as he had experienced with Oprescu or Valéry. Still, Mann did take note of the younger and lesser-known colleague. He mentioned his name again with approval when relating how Béla Bartók and Karel Čapek had drawn music into the discussion, and had made useful suggestions as how to educate the broader public, and awaken their interest through the modern media of radio and cinematography.

Čapek's essay was written in a humorous vein.5 In his

---

3Ibid., p. 428.
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5Čapek, "Geneva pro literatúru a umění."
introductory paragraph he spoke of the commotion and the noise which prevailed in the various chambers of the League of Nations, and remembered that when first poking his head into Hall E, he had felt as though watching a Commission for Disarmament in action. He then playfully speculated who the various persons present could be, before he began to identify them. In his introduction he generally described some physical characteristics:

... ten diplomát s monoklem je prostě Paul Valéry a ten pán, do kterého by to člověk neřekl, je poeta laureatus John Masefield, jehož ptací oči nějak upomínají na neboztičku Antonína Sovu; ... -- a ten typický Němc tuhé sije, to je Thomas Mann ..." (This diplomat with the monocle is simply Paul Valéry, and this gentleman, though you would hardly fancy it, is poet laureate John Masefield, whose bird-like eyes somehow remind one of the late Antonín Sova. ... This typical German with the strong neck is Thomas Mann. ... 6

What was it about the representative of Germany that fascinated the distinguished group and drew their attention and gratitude, as Čapek reported? For Čapek, at least, it was basically Thomas Mann's refreshing realism and honesty. In this first of his descriptions of Thomas Mann he attempted to capture and reflect Mann's personality in an amateur sketch he had drawn. As one examines the sketch and compares it to the others made of Valéry and de Reynolds, one is reminded of a piece of granite: very square, very firmly drawn as if to reflect strength of character and conviction. According to Čapek, Thomas Mann stood up to deliver his speech "harašivou severní němčinou" (in his throaty North German accent). Then, gleefully picking up Thomas Mann's irony, he continued:

... děkuje Společnosti národů že si vzpomněla dát slovo také básníkům a umelcům. ... (... he thanks the League

---
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of Nations for having remembered to allow poets and artists to speak up...)

As if to sum up the purpose of the whole meeting, Čapek quoted Mann, as the latter spoke of the significance of the artist in creating understanding amongst nations:

Mosty, které my budujeme mezi národy, jsou také politika; jsme vdeční za to, že jsme pozváni tam, kde se pracuje na politice shody mezi národy. (The bridges which we are building between the nations are also politics; we are grateful for having been invited to a place where men are working toward a politics of agreement between nations.)

And Čapek concluded:

A všichni jsou vdeční Thomasu Mannovi za to, že měl odvahu užít slova politika v této poněkud platonické akademii básníků a umělců. (And one and all are grateful to Thomas Mann for having had the nerve to use the word "politics" in this somewhat platonic academy of poets and artists.)

After this brief summary of Thomas Mann's speech, Čapek mentioned only the appearance of Mrs. Woodrow Wilson as if nothing else spoken at that session had touched him or had been worth relating in any detail.

The two men met again in 1932 when Thomas Mann went to Prague as the main speaker at the Commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Goethe's death (arranged by Urania). On that occasion he was guest speaker of the PEN-Club. The audiences were fascinated with Thomas Mann's talk. Already he was taking issue with the rising Nazi tide.

In marking this occasion of Thomas Mann's visit, Karel Čapek wrote a short article in Lidové noviny on March 15, 1932, in which he
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summarized the gist of the author's speech:

Príšel do Penkulbu jako spisovatel mezi spisovatele: to co tam řekl a chtěl říci, bylo především politické crédo, crédo jednoho z těch, kterým se říka, 'das andere Deutschland' crédo demokracie, míru a dorozumění. (He came to the PEN-Club as an author to be with his own kind, and what he said there and had wished to express primarily was a political creed, the creed of those who are called 'das andere Deutschland,' the creed of democracy, peace, and understanding.11

This speech, a pledge of faith in democracy echoed Čapek’s own feelings and those of the audience, who responded warmly.

The article, reflecting Karel Čapek’s ever-increasing personal regard for Thomas Mann, described Thomas Mann’s physical features and sought to analyze the well-spring of his personality. While from afar one might deem Thomas Mann somewhat severe and forbidding, Karel Čapek actually found his demeanor different:

Rovný kostnatý muž trochu přísně tváře; ale když se do těch tvrdě řezaných rysů dívate víc zblízka, prečtete v nich něco až chlapecky přímého a bezelstného. (An erect, bony man, with a somewhat reserved expression, but once you look closer into those chiseled features, you begin to read in there something almost boyish, disarming, direct.12

And again, this tribute:

To je na osobním projevu velkého německého prozaika to nejkrásnější ta přímost a prostota, ta severská zdrženlivost a sebevláda, koreněna naprosto neformální otevřenosti. (This is the most beautiful thing about the delivery of the great German novelist--the directness and simplicity, the northern reserve and self-discipline, emphasized by complete lack of self-consciousness and informal candor.)13

It was this genuineness which struck a familiar chord in Karel


12 Ibid.
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Čapek, it captivated him. He found in Thomas Mann as a public speaker one who was entirely lacking in "pathos" and "false theatrics." One must remember, too, that Čapek, in his own mission as a Czech dramatist, vigorously attacked theatrical showiness, simplified the language, and preserved its poetic qualities and playful humor.

What Čapek considered essential in a stage presence he thought he had found in Thomas Mann. Beyond that, the one quality which Čapek the individual treasured so dearly—sincerity—was inherent in Thomas Mann. The lack of artifice, on Mann's part, the desire to confide to his audience what was in his mind without losing touch with reality and matters of primary importance, appealed to Čapek.

... když řeční je skoro bezdečně puzen, aby řekl, co má na srdci, co je starostí dne, co prožívá duch plně a odpovědně obrácený do přítomnosti. (. . . whenever he speaks, he is almost subconsciously driven to speak his mind, of current problems revealing the spiritual dedication of one totally and responsibly committed to the present.)

But the main link between the two were Thomas Mann's political views which reflected Čapek's own. Thomas Mann's responsible liberalism, his democratic creed, and his desire for peace and understanding among nations were shared by Čapek and the intellectuals and leading political figures in whose company he moved. Helena Koželuhová, Čapek's niece, gave a glimpse of this group which included Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk, the President himself, and his son Jan. They were known as the "Pátečníci" --the Friday group (males only). They dined together and talked about literature and politics in free and far ranging lively discussions.

The conclusion of the article summed up best the regard which
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Karel Čapek held for Thomas Mann as a novelist and as a man:

Poznali jsme celého muže v tom, koho jsme znali jako spisovatele moudrých a širokých románů; autor k nám našel cestu již dávno, doufejme, že ji k nám najde častěji a bliží i člověk. (We met the whole man through it (the PEN-Club speech) whom we knew as the author of broad novels filled with wisdom; the author long ago has found his way to us, let us hope that the human being will do likewise, and more frequently.)

Whether Thomas Mann and Karel Čapek met personally on Thomas Mann's visit to Prague in 1935 is not certain. But, as he did in interviews three years earlier, Thomas Mann never failed to mention Karel Čapek's name whenever questioned about Czech literature. What is significant is the growing bond of their relationship in their mutual campaign against the political philosophy of the Nazis: they believed that the intellectuals of the world had to become active in defense of mankind and its spiritual values.

In the private correspondence there is unfortunately very little that could further document the personal relationship between the two men. Much of Thomas Mann's private correspondence was confiscated and lost when the Nazis seized his property. Čapek, according to his friend and editor, Dr. M. Halíř, rarely kept any of his correspondence because he gave letters of famous people to his intimates.
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17 Dr. Halíř wrote to me as follows: Vývoj vzájemných vztahů a osobních sympatie, které od této pražské navštěvy lze předpokládat nejde, bohužel, doložit nejakou zachovanou korespondenci. Čapek sám dopisy neuchovával, listy významných osobností daroval svým přátelům z jejich pozůstatku se ojedinele objevují po letech na veřejnosti, nebyly-li v období protektorátu (1938–1945) zničeny. (The development of a mutual relationship and personal affection, which one may assume began during this visit in Prague, is, unfortunately, impossible to document with any preserved correspondence. Čapek never saved letters, mail from important personalities he gave away as presents to his friends, from whose estates they only rarely appear after many years, if in fact they have not been altogether destroyed during the
There can be no doubt, however, that there existed a relationship of the spirit evident in their contributions to the conference of the Comité de la Coopération Intellectuelle held in Nice, April 1-3, 1935. Thomas Mann did not appear in person. His essay "La Formation de l'Homme Moderne" represented an indirect attack against the barbarism of the Fascists and the half-truths and distortions fed to the mass of deluded Germans and their fellow travelers. Mann's disgust was evident when he wrote:

\[\text{Aujourd'hui, on est convaincu qu'il est plus important et plus facile aussi de dominer les masses en perfectionnant de plus en plus l'art grossier de jouer de leur psychologie, c'est-à-dire en remplaçant l'éducation par la propagande, non, semble-t-il, sans l'assentiment intime des masses facilement accessibles à une propagande pleine d'allant et qui leur paraît plus moderne et plus attrayante que n'importe quelle idée éducatrice.}\]

At the same time Thomas Mann pointed out the dangers democracy was facing. He emphasized the necessity to act, to have the courage to speak up against lies and uncover false pretenses of heroics:

\[\text{Ce mot 'vouloir'... Il signifie cette recrudescence d'activité dont j'ai parlé, il implique la fermeté morale vis-à-vis des phénomènes du temps, le courage de dire oui et de dire non, ce courage qui, dans un monde où règne la confusion et l'égarement, est seul capable de donner naissance à l'autorité de l'esprit.}\]

The essay created a minor sensation at the meeting. Čapek was so impressed by the copy handed to him at the opening of the conference that he referred to it at the close of his own contribution:

\[\ldots \text{mais si nous n'avons pas assez de cet 'activisme'...}\]

---

18 Thomas Mann, "La Formation de l'Homme Moderne" La Formation de l'Homme Moderne; p. 16.
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auquel fait appel notre confrère Thomas Mann, nous manquerons notre but, quit consiste à jouer un rôle actif dans la formation de l'homme modern et de la collectivité dans laquelle il doit vivre.20

Most of Čapek's speech echoed Thomas Mann's fears and sentiments. Like Mann, who pointed out basic irrationality and vacillation of the masses due to inabilities to distinguish between truth and falsehood, Čapek spoke of the fickleness and lack of understanding of so-called public opinion. He asked his colleagues to realize the acute necessity for the intellectual to step "down from his ivory tower" and to take active part in guiding public opinion and in adding moral and spiritual strength to the political programs of the League of Nations. This call for active participation in presenting the truth to the world and enlightening the public went together with the recognition of how half-truths and outright lies were leading to the undermining of Europe.

The next known personal meeting of Thomas Mann and Karel Čapek was in Budapest in 1936— the year that was to be the year of decision for Thomas Mann. A few months earlier in his open letter to Eduard Korrodi, the literary editor of the Neue Zürcher Zeitung, Mann had publicly broken with the Nazis. At Budapest, both authors attended the meetings of the Comité de la Coopération Intellectuelle held from June 8-12. Their personal encounter is documented in Čapek's article "Pest."21

In the introduction Čapek briefly described Pest and the Danube,
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the atmosphere and the populace, drawing a comparison with Prague in an ironic tongue-in-cheek manner. The meeting, he remarked, had been attended by a "collection of major or minor" celebrities. His style was almost mischievous as he vividly described the facial and personal mannerisms of those present and their fields of activity. There was, however, no trace of the playful humor or irony behind which Čapek at times hid his regard when he spoke of Thomas Mann. The same might be said of his accompanying sketch of Mann's head as he captures the author's lips lightly parted as he spoke. The attributes "... pravouhlý, půlní, statečný, a skromný Thomas Mann (... square-hewn direct, brave, and humble Thomas Mann) Čapek used for no other participant. The description went beyond what one writer might conventionally say of another. They were personal and pronounced traits of character which Čapek admired and valued.

Čapek's irony directed at those present as well as the way he portrayed Mann can be readily understood on reading Thomas Mann's reminiscences of Budapest in "Sechzehn Jahre." He had come to Budapest to make a speech. Although the audience listened attentively to what he had to say, it was Thomas Mann's off-the-cuff remarks which created great excitement among the listeners. After what appears to have been a rather phlegmatic speech of an English delegate, Thomas Mann rose to deliver an improvised speech, which was an even stronger warning of impending danger, and a call for active militant

---
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democracy. This speech had such an effect on Karel Čapek, who was known for being a shy and reserved man, that he lost his self-control and emotionally embraced Thomas Mann. This action in turn delighted Thomas Mann to such a degree that many years later he kept recalling the event. He wrote of his surprise at the applause he had received that day from the numerous Hungarian audiences who had come to listen, and commented sardonically on the debates of some members of this select group who were extremely cautious due to the presence of fascist members:

... und in der ungarischen Hauptstadt war es, wo ich mir in öffentlicher Sitzung eine improvisierte Rede gegen die Freiheitsmörder und über die Notwendigkeit einer militanten Demokratie abgewann—eine Aussage, mit der ich gegen den recht akademischen und schon um der faschistischen Delegierten willen ziemlich leisetreterischen Charakter der Unterhaltungen fast bis zur Taktlosigkeit verstiess, die aber mit einer minutenlangen Beifallsdemonstration des ungarischen Publikums beantwortet wurde und mir die begeisterte Umarmung Karel Čapeks, des tschechischen Dichters, eintrug, der, als die Demokratie sein Land verriet, an gebrochenem Herzen starb. 25

This was written in 1948.

He recapitulated the event again in his "Introduction" to Altes und Neues in March, 1952.

... Und acht Jahre später, nach dem Fall der Republik, die Rede des deutschen Emigranten über 'Humaniora und Humanismus' bei einer öffentlichen Sitzung des 'Comité Permanent des Lettres et des Arts' des Völkerbundes in Budapest unter dem Vorsitz des grossen Paul Valéry, der, da er nichts verstanden hatte, höchst überrascht war von dem beharrlich demonstrierenden Applaus, in den nach den letzten Worten das sehr zahlreich erschienene ungarische Publikum ausbrach. Man muss wissen, dass die Beratungen dieses vornehmen Gremiums—oder wie man seine Tätigkeit nennen soll—ausserordentlich akademischen und vorsichtigen, ja leisetreterischen Charakters waren, schon weil italienische Fascisten zu seinen Mitgliedern gehörten. So wirkte der Schluss meiner Rede wie ein halb skandalöses, halb befreiendes und jedenfalls erregendes


As early as February 1946 in a letter to the editor of Freies Deutschland he admitted his inability to forgive the loss of Čapek and Menno ter Braak, for which he blamed the Nazis and those who served them:

... wie ich ihnen, schlecht und recht, den Verlust von Freunden nachtrage, die Zierden meines Lebens waren, (Karel Čapek, der an gebrochenem Herz starb, Menno ter Braak in Holland, der sich erschoss). 27

Surely, it is indicative for Thomas Mann's closeness to Karel Čapek that of the many victims of Nazism whom he mourned in the course of years, he always singled out the Czech writer, in spite of the comparative brevity of their acquaintance.

The relationship between Thomas Mann and Karel Čapek which started with the mutual respect of one artist for another, progressed to the realization of mutual understanding and the desire to avert an historical tragedy by rescuing mankind from self-destruction, and was sealed with a public embrace as one spoke the words the other had in his heart.

Of the written testimonies of this relationship only two

26 "Vorwort zu 'Altes und Neues'," vol. XI, pp. 695-696.

letters addressed to Capek by Thomas Mann are available to me. One of them has come to the surface quite recently. It is dated May 21, 1937, and differs considerably in both tone and content from the second letter dated October 10, 1937. The first letter vibrates with genuine warmth and admiration for Capek's work, and especially reflects the delight Mann had felt at the excellent reception given Capek's play *Bílý Nemoc* (*The White Plague*). The play, published early in 1937, found instantaneous acclaim among critics and audiences both in Czechoslovakia and abroad. Capek had written it with a singular intuition as a warning of things to come, foretelling the collision of the brutal and tyrannical forces of fascism and humanitarian Democracy. In this play noble pacifism is at first challenged by the dictator and finally destroyed by fanatical masses thirsting for war. The impact it created upon Swiss audiences was reported by Mann who had attended the opening night on May 20, 1937, in Zürich.

It was not only the topic to which Mann responded, for the apprehension of the future expressed by Capek was by no means foreign to him. What makes this letter interesting is that Mann tried, however briefly, to evaluate the play. Having himself written the drama *Fiorenza* years ago, which proved to be less than a success in an otherwise consistently

---

28 The copy of the letter was sent to me by Dr. M. Halík. Thus far I am not aware that it had been published anywhere. It is dated May 21, 1937.
excellent writing career, he admiringly spoke of Čapek's ability to use the theatre with such a degree of self-assurance:

Ich kann die meisterliche Keckheit, mit der Sie sich des Theaters bemächtigen und seine Mittel zur Verwirklichung und Einprägung des Geistigen und Ideellen aufbieten, nicht genug bewundern. Das Stück hat die Phantastik und Symbolik, die man auch in Ihrer Prosa finden kann, und sie ist ebenso wie dort mit der größten Lebendigkeit und Plastizität der Figuren vereinigt.  

This evaluation of the play has since been shared by other critics, from Arne Novák to William Harkins. Indeed it is not surprising that this very play captured Mann's imagination or was well accepted, for it was written for an educated audience who could grasp the polarity of views expressed by the various figures, and who could follow its symbolism.

Mann also reassured Čapek that the play had been well staged. He used the term "vorzüglich" and praised actor Deutsch for his dramatic skill: "... besonders Deutsch in der Hauptrolle erwies eine Überlegene Künstlerschaft, die wesentlich zum Erfolg beigetragen hat."  

What must have been highly gratifying to Čapek was Mann's admission that he had been preoccupied with Čapek's writings to such an extent that he felt a need to express his gratitude. It was the novel Válka s mloky (The War with the Newts) which had particularly engaged his imagination and led him to confess that he had not been under a similar spell for a long time:

Ich las Ihren Roman Der Krieg mit den Molchen, der

---

29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
The story is briefly this: the newts, who are subservient like robots to men, turn against them and try to undo their masters. The book was written in the style of an utopian novel, not as a mere flight of fancy but to reveal to the reader the vices and follies of his own time more sharply and objectively. A satire on modern science and pseudoscience, its main quality consisting in baring and ridiculing the political climate of the times. In the last chapter, after mankind had apparently lost its battle against the newts, Capek debates the scant possibilities for the salvation of mankind by instilling the newts with nationalism which would in the end lead them to battle and exterminate one another. Capek exposed the selfishness of the Allies who left nothing undone to appease fascism at all cost: he portrayed individuals who in their selfishness and greed were willing to sacrifice entire nations to the newts in the vain hope of keeping an upper hand and control their robots. Enthusiastically Mann wrote:

Ihr satirischer Blick für die abgrundige Narrheit Europas hat etwas absolut Großartiges, und man erleidet diese Narrheit mit Ihnen, indem man den grotesken und schauerlichen Vorgängen der Erzählung folgt, deren Phantastik ein durchaus zwingendes und notwendiges Leben gewinnt. Ich drücke mich unzulänglich aus, aber als Andeutung des tiefen Eindrucks, den mir das Buch gemacht hat, und meiner Bewunderung für Ihr künstlerisches Wachstum mögen diese einfachen Worte Ihnen genügen.32

The second letter from October 10, 1937, was prompted by external events which both bewildered and angered Thomas Mann.33

---

31 Ibid.
32 Ibid.
order to understand what he was addressing himself to, it is necessary to review briefly the Czechoslovak policy towards émigrés seeking asylum in that country. After the first World War Czechoslovakia had become a haven for thousands of White Russian émigrés who had fled their homeland after the Russian revolution of 1917. The exact figure of the influx from the East throughout the 1920's is not known. In the 1930's Czechoslovakia again became a haven, this time for refugees from Nazi Germany. Once again the final figures of those seeking asylum vary, but it is sufficiently clear that Czechoslovakia was absorbing thousands of people. There was a distinct discrepancy between the "official policy" of the Czechoslovak government towards the émigrés and the policy in practice. Officially the émigrés did not receive working permits and were threatened with deportation if they disobeyed: unofficially, however, a great deal was done to help them. Financial help was generally arranged through the many relief organizations, which were, unofficially of course, recipients of certain amounts of government money, the exact amount of which was secret. As is generally

34 Albrechtová gives the figure of German émigrés as up to 3000 persons, but quickly adds that these figures are incomplete as "illegal migrants" not registered with the refugee organizations, communists, and "legal foreigners" mostly Jews, also artists and writers who were able to earn a living were not included. (Gertruda Albrechtová, "Zur Frage der deutschen antifaschistischen Emigrationsliteratur im tschechoslovakischen Asyl," Historica VIII, pp. 177-233.)

35 Ibid., p. 185. (Albrechtová verifies my findings. I interviewed Oldrich Černý, former Minister of the Interior, and Ladislav Feierabend, former Minister of Finance, both served the Czechoslovak government under Beneš. Both certified that considerable sums of money were paid toward relief organizations under the condition that the amount and the act be kept secret. The most active relief organizations aiding German refugees were: Šaldův komitét pro pomoc německým emigrantům," formed in 1933 by F. X. Šalda, whose members included prominent members of the intelligentsia notably the Arts and Letters, and the "Demokratická péče pro pomoc uprchlíkům z Nemecka" (Democratic
known the Czechoslovak government helped many émigrés by providing them with Czechoslovak passports, as we have seen in the cases of Thomas and Heinrich Mann, and Lion Feuchtwanger, but there were many others of considerably lesser prominence who were also furnished with passports or whatever other documents they needed.

From a recently published study which concerned itself with the subject, the following reasons for this inconsistency in Czechoslovak government policy are offered:

Die jeweilige Behandlung der Emigranten, die Erleichterungen und Erschwerungen ihres Aufenthaltes und ihrer Lebensbedingungen stehen im engen Zusammenhang mit der politischen Lage der Tschechoslowakei, besonders mit den Schwankungen ihrer Aussenpolitik und den jeweils entspannteren oder zugespitzteren Beziehungen zum III. Reich. Mit dem Erstarken der Henlein-Partei, mit der stets zunehmenden Gefährdung der Existenz der Tschechoslowakei verschärft sich natürlich auch der Druck auf die Emigranten, deren Leben immer unhaltbarer wird.36

As the study further disclosed the caution of the Czechoslovak government towards the émigrés reflected other reasons. Many of the émigrés were Communists who were not too welcome in prewar Czechoslovakia, although it did have its own Communist party. Furthermore, the government had to fight unemployment of its own citizens since Czechoslovakia suffered, along with the rest of the world, from the depression. Most of all, the pressures were political: Czechoslovakia was threatened by Nazi Germany from the outside and the Henlein party agitation on the

Refugee Organization). There were many more private organizations (e.g., the "Thomas Mann Society"), such as religious or charitable groups. There were contributions for the refugees from individuals; e.g., the Czechoslovak poet Vítězlav Nezval turned over an award of Kcs. 5000, given to him in 1934, for the support of 250 refugees by the "Vereinigung zur Unterstützung deutscher Emigranten.")

36Ibid., p. 184.
inside. In view of these reasons the official lack of compassion can be understood, if not excused. Therefore, and perhaps, in spite of it, the helpfulness of the people of Czechoslovakia in general and of the Czechoslovak intelligentsia in particular speaks for itself.

Thus when the government undertook official action against the émigrés the Czechoslovak people closed ranks in their support. The following had occurred: In the summer of 1937 the Czechoslovak Ministry of the Interior had issued orders to all the German émigrés who had sought asylum in Czechoslovakia to move to the provinces. These measures caused cries of protest amongst the émigrés. They were joined by various committees and organizations until the public outcry reached such proportions that the government was forced to reconsider its move.  

Mann wrote to Čapek after having been approached, apparently by a number of individuals asking for help, to use his influence with the Czechoslovak authorities and join in the protest. He drew his information from a memorandum by the Comité Central pour les Refugiés en Tchécoslovaquie, which had been provided for him. In spite of the data supplied Mann appeared intensely irritated and disillusioned over

---

what was going on in Czechoslovakia, and he turned to Čapek for advice and assistance. Because their relationship was good, he felt he could be candid yet secure in the knowledge that his request would be handled tactfully. Besides, Mann was only too aware of the influence and high regard which Čapek enjoyed with the highest authorities within the Czechoslovak government, and felt reasonably certain that his protest would be registered.

There is, of course, the question of why Mann chose to lodge his protest in this manner rather than by making it public. Mann settled the possibility of such a question in Čapek's mind by taking pains to explain that his feeling of propriety kept him from criticizing publicly the actions of the Czechoslovak government. Yet at the same time his indignation and the inability, albeit self-imposed, to say openly what he thought, resulted in an uneasy tone. This is apparent in the opening sentences of the letter. In spite of the cordial form of address, Mann came to the point by calling attention in the first sentence to the confidential contents of the letter. Whereupon he summarized his concern for the émigrés, but at the same time stated his embarrassment by the situation wherein he saw himself placed. On the one hand, the fate of the émigrés worried him and he desired to help them; on the other, he was acutely embarrassed at having to protest an act committed by a government of the country whose citizen he had become some 10 months earlier.

Sie werden ebensowohl verstehen, dass mir diese Frage am Herzen liegt, wie auch, dass es mir durchaus widerstrebt, gerade in meiner Eigenschaft, als jüngst aufgenommener Staatsangehöriger der Republik eine öffentliche Ausserung darüber zu tun.38

38 Briefe 1937-1947, p. 29
There is a distinct note of uncertainty over whether or when the measures have gone into effect:

... um die Massnahmen die über sie beschlossen sind oder beschlossen zu werden drohen ... sondern dass ihre Evakuierung in eine Reihe kleiner Bezirke an der böhmisch-mährischen Grenze bevorsteht, beziehungsweise bereits begonnen hat ... . . . Welchen Schlag die geplanten oder schon beschlossenen Massnahmen . . . 39

It was as though he found the measures so absurd and had to ask Čapek for verification, uncertain whether he had become the subject of exaggerations:

Ich möchte nun von Ihnen hören, wie Sie über die Lage urteilen und ob Sie glauben, dass die deutsche Emigration wirklich von den Massnahmen bedroht ist ... 40

He then took pains to explain the situation to Čapek from the point of view of the emigrés, and tried to convince Čapek that the planned measure was not only inhuman but highly disadvantageous to the refugees.

Es ist ja klar, dass die Emigranten, wenn sie auch in den grossen Städten eine ausgesprochene berufliche Tätigkeit nicht ausüben, und nicht ausüben dürfen, doch viel eher in den erlaubten Grenzen Gelegenheit zu kleinen Verdiensten finden, auch dass die Intellektuellen in den grösseren Kulturzentren ganz andere Arbeitsbedingungen und Anregungen (Bibliotheken, Vorträge, etc.) haben, und schliesslich gibt es eine Reihe charitativer Unternehmungen denen es gelungen ist, Erleichterungen, Freitische, Freiwohnungen und dergleichen zu erwerken, die auch in Wegfall kommen würden. 41

The prime reason for his irritation however was revealed when he spoke of his disillusionment about this democratic country whose humaneness he had always praised. Though he assured Čapek: "Es fehlt

39 Ibid., pp. 29-31.
40 Ibid., p. 29.
41 Ibid., p. 30.
mir keineswegs an Verständnis für die Gründe die solche Massregeln veranlassen. 

he was plainly distressed over the persecution of the émigrés. In an attempt to awaken Čapek's conscience, Mann purposefully stressed his feeling of pride in Czechoslovakian democracy in order to contrast it with the sense of growing disillusionment he felt over the measure not worthy of the country's reputation. To emphasize the point, he bluntly reminded Čapek that both Masaryk and Beneš had been émigrés. It is interesting that he used the adjective "grosse" when speaking of Masaryk, showing his respect for the late President, a gesture he knew would be appreciated and shared by Čapek. Mann implied that a country, headed by men who knew what it was to be homeless, ought to know better. Furthermore, he added, no other country placed such restrictions on German refugees.

Finally, he requested Čapek's opinion in the matter and flattered Čapek by expressing his conviction that—if anyone—surely he, Čapek, could help and intervene on behalf of the émigrés. Although he offered to write appeals at Čapek's suggestion, he again emphasized that he considered a public statement on his part out of the question.

Without doubt this letter was a challenge to Čapek, because Mann had questioned the genuineness of the ideals of a human democracy in Czechoslovakia and the goodwill of its leaders.

Whatever value this letter had in the change of events is impossible to determine today. It is known that the outcry of press and public who were decidedly on the side of the émigrés (with, of course, the exception of the right-wing elements) was considerable and

---

Ibid.
had been steadily increasing since the summer months. The fact remains that a scant three weeks after Mann had written to Čapek the measures were greatly altered in favor of the émigrés, only to be dropped altogether shortly thereafter.
Unlike Thomas Mann's personal relationship to Karel Čapek, the relationship with Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk was a spiritual one. They never met. But there can be no doubt that both men knew of each other through their literary work: furthermore, their work shared much the same ideas as to Europe's future, which, in the thirties, was threatened increasingly by economic unrest and fascist ideology. They were alike in their expression of humanitarian principles. While they basically believed in peace and good will amongst nations and rejected war as such, they recognized that if democracy was to survive as the system that embodied the highest humanitarian and social principles it must take an active stand against its enemies. Mann's admiration of Masaryk is evident in the essay "Zu Masaryk's Gedächtnis," yet he had failed to endorse Masaryk for the Nobel Peace Prize in 1936.

In an open letter written in 1935, under the title "Nobelpriset och Carl von Ossietzky" published in Swedish in Göteborgs Handels och Sjöfarts Tidning, July 11, 1936, and reprinted in German under the heading "An das Nobel-Friedens-Comité, Oslo," Mann addressed himself to the Comité with the request that they weigh carefully their approaching final decision as to the winner of the award. The chief

1 "Thomas Masaryk," vol. XII, pp. 820-824.
contenders for the nomination were Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk and Carl von Ossietzky. While he paid high tribute to Masaryk, Mann urged the Comité to nominate Ossietzky. He admitted that Ossietzky's selection might objectively be the less logical one, and went on to explain his reasons. Ossietzky was a social democratic publicist who hated war and brutal power politics and who had fought for peace and cooperation among nations. He was from the start of the emerging military movement in Germany "a thorn in the flesh" of German rightist extremism. (No sooner had the Nazis taken over in Germany than they threw him into a concentration camp where he eventually died.) In him Thomas Mann saw one who had shared his fears for German democracy as well as his ideals for a better world. Moreover, Mann hoped that if the case of Ossietzky were brought to the attention of the world by awarding him the Nobel peace prize, it might alert and warn those who were politically luke-warm and blind to the dangers of Nazism.

While the Nobel peace prize was not to be used as a political weapon it had, and this Mann pointed out, definite political implications. Its very essence was to uphold harmony between nations: and if Ossietzky won, the prize might force the Nazis to either vindicate the man, or stand convicted of their two-facedness when claiming their system was peaceful and just. There is no doubt that Mann's letter was known to Czech officials but it apparently failed to raise any reaction—in spite of the great love and admiration for their president.³

³The case of Ossietzky was front page news in Czechoslovak newspapers. Almost immediately after he was seized a Committee for the Salvation of Ossietzky was set up. Belonging to this organization, as it was formed in September, 1934, were Karel Čapek, Max Brod, and F. X. Šalda among others.
This is, of course, not surprising: any person familiar with Masaryk's philosophy, his ideals of democracy, and his growing conviction in the evil that surrounded Hitler knows that he would have been the first to condone and even support Mann's viewpoint.

As one reads the political and philosophic writings by Mann and Masaryk, one realizes how close these two men were in their beliefs. When one considers the following excerpts taken from Masaryk's writings one need only to recall Mann's essays like "Achtung Europa" and "Vom kommenden Sieg der Demokratie" to find an echo of those passages:

The ethical basis of all politics is humanity, and humanity is an international program. It is a new word of the old love of our fellow man . . . We interpret the humanitarian principle extensively, that is to say, politically and juridically, not merely intensively or ethically. Much as we may love our own people we condemn chauvinism and cherish the ideal of finding some unitary organization for Europe and for mankind at large . . . I repeat the more national we are the more human we shall be, the more human the more national. Humanity requires positive love of one's own people . . . and repudiates hatred of other peoples . . . Nor is humanity identical with passive pacifism, peace at any price. Defensive war is ethically permissible and necessary. Humanity opposes violence and bars aggression. It is active, not passive; it implies efficacious energy; it must not be a mere work upon paper but a deed and constant doing.

There is the same emphasis on humanity, the total rejection of

---

4 An example of this spiritual closeness in outlook is the closing passage of Mann's essay "Achtung Europa." "In allem Humanismus liegt ein Element der Schwäche, das mit seiner Verachtung des Fanatismus, seiner Duldsamkeit und seiner Liebe zum Zweifel, kurz: mit seiner natürlichen Güte zusammenhängt und ihm unter Umständen zum Verhängnis werden kann. Was heute Not tätte, wäre ein militanter Humanismus, ein Humanismus, der seine Männlichkeit entdeckte und sich mit der Einsicht erfüllte, dass das Prinzip der Freiheit, der Duldsamkeit und des Zweifels sich nicht von einem Fanatismus, der ohne Scham und Zweifel ist, ausbeuten und überrennen lassen darf." ("Achtung Europa," vol. XII, pp. 778-779.)

chauvinism, yet a deep love for one's own nation. The same recognition that the danger to humanity is a lack of firmness, is a passivity which stems from the natural desire for harmony, balance and tranquility.

Why did Mann admire Masaryk? Certainly, with the company of political figures and statesmen like Ebert, Stresemann, Rathenau, Roosevelt and perhaps Léon Blum, Masaryk appears elevated, because to Mann he embodied an example of what a democratic political figure should be. In Masaryk, Mann saw the thinker and statesman, uniting the contemplative and active life, theory and practice, the abstract and the concrete. Mann pointed out the danger in Plato's demand that the statesman be a philosopher, and maintained that only the philosopher who is a statesman at the same time could bring about the relationship of the spirit and the deed.6

For a while Masaryk's optimism regarding the new rulers of Germany and their eventual downfall gave Mann hope:

Vielleicht hat Masaryk recht, wenn er sagt, dass die neuen Machthaber, wenn sie die simpelsten Bedürfnisse nicht zu befriedigen vermögen, werden davongejagt werden.7

But to this passage he added his own doubts which attest to his profound understanding of the fascist danger and to his instinctive knowledge about the vulnerability of the German people. There would be danger once they were confronted with the mythos of their mission in history, however threadbare the images presented to them might be.

Neither Masaryk nor Thomas Mann wanted to be political figures, but life steered them into situations where they got entangled in the world of politics; Masaryk, of course, was involved in a much more

7"Leiden an Deutschland," vol. XII, p. 710.
specific way than Mann. Both of them became ideals to many people, although neither craved adulation of the masses: both, in fact, shied away from it. They shared a shyness in the face of large crowds.

When, in his essay on Masaryk, Mann chose to record Masaryk's confession over his nervousness before making speeches, he revealed something of himself: for when he pointed to Masaryk's—"and yet"—and saw in this persistency the center of the statesman's entire life, he spoke in a way of himself. With a shyness when confronting crowds went Masaryk's lack of self-centeredness, a quality which Mann greatly praised. (As we know, Capek and a large segment of the Czech press were particularly impressed by Mann's modesty and lack of conceit.) Mann also stressed Masaryk's hesitancy in using the words "Vaterland" and "Volk." One could not miss the implied attack upon Hitler and the Nazi hierarchy, who were unscrupulous in using these terms to show off their loudly proclaimed patriotism.

Equally revealing was Mann's retelling of a very stormy episode in Masaryk's life. Masaryk, in the interest of scholarly exactness and truth had challenged the authenticity of some "ancient" Czech poetry which had been a forgery similar to McPherson's Ossian: as a result, misguided, fervently nationalistic circles had attacked him for "unpatriotic" activity. As Thomas Mann pointed out, Czechoslovakia at that time had been fortunate in having a man who insisted on truth rather than on supporting lies flattering the primitive national emotions of the people. Relating this anecdote, Mann may have been thinking of his own case for when he wrote the essay he had already been denounced and stripped of his citizenship by German Nazi authorities precisely because he had had character enough to speak the truth.
CHAPTER VIII

THOMAS MANN'S CONCERN FOR CZECHOSLOVAKIA DURING THE WAR YEARS AND HIS EVENTUAL RENUNCIATION OF CZECHOSLOVAK CITIZENSHIP

The war years brought a large flood of letters asking Thomas Mann for assistance and advice. He wrote letters to influential personages on behalf of those who sought help, using his name and the connections, social and professional, which he had made. He selflessly gave of his energy and time to arrange for affidavits, and to support various committees; he did not hesitate to offer financial support when he deemed it necessary. Those wishing to support Czechoslovak refugees often sent their contributions to his address.

On September 26, 1938, he addressed a mass rally of the Committee for the Rescue of Czechoslovakia at Madison Square Garden in New York, where he received ovations for denouncing the fascist acts of aggression toward Czechoslovakia. But while he castigated the menacing pressures of Nazi Germany, he pointed out the weakness and indecision of the Allies. He warned that the gains of the appeasement policy were illusory; within days he was proven right. Hitler had won one more victory by extorting yet another concession at the Munich Conference, namely, the Czechoslovak borderland of Sudeten. It was offered, though the Czechs and Slovaks were not consulted, to buy peace from Hitler.

On October 1, German troops moved into the Sudeten region, and
Czechoslovak troops were ordered to move out and to demobilize.

Shocked by this turn of events, and despairing at the naivete of the Allies, Thomas Mann put his fictional work aside and conceived the bitter stirring essay *Dieser Friede*, in which he attacked England in particular, for its willingness to sacrifice Czechoslovakia to fascism in order to create a bulwark against Soviet bolshevism:

Der Friede war einfach und mit vollendeter Sicherheit dadurch zu retten, dass die westlichen Demokratien, der moralischen Unterstützung Amerikas gewiss, mit Russland zum Schutze des tschechoslovakischen Staates entschlossen zusammenstanden.

He spoke of Czechoslovakia as having been betrayed, and now having become a satellite of the Third Reich. With biting irony he pointed out that what he termed the "weinerliche Geschrei von den sudetendeutschen Brüdern" and their desired "liberation" by their fellow Germans was nothing but a well-calculated thrust towards the East in order to secure economic advantages in industry (Mann cited the Škoda works of Czechoslovakia, Rumanian oil refineries, as well as Hungarian wheat.) He emphasized that Czechoslovakia had been an exemplary democracy which was used by the Western powers, England and France, to appease Hitler by turning over its border territories and by permitting the installation of a government with obviously profascist tendencies.

His sympathy for Czechoslovakia was obvious as he demonstrated his disgust with a *Times* article:

... der "Times" Artikel, der, offiziell verleugnet, die schlichte Abretung der Sudeten-Gebiete an Deutschland mild

---

1."Dieser Friede," vol. XII, pp. 829-845.

2. Ibid., p. 841

3. Ibid., p. 839.
The essay presented one of the major outcries at the injustice and cowardice of the times, and illustrated how a nation—in this case Czechoslovakia—was forced to suffer total collapse in the name of peace.

It was difficult for Thomas Mann, as he saw the devastation caused by Hitler's armies, not to despair over America's neutrality. He warned Americans repeatedly of the danger, and sent his anti-Nazi radio broadcasts to England to be broadcast from there to Nazi-occupied Europe. He received considerable satisfaction from the fact that he was heard there:

Ich weiss nicht, ob ich zu diesen erfreulichen Dingen auch die Botschaften nach Deutschland rechnen soll, die ich einmal monatlich auf Platten spreche, Briefe aus Prag und aus der Schweiz beweisen mir, dass ich dort gehört werde.5

His broadcasts stated his belief that the Nazi system was the adversary of humanism and the ideals of democracy. In sharp language he denounced Nazi atrocities, and interpreted the reaction of the free people to these crimes. He repeatedly forecast that the outcome would be the eventual ruin of the Third Reich.

In his broadcasts to the German nation over the B.B.C. he never failed to mention latest developments in Czechoslovakia. He especially sympathized with that nation because it had become the first victim of an expanding Nazi imperialism. In his September, 1941, broadcast he

4 Ibid., p. 836.
5 Briefe 1937-1947, p. 186.
mentioned Himmler's threat to the Czech nation that unless they submitted completely they would be annihilated. Also as an example of Nazi cynicism towards the subjugated nations he cited the German reply to the pleas of the Czechs to re-open their universities, specifically Charles University, Prague: "... if we win you shall have no need for universities." This reduction to a "vegetierende Sklavenherde" of all nations under Hitler's domination was to him the ultimate of brutality, devoid of compassion or any trace of respect toward fellow human beings. He warned the Germans repeatedly to consider the consequences of such actions.

Mann doubtless suffered with and for the German people as the tide of the war slowly turned against them, but he knew that in following Hitler they had brought it upon themselves.

Die Zerstörung von Köln hat mich ernstlich erschüttert. Unglückliches Volk! Die Sühne beginnt. Man muss sich erinnern wie sie in Prag, in Polen gehaust haben, muss an Guernica, an Rotterdam denken, um sich das Mitleid zu verbeissen.7

These lines were written on June 2, 1942, one week before the ordeal of Lidice started. The leveling of Lidice was the Nazi punishment for the assassination of Reinhard Heydrich, the Acting Protector of Bohemia and Moravia, on May 29, 1942. When he finally succumbed to his wounds on June 4, 1942, a bloodbath was already on its way. Immediately executed were 1,331 Czechs, while 3,000 Jews were removed from Theresienstadt and sent for extermination to Auschwitz. On the day of the assassination, 500 Jews who had remained in Berlin were arrested and 152 were executed in "reprisal." On June 9 the entire male

populace of Lidice over 16 years of age were executed. The women were mostly shipped to the concentration camp Ravensbrück; the children, ninety in all, were dispersed over Germany to be raised as Germans. The village was reduced to ashes. All over Bohemia and Moravia trials went on for months. Thus Lidice had become the example of what Germans serving the Nazi system were capable of. Helplessly Mann witnessed the suffering of the nation which had extended a helping hand to him. As one who had warned the world against the growing evil of Hitler and seen the inaction and the bungling on the diplomatic level, he felt angry and bitter for he believed that all this could have been prevented. He expressed his sentiments in a letter to his friend and patroness Agnes Meyer:

... und heute morgen habe ich die fällige Europa-Message improvisiert: Über Heydrich und Lidice, - mein Gott, es ist ja nur eine Einzelheit, die verschwindet in dem Meer von Scheusslichkeit, das sich über den ganzen Machtbereich dieser Hundsfotte breitet. Das ganze Mass von Elend auszudenken, das die Canaille über die Welt gebracht hat und weiter über sie bringen wird, weil die gesittete Menschheit zu dumm und egoistisch war sie beizeiten zu stoppen, ist keiner Seele möglich, und doch fühlt man sich gewissermassen dazu verpflichtet. Ich bin doch sonst kein Menschenfeind und kann mit Joseph sagen, dass wir, die Menschen und ich, "meistens einander lächelten." Aber dass die civilisierten Staaten 'dies' gross werden liessen, nein es gross zogen, das ist meine grosse, bittere Enttäuschung mit der Menschheit, und den Groll darüber werde ich mit ins Grab nehmen. 8

In his broadcast of June, 1942, Mann sought to denounce what had happened, and to bring the truth to the German people. Reinhard Heydrich had been presented by German propaganda as an ideal of manliness and character, a pure soul filled with human generosity. This, of course, was the complete reversal of what he really was--a cold-

8 Ibid., p. 263.
blooded sadist. Mann ridiculed Hitler's mourning and burial rites which were theatrical, contrasting them with the pitiless vengeance that was taking place.

His information concerning the reprisals in Bohemia and Moravia was correct but not his interpretation:

Dass das Attentat und die Flucht der Attentäter ohne Wink und Nachhilfe von Naziseite selbst schwerlich hätte gelingen können, wollen wir beiseite lassen. Korruption ist ein bodenloser Sumpf: es ist ihr schlechterdings alles zuzutrauen.9

The assumption that the two men, Ján Kubíš and Josef Gabeik, who hurled the bomb at Heydrich were in any way assisted by the Nazis was false.10 Kubíš and Gabeik, members of the free Czechoslovak army in England, who had been parachuted from an RAF plane were well equipped and ready to carry out their mission. In the ensuing confusion they escaped, and found refuge with the priests of the Karl Borromaeus Church in Prague. There they were killed along with the priests and 120 members of the Czechoslovak underground. One can readily understand Mann's doubts because the events surrounding the assassination were so fantastic. At the time it was difficult to believe that a prominent Nazi like Heydrich could be attacked within the confines of Nazi-controlled Europe.

The June, 1942, broadcast, one of the strongest and most bitter denunciations of Nazism, explained to the German people the terrible implications of absolute power, a power which can twist or

9"Deutsche Hörer," p. 1042.

completely reverse facts, and enforce meek acceptance of scarcely credible statements:

Es ist die Verrücktheit, die eine verwirrte Welt hat absolut werden lassen und die nun die Macht hat zu jeder Schändung des Wortes, der gesunden Vernunft, des Menschenanstandes... Man braucht keine Macht, um die Wahrheit sagen zu können. Aber um sagen zu können: Heydrich war ein Edelmensch, dazu braucht man Macht, - die absolute Macht, zu bestimmen, was Wahrheit und was Blödsinn ist...11

Mann's speech was translated into Czech and re-broadcast on the B.B.C. "Special Late Night Czechoslovak News" on July 7, 1942. The following day the same program was devoted to an analysis of the speech. In the introduction it was mentioned that Thomas Mann was a German and that Czechoslovakia had saved him for German as well world literature. A point was made that he as a German author had sharply denounced the atrocities committed in retaliation for the Heydrich assassination. He was praised for his ability to reveal the hypocrisy displayed by the Nazis over Heydrich's death. Thomas Mann was referred to as the "greatest living German author," and his German background was mentioned three times intentionally in order to emphasize humanism above national loyalty: "Ač Němc je víc člověk než Němec." (Although being German he is more a human being than a German.)12 His philosophy of life—a humane concern for his fellow man—was described so that listeners might comprehend the sharp contrast between him and the nationalistic philosophy of the Third Reich which had chosen to discard human emotions in place of rabid nationalism and racism. But, and this was


12 B.B.C. "Special Late (Czech) Night News," July 8, 1942: From the private collection of papers of Dr. Juraj Slávik, who had assembled the material for the broadcast.
emphasized, Mann despite his compassionate nature had refused to show any sorrow over the death of Heydrich precisely because he did not consider him a human being. Conversely the Czech listeners were told that Mann had expressed sorrow over the fate of Lidice, and that he had declared his solidarity with the unfortunate victims. The broadcast ended with the reminder that the nations of Europe, even the Germans, if they shared Thomas Mann’s character, were hated by the Nazi regime, and that the village called Lidice was a symbol of Nazi cruelty.\textsuperscript{13}

It is obvious that those making the broadcast wished to console the Czech people by telling them of Mann’s sympathy; in addition, the broadcast would make them realize that there were people, even Germans, who would condemn what was going on in Nazi-dominated Europe.

Mann had used Czechoslovakia as a symbol of European humanism and democracy and as an illustration of how the Nazis degraded and destroyed those values. Now the Czechs—and their sympathizers—could use Mann himself as a symbol of the "good German," who could retain his German identity while rejecting the current government of his native country.

In the subsequent months and years Mann continued to condemn German nationalism for wishing to dominate all Europe. Again he used what was occurring in Bohemia and Moravia as an example, the closing of universities, almost all gymnasia, the barring of Czech history lessons, and the compulsory attendance of German language and history classes, which heralded the death of the Czech language. He cautioned

\textsuperscript{13}The root word of Lidice is "lid" (the people, as in "Lidskost" humanity), and it follows that Lidice can be translated as "the village of the people," or "the village of human beings."
In August 1942, that the concept of Europe would have to be re-formed and recreated:

Wiederherzustellen ist vor allem und in einem damit die Idee "Europa", die eine Idee der Freiheit, der Völkerehre, der Sympathie und der menschlichen Zusammenarbeit war in den Herzen der Beaten und es wieder werden muss.  

As the war continued Thomas Mann continued his attacks against the Hitler regime. Since he had settled in the United States, he felt obligated, especially because of his various public commitments (such as his lectureship at Princeton and his connection with the Library of Congress as Consultant in German Literature) to take steps towards becoming an American citizen.

On January 5, 1944, Thomas Mann and his wife Katja passed their U.S. citizenship examination in Los Angeles. As most Czechs had been openly happy over gaining such a citizen, so were the Americans. Not only the examiner and the judge were pleased to welcome him, but the press and radio commented on it. A few days later, in a letter to his friend Kahler, he made the following remark:

Wir haben unser Bürger-Examen abgelegt, sind also eigentlich schon cives romani. Nach Europa reist man aber, glaube ich, besser mit einem tschechischen Pass.  

In general, he viewed the change of citizenship as both practical and reasonable, but nevertheless he did confess to having qualms in giving up his Czechoslovak papers:

Ein bisschen schlug mir das Gewissen von wegen der guten Tschechen, und ich sollte wohl Benes noch einen Brief schreiben.  

---

14 "Deutsche Hörer," p. 1050.
16 Ibid.
This he did in a letter dated July 29, 1944, when he expressed his reasons for the step taken, as well as his gratitude for the help rendered him and his family by the Czech people.

In deed Mann felt considerably obligated to Beneš, and their relationship deserves some attention. As we have seen, it was Beneš who had set into motion the means of procuring Thomas Mann's Czecho-Slovak citizenship, and thus was carrying on Masaryk's endeavor to help the Mann family. It is unthinkable that the ten years residency requirement for Czechoslovak citizenship could have been waived without his orders, or without his personal influence with the Minister of the Interior, Oldřich Černý.

It is significant that in Beneš' collection of essays on Czechoslovak foreign policy, Boj o mír a bezpečnost státu (The Struggle for Peace and the Security of Nations), Thomas Mann is one of the few authors mentioned. The authors enumerated represent the very foundation of Western culture, philosophy, and literature: among them are Plato, Aristotle, and Dante. Beneš refers to and/or directly quotes these authors to support his political philosophy.

In his chapter on "The Little Entente and the Great Powers," written as early as March 1, 1933, Beneš spoke of some post-World War I political movements: he stated that the Pan German (or Pan Slav) dream was something of the past, for it had no longer any relevance to modern European thought. He made a direct reference to a "recent" Thomas Mann speech, in referring to such dreams:

... a je to jen, jak to dobře řekl nedávno spisovatel Thomas Mann, i s hlediska mezinárodního dočasné oživení zvláštní směsi z poválečného pseudoromantismu a pseudoreakcionalismu. (. . . as the author Thomas Mann said so well recently, regarded from an international point of view, a temporarily reawakened
specific mixture of postwar pseudoromanticism and pseudo-reaction.\textsuperscript{17}

The specific passage Beneš had in mind is not known, but he seems to be referring to Mann's familiar theme—that Europe had nothing to gain from nationalism. The phrasing of Beneš' sentence leaves no doubt that he had been impressed with what Mann said, and that their political outlooks corresponded on the question of nationalism.

It was during Mann's lecture tour of 1936 that he met Beneš personally for the first time on May 11, 1936. In the volume of \textit{Zahraniční politika 1936}, which contains the daily itinerary of Beneš, there is the following entry:

\begin{quote}
Projevy a činnost prezidenta republiky dra. E. Beneše . . .
11.V. prijal min. dra. K. Kroftu; spisovatele Thomase Manna,
(The statements and activities of the President of the Republic Dr. E. Beneš . . . 11.V. he received minister Dr. K. Krofta; the author Thomas Mann. . . .\textsuperscript{18}

During an interview with Willy Haas the meeting was discussed briefly.\textsuperscript{19} It is interesting that Mann did not volunteer the information of his visit, but that Haas cautiously and tactfully inquired, claiming first that he had "heard" talk of the meeting, whether Mann would care to enlarge on the subject. While Mann was discreet, what he did say about his visit with Beneš was complimentary. Not only did he praise Beneš' liveliness and interest in all sorts of matters, but he spoke of him as a faith-inspiring statesman.

\textsuperscript{17} Edvard Beneš, \textit{Boj o mír a bezpečnost státu}, 1924-1933, p. 694.

\textsuperscript{18} Ministerstvo zahraničních věcí, \textit{Věstník}, 1936, p. 381. Regrettably it has not been possible to locate the subsequent volume for the year 1937, in order to find the exact date of Mann's second visit.

\textsuperscript{19} Willy Haas, "Pražská rozmluva s Thomase Mannem," \textit{Literární noviny}, Prague, May 22, 1936.
While Mann avoided controversial topics, he did indicate that they had talked about international affairs. He admitted how worried he had been about political developments, and stressed that the calmness which Beneš displayed was helpful. What impressed Mann most was Beneš' confidence, and his realistic approach to the world situation. Mann, who conceded that he felt nervous most of the time, felt able to view the political situation from a different angle and with greater confidence.

They discussed British international policy, which worried Mann a great deal. Again Mann voiced his admiration for Beneš' ability to analyze the complexities of the current political situation, and he professed to be greatly relieved by the President's enlightening disclosures. There is no hint in the interview that might indicate whether Thomas Mann's citizenship had been mentioned, although it might well have been a topic they discussed.

Mann's position at this time was continuously enhanced in the eyes of the Democracies by his political stand as well as the continued high standard of his work. The celebration of his 60th birthday on June 6, 1935, had become a tribute brought to him by the cultural elite of Europe. Harvard University had honored him by awarding him the honorary degree of doctor in literature. He and his wife were invited to the White House as guests at a private dinner given by President and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt. The acceptance by the American cultural and political elite gave added weight to his standing and consequently to his pronouncements in Europe. His statements about Beneš' confidence.
self-confidence and brilliance probably gave Beneš' opponents food for second thought; in addition, Mann's words would not have been lost on those citizens of German descent living in Czechoslovakia who were as yet uncommitted to the Third Reich.

However, Mann and Beneš did not only discuss politics. They also talked about literature, but here again Mann failed to give any concrete details. Yet he did praise Beneš' unusually broad literary knowledge which surprised and delighted him.

The two men met again in January, 1937.²¹ Mann had come to Prague for two reasons; to lecture at the Urania and to collect his Documents of Domicile in Prösèć. It is probably during this stay that Mann took the opportunity to thank Beneš personally for his assistance and interest in his citizenship application. Hanuš Bonn, who interviewed Mann soon after this meeting, was evidently preoccupied with the growing tensions between the Czechs and the Germans in Czechoslovakia, and impressed by the statement Thomas Mann had made, for he chose the following sub-title for the heading of the interview: "A Conversation with Thomas Mann--Trust in Czech-German Cooperation." He referred to Mann's public declaration of solidarity with democratic principles at the Urania, recalled Mann's statement that it was possible to be a good German as well as a good citizen of the Czechoslovak Republic, and asked Mann to enlarge specifically on the subject of Czech-German cooperation. In his reply Mann displayed considerable caution. Diplomatically he claimed that time would be the decisive factor, implying that in time everything would work itself out. Then to back up his remark he

²¹ Hanuš Bonn, "Rozhovor s ThomaseM Mannem--Víra v česko-německou soužinnost", Lidové noviny, Prague, January 13, 1937.
referred to his conversation with the President:

Tady je zapotřebí jedině času. Hovořil jsem o těchto otázkách s panem presidentem a vím, jak velká je na najvyšších místech státu i v národě samém ochota k úpravě těchto vecí. (Time is needed here above all. I spoke about these questions with the President and I know how great the willingness is, at the highest levels of government as well as among the people, to work out these matters.)

He also reminded Bonn of what he himself had said in this connection during his speech at the Urania. Then, as well as during the interview, he was addressing himself specifically to the restive German minority in Czechoslovakia. He emphasized the need for them to cooperate willingly with a nation which was giving them the opportunity to work and live within their own cultural framework and called such an accommodation a sign of true German culture.

But while he attempted to help Beneš save Czechoslovak unity, and to remind people to be rational, to respect one another, to think beyond the immediate towards the survival of all, stronger forces were at work and time was running out. Unfortunately, Mann failed in his call for rationality because the members of the Konrad Henlein party and the wildly cheering German-speaking crowds of so-called Czechoslovak citizenship were soon to welcome hysterically the divisions of the Third Reich.

The next time Beneš and Mann met they were both exiles. It was during a Congress of the League of American Writers which they both attended on June 2, 1939. Mann referred to it in a letter to James T. Farrell, which was dated September 22, 1939.²² Both Mann and Beneš

²² Ibid.
²³ Mann sharply refutes Farrell’s claim that the League of American Writers was a Communist organization for as he pointed out, the very fact they had elected him to the highest conceivable office
had spoken on this occasion, and Mann expressed his appreciation at having been appointed honorary president.

Probably because they met infrequently Thomas Mann composed a letter of explanation to Beneš informing the Czechoslovak President-in-Exile that he had acquired American citizenship. There are few letters in the many volumes containing Mann's correspondence written with as much warmth and anxious consideration. Knowing his usual reserve and intellectual distance, one might find the opening paragraphs almost exaggerated in their solicitude for Beneš.

Mann came almost abruptly to the point by stating in one sentence the actual reason for the letter: he and his wife had obtained American citizenship after their six-year stay in the United States. This short one-sentence paragraph was followed by a lengthy explanation of why this step had been taken. Listed as reasons were matters of family and material existence, the friendly reception America had accorded him, and the fact that two of his sons had joined the U.S. Army and by virtue of this act had become American citizens. Speaking of other members of the Mann family, he mentioned his daughter having become an American citizen through her marriage. He informed Beneš of his grandchildren, who had been born on American soil and were speaking the language of the land, and expressed his conviction that they, like their parents, would remain residents of this country.25

proved this assumption incorrect. He did not mention anyone else present except Beneš, as if to prove to Farrell the unsoundness of his accusation by the argument that a man of confirmed democratic convictions like Beneš had participated in the Congress. (Briefe 1937-1947, pp. 111-112.)

Ibid., pp. 379-381.

Michael Mann is professor of German literature at the
Referring to his professional life, he spoke of his connections with American institutions of learning as well as with the Library of Congress where he was engaged as a consultant of German Literature which made him, in effect, an employee of the Federal Government. He felt that, having enjoyed the privileges of American life for so long a time, he was now under obligation to accept the responsibilities of a citizen. He then began to confide and explain his problem as an author, expressing his apprehensions of the future and his regret that his books had to appear in translation. Because of the war they were printed only in English.

Ich gewinne hier als Schriftsteller und lecturer meinen Lebensunterhalt hauptsächlich aus meinen Büchern, die schmerzlich genug, in all diesen Jahren nur in der englischen Übersetzung überhaupt existent waren.26

The regret, though not exactly spelled out, resulted from the fact that they could not appear in the language they had been written in because of his estrangement from the German people. Having lost his European audience because of the war and his German audience because of a spiritual estrangement, he was obliged to assess realistically the future of his work. He stated his belief that "meine Art von Deutschtum" was best served in cosmopolitan America, but he concluded this statement with a question mark. Feeling as he did that Germany, even after the war, would hardly produce an audience which would

University of California in Berkeley and his sister Elisabeth Mann Borgese is Senior Fellow at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, California. The oldest child of Thomas Mann, Erika, resided in Switzerland until her recent death; Golo also resides in Switzerland. Monica now lives in Italy.

26 Ibid., p. 380. Here Mann exaggerated, as his books did appear abroad, e.g., in German editions in Stockholm, Sweden, not to mention the translations into foreign languages in other parts of the world outside the German orbit.
understand his work, he expressed the hope that Europe—he specified France, Czechoslovakia, and Switzerland—would in the end be the real recipient that would appreciate his novels, dismissing Germany until she was ready to return to the European spiritual fold.

The letter revealed that his former compatriots were still very much on his mind, because he wanted them to change and embrace his work. Although he assured Beneš of his intention to come to Europe in the future only as a visitor and to remain in America for good, his eventual return to Europe is already foreshadowed here. After all, he spoke of Europe as "die Leuchte der Welt," and had once referred, possibly in a fit of sarcasm, to America as "robustes Totenreich": he expressed hope for a favorable reception and understanding of his work specifically by a European reading public. Clearly Europe had been, and was to remain, his first love.

Further in the letter to Beneš, Mann freely admitted feeling uneasy about his renunciation of the Czechoslovak citizenship, although quickly, as if in self-defense, he added that the step was logical. He expressed his fear of being thought of as ungrateful by Beneš and his countrymen. He spoke of being more pained by his decision of leaving the Czech community than he had been upon learning that he no longer was to consider himself a German, since by the time of his expulsion he had already become alienated from the government in power. He asked Beneš to consider his change of citizenship status an act of destiny rather than an intentional act. Finally he assured Beneš of his confident hope for a future visit to Europe which would include paying his respects to Beneš at the Hradčany castle in Prague. The letter was signed "In herzlicher Ergebenheit." Later Thomas Mann claimed to have
received a sincere and most understanding reply from Benes.27

Although Thomas Mann returned to Europe on visits, and finally
moved back to Switzerland, he never carried out his plan of visiting
Benes at Hradcany after the liberation of Czechoslovakia. Nevertheless
he evidently felt sure of Benes' affection. This relationship included
Mann's children as well. Benes was one of the patrons of Klaus Mann's
literary magazine, Decision, A Review of Free Culture, which had
appeared in New York from January, 1941, until February, 1942. After
the war in 1947 Erika Mann paid Benes a visit. Mann informed Agnes
Meyer of this visit on October 10, 1947:

Erika die die Rückreise von Europa getrennt von uns
zurücklegte (sie ging von der Schweiz nach Prag zu unserem
Freunde Benes und nach Polen) .28

It is perhaps surprising that Mann spoke of Benes as a "friend" since
they had met no more than three times as far as can be presently
documented. From books about Benes and interviews with those who knew
him it can be assumed that Benes was an extremely lonely man; indeed he
may have had no friends save perhaps his wife Hana. He did not
particularly inspire loyalty, much less affection, and was much too
complicated a person ever to reveal his true self. What Mann really
tried to express was his own feeling for Benes, rather than a mutual
relationship.29

27 Mann mentioned Benes' letter twice, once in his reply to J. A.
Winn to be discussed shortly, and also in his Die Entstehung des Dr.

28Ibid., p. 555.

29 In 1947 Thomas Mann wrote a "Foreword" to the novel God's
village. The author, Bohus Benes, was a nephew of the president of
Czechoslovakia. Mann expressed his pleasure at having met the author
After the war Thomas Mann was the recipient of many letters urging and inviting him to return to Germany. One which aroused wide attention was written in the form of an open letter by Walter von Molo. In his reply Mann explained, why he did not wish to return to Germany permanently. He bitterly described the spiritual anguish experienced during the war years, and gratefully pointed out he had been given shelter in Switzerland and the United States from Nazi persecution. But he did not forget to remark sarcastically that as the situation in Europe grew increasingly critical, the Swiss had felt embarrassed and uneasy about his stay there. He fully credited the United States for accepting him hospitably. There was, however, no mention in the letter of the part Czechoslovakia had played in these years, and of the insecurity of traveling without a valid passport which was embarrassing, difficult, and even dangerous. As soon as the contents of his letter to Molo became public, some Czechs still living in the United States felt hurt. In Czechoslovakia, it seems, no one paid attention to the exchange:

and praised the president as a "great statesman." He also demonstrated his personal affection by referring to Edvard Beneš as "my friend." Mann was very generous in his critique of the novel. He applauded the book not so much for its form or language as for the message it bore. This message contained a rejection of narrow-minded chauvinism behind which something evil and morally spineless was hiding. He described it as a "moral achievement," because after six years of German rule Bohus Beneš had been able to put together a "simple and engaging" tale, without hatred or bitterness toward the occupiers. Mann saw the best qualities, of what he believed was "the Czech national character," expressed in it: "Reason, humor, common sense, modesty, uprightness, and a practical desire to do good, such are the characteristic qualities of your nation." Even though the novel, as Mann put it, was "individual-national" rather than intellectual or abstract, he praised it because it emanated "a feeling of warm-heartedness," which to him signified "hope for the future of Europe." (Thomas Mann, "Foreword," in Bohus Beneš, God's Village, pp. v-vii. This novel was published in the English language in England only; Thomas Mann's introduction is also written in English.)
those who had returned were preoccupied getting the country on its feet again, and the general anti-German sentiments ran so high that not too many considered getting involved in what was written or said in Germany or by German nationals.

J. A. Winn, M.D., a psychiatrist by profession and a poet by inclination, who resided in New York at the time, was himself a Czech refugee from Nazism. He had chosen to remain in the U.S.A. Winn had never met Mann but had been an ardent admirer of his work, so much so that in 1930 he had taken a pilgrimage to Lübeck to visit Mann's birthplace. He was indignant about the omission of the part which Czechoslovakia played in Mann's life, and wrote Mann an open letter reminding him of Fleischmann, Proseč, and of the great numbers of émigrés who had at one time been given asylum in Czechoslovakia.

Giving credit in your letter to Switzerland and America it would have been at least a gesture of courtesy to mention Masaryk's country.30

The reprimand obviously upset Mann who replied quite sharply. He rejected the accusation that he had been ungrateful. As he explained in an open letter to Winn, he had intended to recapitulate for Molo and the Germans the strain of the first years in exile, which he had spent in Switzerland, and subsequently, his war years in the U.S.A. He pointed out that he had never actually resided in Czechoslovakia, and that he valued highly the fact of having been given Czechoslovak citizenship without fulfilling the residency requirement. The decision to renounce Czechoslovak citizenship he admitted, had not

been an easy one. President Beneš, to whom he had addressed himself explaining his action, had replied in an understanding manner:


Keine Bitterkeit also, wenn ich bitten darf, und kein Missverständnis! . . .31

Winn's reaction can be justified easily for he did not have any knowledge of Mann's rather apologetic letter to Beneš, and Mann's omission was obvious. One can question, however, how Beneš could have sent anything else but a "Zustimmungsbrief" since he was presented with a fait accompli. But in the end the dispute was fruitful, because it offered Mann another chance to pay tribute to Czechoslovakia. But there are few indications that Mann kept up any appreciable interest or relationship with Czechoslovakia or its citizens in the postwar years. There was an affable exchange of letters with Fleischmann, and a meeting in May, 1949, when Mann stopped over in London. 32 Other correspondence with Czechoslovak nationals, if it exists at all, has not been published to date.

Postwar Czechoslovakia resembled little of its former prewar

31 Ibid.

self: The war had left its imprint of hatred towards the invaders. At the end there was an outburst which was not entirely rational. While the whole nation did not approve of it, and some of the major exaggerations were corrected, it took a while to quiet the emotions of the people. The paranoid fear and hatred of everything German was further fostered by the Russian "liberators," who thus had an occasion to parade as protectors, so that in the first postwar years anti-German sentiment ran high. Along with the three million Germans who were transported "Heim ins Reich," where many of them had clamored they belonged in 1938, German property was confiscated, public places like the Deutsches Haus in various towns, such as Brno, were levelled, and German books burned or removed from library shelves. Thomas Mann had in theory anticipated that punishment for inflicted suffering would be considerable, but he had not quite expected what it turned out to be in practice. He hardly understood why acts of irrationality extended into the realm of culture. As he wrote in October, 1945: "A propos die Tschechen. Sie haben für einige Zeit die ganze deutsche Musik verboten, einschließlich Bach's und Beethoven's. Smetana in Ehren, aber das heisst doch, sich ins eigene Fleisch zu schneiden." 33

Not only did the postwar world resemble little the hopes and ideals the people of Europe and of the world might have had, but the new tensions of the "cold war" built up everywhere. It is not our purpose here to examine Mann's political beliefs and attitudes in the postwar years in general. But because Mann did speak somewhat about

33 Briefe 1937-1947, p. 454.
Czechoslovakia and did use his existing link with President Beneš, some comment is unavoidable.

In 1934 writing to Karl Kerényi, Thomas Mann had made the following statement:

Ich bin ein Mensch des Gleichgewichts. Ich lehne mich instinktiv nach links, wenn der Kahn rechts zu kentern droht, - und umgekehrt.\(^3^4\)

He had rejected from the beginning the right-wing movement in Germany and had dedicated a good part in his life to fighting fascism. In effect he became a self-appointed critic of rightist elements wherever he thought they appeared, and he became convinced they were on the upsurge in America. His attitude towards the extreme left was far more complex. Even though he rejected communism of the Moscow variety for different reasons, there is doubt that he recognized the difference between communism in theory and communism in practice.

His understanding of the situation of postwar Europe, especially Czechoslovakia in later years, did not show his former penetrating political insight. His reply to an open letter by Paul Olberg illustrates his difficulties.\(^3^5\) The letter itself is long-winded, a rebuttal of the criticism which followed his appearances in Frankfurt and Weimar in connection with the Goethe 200th anniversary celebration. In fairness to Mann one must keep in mind that he was hurt because the press in West Germany and other Western countries attacked his visit to East Germany.

As was the case with many well-meaning persons in the postwar period, wishful thinking, and desire to help overcome cold-war tensions,

\(^3^4\) Briefe 1889-1936, p. 354.

\(^3^5\) Briefe 1948-1955, pp. 94-98.
seemed to predominate in his mind. He, therefore, did not come to a realistic assessment of the fundamental reasons for those tensions. While he was capable of realistically appraising many of the shortcomings of Western Europe and the United States, he failed when it came to the Soviet Union and especially the Satellites.

In the letter to Olberg the contradictions and misconceptions prevalent can be seen. Mann asserted his goodwill gesture stemmed from a desire to build bridges between West and East Germany. He further took it upon himself to illustrate how liberal the regime in East Germany was, citing Thuringia as proof: "Nicht-Kommunisten sitzen in der Regierung noch mehr im Stadtrat."\(^{36}\) There were other "facts," such as the political affiliation of the Mayor of Weimar with the Christian Democrat party. He also proceeded to describe the assorted spiritual leaders who paid homage to him and welcomed him.\(^{37}\) Unfortunately, he did not concern himself with how they voted in the elections or what their real mission was in East Germany. He fully fell for the East German image of political freedom and religious liberty paraded before him and other gullible visitors for propaganda purposes. He praised the stamp collections issued by the state because of their cultural motives and deplored a similar respect for culture in the West. It pleased him greatly that he did not meet with any negative references to his visit in the Eastern press, and he wrote with obvious satisfaction of the interest exhibited in his work since 1945.

His thoughts on Russian communism as they appeared in this

\(^{36}\) Ibid., p. 95.
\(^{37}\) Ibid.
letter were somewhat contradictory. On the one hand his definition of Russian communism was penetrating for he described it as an "autokratische Revolution" which continued to use the same methods as the Czar's police state. But there again he underestimated the grisly efficiency of the Stalin era, which, although it had its roots in the Czarist police state, far surpassed it. His statement extolled communism over fascism, an opinion which can be understood in view of his dedicated fight against the latter; however, he seemed to dismiss the atrocities committed during the Stalin era in Russia and the satellite countries. Like many others he had been smitten with a communist ideal which after 50 years has yet to be made a reality; as he stated:

Trotzdem die Tatsache allein, dass ich mir vorbehalte, einen Unterschied zu machen zwischen dem Verhältnis des Kommunismus zum Menschheitsgedanken--und der absoluten Niedertracht des Faschismus; dass ich mich weigere, an der Hysterie der Kommunistenverfolgung und der Kriegshetze teilzunehmen und dem Frieden zugunsten rede in einer Welt, deren Zukunft ohne kommunistische Züge ja längst nicht mehr vorzustellen ist, dies allein genügt offenbar, mir in der Sphäre jener Sozialreligion ein gewisses Vertrauen einzutragen, um das ich nicht geworben habe, das aber als ein schlechtes Zeichen für meine geistige und moralische Gesundheit zu empfinden mir nicht gelingen will.38

With this he, in effect, underwrote the existence of Communism as an integral philosophy of the future. While he stated that he had not courted communism he refused to be upset by the deference and confidential attitude it displayed towards him.

Ich bin kein Mitläufer! Aber es scheint, dass ich gescheite Kommunisten zu Mitläufern habe.39

38 Ibid., p. 96.
39 Ibid., p. 97.
It apparently never occurred to him that he was being used, and that his attitude would ultimately influence and impress others belonging to the cultural elite.

The high point in the letter, which showed his misunderstanding and misjudgment of a political situation, is, of course, his comment on developments in Czechoslovakia. After having chided Olberg for lack of originality in his comments he suddenly remarked:

Gewalt ist natürlich ein böses Ding und Konzentrationslager ein furchtbares Agitationsmittel. Aber Versuche, den Sozialismus gewaltlos zu verwirklichen, wie Beneš einen unternahm, haben ebenfalls keine Gunst gefunden, und auch gegen das englische Experiment geschieht alles Erdenkliche.

From these lines alone it is obvious that Mann's concept of Socialism, of Beneš' postwar policy or possibly of both was woefully confused. To be sure, prewar Czechoslovakia was a democracy with a highly developed socialist system. The postwar years represented an enormous effort to return to the prewar situation in spite of overwhelming odds. For Czechoslovakia, thanks to the agreement at Teheran and Yalta, had entered the sphere of Soviet influence. Again, as at Munich, no one consulted the Czechs. With the liberating troops came also the agents to begin their subversive work. On February 23, 1948, in a bloodless coup, the Communist party, organized and trained in the Soviet Union took control of the country. Beneš became an unhappy figurehead. He certainly was not a Communist, but a man walking a political tightrope. He made many mistakes; he showed a lamentable lack of firmness towards the dictates of Moscow and increasing softness toward well-known Communists and fellow travelers when, for example, he granted traveling

\[^{40}\text{Ibid.}\]
papers to a well-known Communist like Hans Eisler. The spectre of the Munich sell-out and the fear of Nazism resurgent in Western Europe—a favorite Soviet scare tactic—were ever present. He honestly tried to save at least a margin of liberty for his country.

As Mann came under attack for his statement on Czechoslovakia he restated it, making it even worse:

Ich habe gesagt, 'Gewalt sei abscheulich, aber der gewaltlose Sozialismus, wie der des armen Benes, habe bei den Geldmächten ja auch keine Gnade gefunden, und auch gegen das englische Experiment eines liberalen Kollektivismus geschah alles Erdenkliche.'

While displaying a lamentable lack of compassion for the fate of Beneš he blamed the western Democracies which he called "Geldmächte" (ironically in the best fascist and communist tradition) for Beneš's and Czechoslovakia's troubles. It never occurred to him to look to the Soviet Union or suspect its motives towards that country.

Beneš died a broken man, stripped of his power, existing in the last months as a mere figurehead. His dream of a great Europe with his nation as an active member of that community, a dream he had once shared with Mann was shattered.

---

41 Ibid., p. 112.
CHAPTER IX

THOMAS MANN'S RECEPTION IN THE POST-WORLD WAR II ERA

In the first two years after World War II translation and secondary literature concerning Thomas Mann remained at a standstill similar to the war years. But then Dr. Faustus appeared in Czech translation in 1948. Thereafter followed a number of translations, which were now in Slovak rather than Czech as before, new editions of prewar publications, new and improved translations of novels, and several new translations of Mann's earlier works, as well as works completed during and after the war. Again, as in the 1930s, this development was paralleled by an increase in secondary literature.

In the postwar years there appeared a number of articles, essays, studies, two books, and a bibliography. Unlike the 1920s and earlier, there can be no question of any shortage of secondary literature. As to the quality of the criticism, the following has to be kept in mind: contrary to the freedom of expression and evaluation customary in most countries after February, 1948, Czechoslovak secondary literature follows the pattern set by the Soviet Union in literary criticism. Literary interpretation and evaluation follow Marxist guidelines. There exists, as we shall see, some essays and articles relatively unmarred by political references, which are obvious contributions to the

---

1A list of translations into Czech and Slovak is included in the Appendix. Because of the volume it was not feasible to mention them in a footnote.
literary criticism of Thomas Mann's work, but many are distorted by remarks bearing little resemblance to the rest of the text and clearly politically dictated rather than objective scholarship.

The occasion of Mann's 80th birthday in 1955 was commemorated by numerous press accounts, articles and essays. Eisner compared the impact and popularity of Mann's novel Buddenbrooks with Goethe's Die Leiden des jungen Werthers, and in his judgment the tetralogy of Joseph was "unsurpassable."²

As the translator of the fourth volume, Joseph der Ernährer, Eisner spoke with the authority of one who had minutely studied the novels. He considered this to be not only an epic drama of theogony, but also a study of all humans in "incredible detail." Eisner felt that since it coincided with the times of racial persecution and atrocities, it was an answer and a condemnation of current problems. However, he rejected the contention that the Joseph novels had been written solely as a gesture of moral support for those racially persecuted. Eisner believed the greatness of Mann was that he wrote "for the humanization of life and the world," a value which far surpasses "mere literary excellence." The essay, except for a reminder of Mann's firm antagonism toward fascism, was free of political comment. This was not, however, the case in the other essays and articles on the occasion of Mann's birthday.

Kamila Jiroudková, for example, only fleetingly mentioned Mann's literary contribution which she summarized in a comparison with

Balzac. Where Balzac was the "Chronicler of the dying aristocracy," Mann had done the same for the bourgeoisie. But the important difference was Mann's humanism, faith in and love for the human being.

Jiroudková's article contained a number of mistakes. For instance, she had Mann speak at the Berlin Mozarteum in November, 1933, when as is generally known, he already resided at Küsnacht/Zürich. She also had him "living" in Czechoslovakia "for a short time," which of course was not the case at all. Furthermore, she seemed unaware of the most important factor which established ties between Czechoslovakia and Mann—namely the Czechoslovak citizenship given to him. In the rest of the article she cited Mann's statements critical of the United States, such as his press interview in Rome.

While there is no denying that Mann did quarrel with certain policies of the West, Mann also condemned a number of aspects of the East. Correct, however, were her statements that Mann wanted to see the end of the division of Germany and a secure world peace.

For Rudolf Vápeník, Mann's novel Buddenbrooks was essentially a study of the decline of the bourgeoisie at a time "when capitalism was in a progression towards imperialism." Vápeník saw all of the other novels as variations on the same theme. It was remarkable to what a degree he managed to misinterpret a work like Königliche Hoheit. He seemed to believe Mann was trying "to expose" Kaiser Wilhelm's Germany by showing an "alliance between aristocracy and the higher bourgeoisie,"

---


and regretted that Mann had been unable "to realize the decisive part played in modern times by the proletariat."

The latter complaint was echoed by Miroslav Janek, who apparently preferred Heinrich Mann. He pointed out that Heinrich had turned early against German Prussianism and fascism and that his books, unlike those of his brother Thomas, had been burned. But in the end, after that pointless criticism of Thomas Mann, he had to admit that Thomas was a far more sensitive observer of society, superior to Heinrich in form and depth.

Two short essays by Antonia Šafránková discussed Mann as being not only the last representative and critic of the declining bourgeoisie, but also the representative in German literature of a continuation of a "progressive, humanist, literary development begun by Goethe." In her judgment, Mann's most important novels were Buddenbrooks, Der Zauberberg, and Dr. Faustus. She cited Dr. Faustus in particular, because it was Mann's "political creed, his confession and declaration for a new and better world." Mann was acclaimed not because of his qualities as an author (his style or his form) but because, having been born into bourgeois society, he nevertheless possessed a sufficiently deep "moral and philosophic attitude," which enabled him to sit "in judgment of the bourgeoisie and fascism."

One essay devoted specifically to Mann's birthday differed from

the rest in that it was not only informative, but was a solid scholarly contribution. Hugo Siebenschein concentrated on Mann's last works—Der Erwählte, Die Betrogene, and Die vertauschten Köpfe—in connection with Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull, which, according to Siebenschein, formed a unit within the total complex of Mann's work. As Siebenschein demonstrated, the early Krull fragment became the motive source for the other late works. Hence Krull and Gregorius are both the "chosen" ones, the mother-daughter motif in Die Betrogene leads back to Krull, and the theme of impersonation ("Ichvertauschung") exists in both Die vertauschten Köpfe and Krull. Furthermore he explained the connection between the three late works as follows: the thesis is Der Erwählte, the antithesis is Die Betrogene, and Die vertauschten Köpfe is a synthesis in terms of the individual and society. Where Der Erwählte is "die öffentlich kollektive" and Die Betrogene "die vertraut intime Sphäre," they both unite and merge in Die vertauschten Köpfe.

Indem er zwischen dem Einzel- und Gesamtwollen die vollkommenste Übereinstimmung herstellt, verwandelt er den Sinn und die Bedeutung der beibehaltenen Sach- und Geschehnissymbole. Siebenschein denied the contention that Mann had written Krull as an accusation of the capitalist system, but maintained that Mann portrayed society as he saw it. Although he called the result "eine köstliche,


8Siebenschein reverses the chronological order of the three works. This makes the triad: thesis-antithesis-synthesis doubtful. (Die vertauschten Köpfe, 1940; Der Erwählte, 1951; Die Betrogene, 1953.)

9Ibid., p. 367.
unschätzbare Satire," he absolved Mann from having written it with such an intention.

The year 1955 brought not only festivities surrounding Mann's 80th birthday, but shortly thereafter news of his death on August 12, 1955. Even in small Czechoslovakian newspapers countless necrologies appeared. In many cases political appraisal ran next to literary evaluation.

Práce claimed that Mann's entire work was influenced by the era in which capitalism was entering into its "last phase"—"imperialism." It declared Mann's great merit as that of a portrayer of the alienation between capitalism and art by showing:

... zepětí dekadentních směrů německé filosofie (i když sám jimi byl z počátku ovlivňován) s imperialismem. ... (the tie between decadent tendencies of German philosophy [although at the beginning he had been influenced himself by them] with imperialism.)

Práce stated factually that Mann expressed his affection for the Russian authors of the 19th century and that he never became "třídně uvědomelým spisovatelem socialistyckým" (a class conscious socialist author).

Rudé právo, the official newspaper organ of the Communist party, produced a somewhat more fitting announcement. It spoke of Buddenbrooks as a novel in the best tradition of "critical realism" and "great human psychology" as well as a "first rate study" of the decline

10 "Thomas Mann zemřel," Práce, Prague, August 14, 1955.
(Clearly there is no need to comment on this statement, as it is utter nonsense.)

11 Ibid.

12 "Zemřel Thomas Mann," Rudé právo, Prague, August 14, 1955.
of a social class. Mann was praised for his self-discipline and spiritual depth which were "exemplary," as was his faith in democracy and progress. Rude právo repeated the mistake made by Jiroudková about Mann's period of residence in Czechoslovakia. Nothing was said about his Czechoslovak citizenship, although considerable space was devoted to his visits in East Germany and his support of "peace causes."

Socialistický směr, which published a necrologue by Pavel Eisner, allowed a more objective and literary approach. Of Eisner it can be said that he handled his task with a sense of propriety, free of political allusions. Eisner spoke of Mann's singular linguistic ability which brought the German language to heights achieved only by Goethe. As for Mann's essays, Eisner expressed his conviction that it would no longer be possible for anyone to write responsibly on the same subjects Mann had chosen in music or literature without consulting what Mann had said. Mann's programmatic "strenges Glück" had dominated his entire life, and Eisner held up this life as exemplary from every human angle.14

Mann's obvious affection for Russian literature, in particular for Tolstoy, was underscored by Jiří Cirkl15 and Vítězslav Kocourek.16


14The term "strenges Glück" was taken by Eisner from the concluding speech of the prince in Mann's early novel Kö nigliche Hoheit, vol. II, p. 363.


Kocourek summarized most of Mann's better known novels and novellas, such as *Buddenbrooks*, *Tristan*, *Tonio Kröger*, and *Dr. Faustus* as essentially re-examining the same theme—the conflict between the artist and bourgeois society, which, in its "intellectual confusion," was best reflected in the novel *Der Zauberberg*. In Kocourek's judgment the tetralogy of *Joseph* proved most Mann's confidence "v životní sílu humanismu" (in the life strength of humanism), and was his greatest novel. Neither writer revealed any originality, and apparently they had not been formerly involved with the study of Mann.

The case was different with Nora Kocholová, who not only was an author and essayist, but who also had translated Mann's *Buddenbrooks* and *Der Zauberberg*. In spite of these qualifications her necrologue was quite disappointing because of interpretations such as that of the novel *Königliche Hoheit*. Kocholová claimed Mann's prime intention at the time had been to establish "the impossible German synthesis" between "Goethe and his Weimar humanism" and "Bismarckian imperialism."

A large part of the essay was devoted to the contention that Mann's only wish was "odmešťovanie" (a term best translated as to de-bourgeoisie the bourgeoisie!) from *Buddenbrooks* to *Die Betrogene*. The rest of the essay was purely political, that is to say, Mann was discussed in terms of his "leftist communist sympathies."

Those "sympathies" were also re-examined by František Kubka. He, however, came to the conclusion that Mann had not used "the people"


in his novels and that the Russian Revolution and the revolutionary times in Germany had not "neprívolaly do tvůrčí dílny Thomase Mannu skutečné postavy z prostředí lidového." ( . . . brought into Thomas Mann's creative effort real figures from truly proletarian background.)\textsuperscript{19} Kubka's article contained a number of errors. Quoting an unidentified Soviet literary source, Kubka spoke of the realm of art in Dr. Faustus as being "blízkého životu" (close to life), which was the very opposite of Leverkühn's music, almost removed from the human realm.

F. Veselý, in his necrologue, "forgave" Thomas Mann for not having recognized the proletariat as the leading force of the world.\textsuperscript{20} Apparently the exonerating circumstance for Mann was that "už za prvej svetovej vojny ostro vystupoval proti prušiackému militaristickému besneniu" (. . . already during the First World War he reacted sharply and stood up against the Prussian militaristic raving.)\textsuperscript{21} A refusal to share "bourgeois anxiety of Communism" was added to Mann's credit. Veselý concluded:

Vo svete stál vždy ako vytrvalý bojovník za svetový mier a získal si tak vecťe ucty k svojmu dielu aj našu lásku. (In the world he stood always up as a steadfast fighter for world peace and thus earned, apart from the respect for his work, also our love.)\textsuperscript{22}

Like Veselý, Jaroslav Mazal based his article in part on faulty

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{21}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22}Ibid.
information. Mazal claimed that both Heinrich and Thomas Mann had been expelled shortly after the Nazi takeover in Germany and that their books had been prohibited. He related that it was the result of Czechoslovak generosity that the Mann brothers survived the Hitler era.

Mazal failed to mention the roles of Masaryk, Beneš, and Fleischmann in the citizenship story. Instead he spoke of the "vehement protest of the Communist party, workers organizations, and some city councils," which wished to indicate their antifascist feelings over the refusal of Liberec to grant Heinrich a Certificate of Domicile. "The people of Proseč" offered the necessary document to both, Mazal recounted, and Mann and his wife came to pick it up in February, 1937." Also we are told that during their "stay" in Czechoslovakia, the Mann brothers helped their countrymen. Neither the date of the Proseč visit was correct, nor was there a question of any prolonged stay in Czechoslovakia, either of Heinrich or of Thomas Mann. As for the Communist party and the worker's organizations, they hardly had anything to do with the citizenship proceedings, as had been demonstrated in Chapter One of this dissertation.

After these truly mediocre articles Julius Pašteka's commemorative essay seemed definitely superior. Pašteka displayed a

---


24 We know that Czechoslovak citizenship enabled the Mann brothers to travel with a valid passport, thus avoiding the inconveniences connected with invalid German passports, but at no time was a Czechoslovak passport a matter of life and death for either of them.

25 These errors mentioned here are only a few examples discussed for the purpose of illustrating the total lack of information many writers had about Thomas Mann.

thorough knowledge of German literature. Speaking about the German novel, Pašteka explained how after the Bildungsroman had run its course it became localized in the second half of the 19th century until it reentered the field of European literature in 1901 with Mann's Buddenbrooks. Even though a number of German writers followed, it was Thomas Mann who remained the most versatile and most representative of both German and European literature in the first half of the twentieth century. Pašteka also noted how Mann had become "a literary experience" to such men like Faulkner, Kafka, and others. He compared Buddenbrooks to The Forsyte Saga without however making sufficiently clear that Mann had preceded Galsworthy by twenty-one years. In his opinion the Joseph tetralogy was the representative historic novel of the 20th century, as Tolstoy's War and Peace had been of the 19th century.

Pašteka also reviewed the publication of Mann's essays in Slovak. He compared Mann's quality as an essayist to that of E. R. Curtius, "because of their interest in and concern for humanity." But instead of pursuing and developing the comparison further Pašteka got off the track. He traced Mann's development from "a passionate German nationalist" of the World War I period to a genuine representative of Democracy. In literature, Mann to him was more a "diagnostician of the social decadence" of the bourgeoisie than a "therapeutician." He felt Mann's best efforts were essays, because he dealt with contemporary problems on a contemporary level, and this made it imperative that for a full understanding of Mann's whole work the balance of his essays be

---

translated. Though Pasteka did his best to encourage translators, he failed to discuss the individual essays already translated. Thus he abdicated his responsibility as a reviewer to improve by constructive criticism the standard or inform readers which essays had been translated.

Kocholová's essay about Mann's "Weltanschaung" opened with the same material as her necrologue. The central part of the essay consisted of a discussion of the three great influences in Mann's life: Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Wagner. Her explanation of Mann's attraction for Schopenhauer was "his realization of the impossibility of a cultured spiritual person to exist in capitalistic society." Thus Mann, according to Kocholová, turned to Schopenhauer's pessimism for "consolation": Nietzsche received a bad mark for not aiming his philosophy against "capitalist industrialism," though he did get a pat for his disgust with the "shopkeeper bourgeois." Nietzsche was finally exposed as "some kind of a philosophic patron of imperialism and later fascism." Fortunately Kocholová pointed out that Mann did not share her evaluation on Nietzsche. But her zealous Marxist interpretation led her further:

A tak isto to bol humanizmus, ktorý Manna zaviedol ďalej od demokracie k socializmu a na konci života ku komunizmu. (And it was also humanism, which led Mann from democracy to socialism and at the end of his life to communism.)

The last statement has to be taken issue with. Although it is true that Mann stated on a number of occasions that he was a socialist, he

---


29 Ibid., p. 288.
did not declare himself to be a communist! Furthermore Kocholová's alleged quote from "Humaniora und Humanismus" is her invention. Describing how Mann envisioned the epoch following ours, she writes that he:

... otvorene vyznával že to bude humanizmus, ako ho navrhují komunistickí autori. (... openly declared that it will be the kind of humanism, in the manner suggested by some communist authors.)

Such a statement does not exist in the entire essay. Kocholová constantly quoted Mann but used words (never whole sentences) out of context to suit her purpose. Since she did not use footnotes or give other information regarding the sources a reader cannot trace the quotations.

Again, as in her necrologue, she made great issue over the reprint of a Mann article "Der Antibolschewismus - eine Grundtorheit unserer Epoche." Kocholová stated that the article was "one of Mann's last." Actually it first appeared under this heading in 1946, having been conceived in part as early as 1943. Regrettably she said little about the individual essays, and her interpretation of Mann's "Weltanschauung," such as she offered, left much to be desired, for it was quite slanted.

In contrast to Kocholová, Ondra Lysohorský, in his commemorative article (whose critical evaluation was in part guided strictly by

---

30 Ibid.

31 This article was taken in parts from the essay: Thomas Mann "What is German?" Atlantic Monthly, New York, vol. 173, No. 5, May, 1944, pp. 78-85, appeared at first as: Thomas Mann, "Der Antibolschewismus - eine Grundtorheit unserer Epoche), Einheit, Theoret. Monatschr. f. Sozialismus, Berlin, H. 2, July, 1946, pp. 105-107. Bürgin noted that the essay was: "In zahlreichen weiteren kommunistischen Tageszeitungen": he certainly was correct.
"socialist realism"), was quite capable of discussing Mann on a purely literary level once he had dispensed with the political part. He did well while discussing Goethe's great place of honor in Mann's life, and Mann's auditive approach and description of his figures with their own manner of speech, almost musical in nature. In contrast, Lysohorský described how Balzac and Tolstoy made their figures visual to the reader. Comparing Mann with Balzac and Tolstoy, Lysohorský felt Mann lacking in "robust elemental forcefulness and energy" but superior to them in "psychological penetration" and especially in "stylistic perfection."

Zdeněk Kožmín complained about Mann's "overabundant use of mythos and symbolism." This, he felt, "hindered" Mann in achieving genuine "realism." Another "obstacle" in Kožmín's opinion was Mann's inability to escape the influence of his "idealistic philosophical schooling." But Kožmín credited Mann with restoring satire to the place of importance it had enjoyed in 19th century literature, and called the Krull fragment a "literary gem" in this respect. He described Felix Krull "a cross breed between Lucifer and clown" who though parodied by his creator was still a subject of his "affection and admiration." Furthermore he drew attention to the "organic connection" between Krull and the rest of Mann's works. As an example, Kožmín offered Mann's apotheosis of sleep which coincides with Krull's praise of sleep, both written in 1909.  

---

33 Zdeněk Kožmín, "Satira velkého stylu," Host do domu, No. 9, pp. 420-422.
Lydia Pokorná demonstrated how Mann's problematic attitude toward the mission of the artist underwent a change. The doubts and uneasiness toward art and artist as expressed in early works like Tonio Kröger, Tod in Venedig, turned to a condemnation of the artist, because he was, like Leverkühn, a failure as a human being in his responses to society. Finally, Mann revealed a more positive concept of the artist, as an entertainer, who brought joy and happiness to his surroundings, no longer seeking in art the replacement of real life, but merging art and living into an "artistic act." It was Pokorná's contention that Mann did not conclude the fragment because of other pressing commitments like his "fight for peace and social justice."

However, we know from Mann's essay "Rückkehr" that he had deliberately decided to leave Krull a fragment.

A slightly more sophisticated reason for Mann's failure to complete Krull was given by Ivo Fleischmann. Fleischmann tried to demonstrate how there was hardly anything "more consuming and tragic" in creative writing than satire, implying that the effort to sustain the tone of the novel had been too exhaustive to Mann. In addition Fleischmann believed that an inner division had prompted Mann not to finish the work, a division which was due to Mann's "skepticism"

35 Lydia Pokorná, "Jediný nedokončený román Thomase Manna," Časopis pro moderní filologii, Prague, 1960, No. 1.


37 Ivo Fleischmann, "O dříve velkého Němce," Literární noviny, Prague, September 27, 1958, No. 39.
toward bourgeois society on one hand, and his unwillingness to further "ridicule" the bourgeoisie on the other. He also examined the "Hochstapler" type as existing, though not as pronouncedly as Krull, in others of Mann's novels, namely Buddenbrooks and Joseph. Fleischmann pointed out scenes in Joseph—such as Joseph's conversations with Jacob—in which Joseph displayed the same "charm, slyness, talent for mimicry, and acting ability" as are found in Krull, only more caricatured. However, from the Marxist viewpoint, Fleischmann found the whole matter disturbing. He called for an author to portray the artist of the "new order"—"the artist revolutionary"—someone who would, hopefully, be capable of counteracting Mann's "unnerving skepticism" with something "contemporary and unchallengeable."

The fragmentary Krull novel represented something entirely different to Pavel Eisner, the Czech translator. It was one of Eisner's last translations before his death. He admitted to a sense of infinite sadness when his work on Krull was over, and guaranteed the reader a "feeling of happiness and restful mirth," without "complicated heaviness" of which Mann's critics often complained. In his critical evaluation, he praised Krull for "a perfect motive structure and compositional economy," which he likened to a "symphonic execution." He found it to be one of Mann's best literary efforts in the "art of dialogue" and said that the "fine, ironic glance" at society was "unsurpassable" in German literature. Eisner also observed the great effort exerted by Mann to sustain the charm and apparent lightness of tone throughout the fragment, into which he

---

had managed to draw a great many literary traditions. Eisner's whole essay was concentrated on a literary examination free of the interference of a political interpretation.

Eisner's nonpolitical approach can also be seen in reviews of Mann's novellas *Herr und Hund* and *Die vertauschten Köpfe*. The novella *Die vertauschten Köpfe* earned admiration because of Mann's ability to take a story of Indian origin and recreate it in a manner which "raises doubts that a European could have been capable of doing it." In the critic's opinion Mann thoroughly penetrated Indian religion and mythology and lent it concrete aspects of life. 39

Dedinský especially drew attention to certain similarities with the *Joseph* novel because Joseph formed a kind of synthesis between the intellectual Schridaman and the handsome but dull Nanda. 40 He further recognized and discussed the problem of a synthesis between body and soul, beauty and intellect, as having engaged Mann throughout his lifetime. He also explained how Mann recreated a simple story, giving it many levels of meaning and perspective, in order to reflect the complexity of real life. Dedinský praised the Slovak translator for her ability in recognizing that a "dramatist of feelings and thoughts" of Mann's calibre could not and should not be "simplified," for Mann's complexity was due to his great irony, so often aimed at himself. But unlike Fleischmann, who expressed irritation over Mann's skepticism, Dedinský saw only "wisdom and kindness," because underneath Mann's psychologic absorption and description of man's frailties there lay

---


concealed a "fondness for humanity" with all its folly.

While Dedinský had welcomed Die vertauschten Köpfe as a worthwhile translating effort because of the literary value of the novella, the translation of Herr und Hund did not fare as well. The reason given was that it was an undistinguished topic, "too systematic in description to be plastic." It was described as of little "esthetic or literary value," because it was not as "representative" of Thomas Mann, as a number of other untranslated novellas and essays would have been. However, the benefit was that the story was refuting those who claimed that Mann had "little understanding or contact with nature."

The only scholarly paper on a novella by Mann was Inge Kejzlárová's essay about Mario und der Zauberer. From the opening sentence she made it plain that she considered the novella to be primarily a socio-political work critical of the bourgeoisie:

> Je mu jasné, že buržoázie už není schopná postavit proti fašismu neco pozitivního a že proto i její antifašismus ztroskotá. (It is clear to him, that the bourgeoisie is unable to come up against fascism with something positive, and therefore its anti-fascism collapses.)

To be sure, Thomas Mann remained seated in the hall throughout the magician's performance Kejzlárová noted, and behaved quite "passively"

---


43 Ibid., p. 194.
when watching the outrage Cipolla performed. But, as she instructed the reader, Mann "learned his lesson":

"Ukázal mu politovánědodnou úlohu jeho vlastní třídy, měšťanstva v pravém světle. Thomas Mann uvedl zcela jasně negativnost její existence a vydal se proto hledat "nového občana". Na této cestě dosel k názoru, že základem budoucí společnosti nebude měšťanský individualismus, ale pospolitá práce lidu. (It revealed the pitiful role of his own class, the bourgeoisie, in its real light. Thomas Mann saw quite clearly the negativity of its existence and therefore set out to look for the "new citizen." This way he came to the conclusion that the foundation of future society shall not be bourgeois individualism but the mutual labor of the people.)" ¹⁴⁴

This paragraph showed how completely she misunderstood the novella. This is all the more lamentable since the rest of her presentation revealed a good literary background and talent. To set the record straight: Mann the story teller recreated in Mario part of a real life experience. He presketchet certain danger signals of which he himself was probably only dimly aware at the time of writing. Although he admitted the existence of political overtones in the novella in a letter in 1930, he obviously was unhappy about its overemphasis. ¹⁴⁵

It was only later on when history had run its course, that he spoke of the "stark Politische":

"... Mario und der Zauberer, einer stark ins Politische hinüberspielenden Geschichte, die mit der Psychologie des.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 198.

¹⁴⁵ "Besonders dankbar bin ich ihnen dafür, dass Sie meinen Willen zur Gerechtigkeit anerkennen und keine Gehäsigkeit gegen Italien und das Italienische in der Geschichte finden. Etwas Kritisch-Ideelles, Moralisch-Politisches ist mir freilich im Laufe der Erzählung aus dem Privaten und zunächst Unbedeutenden erwachsen, was eine bestimmte Abneigung erkennen lässt und der anfangs nur irritierenden Atmosphäre zuletzt den unheimlichen und explosiven Charakter gibt." (Briefe 1889-1936, pp. 299-300.) In 1932 Thomas Mann irritated by the over-emphasis on the political in the novella wrote in a letter to B. Fučík: "Ich möchte die Bedeutung der kleinen Geschichte, vom Künstlerischen abgesehen, doch lieber im Ethischen als im Politischen sehen." (Ibid., p. 315).
Certainly Mann was attacking the dark, sinister powers of fascism, but he incriminated society as a whole, not an isolated class because of a certain weakness and lack of resistance towards fascism. There can be no question that the "gentleman from Rome" was a bourgeois who yielded to Cipolla's diabolic magic, but so did Kejzlárová's "the people."

The Giovanotto stuck his tongue out at the magician, but did succumb to the suggestive "stomach ache" in the end. Kejzlárová's conclusion that Mann searched and found the "citizen of the future, and an active member of a new society" in Mario or his like seems quite far-fetched. It is unlikely that his ideal would be an uneducated, simple-minded, gun-toting youth.

Thomas Mann's essays which contained his studies of German and Russian literary figures, were published in Slovak translation in late 1959. From the two available reviews it is apparent that this essay collection is not identical with the German edition, Adel des Geistes. Here we have the interesting opportunity of comparing two reviewers, both obviously aware of Mann's value as an essayist, but one trapped by and unwilling to deviate from the Marxist manner of interpretation accepted as "safe," the other far more objective and to the point although within the same confines as the former.

V. Jasenčák, the first reviewer, saw Mann as "a son of his time,"


47 Thomas Mann, Síla a sláva literatúry (Eseje o nemeckých a ruských klasikoch), 260 pp.
a representative of the bourgeoisie. Mann, although he had become a "victim of national exaltation" during the First World War (in part as a result of "being under the spell of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche"), eventually came to terms with the "new currents" of the twentieth century such as the "October revolution." Jasenčák carefully explained that while Mann did not become a Marxist, remaining to the end of his life a bourgeois democrat, he did realize that the future belonged to "socialism." He found it lamentable that Mann believed bourgeois culture could become the basis of the "new order," for it proved that Mann did not "fully understand" what was involved.

Among the essays, Goethe und Tolstoi and Versuch über Tschechow were singled out for examination, and evaluated to be of a "very high literary standard." Jasenčák praised Mann for admiring Tolstoy without idolizing him and for not failing to recognize Tolstoy's inner contradictions. But Jasenčák claimed Mann "over-emphasized" their inner contradictions as being the result of a "reactionary," philosophical concept.

The essay on Chechov was described by Jasenčák as "very interesting." But he found Mann's criticism of Chechov highly ironic, because the criticism applied to Mann himself, such as his "lack of positive program, or a philosophic concept which would lead him to new social ideals." for all of Mann's (or for that matter Chechov's) criticism of "capitalist society," they were both too closely "related" to it and, according to Jasenčák, "sadly watched its death,

for with it died a part of themselves." Strangely, in spite of this observation, Jasencák found Mann in the end to be a "participant of a great cultural revolution," and recommended his essays as "useful," because they enable readers to "understand progressive bourgeois culture."

The other review by Nora Krausová, began as a conventional literary examination of the value of Mann's essays. Their "attraction" for the discriminate reader was in Mann's "fresh, novel" approach to the subject. For Mann offered "highly subjective" criticism, as a result of inner experiences based on his own authorship; this criticism was a welcome change from the customary interpretations of scholars.

Krausová's examination of Mann's lifelong relationship with Goethe revealed thorough research and understanding on her part. Some of her criticism was legitimate, especially when leveled against Mann's "metaphysical reflections" in evaluating illness as an artistic phenomenon, or his uncritical acceptance of Schiller. Once she left that subject, however, her objective point of view deteriorated. She discussed the "mistake" Mann made in the essays of the 1920's and 1930's, because "he took it for granted" that a dissident attitude was a part of the author's existence and fate, and did not sufficiently consider the "real substance," namely, "class difference."

She disagreed with Mann's interpretation of Chechov's pessimism, which as she pointed out Mann shared, but was in Chechov's case not nearly as hopeless. Here she clearly misunderstood Mann for

---

he distinctly spoke of a "Zukunftsgläuben," and the doubt expressed in the final paragraph was his very own. She explained this pessimism largely due to "bourgeois encirclement," which had a retarding influence in spite of Mann's refutation of "old principles and prejudices" in his later years. This concept of Mann as the victim of his environment was examined by others, too. Such thoughts took priority over a literary evaluation especially in the case of Mann's Dr. Faustus.

Dr. Faustus was translated by Eisner in 1948 and became the most discussed of Mann's works. The evaluation of the novel varied considerably. Eisner, in an essay appended to his translation, summarized Mann's great novels as stages of the author's spiritual development: Buddenbrooks as the end of a Lübeck bourgeois family; Der Zauberberg as the spiritual existential crisis of European culture; Joseph as a rejection of cultural pessimism in favor of humanism; and finally, Dr. Faustus as a last reckoning with music as the source of artistic crisis in our century--on the personal level, as Mann's own problem of the past.50 Mann's reckoning with the infection of romanticism, a kind of titanism and lack of humanity which, through the figures of Leverkühn, became a condemnation of the German nation.

Eisner described how Mann not only showed this to be the novel of the crisis of contemporary music, and of the crisis of creativity and morals, but also of the disintegration of the artist (Leverkühn) which paralleled that of his nation. It was seen as a bitter comment on German humanism: the intelligentsia are portrayed by the figure of

50 Pavel Eisner, "Faust Thomase Manna" (Conclusion in the Czech translation of Thomas Mann, Dr. Faustus) pp. 543-547.
Zeitblom, the esthetes, wrapped up in self-love like George and Daniel, who are exposed as poetic revolutionaries, talking without acting.

Eisner warned that though it was not wise to identify the author with any one of his figures, there were passages which reflected Mann's views, such as Zeitblom's regret over Germany's failure to accept the "friendly hand extended by Russia," and disappointment over the Weimar Republic which allowed itself to be harnessed by "Western victors." Thereafter Eisner deserted the topic for an examination of Mann's "love of Russia."

The question of whether or not Mann portrayed the proletariat seemed also of importance. Eisner concluded that Mann did not, and gave the reason that Mann probably "did not know any of this class." But to his obvious satisfaction Eisner announced that Mann in Dr. Faustus began to discover "the people" after all for he described the farmers with "love and respect." The only "woman of the people," Anna in Buddenbrooks (the flower-shop girl Thomas Buddenbrook has an affair with) was also in Dr. Faustus in an older version, namely Elsa Schweigestill. Elsa, who came from a "modest peasant background," was endowed with the uniqueness Mann lent only those "highest ranking spiritually," or the simplest of "the people."^51

Dr. Faustus, although praised by Götz, was clearly a puzzle to him: he was hard put to find the right terminology in its evaluation.^52

---

^51 With this dialectically most important question settled, others were able to proceed to an interpretation of structure and content.

^52 František Götz, "Thomas Mann a soudobá próza," Literární noviny, Prague, November 11, 1961.
He found several scenes as electrifying and emotionally charged as any written since Dostoyevski. However, Götz asked himself if the book did not represent the end of an artistic era. In his judgment it was the last of the "old novelistic epic," which already had turned away from "creative psychology," "novelistic illusionism," "continuity of time" and "space," and "individual motivation," with its "fantastic limitlessness" and "unbridled demonology." It clearly concluded an epoch, without indicating the beginning of a new structure for the novel. The reasons Götz gave for the end of an epoch was that a return to "some kind of mythical baroque" in literature was out of the question: he implied the term "mythical baroque" would describe the novel fittingly. Modern prose, in his opinion, demanded a look at the fundamentals of the times and a direct questioning or "penetration of the human soul" as it developed in the midst of a concrete, "social struggle": again the implication was that these qualities were lacking in Mann.

Kocholová disagreed with this evaluation. Where Eisner had called it an "end-signal" to centuries of bourgeois culture, and Götz could not make up his mind as to what precisely it was an end, she felt Mann had preserved the form of the novel, even while describing the destruction of an art form as symbolizing the end of the bourgeois world. The ironic distance which Mann preserved was in the end not cheerless. The novel presented a singular attempt in depicting the spiritual life of its characters, for Leverkühn's artistic and human development was shown with a plasticity originating entirely from the

spirit. Adrian's madness resulted from his realization of the questionable meaning of his art and the impossibility of his art to exist in the world which surrounded him. To Kocholová this was a significant confession of Mann the artist, irrespective of his previous or following productions.

Dr. Faustus, as Mann's great confessional novel, was also Frýd's main theme. He found that this "essentially tragic novel" had serious consequences for the reader, since it was not nearly the kind of "popular reading material" like Buddenbrooks. Dr. Faustus was too "complicated, special, exclusive," and too wrapped up in the analysis of Mann's old intellectual "sins." In spite of this, however, the novel was "excellent" with an "incredible" amount of motives. To Frýd it was above all a book which demonstrated a surprising awareness of its own shortcomings, as evidenced in Leverkühn's yearning for an art which would be on a "first name basis with humanity." The novel was pointed out as an example of artistic diligence, programmatically planned to the last detail, and thus symptomatic of contemporary art, which appeared in direct polarity to the realities of modern society. Largely the novel was interpreted as the summary of Mann's thoughts on individual, artistic, and social responsibility and his criticism of the noninvolvement of artists in society. It portrayed the utter failure of art and the artist to challenge the pitfalls of society; there was the tendency to withdraw by diabolic sublimeness into spiritual isolation.


Jiří Fried, "Mannův Dr. Faustus," Krášná literatura, Prague, July/August 1961. A similar approach is to be found in Václav Placht, "Román románu," Křesťanská revue, Prague, 1963, No. 30.
Ivan Poledňák claimed that the novel concerned the "German soul," and reflected Mann's feeling of responsibility as a German. It was a reckoning with negative influences and drives "typical" of that national character. Therefore the interpretation of Dr. Faustus as a novel of the decline of modern music was firmly rejected. Music merely became the material means to express philosophic thought, a traditionally German domain. Otherwise the novel was praised for its incredible abundance of compositional principles as "some kind of milestone" (Poledňák was evidently not sure which) of a "classic, broadly epic, novelistic type of composition."

Just as nearly every writer acknowledged the novel to be complicated and challenging, it seemed impressive but beyond his intellectual abilities (at least when it came to define or interpret) for Karel Tomášek. He preferred to report the contents. But both O. Stein and Hugo Siebenschein had considerably more to say, except that they agreed the novel was impossible to analyze in a review because of its complexity. Both pointed out G. Lukács's attempt to offer a historic and political examination which fell far short of the demands of the novel.

Stein, for example, called the novel not only Mann's autobiography, but also his confession of his own part in the ideologic decay.

---


57. Karel Tomášek, "Při četbě Doktora Faustu," Kulturní tvorba, Prague, 1965, No. 3. This author is mentioned because he was considered to be one of the better known poets at the time. His "interpretation" proves it for it is a take-off rhapsodizing Dr. Faustus.

prior to and during the First World War.\textsuperscript{59} His realism was criticized, for while it was the "foundation of his greatness" it was also his "weakness." Stein called attention to Mann's inner division between knowing and declaring bourgeois society defeated and unable to arise, and his difficulty in moving away from it. The problem was seen in Mann's tendency to speak about "the people" in quotation marks and his lack of faith in the ability of the bourgeoisie to breathe new life into moral and ethical values.

The temptation to comment on Dr. \textit{Faustus} was too great for Siebenschein, even though his topic was a review of \textit{Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus}.\textsuperscript{60} He briefly summarized \textit{Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus} as "sensational," because of the author's ability to "fascinate and hold the attention" of the reader by introducing him to political actualities.

It was described as a cardiogram of the political world situation between 19\textsuperscript{2}19\textsuperscript{6} and a "graph of the pulsebeat" of Mann. Siebenschein spoke of the author as "the greatest German literary figure in the era of the decline and fall of German fascism." As to the novel, \textit{Dr. Faustus}, Siebenschein described it as "eminently musical," "German and Faustian," and therefore unquestionably political. Siebenschein demonstrated how Mann, consciously reverted to the traditional tragic end of the \textit{Volksbuch} (\textit{Historia von Dr. Johann Fausten}) rather than to follow Goethe's radiant triumph over life and death, and in this way Mann symbolized the state of his times and his nation.

Like Stein, Siebenschein asked the question why Mann, who so

\textsuperscript{59} Stein, "Thomas Mann: \textit{Doktor Faustus}.

\textsuperscript{60} Siebenschein, "Roman románů."
strongly, and at times unmercifully, criticized his class—the bourgeoisie—failed to break away from it. But like many others he offered no convincing reply. Therefore, the repeatedly raised question: "Quo vadis Thomas Mann?" prompted these three writers to try and find legitimate answers and speculate on who were Mann's possible "literary disciples." The general feeling, best expressed by Zdeněk Kožmín, was that of disbelief that contemporary authors would follow Mann's footsteps because "Mann's art was tied to his particular personal experiences," to his problems and questions influenced by the "schooling of German idealism," and to the very particular situation of Germany in the first half of the twentieth century. 61

Still they also agreed that Mann's intellectualization of form and his use of philosophic discourse, psychologic insight, and dramatic descriptive ability belonged to the history of modern prose. Examining German literature Vítězslav Kocourek noted, how contemporary German prose had paid lip service to Mann, but had absolutely no relationship to his work, as his "preoccupations and problems" were no longer valid. 62

Offering examples of the writings by Ledig, Kirst, Ascher (sic!) and Böll, Kocourek tried to prove that the "dillettant philosophers," Settembrini and Naphta, and their bourgeois surroundings had been replaced by "assorted sergeants" and a World War: the only value that had been left was "naked existence," for survival was the dominant question. The contemporary artist was seen as having become an

existentialist not by choice but by fateful experience. In contrast Mann's world had been dominated by bourgeois philosophy with sometimes even "beautiful," though not always "correct," ideas. Furthermore, Mann distinctly felt the crisis of bourgeois society to be one of philosophical thought and spiritual values, but he never gave up hope for a revival. The young generation in Germany were first told, by authors like Mann, that the bourgeois world was decaying: they then became convinced of its decay by their own experiences and had totally lost faith in it. Their concern was mainly with the experience of the recent past with little idea about how to go on in the future. The world of Thomas Mann was seen lying far behind not only in the eyes of the German authors as Kocourek claimed, but also in his own eyes. Its realities were neither of the present nor of the future, he concluded.

Bedřich Löwenstein was of quite another opinion, for he felt that Mann was an exemplary figure for the Germans, as he was filled with a true sense of "social and humanitarian responsibility."63 His "sympathy for socialism" dated back to his struggle against fascism. Of greatest importance was, however, that he had an "unbiased view of communism," and recognized it as the direction all of Germany and eventually the world "will have to take." Yet in the last paragraph Löwenstein expressed the wish that future generations pay more attention to Mann's literary work than to his political life: he described it as "ironic, multileveled in meaning, timeless, eternally human in character" and suggested that it should not be "dogmatized."

Thus the obsessive absorption with Mann's political views, so

---

63 Bedřich Löwenstein, "Thomas Mann a Němci," Dejiny a současnost, Prague, 1964, No. 4.
often concealed as discourses on Mann's "humanism" had been, albeit hesitantly, exposed. But this problem was not confined to articles in Communist party newspapers, or in literary reviews and essays. This was also true for the well known scholars in the field of German literature in Czechoslovakia: Pavel Eisner, Hugo Siebenschein, Alois Hofman, and Eduard Goldstücker were all at one time or another active as professors of the German Department at Charles University, Prague. Each of these men devoted some of their efforts to criticism, research, or translation of Thomas Mann's work.

The late Eisner will be primarily remembered as a thorough translator of Thomas Mann's work, who generally accompanied his work with a concluding essay; Siebenschein concentrated on the novel Der Zauberberg, comparative essays, and reviews of German secondary publications on Mann; Hofman studied Mann's relationship with Russia; and Goldstücker published occasional short essays and one introduction.

Eisner concluded his translation of Buddenbrooks with an essay in which he traced in great detail the history of Lübeck, and eventually proposed a "new" interpretation of the novel, because it had been "misinterpreted" by the literary historians of the "bourgeois era." This "misinterpretation" centered on the premise of a gradual decline of the "will to live." Eisner refuted this "biological" explanation on the grounds that there was no suggestion of "inherited family malady" in the novel. Equally he protested against the metaphysical interpretation explaining Hanno's death as "voluntary

---

suicide." He also denied that Thomas Mann agreed with Schopenhauer, arguing that the "inner voice" was that of ecstasy at the prospect of re-entering life through the brave and the strong. The decline of the family as a result of a confrontation with art was dismissed on grounds that the individual could stand up to amoral temptation. Eisner saw the reason for the decline of the Buddenbrook family in their "inability" to be "progressive." Thomas Buddenbrook was undone the moment he began to question the values, institutions, and principles of the bourgeoisie. From this moment on he no longer was trapped in the "class ghetto." Still what eventually killed him was the division between his own progressiveness and his "regressive position in society." With considerable self satisfaction Eisner announced the "discovery" of "Ann the proletarian," the only "genuinely human" figure in the novel next to Thomas and Toni. Thomas succumbed to spiritual malady, because he rejected the "salvation" of this true humanism and refused to liberate himself from the "class cage."

Eisner showed how Mann constantly criticized bourgeois society, making even Permaneder more likable than the Lübeck patricians, and concluded that the novel represented Mann's "self-liberation" from patrician traditionalsim. By his rejection of the other possibilities in interpretation, Eisner misunderstood Mann completely. Mann's genius made it possible to accommodate Eisner's interpretation as well as many others which distinguished the novel from other family chronicles.

The essay, carefully styled, was spoiled in the end by Eisner's

remarks which were completely divorced from his topic. Mann was presented as a "great personal friend" of President Roosevelt, and an open enemy of Roosevelt's political opposition: Mann did not change with fortune or fame but remained a "fighter and relentless judge" of society. Eisner warned that the novel was intended for the contemporary reader rather than the "essayists and professors of the bourgeois era."

The conclusion to Eisner's translation of Lotte in Weimar was headlined as "Mann's humoristic novel about Werther and Lotte." It began as an examination of Mann's portrayal of the old Goethe. Eisner pointed out Mann's infinite love and understanding for his subject as he dealt with the question of the existential and social morality of an artist. But, after a promising start, the essay deteriorated to a detailed enumeration of Goethe's love affairs. While it made for some suggestive reading (for example Eisner's remark that "the story in Sesenheim was not as innocent as most German professors and literary historians wish us to believe. . . ."), it had nothing whatever to do with the novel, its evaluation, or anything from which the reader might conceivably benefit.

Siebenschein's essay on the novel Der Zauberberg was an unquestionably better effort than Eisner's. In his opinion, Der Zauberberg was not Mann's best novel, but it was nevertheless an enormously important one, "an instrumentation" which reached its heights in Dr. Faustus, and thus was a promise of much to come. It was

---

66 Eisner's essay on Dr. Faustus, as well as Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull, have been discussed elsewhere.

67 Hugo Siebenschein, "Kouzelný vrch", Časopis pro moderní filologii, Prague, 1958, No. 3.
Siebenschein's theory that there were as many as seven keys hidden in the novel, and their discovery would, ultimately, not only further its understanding, but also point to Mann's future development as an author.

Siebenschein's analysis of the seven points in Der Zauberberg included: to the literal content of words a transcendent meaning was being added; an emerging change from the non-political individual to the political collective; a change of emphasis in the function of tragedy and humor; certain signs of the onsetting "Altersstil," which became more apparent in subsequent novels; a growing disengagement from the bourgeois capitalist social order; Mann's declaration for classicism and its love of life, and the rejection of life-shunning romanticism; finally, the move towards the abolishment of the time factor. In this presentation Siebenschein made a critical contribution, as he carefully illustrated each point to prove that the novel was a "great divide" in Mann's creative writing.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the conclusion of his essay. There are simply too many points which show basic contradictions: for example, there is a contradiction between the effort to speculate on how Hans Castorp might decide once he returned from the war and the reality that Thomas Mann intentionally did not tell how Castorp came to his end. The result was that Siebenschein concluded with a somewhat fancy version. He claimed that Castorp had been repulsed by the "anti-social spirit of life" in a "capitalist society." Therefore, after the war, when he became the master of his own fate he would ultimately choose a "new way of life," for he

---

would recognize that the future belonged neither to decayed, liberal-bourgeois society nor to fascism. No doubt, to Siebenschein, Hans Castorp would return a solid Marxist, ready for a future under communism!

Siebenschein insisted that emotionally Mann dwelt in the bourgeois period, while rationally he had realized the ultimate fate of future events. He was, according to Siebenschein, "innerly driven" to carry forward the classic heritage of Winckelmann, Goethe, and Hölderlin, and believed that along with other bourgeois values that heritage would be handed over to a "socialist future." This Siebenschein found to be the most praise-worthy move on Mann's part, for from the non-political humanism of his early youth, Mann's development lead to "political activism" and recognition of the "democratic responsibility" of an author.

This extremely political interpretation was not universally accepted. Jan Rovenský in a direct allusion to Siebenschein's interpretation insisted that Castorp, who reflected Mann's political viewpoint to a considerable degree, elected to remain uncommitted: for Rovenský this meant that the author preferred to reserve his own decision for the future. 69

Although the whole novel obviously went beyond Fleischmann's abilities, he openly dismissed political allusions and sought a comparison with Kafka's work. 70 Mann reminded him of Kafka in the sense that they both challenged the reader to think about the problem


70 Fleischmann, "O díle velkého Němce," Literární noviny, p. 4.
of human existence between life and death. He noted the difference between the authors in what he described as Mann's realistic portrayal of life compared to Kafka's "evasiveness and poetic licence." Where Kafka tended "to hide in the castle," Mann's novel reminded Fleischmann of an operating room atmosphere with the human soul spread out on the operating table, and the reader present to partake in the quasi-scientific dissection. He admitted to finding this a personally chilling experience, and criticized the novel indirectly by comparing it with the "clear logic of romance novels" or the "immediate warmth" of Slavic literature.

Siebenschein in two essays on Kafka drew on Mann for analogy and contrast. He found the contrast between the authors in structure, style, and language, but pointed out that their common denominator was a sense of universal irony. The essay was professional and constructively critical without digressing from the literary topic.

It has to be pointed out that other essays by Siebenschein which according to bibliographic entries presented original analyses were found to be reviews of secondary literature on Mann published mainly in Eastern Germany. None contained any truly original critical comment by Siebenschein. In fact some were translations of Mann's work, but (judging from the bibliographic entries) appeared to be literary interpretations for the bibliographers failed to identify them more accurately.

---


72 The entries in Jonas I and II and Kafka are disturbing for they pose the question whether it is necessary to consider as worth
Unlike Siebenschein or Eisner, Goldstücker, except for an introductory essay accompanying the translation of Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus, wrote only short informative articles and reviews. What he had to say, however, is of some importance, because Goldstücker was, in addition to being a professor of German literature, also chairman of the Czechoslovak Communist Writers Union until the fall of 1968.

Goldstücker spoke of Mann's inner need to confide his thoughts to his readers at all times, in his essays, and more comprehensively in Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus—a chronicle of decisive years of Mann's life. He pointed out Mann's obvious effort to avoid questions of authenticity which arose over Eckermann's conversations with Goethe. Mann was described as an outstanding diagnostician of bourgeois society, not its therapeutician. Also he was seen as an author, whose optimism was based on hope not on belief or trust. What Goldstücker called

entering reviews of secondary literature on Thomas Mann which do not directly contribute to the material reviewed. Being in possession of these essays I wish to identify their content in an effort to correct bibliographical entries:

Hugo Siebenschein, "Mann o Wassermanovi", Časopis pro moderní filologii, Prague, 1948. (Content: a translation of what Mann wrote about Wassermann, without Siebenschein's comment.)

Hugo Siebenschein, "Umení a lidstvo," Časopis pro moderní filologii, Prague, 1949, No. 4. (An examination, actually a summary, of Ernst Fischer's volume of three essays.

Hugo Siebenschein, "Objevy v 3 neďávných knižách o Tomáši Mannovi" Slovo a slovesnost, Prague, 1950, No. 1. (A summary of the contents of books by the following authors: Hamburger, Kerenyi, Mayer, Hermelin, and Siebenschein's tiresome political comment.)

Hugo Siebenschein "O ideovém vývoji Heinricha a Thomase Manna", Časopis pro moderní filologii, Příloha Philologica, Prague, 1957. (A summary of a comparison between Heinrich and Thomas Mann by Kantorowicz.)

Hugo Siebenschein, "Moje poslední setkání s Thomase Mannem", Světová literatura, Prague, 1955, No. 2. (Contains three paragraphs on Mann's presentation of the Schiller lecture in Weimar, succeeded by the translation of this lecture.)

"Mann's self-imposed mission to improve society" was examined in terms of his "peace" efforts and interest in German reunification, for which Goldstücker drew quite heavily on Erika Mann's book concerning her father.\textsuperscript{74}

In another essay on the subject of the Joseph tetralogy, Goldstücker maintained that the novel had been written chiefly for the benefit of the German nation, and was proof that no literary work could escape the compelling influence of its times.\textsuperscript{75} The humanization of the mythos had been an act of victorious defiance against the forces of fascism. Goldstücker further interpreted the "message" of the tetralogy to lie in the satisfaction which the individual derived from serving the communal. Goldstücker praised Mann's ability to make the mythos acceptable to the contemporary reader by introducing results of current scientific research in mythology, and comparative religion and anthropology: this material made the contents intellectually "fascinating," without sacrificing the esthetic value of the narrative. The novel was described as filled with "glittering irony and humor" of the highest intellectual order.

In an evaluation of the early novella Tonio Kröger, Goldstücker described it as having been Mann's victorious defense against the "temptations" of contemporary, decadent literature, and filled with a

\textsuperscript{74}In Goldstücker's opinion Erika Mann was not a "great" authoress. Much of what she wrote was "limited" and not of a "lasting quality" because she emphasized "superficial society" details completely uninteresting to the contemporary reader. The only excuse he found for this shortcoming on her part was that the book was originally published in West Germany and aimed at the "intellectual level" of that reading audience.

\textsuperscript{75}Eduard Goldstücker, "O biblických románech Thomase Manna," Krášná literatúra, Prague, January, February, March, 1959.
"great expression of gratitude" towards Russian literature. He interpreted the affection and inner longing for the "average" as Mann's own inner division, on the one hand as the beginning of a humanist relationship towards society, and on the other as a surrender to unrealistic ideals ("historically outdated") which lent the story a "conservative and romantic flavor." But in a somewhat surprising manner Goldstücker quite evidently turned on those who had criticized Mann for his inability to turn his back on his bourgeois past. He pointed out that the effort to hold on to the past, recreate it, and to lend it new values, ideas, and veritability was the basic force from which all great, literary epics of the world emanated. However, he also observed that Mann in his later years "seemed" to have fixed his thoughts towards the future, in a firm belief in mankind and its life "beyond the confines" of bourgeois society.

Subsequently, Goldstücker restated his thoughts on the subject of Mann's relationship with the bourgeoisie and "the future." He spoke of Mann's work as the last universal portrayal of the bourgeois world, conceived and executed in the full realization that the author was standing at the very end of that epoch. Goldstücker expressed his conviction that bourgeois society would never again be capable of producing an author of Mann's caliber, equally representative and universal. For none of the other bourgeois authors, even those whose work was of considerable universal value, could pretend to have his

---


faith in the humanist ideals of his class any longer. However, even Mann underwent a change towards the end of his life, a change evident in his essay "Schicksal und Aufgabe," which exposed his "openness" to the "new order of things." Goldstücker concluded with an "analysis" of Mann's duality, which was in part a result of Mann's existence both within a given social class and within a certain era. This had given the impetus to a work of "overwhelming" dialectic character, which in spite of the fact that "idealistic" elements outweighed "materialistic" ones, could not fail to absorb the reader. What Goldstücker was doing is obvious. He highly endorsed Mann's work while remaining carefully within the prescribed means of expression. It is unfortunate that he was unwilling to devote himself to a closer study of Mann's work.

As mentioned before, the only Czechoslovak scholar who made a thorough comparative study on the subject of Mann's relationship with Slavic (that is, Russian) literature was Hofman. His studies concerned Tolstoy's and Turgenjew's influence in Mann's life (as evident in Buddenbrooks), and the examination of similarities between Mann's Dr. Faustus and Dostoyevski's The Brothers Karamazov. The first essay showed in considerable detail Mann's indebtedness to the Russian novelists. They, as Hofman demonstrated, inspired and helped him to express his devotion to his homeland, its traditions, and to connect it with a universal concern. Because of this awareness, the tired, isolated, and lonely people in Buddenbrooks had become part of world history.

The second essay was literally a reproach to Mann for having

---

neglected the spiritual heirs of Marx and Münzer, as well as other "noble Germans" by failing to let their representatives appear in Dr. Faustus. He could have, argued Hofman, having known people like Ossietzky or Riemenschneider (who are, after all, representative of a faction of German revolutionaries, at least have acknowledged their existence. Instead he devoted himself exclusively to the negative fascist element, failing to notice the heroes of the anti-faction.

Dr. Faustus, in Hofman's interpretation, formed a parallel to Buddenbrooks, for it traced the decline and annihilation of the human spirit, just as the former had dealt with physical degeneration. Hofman was at his best once he began seriously his comparative study. For instance, he pointed out how both novels Faust and Karamazov symbolized each in its own way the decline of its epoch and its nation. Alyosha and Zeitblom were shown to be the passive onlookers and counterparts of Ivan and Adrian, who, though they too suffered intensely, failed to intervene. Hofman's examination of the difference between the Russian and German devil was excellent. Hofman proved how, even in the words of complete despair uttered in both novels, there was hidden a slender hope in life.

Unfortunately, Hofman did not reach this truly high level of critical interpretation in all of his work. Examining Thomas Mann and his literary reception, he said very little immediately concerning the

79 Alois Hofman, "Doktor Faustus und die Brüder Karamasoff," Philologica Pragensia 7, Prague, 1964. It is remarkable to observe the ease with which Hofman is able to traverse centuries, without apparent explanation, to make his point. Münzer (1489-1525) and Riemenschneider (1460-1531) participated in the Peasants' war (1525) praised as "great peoples' effort" by communist doctrinaire literature. Ossietzky, a contemporary of Thomas Mann, was not a communist, so the whole historical equation is ridiculous.
topic. He appeared quite concerned about the methods and ways advanced by studies of comparative literature in the West and in the East. He expressed his conviction in the importance of allowing authors themselves to speak out about their experiences and influences. He named Mann as a case in point, in which the author himself led critics to recognize the major influence in his life, namely, that of Russian literature, and ably expressed the nature and degree of his indebtedness. Thus Mann, in addition to being classed as "one of the great" novelists and essayists, was considered to be an inspiration to scholars in the field of comparative literary criticism because of his recognition of the "universally human."

As far as can be determined only two books were published concerning Thomas Mann. Hofman's was a major study of Thomas Mann and Russia, consisting of individual essays which examined the various relationships between Russian writers and Thomas Mann and Mann's attitude towards the various political developments in Russia, and also contained Mann's 30 letters to Eliasberg, followed by their respective Czech translations. Hofman's obvious ambition was to prove that the influence of Russian literature served as inspiration and a moral example to Mann. Russian culture was presented as the "salvation directing him from the paths of pessimism of former German reality."

---

80 Alois Hofman, "Thomas Mann a jeho poměr k literární recepci," Philologica Pragensia, Praha, 1964, No. 7.

81 Alois Hofman, Thomas Mann a Rusko, Praha (Československá Akademie Věd, 1959), pp. 183. Also: Thomas Mann und die Welt der Russischen Literatur, XX, Berlin, 1967, 397 pp., including the miscellaneous papers on the subject which Hofman had published previously. Mostly a translation into German of the Czech original.
There are a good number of passages which should have been omitted because they have little to do with the topic. Also the book revealed an all too strong effort to intersperse basically sound and speculatively interesting criticism with political platitudes. Furthermore Hofman was given to exaggerate not only Russian influence on Mann's work, but also Mann's knowledge of that literature. While there can be no question that Mann factually knew a lot about the great figures in Russian literature, admired, and understood them, he was not particularly aware of the lesser writers. His knowledge of contemporary authors was nearly zero. But what Mann said about Tolstoy or Chechov showed great insight and had been universally recognized, so that the exaggeration on Hofman's part was uncalled for.

The same must be said about the literary influence. To give an example: Peeperkorn was by Mann's own admission a portrayal of Gerhart Hauptmann. Hofman, in misguided zeal, claimed that it was also that of Tolstoy as Gorki had described him. Still he did not show proof that Mann had been particularly acquainted with Gorki's writing, and certainly had never indicated anything of this sort as far as Peeperkorn and Tolstoy are concerned. The political allusions often bordered on the ridiculous, such as the statement that both Chechov and Mann, though their instincts were correct, were incapable of reaching a true understanding of social evolution because of a lack of "theoretical schooling."

A second book published under the title Exulant Thomas Mann (The Exile Thomas Mann), by František Kafka was different in tone. The volume consisted of an essay by Kafka and three competent translations of Mann's "Ein Briefwechsel," "Dieser Friede," and "Meine
The essay was written in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of Thomas Mann's death, on August 12, 1965. In it the essence of Mann's life and his relationship to Czechoslovakia were poignantly summed up. Kafka recalled Mann's "successful visits" to Prague, and the "enthusiasm" with which his work was received by the reading public. He also noted that instead of a decrease in the author's popularity after his death there was steady interest maintained in him and his work in Czechoslovakia. Kafka spoke especially of the Joseph novel and Lotte in Weimar which almost instantly sold out.⁸²

Kafka raised the question of the final message which could be derived from Mann's life and work. What would be inspiring for future generations of readers? "Will this gracious irony and virtuosity be the criterion or will it be the example set by Mann in his life."⁸³

It seems that in conclusion to our topic, one can safely predict that the second alternative is the more likely one. Thomas Mann was and shall always be revered as an author, but more importantly he shall particularly be revered for his humanitarian message by this nation that has known the horrors of war, the absence of freedom, persecution for its convictions, a nation which has had a desire for personal liberty and democracy. For this nation Thomas Mann will always be a living symbol of integrity, character, love of one's fellow man, expressed in his deep desire for peace and goodwill among nations.

---

⁸² František Kafka, Exulant Thomas Mann. Kafka also wrote a short study in memory of Mann's and Werfel's deaths recalling their friendship as portrayed by Mann in Die Entstehung des Dr. Faustus. The name of the study is: František Kafka, "Dva velcí mrtví, Vestník židovských náboženských obcí v ČSSR, Prague, 4, 1965.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 84.
Gemeinde in e.c.

Der Unterzeichnete gesucht ihm die Gemeindeangehörigkeit ausweisen.

Der Unterzeichnete wird es sich zur Ehre ansehen die Gemeinde Fresee und samt dem tschechoslowakischen Staatverband anzugehören.

In versöglichem Hochachtung

[Signature]
Übersetzung.

Gemeindeamt Prosec bei Skutesch.

Prosec, den 18. VIII 1936

Auszug aus dem Protokol

darf sich mit der Stadtratsitzung, die am 18. VIII 1936 war
in der Gegenwart von 16 Mitgliedern besetzt, von 18 befasst.

1./ entfällt

2./ Die Zusage des Heimatsrechtes dem Herrn Prof. dr. Th. Mann
und auch den Mitgliedern seiner Familie. Der Bürgermeister
liest vor das Gesuch des Herrn Fleischmann, des Bevollmächtig-
ten des Dr. Mann, dem auch die Originalgesuche des Dr. Th. Mann
und Dr. Gofffried Mann beigelegt sind. Der Herr Vicebürger-
meister Postmeister Fritz nimmt sich das Wort und unterstützt
aufs wärmste, dass dem Dr. Th. Mann und Mitgliedern seiner
Familie die Zusage des Heimatsrechtes in der Gemeinde Prosec
gegeben wird.

Der Antrag wurde mit 12 Stimmen angenommen.

Die anderen Punkte des Protokoles haben keinen Zusammenhang
mit der obenstehenden Angelegenheit.

Der Auszug aus dem Protokol stimmt überein mit der
Eintragung.

Kamil Fritz der Stadt Prosec
Vicebürgermeister
Rud. Novak
Mitglied des Stadtrates

Stempel der Stadt Prosec
Bürgermeister J. Herynek

Translation of the Proseč Council proceedings received from Rudolf
Fleischmann's daughter, Mrs. Baines.
Podepsaný Rudolf Fleischmann, klade si za část předložit žádost čestného profesora M. a r. a. u. university v USA, nositele Nobelovy ceny prof. Dr. Th. Mann a, za udělení československého státního občanství.
Vzhledem k neobyčejnému významu žadatele, prosím, aby jeho žádost byla postačivě urychleně vyříšena. Za tím účelem přikládám:
1. plnotu moc,
2. žádost o udělení příslušku,
3. výpis protokolu o schůzi obecného zastupitelstva,
4. křestní list
5. výpis list, Elisabethy Veronky Mannové
6. výpis list Michaela Thomasa Mann.
Vzhledem k tomu, že o tuto vše projevili zájem naší nejvyšší státní úřední, jsem přesvědčen, že budou této žádosti v jejich intenzích vyhověny.
Zemskému úřadu v Praze.

Podpisuje Rudolf Fleischmann, klade si za účet předložit žádost až u zemského úřadu. Zemský úřad v Praze.

Zemský úřad v Praze.

Datum 21.VIII.1898 7
Letter by Thomas Mann to the state office in Prague written in Küssnacht October 8, 1936 stating his position on military compensation for his family in the case he would be drafted into Czechoslovak Army. Letter is verified by Consul Laska, October 13, 1936.
Letter from Prof. Dr. J. B. Kozák to the state office in Prague sending the last documents needed with the application for the citizenship of Thomas Mann and urging a speedy action in approving the application. Letter is dated November 4, 1936, and was received the the State Office November 7, 1937 with two enclosures.
Konsulát zdůlhuje, že na téměř požádání se dne 9. listopadu tř. č. 4722/2 předvolal spisovatele dr. Thomasa Käna, nar. 6. června 1875 v Lübecku, k sles- 
zení předepsané přísahy státoobčanské, jak se stalo dne 19. tř. do rukou podepsaného podle připojovacího protokolu, 
spolupřízně s dřiž. Kännem při sleszení přísahy v přítomnosti 
svědků a členů Känské rodiny /mnišské Kateřiny roz. 
Pringsheimové a některých dětí Alžběty a Michala/. 
Dívka za učlenění čl. 1 stavu občanství v státce 
KČ 2000. - byla konsulátem poukázána j. na strany ještě 
tehdy dne na adresu tóniho úřadu.

Letter of the Consul in Zürich to the state office in Prague certifying 
that Thomas Mann and his wife Katerina nee Pringsheim have taken an oath 
and paid a fee of Kč2000.
Letter of the magistrate of the city of Prague to the state office in Prague notifying them about the oath taken by Gottfried Mann. Also mentions that the naturalization papers were given to him January 22, 1937. Letter is dated January 28, 1937 and signed by Spacek.
Letter of the Czechoslovak Consul in Zürich, dated March 9, 1937 to the State office in Prague requesting a speedy action in sending the naturalization papers of Klaus Mann to Zurich, if his application has been already approved.

It states also that Klaus Mann will be leaving for the U.S.A. in about three weeks and would like to take the oath before the departure.
A protokol in the matter of Klaus Mann written at the Czechoslovak consulate in Zürich March 25, 1937 in which he takes the oath and is notified of his Czechoslovak citizenship. Consul Laska signed the protokol. The actual naturalization papers were given to Klaus Mann March 31, 1937.
A letter of the Consul in Zürich to the State office in Prague notifying of Klaus Mann naturalization proceedings done April 21, 1937. Letter also mentions that Klaus Mann has given to the Consul a German and Dutch passport and paid Kč. 500 in fees.
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Buddenbrookové. (Buddenbrooks)


Translated by J. Skalický; introd. by Arne Novák. Prague: Melantrich, 1930.


Doktor Faustus


Josef a bratři jeho. (Joseph und seine Brüder)
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Book II. Translated by Pavel Levit and Jan Zahradníček. Prague: Melantrich, 1930.


Translated by Pavel and Berta Levit; conclusion by Hugo Siebenschein. Prague: SNKLHU, 1958. Thomas Mann, Spisy, vol. 3.

Královská výsost. (Königliche Hoheit)


Translated by Bedřich Vaníček. Prague: Melantrich, 1931.


Lota ve Výmaru. (Lotte in Weimar)
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Malý pan Friedemann. (Der kleine Herr Friedemann)

Mario a kouzelník a jiné novely. (Mario und der Zaubere r und andere (Novellen)
(Cont.: Mario und der Zaubere r. Tonio Kröger. Unordnung und frühes Leid. Wie Jappe und Don Eschobar sich prügelten. Das Wunderkind. Tobias Mindernickel.)

Mario a kouzelník. (Mario und der Zaubere r)

Novely. (novellen)

Novely a povídky. (Novellen und Erzählungen)

Novely. (Novellen)
Povídky o životě a smrti. (Erzählungen vom Leben und vom Tode)

Translated by Jan Zahradníček. Prague: Melantrich, 1932.
(Cont.: Der Weg zum Friedhof. Luischen. Der Kleiderschrank.
Schwere Stunde. Das Eisenbahnunglück. Der Tod in Venedig.
Herr und Hund. Bekenntnisse des Hochstaplers Felix Krull.)

Smrt v Benátkách. (Der Tod in Venedig)

Translated by Rudolf Pazderník. Prague: Kvasnička a Hampl, 1927.

Tonio Kröger a jiné novely. (Tonio Kröger und andere Novellen)

(Cont.: Tonio Kröger. Beim Propheten. Das Wunderkind.
Schwere Stunde. Gladius Dei.)

Tonio Kröger. (Novelle)


ESSAYS

Utrpení a velikost mistrů. (Leiden und Grösse der Meister)

Translated by Pavel Eisner. Prague: Melantrich, 1936. Thomas
Mann, Spisy, vol. 13. (Cont.: Goethe als Repräsentant des
bürgerlichen Zeitalters. Goethes Laufbahn als Schriftsteller.
Leiden und Grösse Richard Wagners. August von Platen. Theodor
Storm. Meerfahrt mit Don Quijote.)

Freud a budoucnost. (Freud und die Zukunft)

Translated by Pavel Eisner. Prague: Julius Albert, 1937.

Odpověď. (Ein Briefwechsel)

Translated by Otokar Fischer. Prague: Melantrich, 1937.
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