

"GERMAN CULTURE IS WHERE I AM": THOMAS MANN IN EXILE

Helmut Koopmann
Universität Augsburg

FOR LAM

I

As we know, Thomas Mann escaped from Germany only because he was abroad when Fascism usurped the reins of government in Germany. And he reacted like most of the German emigrants, except that for some of them (for instance for Heinrich Mann and René Schickele, who were at home in France as well as in Germany), leaving Germany was not a flight into the unknown: as a rule, the escape into exile was a path into totally foreign areas, and this was in general a very depressing experience. Anna Seghers described it in her outstanding novel about a fugitive, *Transit*, as did Brecht in his poem, "Verhalten in der Fremde" or in "Der du zu fliehen glaubtest das Unertragbare" and Franz Werfel in his comedy *Jakobowsky und der Oberst*, where he turned an intrinsically tragic experience into a queer and curious story. Like them, Thomas Mann also reacted with fear, horror and flight when he heard the news of the seizure of power by the Nazi regime, and like hundreds of other emigrants, he regarded the assumption of supreme authority by the new government as "meaningless catastrophe"¹ and as the total destruction of the German democracy. And he reacted to it as many of those did who had to leave Germany. Shortly after his escape, his inward restlessness was one of the causes of his longing for home; particularly abroad he longed for Germany in spite of the reign of Fascism, and the idea of being separated from Germany was unbearable to him. As the most outstanding German writer of his

age, he was certainly not confined to the cultural limits of his native country or to those of the German "Bürger." But in the very first letter he wrote from exile, he remarked: "I am too much of a good German and too much linked to the cultural traditions and to the language of my country, and so the idea of being an exile for years and even for the rest of my life has a very hard and ominous meaning for me."²

Mann wanted to stay in the German-speaking part of Europe at least and he went so far as to identify the loss of his native country with the loss of his bourgeois existence and citizenship. When it turned out that his country was closed to him, he withdrew into a circle of writers he knew, an act which in a certain sense was a substitute for the loss of his native country. The threatened separation from his home made him anxious and uneasy, and this feeling recurred repeatedly in the subsequent letters he wrote from Switzerland. This signaled the extent of the uprooting against which Thomas Mann tried to defend himself, for Germany was still his home and the familiar part of the world and the foreign country, wherever it might be, was the unknown and dangerous. Thomas Mann was obsessed with this idea, and since he hoped to return very soon, he made some of his most senseless and unbelievable remarks and prophecies against all better judgment. He believed in Germany and hoped that everything would take a turn for the better in a short time. In Bavaria especially, he saw a kind of judicial security which would sooner or later be reinstated and at the same time permit a tolerably decent way of life for everybody.³ The possibility that the horror would last much longer and that he personally would have to stay abroad for years seemed less realistic than the prospect for an early return home. In particular, the loss of the normal world around him led Thomas Mann very early to misjudgments about the gravity of the situation and to a disorientation which reveals that he totally lost any ability to judge the political events objectively. This may explain the fact that most of the political remarks he made in July of 1933 were much more optimistic than all his warnings against Fascism in his lecture on Lessing in 1929 or the very heartfelt and unmistakable judgments in his "Deutsche Ansprache" in 1930. He wrote in a letter of July 27, 1933: "All those unsatisfied people, and they are very numerous, are powerless, and nothing will happen very soon. The present situation must come to an absurd end and must prove itself to be a horrible and useless detour on the way to reason."⁴ But Thomas Mann now regarded as harmless what he had seen very clearly four years

earlier—and obviously there is only one plausible explanation for his misjudgment concerning the political events in Germany; things themselves had not improved. The main reason was that he wanted to see the better Germany still in Germany itself, and all his efforts led him to endeavor to stay near Germany, within German-speaking surroundings. To live abroad seemed to be unbearable to him in spite of the fact that he had to do it, and all his lectures of 1933 give evidence of this paradoxical situation. The more Thomas Mann tried to hold onto his native country, the more it slipped away from his grasp. At the end of 1933 he wrote: "As a matter of fact I am well aware that my books are not written for Prague and New York but for Germans. The world was always a distant place, and I don't know how to deal with it."⁵ The longing for the return to his familiar situation in life overcame him again and again, and consequently we may well understand that he was so apprehensive at the prospect of losing his personal belongings because they bore for him the aspect of the familiar; the lack of them depressed him deeply. He wrote to René Schickele: "I cannot understand why I have been expelled from Germany and have had to leave those idiots my house and my property."⁶

What remained was the German language, and he clung to it as many emigrants did: during the first months of exile there were more and more comments on this one part of Germany he had been able to take along and which guaranteed him his native world even abroad. It may be his insight that the German language was with him and consequently a decisive part of the German cultural heritage, that caused Thomas Mann to see himself affirmed in his position as a representative of German culture. Sinclair Lewis sent him a telegram during his first stay in the United States: "As long as Thomas Mann writes in the German language the world will not forget its debt to the people and the culture that produced him."⁷ The intensity of Mann's dispute with Ernst Bertram was due to the fact that he saw himself as the true representative of German culture and that he regarded Bertram as a writer who misapprehended the idea of Germany, only to end up with a travesty of it.

II

All this had some influence on Mann's self-understanding and especially on his feelings about his position as a refugee. There is no

hint that Thomas Mann regarded the foreign surroundings in which he had to live as his new homeland; on the other hand there are numerous signs that he felt himself more linked to his country than those who ruled it. The climax of all these feelings was reached in the exchange of letters with Karl Kerényi, to whom he wrote in August of 1934:

I have tried to attend to my personal tasks during those years in which the sorrow about the fate of my country seemed to overcome me, the fate which seems to threaten the whole of Europe in the future. But the atrocities of the 30th of June, the cruelties in Austria and then the rise to power of that person and his growing influence irritate me in a cruel way and separate me from that which was most important to me. Maybe I should think: why am I concerned about the history of the world as long as I am able to live and work? But I am unable to react in such a way.⁸

For some time his stay in Zürich seemed to have calmed down his irritation and nervous reactions, and certainly it is no mere coincidence that he spoke about the new state of the German mind in his letter to Eduard Korrodi of February 1936. Korrodi's essay had dealt with German literature as it was reflected in the writings of the emigrants, and Thomas Mann wrote in his answering letter that he was restrained from returning to Germany only by the feeling that the present German authorities would not do him any good. But still, Germany was the country to which he was linked by his own cultural tradition; and he was convinced that this liaison was stronger in him than in those who ruled in Germany. In his letter, Thomas Mann always put the words "exile" and "emigration" in quotation marks. The letter to the Dean of Humanities at the University of Bonn, too, indicates his enduring identification with Germany. He wrote:

The mere knowledge of who these men are who happen to possess the pitiful outward power to deprive me of my German birthright is enough to make the act appear in all its absurdity. I, to be sure, am supposed to have dishonoured the Reich, Germany, in acknowledging that I am against *them*! They have the incredible effrontery to confuse themselves with Germany! When, after all, perhaps the moment is not far off when it will be

of supreme importance to the German people not to be confused with them."⁹

III

All these remarks are understandable and quite plausible, and it was not Thomas Mann alone among the emigrés who felt the still existing links to Germany. His letters and public remarks were accompanied by numerous other comments on Germany and the irrevocable loss of his cultural surroundings. But more important are his efforts to transpose his experience of exile into a literary context; and as the importance of his literary evaluations is likely to be more interesting, we shall shift our attention to this point. Admittedly, there is no disjunction between his biographical experiences and personal actions on the one hand and his literary message on the other—and so, it was not without a certain logic that we looked first at his personal reaction. But all his moods and considerations have their counterpart in his literary work during this time. This doesn't mean that this work is simply an expression of his personal feelings. Nevertheless, his writings express his own situation even better than his letters. Thomas Mann, speaking about Germany and his homeland, reveals a spiritual familiarity especially with a cultural heritage and tradition which was the starting point of all his writing and activity. All these attempts to secure the cultural tradition were not frustrated, despite his emigration, and they are present even more vividly in his essays and novels than in his private statements. There is a remarkable gap between his diaries on the one hand and his letters and the literary work on the other. But this is easy to explain: his diaries deal mostly with occurrences of his daily life, whereas his letters and his literary works represent an everlasting effort to salvage the basis of his spiritual existence, and this lasted until 1937/38. Last but not least, Mann wasn't so much apprehensive at the loss of his bourgeois home and life-style as he was concerned with a phenomenon which may only be described very vaguely by the word "German-ness," *Deutschtum*: this was what he was always in fear of losing. We may even speak of an identity crisis which manifested itself approximately in the period 1933/34 and lasted for about four years. The main reason why this didn't become very obvious was Thomas Mann's feeling that German culture had followed him ("Wo

ich bin, ist die deutsche Kultur"). Critical situations like these occur very often in literary exile—but normally, they affect only one's personal life. Thomas Mann's identity crisis arose out of the question, to what extent he would be able to maintain his cultural background and his "German-ness." This problem was much more important than the circumstances of his personal situation, and for this reason his diaries are rather meaningless. More productive are his literary works, and not only do they prove that Thomas Mann was unable to profit from experiences outside his literary sphere, but also that his reactions to the fate of being a homeless emigrant were mainly literary. If we wanted to criticize Thomas Mann we could say: he had experiences only in writing about these experiences in a very sophisticated and well-wrought, highly elegant and artistic manner. And all his efforts to maintain his cultural tradition in spite of all difficulties amounted mainly to a literary task, just as all his feelings about his identity were to be seen within an established literary tradition. That is to say: all his holding on to his special form of existence, his clinging to Germany and his "German-ness" was rooted in literature and not in his bourgeois behavior and life-style itself. All this begins very early, and we have some remarks even in those years when he began his campaign against Fascism. We are not quite sure whether or not in his lecture on Lessing in 1929 there are the first visible traces of his origins in a literary and not in a bourgeois tradition. But some sentences lead in this direction. Thomas Mann mentions the paternal archetype which was established by Lessing, and shortly after this there is another remark on the patriarchal era ("Patriarchenzeit").¹⁰ He tends to go back to the roots and his origins, not in a general sense, but more specifically, to the roots of his own literary attempts to reassure himself, to adapt the literary tradition as his personal literary heritage. These traces are still more visible in his "German Lecture" ("Deutsche Ansprache. Ein Appell an die Vernunft," 1930).

IV

Thomas Mann felt convinced that he had to defend his own tradition and, within it, his own identity. The most obvious traces of

this acceptance of his own heritage occur in the lecture on Goethe as representative of the bourgeois age ("Goethe als Repräsentant des bürgerlichen Zeitalters," 1932). It is the most striking self-portrait that Thomas Mann ever painted. There is no closer coincidence of thoughts and manners than when Thomas Mann described the well-known atmosphere of familiarity of Goethe's surroundings:

I went for the first time through Goethe's family house, in the Hirschgraben in Frankfurt. These stairs, these rooms, were familiar to me of yore: their style, their atmosphere. Here were the origins, the 'sources,' just as they are in the books—and in the book of my own life. And at the same I was a timid and tardy guest on this native heath of genius. Home and fame here meet. The bourgeois and the patrician have become the resort of the Muses, where the foot falls with reverence, as the cradle of the hero; here reign dignity and respectability. . . . I looked at it; I breathed it in."¹¹

There is no other attempt to keep Germany as for its own sake, and there is no other essay that mobilizes the good Germany more clearly against Fascism. We all know that the title of this essay is misleading in a certain way, for Goethe was anything but a representative of the bourgeois world, and the bourgeois world of which Mann speaks arose in the 19th century, not in the 18th. In fact, the opposite of Mann's representation appears to have obtained, so far as we can judge from a historical point of view. But Mann's somewhat faulty interpretation of the bourgeois age is quite telling in what it reveals about his identification with Germany. He stresses his interest in Goethe's bourgeois attitude and conviction—and thus underscores the fact, evident to all, that the present-day Germany was a dangerous country cut off from all its bourgeois traditions. From this point of view, his statement, "where I am is German culture," is again understandable: German culture was present where Thomas Mann wrote about Goethe. There are some other representatives of German culture and Thomas Mann has dealt with all of them: Schopenhauer, Wagner, Platen, Storm, Fontane and Kleist: a whole chain of writers representing bourgeois Germany, and they all are assembled in "Adel des Geistes," 16 essays on humanity, i.e. on that phenomenon that Mann wants to defend against the rise of totalitarianism.

V

Mann tries to defend “German-ness” in this area, too, and there is no question that there are strong connections between these essays and his remarks on Germany in his private letters; they all aim in the same direction: to strengthen that which he had left behind in Germany. It is quite characteristic of his efforts that he asked a professor of German, Fritz Strich, to explain the meaning of the words “Klassik” and “Klassiker.”¹² He wondered whether German classicism had been a strictly defined literary school or group, whether there had been a classic *confessio* or something like it. We find this strange, because here Mann is dealing with himself and his own cultural background, and his longing for more historic information is nothing more than camouflage, as is so often the case with Thomas Mann. Apart from these questions, there are further remarks on the bourgeois age and heritage, attacks on the brutality of the new German government and remarks on the weakness of the bourgeois who was in a certain way impressed by the rituals of the new government. Mann tries to explain to himself why the bourgeois world does not realize the seriousness of the situation and why the many warnings are not effective, and he adds: “I really wish to complete the work of my life under the care of a society which appreciates not so much my convictions but my representative function and my being.”¹³ Because it is his point of view that is expressed here and because he wants to attack the preoccupations of the bourgeois world, even a novel like *The Beloved Returns* (*Lotte in Weimar*, 1939) is a direct continuation of his attempts to assure himself of his bourgeois heritage, as he had done since 1929 or at least since 1932. There is also a good reason why he wrote his essay on Schopenhauer at the same time, on this philosopher and his metaphysical experience which had impressed him in his youth more than anything else. This is a flashback of memory, too, and even when we assume that the starting point came from without, it is remarkable that Mann writes not the 20 pages he was allowed, but 60. The main reason is that he is able to defend again one of those topics that were familiar to him and to his bourgeois philosophy from the very beginning of his career. At that time, Thomas Mann had also written letters to various people acquainted with German culture about the necessity of keeping it alive. Thus he wrote, to quote just one statement, in a letter to Anna Jacobsen:

The shortsightedness and weak policy of the western countries has given to the Nazi regime an amount of power which enables the German government to do the utmost without any hesitation. This is a shame for Germany, and it will take a long time to get rid of this. But on the other hand, the German spirit has contributed admirably to the development of culture, and we all hope that this will continue when the Germans have expelled the present government. German music, German art and German literary culture are highly esteemed, and nothing is able to legitimize staying away from this culture and from the language in which it has manifested itself.¹⁴

I think this is a very vivid defense of the old Germany, and this letter seems to be a commentary on *The Beloved Returns*, and it seems to be a repeated approach to the sphere he had regarded as his own since 1932.

VI

Approximately in 1938 we observe a reversal of that state of mind which had prevailed up to now, or more precisely, we observe an alienation from what Mann had previously termed "German culture" or his *Heimat* (his "cultural home"). In 1938, there was a visible turning point which led to a re-evaluation of the norms which had been valid up to then. The first explicit traces of estrangement can be found in the little essay "Brother Hitler," where sentences like "Germany awaken!" and "it is awful but correct" clearly show that although Thomas Mann did not identify Hitler with the Germans as such, he nevertheless saw clearly that the Germans had identified themselves with Hitler and that Hitler had identified himself with Germany. This was reason enough for regarding the fatherland as an alien country. Thomas Mann turned away from Germany and the Germans at this time; it is not by accident that his path led him just at this period into the American exile. In "Brother Hitler" he states that our time has succeeded very well in discrediting so much: the myth of national socialism, vitalistic philosophy, the irrational, faith, youth, the revolution and whatever else. Along with nationalism, German-ness as well has been discredited, of course, and can no longer be of value for Thomas Mann. In addition, he not only saw Germany

handed over to Fascism but Europe, too, the victim of Fascist ideas; this may have been the last straw that caused Mann to turn away from Germany and to adopt a more positive attitude toward his place of exile as his actual home. During the same year he states in "This Peace":

I have not underestimated the psychological susceptibility of Europe to Fascist infiltration in political, moral and intellectual matters. What I did underestimate and not only I, was the speed with which this process would be completed. I underestimated the decisive influence of Fascism in the democratic countries which came to light in the Czech crisis in a devastating and highly infamous way. The German emigrés had a terrible experience in common with those who shared their pains and hopes within Germany. It was the painfully slow and often denied realization of the fact that we, the Germans of the emigration and inner emigration did not really have Europe standing with us, although we always identified ourselves with Europe and thought that we had it morally on our side; that this Europe was not interested in toppling the National Socialist dictatorship, although that would have been possible several times.¹⁵

Mann saw the growing influence of Fascism on the continent, and since he recognized that the Nazis had not only occupied merely a section of Europe militarily and intellectually, but that more or less everything had been occupied by them, he expanded his criticism of them into a criticism of Germans in general.

In a similar way, Thomas Mann tried to gain an inner distance. And even more visible traces can be found in *The Beloved Returns*. The novel is filled with important topical and political allusions. Chapter VII contains perhaps the most radical coming-to-terms with the Germans, and of course it isn't spoken from Goethe's perspective but from that of Thomas Mann when he has Goethe say: "We can march along with the Germans neither in victory nor in defeat,"¹⁶ or when he speaks of the sinister-looking Germans, the tactless German impudence. The reproaches against the Germans increase during the course of Goethe's soliloquy; one section most clearly refers to Hitler and Nazi Germany:

That they hate clarity is not right. That they do not know the charm of truth, lamentable indeed. That they so love cloudy

vaporing and berserk excesses, repulsive; wretched that they abandon themselves credulously to every fanatic scoundrel who speaks to their baser qualities, confirms them in their vices, teaches them that nationalism means barbarism and isolation. To themselves they seem great and glorious only when they have gambled away all that they had worth having. Then they look with jaundiced eyes on those whom foreigners love and respect, seeing in them the true Germany. No, I will not appease them. They do not like me—so be it; I don't like them either, we are even. What I have of Germany I will keep—and may the devil take them¹⁷

It is obvious that the term "fanatic scoundrel" refers to Hitler; it is equally obvious that Thomas Mann here identifies himself with Goethe when he remarks that the Germans don't like him, that he therefore doesn't like them either and that he has his "German-ness" for himself. His sentence "German culture is where I am" cannot literally be found here, but it is present indirectly between the lines, especially since he subsequently speaks about his "German-ness" (that is, Goethe's or, to be more precise, Thomas Mann's) which is at stake here. When later on there is so much laughter about the sentence of Confucius: "The great man is a public disaster,"¹⁸ the laughter is about Goethe, who at first seems to be speaking unconsciously about himself, whereas Thomas Mann is actually quoting himself. For, in his essay on "Brother Hitler," he deals not only with the wrong interpretation of the idea of nationalism; he adds: "Well, they [the National Socialists] brought us, too, the mess of the great man."¹⁹ Certainly Hitler is the public disaster, and as it was the Germans who had made him so powerful, there was no longer any identification on Mann's part between himself and Germany and the Germans. But the sentence about the great man as a public disaster is even more full of meaning. They had all laughed at this absurd statement:

(only Lotte fears that somebody might get up and shout:) The Chinese are right. Charlotte alone sat on the defensive stiffly upright, her forget-me-not eyes wide with alarm. She felt cold. She had actually lost color, and a painful twitching at the corners of her mouth was her only contribution to the general merriment. She seemed to see a spectral vision: a scene with

many roofs, towers with little bells, and in the street beneath a train of people, repulsively sly and senile, in pigtails and sugar-loaf hats and colored jackets; they hopped first on one foot and then on the other, then lifted a shrunken long-nailed finger and in chirping voices pronounced words that were, utterly, fatally, and direfully, the truth.²⁰

Of course the Chinese are right within the context of the novel and, even more in the context of other critical remarks of Thomas Mann's concerning contemporary Germany. It is a topic of conversation at Goethe's table that the Germans are so closely related to the Chinese, and even if it appears rather funny, in the final analysis it is correct. The crazy people hopping from one foot to the other: this marionette-like parody of marching troops is also directed against the Germans. And Lotte's vision is not an unrealistic element within a realistic description, but the only realistic thing; everything else is unrealistic. Here, too, the signals have been turned around. The familiar is alien; the alien has become familiar.

VII

This attitude of Thomas Mann's grows more intense during the following years; it reaches its climax in the radio broadcast "German Listeners" ("Deutsche Hörer," 1942) where he explains to the Germans: "Some day my work will return to you, that I know, even if I cannot do it myself."²¹ In Germany, however, he now only saw the alien, or, more precisely, the evil, the terrible and the eccentric. He also attempted in his radio broadcast to uncover the long roots of National Socialism. Thomas Mann saw in it only the manifestation of distorted ideas which had already existed in the good old Germany which, however, had been transmuted into mere evil. In other words: not only present-day Germany, but also that of the past appeared to him now as a monstrosity. Thomas Mann not only turned against his earlier ideas, but also against the earlier history of his homeland. This horror in the face of things German continues in *Doktor Faustus* (1947) where not only evil but the devil himself appears identical with evil Germany, and there is nothing in the novel which represents the good Germany, because the roots extend back even into Dürer's

time. The propagandistic judgment on Germany and the Germans is therefore followed by the novelistic, and from that viewpoint the chronicler Zeitblom appears in the easily recognizable mask of the chronicler Thomas Mann. But even more than from the point of view of the fictional action, basically nothing remains; everything ends in general collapse a few months before the actual collapse of Germany. Nowhere in the literature of German exile has the German as the estranged being been described more critically as the absolute opposite, as the incomprehensible and inexcusable. The radical coming-to-terms with the heritage, with the home of which there were no more memories, which had become much more foreign than any conceivable foreign country—we know all that, and it remains to be kept in mind that this novel should not be read in isolation. It represents the end in a line of re-evaluations of the concepts “Heimat” and “Fremde,” and it was this re-evaluation that made it possible for Mann to come to terms with his heritage during this period.

VIII

I would like to make some additional remarks. Thomas Mann saw Germany now as an alien thing that he could no longer understand. Conversely, he now tried to regard the foreign country as his own. We are well-informed about the extent to which Thomas Mann integrated his American existence into the Joseph novels, and he once observed that the blue California sky had an important influence on his descriptions of the Egyptian sky. In exile, the originally quite unknown country became familiar to him. We know furthermore, for instance, that *Joseph in Egypt* (*Joseph in Ägypten*, 1936) was partly a portrait of Roosevelt, whose New Deal influenced the description of the economic administration in Egypt.

Some critics have described this as Thomas Mann’s technique of “montage,” and some others have mentioned that Mann had been dependent on his surroundings and on external influences since his youth and that this attitude had become even stronger in his old age. Thomas Mann indeed did not hesitate to make use of materials from the outside world. But I think that there is a better explanation. By the end of the Joseph novels, Mann’s efforts to adjust to the unknown and foreign country in which he lived had become visible, and nothing

could be more helpful to him than to incorporate the foreign country into that novel which supported the continuity of his life more than all others. It is an effort to integrate his new homeland, and it is part of his new self-image. In *The Beloved Returns*, Thomas Mann had made his decision against Germany; in the last novels on Joseph and his brothers he has integrated himself into his new surroundings and regards the country of his exile as his own. Perhaps we may be permitted to go even one step further: since we know that Joseph is partly a self-portrait of Thomas Mann, we may conclude that the foreign country has become nearly a part of Mann, and since all things are, to say the least, mixed up, since Joseph is partly Thomas Mann, partly a portrait of Roosevelt, we may venture to say that this mixture indicates that the foreign has in fact become his own: now the foreign country was his own not only in a geographical sense. There is no other way of coping with a foreign environment than to integrate it as Mann did into one's own work, and that means that we have to deal not with a technique of montage or with a lack of inspiration, but with an essential experience of his exile. We may consider this from another perspective as well: when Thomas Mann integrates his own experience of exile into his novels in such a way and when he makes use of his most personal narrative technique we may conclude that he has adjusted to his new home country even so far as narrative technique is concerned.

IX

Thomas Mann behaved in this way approximately until 1950, and he wrote in an essay on "The Time of my Life" ("Meine Zeit"): "Some people have said that I always am a patriot, first as a German, now as an American. That seems to be right."²² And he once mentioned: "As an American I am a citizen of the world."²³ On the other hand, we are aware that Thomas Mann went back, not to Germany, but to Europe and indeed to the most European country, that is, to Switzerland. But most probably he didn't consider this as a return from exile. On the other hand, the fact that his last novel is a novel dealing with traveling seems more than a mere change of topics. Thomas Mann deals here with questions of identity and split personalities without solving these problems. The hero, a

personification of the Greek god Hermes, is apparently at home in many countries but in fact in none of them, and certainly in none of them for a long period. Is it more than pure chance that he handles problems of nationality, of the belonging to a certain country, only at those moments when they enable him to assume a new costume or disguise? Krull is able to express himself in many languages, often more articulately than those who are native speakers. We readers do not exactly know who Krull is, and he himself is very reluctant to say anything about this. But we can be sure that the question of nationality, the problems of the familiar and the alien, the matter of belonging to one country or another are no longer questions: he doesn't care about this at all. For he is at home everywhere, there is nothing which is totally foreign to him—and at least this is a sort of epilogue to be added to the palpably threatening fact of exile. At the very end, neither Thomas Mann nor Felix Krull is very much interested in the differences between the alien, the foreign and the familiar, and so the problem has vanished, not without help from the philosophy of Arthur Schopenhauer, who knew the difference between the familiar and the unknown, too, but in a sense other than the one in which it had been a problem for Thomas Mann in exile. With Felix Krull his exile came to an absolute end.

NOTES

1. Thomas Mann, "Letter to Lavinia Mazzucchetti," 13 March 1933, in *Briefe 1889–1936* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1961), p. 328.
2. "Letter to Albert Einstein," 15 May 1933, in *Briefe*, pp. 331 ff.
3. see note 1.
4. "Letter to A.M. Frey," in *Briefe*, p. 334.
5. "Letter to Julius Meier-Graefe," 23 December 1933, in *Briefe*, p. 340.
6. "Letter to René Schickele," 2 April 1934, in *Briefe*, p. 356.
7. Quoted by Thomas Mann in "Letter to Gottfried Bermann-Fischer," 21 June 1934, in *Briefe*, p. 362.
8. "Letter to Karl Kerény," 4 August 1934, in *Briefe*, p. 369.
9. Thomas Mann, "Briefwechsel mit Bonn," *Altes und Neues* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1961), p. 573.
10. Thomas Mann, "Rede über Lessing," in *Adel des Geistes* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1959), p. 9.

11. "Rede über Lessing," in *Adel des Geistes*, p. 91.
12. "Letter to Fritz Strich," 4 January 1938, in *Briefe*, p. 42.
13. "Letter to Fritz Strich," 21 May 1938, in *Briefe 1937–1947* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1963), p. 46. Similar in a letter to Erich von Kahler, 19 October 1938, p. 58.
14. "Letter to Anna Jacobsen," 30 November 1938, in *Briefe 1938–1947*, p. 66.
15. "Dieser Friede," in *Altes und Neues*, pp. 596 ff.
16. Thomas Mann, *Lotte in Weimar* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1965), p. 260.
17. *Lotte in Weimar*, pp. 297 ff.
18. *Lotte in Weimar*, p. 374.
19. *Altes und Neues*, p. 593.
20. *Lotte in Weimar*, p. 374.
21. Thomas Mann, *Reden und Aufsätze II*. (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1965), p. 171.
22. *Reden und Aufsätze I*, p. 588.
23. *Reden und Aufsätze I*, p. 314.