Unabashed Patriotism; How Thomas Mann Came To Embrace the Weimar Republic

By
Scott Seidler

Senior Seminar: HST 499
Dr Ben Lowe
Western Oregon University
June 9, 2006

Readers:
Dr David Doellinger
Dr Laura Stahman

> We watch the transformation of a self-appointed defender of a Prussian discipline that he [Mann] saw incarnated in the German state which fought the First World War, an advocate of German *Kultur* whose spirituality and life-dedication seemed deeper and more valuable than rationalistic word-obsessed Western "civilization"...into a champion and supporter of a democratic republic.
>
> S.S. Prawer[1]

If there is a singular statement that might be established regarding the tumultuous events of the twentieth century it would be that the writings of Friedrich Nietzsche rested indirectly and often directly beneath the course of every event. The cult of nihilist thought that exposed the weak underpinnings of the new European society would in fact change the world and we therefore are descendant of both the decadent and the aesthetic. Truly, as the century turned its newborn face toward us, the triangular battle between Religion, Science and Art was reaching quickly for its finale. For truly, the intellectual debates, the cultural wars, the coming of an industrial age, forecast a brave new world, one both mechanical and organic, both Dionysian and Apollonian, and certainly one that would struggle mightily to find itself. Thomas Mann, being an ardent student of Arthur Schopenhauer, Richard Wagner and the aforementioned titan, Nietzsche, crafted in his literary tales, a world that was first built upon their concepts and then fleshed out with his own suppositions. According to the literature written about Mann, each character, each instance, each setting, is a single concept inside a greater landscape, which, when viewed as a whole, paints a striking portrait of European decline. This literary portrait gives Mann the opportunity to both criticize and evaluate his beloved German "*Kultur.*" While accepting the decline of European civilization, Mann is always quick to extol the beauty,

---

[1] Thomas Mann, *Diaries* (London: Robin Clark, 1984) Insert.

power and strength of "Germanism." This continued show of patriotism is not misguided nor is it stationary. Mann takes special care to explain his allegiance as one only to cultural and heritage. Let the Kaiser talk of God and country, let the technicians and scientists parade their cures and weapons and give the masses Wagner, grand opera and high drama; for Mann, this triangle defines his patriotism. He is not beholden to Germany as a state; he is cleft to her by *Geist*[2]. Mann's patriotism is especially important during the Weimar Republic because, as a leading intellectual in the Republic he understood the monumental changes facing Germany. If the Germany Mann loved, the superior culture and striking beauty were to survive, it must be willing to change and thus, seeing no other option, Mann put his weight behind Friedrich Ebert and the Republic. How then did Thomas Mann come to support Ebert and what does it tell us about his patriotism? Did he in fact turn his back on the earlier conservative values of his youth or is this simply a new form of conservatism? Mann's pre-war writings help us understand his progression during the war from imperial conservative to cultural conservative and eventually his support for the Weimar Republic.

Thomas Mann was born in Lübeck on June 6, 1875. He was the second child of Johann Heinrich Mann and Julia da Silva Bruhns. His father an influential senator in the city, and provided a secure family life through his trading business until his death in 1891. After the death of Johann, the Mann family moved to Munich where Thomas studied at the University of Munich and worked for an insurance firm. Formal education could not hold Mann's attention and he later wrote, "Whatever education I possess I acquired in a free and autodidactic manner. Official instruction failed to instill in me any

---

[2] Spirit

but the most rudimentary knowledge."[3] At this time Mann invested himself heavily into the writings of both Nietzsche and Schopenhauer. The former author with his nihilistic writing and his staunch idealism of man's will to power. Schopenhauer in turn espoused a post-Kantian philosophy, one that believed knowledge was based not solely upon reality, but upon what sensory perception can perceive.

Mann married Katia Pringsheim in 1905, who was the daughter of Alfred Pringsheim, the chair of mathematics at the University of Munich. Together they had six children, three boys and three girls. Mann's most famous works include; *Buddenbrooks* (1901), *Death in Venice* (1911), *Fredrick and the Grand Coalition* (1915), *Reflections of A Nonpolitical Man* (1919), *The Magic Mountain* (1924), *Joseph and his Brothers* (1933-43) and *Doctor Faustus* (1947).

Thomas Mann left Germany in 1936 due to the rise of Hitler and settled first in New Jersey at Princeton University. For five years Mann taught, spoke and wrote until 1941, when he moved to Santa Monica, California, where a "burgeoning community of German expatriate intelligentsia"[4] had laid roots and, eventually settled in Pacific Palisades. Over the next six years Mann aided the war effort, producing broadcast over the BBC that extolled the German people to rise up and resist Hitler's destructive war. Mann also wrote several essays and speeches most important of which is *War and the Future* (1940). While in America, Mann extolled the virtues of democracy and the inherent strength of the German culture. Due to the rise in anti-communist sentiment and the aggressive tenets of McCarthyism, Mann immigrated to Switzerland and made his

---

[3] Ibid.
[4] Little Blue Light- Thomas Mann (http://www.littlebluelight.com/lblphp/intro.php?ikey=17)

home just outside Zurich. Mann continued to write until his death on August 12th, 1955 at the age of 80.

The focus of this study shall be upon Mann's literary masterpiece *Death in Venice*, as well as selections from *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, and several essays. His dilemma as a Weimar intellectual, forced to choose between his conservative history and the newborn liberal present is what makes Mann's patriotism so striking. An ardent monarchist before World War I, a rational republican at war's end, Mann finally made a honest commitment to the republic in the early 1920's. Through Mann's texts, my goal is to illuminate the notions of "Germanism" that seem to inform his endorsement of the Weimar Republic and underscore his unwavering patriotism. Mann's support of Friedrich Ebert marks a very vocal turning point in Mann's civic persona. Whereas Mann had been content to publish and write, this was the first time he had come out and actually spoke in person about his support. The genteel nature with which Mann refers to Ebert belies camaraderie beyond merely politics. Like Ebert, Mann appears to disparage his former viewpoints of monarchy and conservatism as he shifts toward republicanism. For Mann to stand behind Ebert and declare that the Republic was not only viable, but necessary says much about the character of the President. Mann was certainly impressed that Ebert had been able to move to the center and still rule with some measure of effectiveness. If a man left of center before the war could politically migrate, could take all the abuse and still govern, what did that say about Mann? The fact that Mann has been right wing versus Ebert's left leaning SDP shows charisma and personality that Ebert brought to the office of President. Ebert led with courage and vision; these attributes were exactly what Mann was discussing in his *Reflections of a Nonpolitical*

Man. Mann's support of the President effectively validates all that Mann has wrestled with during the war. For Ebert, Mann's endorsement speaks volumes about the figure he has become. While Mann may not have moved legions of men to support the Republic at least he had affirmed the man who was the President. Whereas the politics may differ, for Mann the duty to the culture and the survival of an environment amicable to cultural growth outweighed all other concerns.

In *Order of the Day* Mann prefaces the text by writing

> When I spoke out in favour of the Weimar Republic, whose officials applauded my words amid the catcalls of the gallery, I did not do so for its own sake, for I knew its weaknesses, the inadequacy of its revolutionary momentum, and even its errors of principle. That which, quite against my nature and inclination, drove me into the arena was the feeling that it was my duty to pledge all the intellectual credit I had…to the struggle against the frightful, world-menacing thing which I saw growing and increasing, and of which the world was to learn— too late.[5]

The Weimar Republic was born out of the ashes of the Prussian Imperialistic dream in 1919. The Treaty of Versailles signed on the 28th of June, in that same year, effectively sentenced Germany for instigating and engaging in active and willful warfare against the West. Through 440 tedious, overwrought and harsh articles the Entente Powers brought a merciless gavel upon the German state, both spiritually and physically. The infamous Clause 231, known as the "War Guilt Clause", put all blame squarely upon the Second Reich and dealt a mortal blow to the social conscience of the German people as a whole.

However, rising from this calamity of economic, social and spiritual dimensions, the Weimar Republic strove to accomplish the unheard of; establish a parliamentary democracy in Germany. At the forefront of this new revolution and without whom, the

---

[5] Thomas Mann, *Order of the Day* (Freeport; Books For Libraries Press, 1969) ix-x.

notion of any democratic unity in Germany would be doomed, was the socialist turned Republican, Friedrich Ebert.

By the end of the war in 1918 Ebert was the Party Leader of the SDP (Social Democratic Party) and was now entering into negotiations with the Supreme Army Command on a path to parliamentarization as a means of "continuance." Ebert firmly believed, above all things that 'continuance' was vital to the survival of the German people, that the very effect of a Germany hinged upon some sort of governmental transition to save it from anarchy and thus total destruction. The attempted Revolution of November 9th put Ebert in a strange position of having to suppress the far left Communist revolt and still appease those of his leftist SDP. With the Kaiser unwilling to abdicate and thus preserve some structure of government intact it was left to Prince Max of Baden to hand the reigns of the government to Ebert. Unfortunately for Ebert his close friend and confidant Phillip Scheidemann "...proclaimed the Republic on the 9th of November."[6] This statement ended all hope that Ebert had harbored for some form of Monarchical presence to give a stabilizing effect upon the populace in general.

Friedrich Ebert, President of the Weimar Republic, was now faced with the dilemma of protecting the German state and appeasing his left wing counterparts. Without an ability to create a truly republican army and with the forces of disarray close at his heels, Ebert was faced with an untenable situation: allow the military to deal with the communists and far left extremists or give the radicals a chance to destroy everything he had built by disbanding the military force. Ebert chose to have the military put down

---

[6] Willie Eichler, "Friedrich Ebert: The Exponent of the Upheaval" *Friedrich Ebert, 1871/1971* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1971), 47.

the brewing revolution and his former friends within these radical groups denounced him as a traitor regardless of his intentions.

Up unto his death in 1925, Ebert was both reviled and praised for his work in reconciling the Germans with each other. Eulogized by Gustav Streseman, the right wing Chancellor at the time of Ebert's death, his legacy was duly noted; "I have spoken before of the loss we have sustained in losing a man who might well have been the instrument of a great work of reconciliation in Germany. To me his loss seems the heaviest because such reconciliation is so sorely needed."[7] Ebert himself believed that the stability of the state was the most important issue at hand and the length to which he would alienate his former party members demonstrates his resolve. In 1919 shortly after putting down the attempted soviet revolution Ebert proclaimed, "Freedom and Justice are twin sisters. Freedom can only flourish when protected by strong governmental order. To protect this order and to recreate it where it was violated is of the highest importance to those who love freedom."[8] Mann came to understand this change as the war raged from 1914-1918. By the time he published his treatise *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, he had come to grips with the necessity of and order in which governmental participation grounded Justice and provided a true culture of Freedom.

Since the death of Ebert, eighty years past historians have grappled with the nature of the Weimar Republic and its subsequent downfall. Beginning with friends defending his intentions as well meaning and wholly spent on the unity of the German people, to historians who question his intelligence and loyalty to the Left, Ebert has become both a rallying point and a proverbial punching bag.

---

[7] Spartacus Educational, "Friedrich Ebert," http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/GERebert.htm.
[8] The History Learning Site, "Friedrich Ebert," http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/friedrich_ebert.htm.

Willi Eichler (1938), a friend and contemporary of Ebert wrote an essay entitled "Friedrich Ebert: The Exponent of the Upheaval."[9] Eichler details Ebert's life and rise in the SDP (Social Democratic Party) to his appointment as Secretariat of the Party Executive in 1905. As Eichler describes it, "Ebert believed that theory could be swept aside by just being ignored. This seems to have been one of his greatest errors of judgment, since theories had long since developed into solid philosophies."[10] This quote refers to Ebert's belief that the petty disputes of theory would be washed away within the party for the sake of the greater good. The peril of the country itself Ebert believed, would lead these inconveniences to be swept aside. This inability to understand the fundamental changes between theory and creed would cause a veritable shift in his perception among his own party and unfortunately, not for the better.

As Eichler points out, Ebert was willing to give up the deepest part of his Socialist nature, the very soul that had been his only solace over the long years of his youth. Friedrich Meinecke[11], an early critic of the new Weimar soon threw his support with Ebert and the government "...not out of initial love for the republic, but for common sense reasons and a love of my fatherland."[12] Meinecke attacked the continuance approach by labeling it "...evil Prussianism and militarism" as well as calling it "...the synthesis of intellect and power" that had been the stumbling block to a unified social consensus.[13] The revisionism seemed to permeate every bit of historical writing of the

---

[9] "Friedrich Ebert, 1871/1971" (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1971)
[10] Willie Eichler, "Friedrich Ebert: The Exponent of the Upheaval" *Friedrich Ebert, 1871/1971* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1971), 32.
[11] Gallery of Historians at the Institute of History, "Friedrich Meinecke" http://www.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/ifg/galerie/texte/meinecee.htm
[12] Ibid.
[13] Wolfgang Wippermann, "The Post-War German Left and Fascism" *Journal of Comparative History* 11 (1976): 186.

era, tainting any real discussion, although discussing one's history as it happens is generally a fruitless endeavor beyond conversation.

In response to the general chaos now threatening to overtake the Republic Ebert struggled to press home the SDP's democratic reforms. This, Ebert believed was "...to be the central task of the hour: to preserve the unity of the Reich and to establish the German Republic on the fundamental will of the people. In this conviction, he belonged to the men of 1848..."[14] Eichler is explaining an important aspect of Ebert's character, in essence the desire for the greater good of Germany over whatever political or personal aspirations he might have.

Ebert's delicate position left him little choice in the matter and Eichler makes sure to remind us of the President's true position: "...democracy is the best and, at the same time, the most complicated system of social order. To be mastered, it requires constant, patient and resolute training. Ebert by his life, has taught us patience and constant preparedness for responsibility."[15]

As the war came to a disastrous end the "...wrecked system just loaded its responsibility for the liquidation onto others. All eyes now rested on the party chairman, "...Ebert felt that only the SDP could prevent the bankruptcy of Imperial Germany from becoming the ruin of the German state."[16] Waldemar Benson show's the desperation Ebert faced as a true believer in the necessity of the SDP to the survival of the German state. Above all other things we see once more that Ebert loves his country more than the politics and personal ambitions that it comprises. Perhaps the greatest illustration of this

---

[14] Ibid, 47-48.
[15] Willie Eichler, "Friedrich Ebert: The Exponent of the Upheaval" *Friedrich Ebert, 1871/1971* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1971), 63.
[16] Ibid., 78.

love is recorded by Benson in a conversation between Prince Baden and Ebert: Baden said, "'I commend the German Reich into your care.' Whereupon Ebert's unpretentious and moving reply was: 'I have lost two sons for this Reich.'"[17]

The very nature of the new republic assumed that a coalition could be formed and when this attempt failed, Ebert was hung out to dry. Betrayed by his fellow Social Democrats, attacked by the Elitist Junkers and crushed by the weight of quelling revolutions led by former friends, Ebert was unable to achieve a cohesive democracy that could last. The continued discussion both directly and indirectly will give historians ample ammunition with which to debate the reasons behind Ebert's decisions, hopefully however they do not lose sight of the man who indelibly touched those who saw his true love for his country.

> The news of his death has moved me profoundly. Here ends the fate of a man which has driven into the realm of the unbelievable, the fantastic, but did not succeed in distorting his personality into the eccentric—a fate that was borne and fulfilled with simple dignity and calm reason. My sympathy is without bounds.[18]

One could argue that the Weimar Republic, as an effective or at least, progressive and functioning government, begins and ends with Friedrich Ebert. He held her in the first hours of her birth and watched her early years, rough and adolescent as he attempted to guide her down a path to common good. Sadly, with Ebert's death in 1925, the heart of the Weimar Republic lost a beat which it would never recover from. The last years of the Republic were guided by the hero of Tannenburg, the man who had bested the

---

[17] Waldemar Benson, "Friedrich Ebert's Political Road from the Kaiserreich to the Republic" *Friedrich Ebert, 1871/1971* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1971), 79.
[18] *Friedrich Ebert, 1871/1971* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1971), 27.

Russians in August of 1914; Field Marshall Paul von Hindenburg. The hope that Ebert had so desperately tried to infuse into his countrymen died with his death and the decline into authoritarianism began.

The Weimar period saw a great revitalization of German culture, from Expressionistic art that harkened to pre-war Romantic idealism, a thriving Jazz scene in Berlin, to the architectural innovations of the Bauhaus school. The literary culture exploded with Bertolt Brecht's *Three-Penny Opera* (1928), Mann's own *Magic Mountain* (1924) and tragic *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1925) by Erich Maria Remarque. Exceptional research in Marxist and Freudian theory was done at the University of Frankfurt am Main and Göttigen University was renowned as the leader in Physics. For Mann, the loyalty and patriotism lay with the German Culture first and foremost. He was overjoyed by the burgeoning society that seemed to rise from the ashes of the past decade, yet still cautious about its freewheeling nature. Mann writes in his diary on October 17, 1920, "...I became quite fervid, and spoke of the unification of Europe by means of the German spirit, and of cosmopolitan as being the genius, essence and destiny of the German national character."[19] This statement embodies the rugged patriotism that knew only commitment to that which was German. Hope springs eternal it has been said and the Weimar period, though perhaps not fully to Mann's satisfaction, at the very least afforded a step in the right direction both culturally and politically. Yet before there was Thomas Mann the republican, there was Thomas Mann the conservative. The terms are not mutually exclusive and in fact, as the Weimar Republic rose Mann came to embody the essence of both terms; a conservative republican.

---

[19] Thomas Mann, *Diaries* (London: Robin Clark, 1984), 102-103.

The beginning of the "The Great War' in 1914 and the years that followed gave Mann ample opportunity to reevaluate his views on the need for strong monarchial leadership and the intellectual and moral superiority of Germany. In 1919, at the war's end Mann published his thoughts on the preceding five years of fire and smoke. *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* was met with widespread disdain and confusion, seen as a hypocritical soliloquy. The frustration with Mann that spread over the ensuing years led the author to forcibly assert his motives in later speeches. After a period of quiet, in which Mann defended his thoughts in various lectures and speeches, most importantly *The German Republic* (1923).

When dealing with Mann as a social critic historians like to say that he arrived as the historian of Weimar's "...problems more by accident than by design."[20] Mann's ability to understand the evolution of the German political system is what gave him the ability to rally to the Republics side. Sidney Bolkosky writes about Mann's foresight; "...any consideration of German society after World War I was forced to deal with politics; the economy, the social structure, the educational institutions, as well as ideologies were all directly traceable to the political experience."[21] This progression seems natural considering the soul searching that Mann did from 1911 till his bold and hungering "German Republic" speech in 1923. Bolkosky asserts that Mann was essentially forced into the role, yet that it was a necessary arrangement.

To understand Thomas Mann's literary output, we must first understand the cornerstone on which he stood. The dualism propagated by Friedrich Nietzsche deserves further discussion as it pertains to Mann. In *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche sets out to

---

[20] Sidney Bolkosky. "Thomas Mann's "Disorder and Early Sorrow'; The Writer as Social Critic." *Contemporary Literature* 22, no. 2 (1981): 220.
[21] Ibid, 222.

understand the origin of art in the imposition of form and measure upon the primitive emotions, as found in its Hellenic emergence. Through his own admission, Nietzsche states "I find it an impossible book: I consider it badly written, ponderous, embarrassing, image-mad and image confused..."[22] Yet the power of his argument, the sweepingly romantic metaphors and the conviction of his assessment spoke volumes to the open ear.

The synthesis that emerges over 24 Sections and 145 pages is one built both on the emotional, passionate and musical Dionysian effect and that of the aesthetic, the formal and the measured Apollinian figure. In the first sentence of *Tragedy* he states, "...the continuous development of art is bound up with the Apollinian and the Dionysian duality—just as procreation depends on the duality of the sexes..."[23] It is an argument for delineation within unity that is the crux of his statement. He continues, "...let us first conceive of them as the separate art worlds of *dreams* and *intoxications*."[24] The Apollinian is of course the dream, the framework; the structure in which the Dionysian passion, hunger and reverie is able to be centered.

Here Nietzsche differentiates the two contrasting but interdependent gods. First, Apollo is to be conceived as one who is made of "...measured restraint, [that] freedom from the wilder emotions, [that] calm of the sculptor god."[25] Secondly, Dionysus is found "...with the potent coming of spring that penetrates all nature with joy, these [Dionysian] emotions awake, and as they grow in intensity everything subjective vanishes into complete self-forgetfulness."[26] They are, in Nietzsche's assessment,

---

[22] Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Birth Of Tragedy and The Case of Wagner*. (New York; Vintage Books, 1967) 19.
[23] Ibid, 33
[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid, 35
[26] Ibid, 36

essential for the construction of an art that could expose the entirety of the human condition (which is the sum of one's experiences in life). In truth, these two forces validate each other and through this affirmation they are both made concrete, that is, set in the artistic lineage. Dionysian reality is validated in Apollinian beauty while Apollinian beauty is built on Dionysian reality. The art that emerged then reconciled the dueling forces into one form, that being tragedy.

This Apollinian and Dionysian duality is demonstrated in the writings of Thomas Mann. *Death in Venice* is Mann's exploration, his simultaneous celebration and declaration that the Reconciliation is coming. The battle formerly described as a threefold endeavor; Religion versus Science versus Art only becomes more apparent when we examine the clues. *Death in Venice* therefore is a tale of reconciliation, and that reconciliation begets the tragedy. As we follow the character of Gustav Aschenbach, who one could argue is the representation of Mann himself; we find the clear duality, the clash of Dionysus and Apollo; and then, Achenbach's response to this inner struggle, this *Gewissenskonflikt.*[27]

Death in Venice is centers itself around the development of the protagonist Gustav Aschenbach and the journey to his life's end in Venice. Aschenbach meets four characters on his journey who carry deeper symbolism and spur him on his path of self-destruction. In Venice Aschenbach fall in love with the young Polish boy named Tazdio, in whom Aschenbach sees the ultimate unity of form and beauty. The more Aschenbach pursues the boy, the less he can see the path he is on. While in chase of the young man, an epidemic (cholera) breaks out across the city and eventually infects Aschenbach. After much inner turmoil Aschenbach dies on the beach while watching Tazdio play in

[27] Inner conflict

the ocean, completing the true tragedy, that is, Aschenbach's true beauty, the unity of both the Apollinian and Dionysian.

From the beginning the protagonist is heralded as a great force in German culture, one who has achieved much in his career, but one who has also given up much to gain such accolade. Aschenbach is the epitome of the master, one who has read and conquered and *mastered* his writing.

> Thus, from his youth onward already obligated on all sides to achieve — and to achieve the extraordinary — he had never known idleness, never known the carefree recklessness of the young…When at the age of thirty-five he fell ill in Vienna, a shrewd observer said of him at a social gathering: "You see, for years now Aschenbach has only lived like this"— and the speaker closed the fingers of his left hand into a tight fist — "never like this"— and he let his open hand dangle at ease from the armrest of the chair.[28]

Here we are exposed to the strict Apollinian form that Aschenbach has followed the entirety of his adult life. The Master was able to master his craft at the expense of forgoing his intoxication. Rather than give himself to the musical and the drunken states of the Dionysian effect, Aschenbach "…had learned to appear benevolent and significant."[29] Mann continues on, setting the contrast between who Aschenbach is at this stage of his life and who he will become by stories end.

> Gustav Aschenbach was the poet of all those who labor on the brink of exhaustion, of the overburdened, of those already worn out, of those still holding their heads up, of all those moralist of achievement who, puny of body and short of means, acquire the effects of greatness at least for a time through an exaltation of the will and wise stewardship of these resources. They are many and they are the heroes of the age. And they all recognized themselves in his work, they found themselves affirmed, exalted and extolled there, they were grateful to him, they proclaimed his name.[30]

---

[28] Thomas Mann, *Death in Venice* (New York; Dover Publications Inc., 1995) 6.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Ibid, 8

As Aschenbach progresses toward Venice and his eventual death, we observe the changes in his emotional and psychological state. Along the way he encounters four uncanny characters who play guides to his journey. His first guide is a red-haired, pale man in Munich awakes Dionysian hunger and is merely the first glimmer of light in Aschenbach's spiritual awakening. Viewed as a jolt to Aschenbach's secure and formed world, again the essence of Apollo, this encounter spurs him to escape, to search after the quiet voice now whispering in his soul. "It was an urge to travel, nothing more; but it presented itself in the form of a real seizure, intensified to the point of passionateness; in fact, it was like a delusion of the senses."[31] Here the spirit awakes and Aschenbach is like a man in the first stages of intoxication, his body unsure of itself, yet ready to move; shaking but hungry with the possibility of a possibility.

On a small island in the Adriatic Sea, Aschenbach finds himself suddenly facing a new frustration. Whereas he once may have found comfort in the respectable guests, those who he perhaps would have previously associated with and enjoyed their company, Aschenbach now finds a "...lack of restful intimate rapport..."[32] This seemingly innocuous statement underlies however the fundamental shift that has taken place in Aschenbach. Rather than enjoying the company of these unnamed travelers, he is annoyed by these "self-contained Austrian guests."[33] The question that must be asked then is why? If Aschenbach is the master, educated in the forms of etiquette, pleasurable company and studied in "decisiveness and pithiness,"[34] why would he suddenly be put off

---

[31] Ibid, 3
[32] Ibid, 11
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid, 6

by that very offering? It must be his newfound need for something more than form. In frustration he soldiers on and finds himself bound for Venice.

During the voyage into Venice we are introduced to a second unnerving character who Aschenbach finds severely discomforting. Among a group of young me, there roves a "spruced up old man"[35] who could not hold his liquor. He rolls and tips, blabbers and obscenely moves his tongue across the edges of his mouth. Aschenbach is more than just appalled as he describes the feeling this intoxicated and feverous man produces in him;

> Aschenbach gave him black looks, and once again a feeling of giddiness came over him, as if the world were showing a slight but uncontrollable inclination to deform itself into the odd and grotesque: a feeling, however, that the circumstances kept him from indulging in…[36]

Again Mann confronts the reader with Aschenbach's indecision, his inability to divorce himself from the Apollonian and "indulge" in the Dionysian, which very clearly, the old dandy is doing. The reader now understands how drastically Aschenbach has changed in such a short time, where he once would have cast off such feelings with haste, Aschenbach now lingers, conflicted over a previously straightforward situation.

Upon entering Venice Mann sends Aschenbach on a strange and disconcerting gondola ride to his hotel. His ease at arrival changes as Aschenbach realizes the boatman is taking him not to the "vaporette" at San Marcos. The gondolier ominously states "You are riding to the Lido." Now Aschenbach feels more than apprehensive and continues his query to which the same answer is applied; when reminded by the gondolier that the vaporette doesn't take luggage, he says, "That's my business. Maybe I want to store my

---

[35] Ibid, 15
[36] Ibid.

luggage. Please turn back."[37] However, Aschenbach allows the gondolier to continue the journey. Though more than put off by the strange turn of events, once again we find Aschenbach settling into a strange sense of calm and enjoyment, "Had he not wished for a ride to last a long time – forever? It was wisest to let things take their course and, most of all, it was extremely pleasant."[38] Again the Master seems to give in, semi-subconsciously at first, but now with a sense of abandon, to the Dionysian voice that beckons him further onward.

In the hotel in Venice Aschenbach is brought face to face with the young boy, Tazdio. This encounter shakes Aschenbach to the core, attacking his already weak mind, setting a narration shift where Mann thoroughly confuses Gustav thoughts and the Narrators. This unsettling perspective gives rise to obsessive self-observation by Aschenbach as he struggles to understand the feelings he now has to this boy he has only seen, let alone even spoken with. Upon entering the hotel Aschenbach immediately "...observed that the boy was perfectly beautiful."[39] In the introspective view Aschenbach continues to describe the boy's attributes and debates within himself over that true color of the boy's skin. This scene conveys the sense of purity that Aschenbach feels when he looks at the boy, what he feels is imbrued within the child's very soul.

Before examining the fourth entity that Aschenbach meets during *Death in Venice*, a brief aside must be taken. In 1900 Sigmund Freud published his earth-shattering book *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Effectually, Freud turned the entire world upside down, claiming that man was merely driven by the subconscious desire; the libido. Through the unconscious, or the Id, Freud postulated that the libido was the inherent

---

[37] Ibid, 17.
[38] Ibid.
[39] Ibid, 20.

force that drove the inner conflict man has with civilization. Both anti-conformity and anti-control, this libido was essentially the expression of the more carnal, the more base nature of man. Suppression over time naturally creates a pressure build up and, therefore the greater possibility of that pressure escaping. The true turning points that exist within *Death in Venice* are Aschenbach's four encounters with the strange men. The conjecture that can be posited from these encounters, if the underlying story is about Aschenbach's Dionysian awakening, is that these men are the manifestations of Gustav's libido. The unconscious then divined these as his Dionysian guides, who led of course then to the reconciliation; the tragedy; the death of Aschenbach.

The first three meetings all encourage Aschenbach's decent into the Dionysian underworld that he has so long suppressed. It is an apt comparison to that of the aforementioned gondolier and that of Charon, the Ferryman who plies the River Styx of Dante's *Divine Comedy*. How appropriate is Aschenbach's journey then, riding in the gondola and ruminating over the nature of his transportation; "...that is a black coffin...it recalls death itself, the bier and the dismal funeral and the final taciturn passage."[40]

When Aschenbach meets the fourth incarnation of his subconscious it is seen in a different light. This new encounter is even more unsettling than the first three combined. Aschenbach, having progressed further in his Dionysian quest and pursued Tzadio, the young Polish boy, throughout the cholera plagued city, is completely on the edge, both physically and mentally. Here, in the humid and suffocating Venice night a Russian troupe, appears and begins to serenade the seated guests at Aschenbach's lodging, the Hotel des Bains. The small group of two men and two women sing to the increasing adoration of the assembled crowd. Aschenbach at first enjoys the entertainment as he

[40] Ibid, 16.

"...eagerly drank in the tootling sounds and the vulgar, languishing melodies, because passion deadens one's taste..."[41] Passion? Aschenbach? Is this the final succumbing to the ecstasy of the Dionysian god, the fall of the Apollinian construct that he has known his entire life and that which has propelled him to the renowned status as Master? Yet the story goes on and a second red-haired man, who is the lead singer of the troupe, described as the "buffoon"[42] interrupts Aschenbach as he gazes longingly at the young Tzadio and attempts to catch the boy watching him as well.

As the fourth man begins to steal the stage and his appearance is decadently defined; "...half pimp, half entertainer, brutal and reckless, dangerous and amusing...His pale snub-nosed face...was wrinkled as if from grimacing and vice..."[43] At the conclusion of his song he moves among the crowd soliciting donations and finally reaches Aschenbach. He proceeds to describe the conditions in the city, the creeping plague, the measures in place to stop it and the cover-up hastily arranged by the police. In his desire to chase after the boy, in whom he sees the ultimate culmination of form and art, the incarnate power of beauty, Aschenbach has already caught the plague.

The singer continues however after this devilish exposition to become even more caustic in his tone and song. He begins to laugh as he sings in the most heinous way, grating and coarse, as if his throat were caught in the throes of a fiery demise, the ashes tumbling against the hot coals of his malice. "...all of his impudence had returned, and his artificial laughter, brazenly directed upward at the terrace, was once of mockery."[44] Aschenbach, more than uncomfortable now, having been exposed to the utter

---

[41] Ibid, 48.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid, 49.
[44] Ibid.

lasciviousness of the Dionysian excess as acted out in the singer and within his own lust for Tzadio, begins to lose himself.

Tzadio is in fact the ultimate work of art, the true expression of beauty in form. Aschenbach's pursuit of Tzadio takes him throughout the plagued city of Venice and even to a barber's shop where he has himself made up not unlike that of the dandy upon the ship into Venice. After a long day of pursuit Aschenbach is sick and losing his Apollinian grip. He collapses at a well in the inner-city of Venice in the hot of the day and strikes up a conversation with himself in which he speaks to Phaedrus, the young pupil of Socrates. Aschenbach, as if playing the role of Socrates instructs Phaedrus on the merit of beauty, its form and the enjoyment thereof. "But form and naïveté, Phaedrus, lead to intoxication and desire, they may even lead a noble man to horrifying crimes of the passions, which by his own beautiful severity rejects as being detestable; they lead to the abyss, they, too, lead to the abyss."[45] What Mann has given the reader here is the last step, the edge if you will of Aschenbach's ability to suppress his libido.

In the pages that follow Aschenbach finally descends into his dream-like intoxication and like his ride into Venice with Charon, he rides right back out on the mornings tides. As he watches Tzadio that fateful morning he takes his last course of pursuit.

> His [Aschenbach] head, leaning on the back of the chair, had slowly followed the movements of the boy who was walking so far out there…But it seemed to him as if the pale, charming pyschagogue out there were smiling to him, beckoning to him; as if he were raising his hand from his hip and point outward, floating before him into a realm of promise and immensity. And, as he had done so often, he set out to follow him. Minutes went by before people hastened to the aid of the man

[45] Ibid, 60.

> who had slumped sideways in his chair. He was carried to his room. And, before the day was over, a respectfully shocked world received the news of his death.[46]

The true reconciliation ends finally, not in Aschenbach's favor; that is Aschenbach's desire for Tzadio's acceptance of his smile, but rather in Achenbach's death. For Nietzsche and Mann, the tragedy reconciled itself in Aschenbach, the Master, and the Apollinian master; as well as the Dionysian reveler, the woken spirit of intoxication and the wandering soul made whole. When Aschenbach becomes whole, only then can this reconciliation take place.

If *Death in Venice*, now laid out to a certain degree, can be described as an act of reconciliation, what does this say about Thomas Mann's patriotism? To be so bold, this story is not only an examination of the dueling forces within Germany, that is, the Prussian Junker system of control and logistics and that of Wagner's grand opera, high drama and Nietzsche's nihilism, but it is a sagacious view of the future. Mann could feel the shifting of cultures and peoples that rumbled in the gut of Europe during those first years of the twentieth century. The battle of Religion, Art, and Science is destined to compete upon a larger stage, that which would be seen in the First World War. Throughout *Death in Venice*, Mann praises the virtues of German *Kultur* and those quality attributes that made up Aschenbach. If Venice is Mann's allusion to the decline of Western culture, then when he describes her wound as due to "...the money-grabbing, business mentality of the fallen Queen..."[47] it is a direct representation to this new emerging society.

One cannot argue that Mann lacked patriotism; it is simply not possible. If *Death in Venice* is to be read as Mann's perspicacious view of the European future, then it must

---

[46] Ibid, 62.
[47] Ibid, 29.

be asked, what next, what rises from the ashes of Religion, Art, and Science? By 1919 Mann had found an answer; the fledgling democracy of the Weimar Republic.

At the publishing of *Reflection of a Nonpolitical Man*, Thomas Mann seemed to have emptied himself of all thought and suppressed fervor that the war had created within. Long and laborious, yet built on solid metaphors and Mann's unceasing love of Germanism, it details his struggles with protest, literate culture, the soul, justice, truth, the essence of humanity and of most important note, politics. Devoting over a hundred pages to the subject Mann thoroughly and some might say, unnecessarily so, discusses the arguments for and against democracy.

At the beginning of the chapter entitled "Politics" Mann strives to distinguish between those who would philosophize and those who would act. The difference is crucial to Mann's argument for if not directly representative government, at least for societal involvement in government. Quoting Tolstoy, Mann drives home this message;

> Human beings have created compartments for themselves in this eternally moving, shoreless, infinitely mixed-up chaos of good and evil, they have drawn imaginary lines in this sea, and they expect the sea to divide itself along these lines. As if there were not millions of other divisions of completely different points of view from and in other levels!...Civilization is good, barbarism is evil; freedom is good, restraint evil; This imaginary knowledge destroys the instinctive, blessed, original strivings for good in human nature. Who can define freedom, despotism, civilization and barbarism? What are the boundaries between these concepts? Who has in his soul such an infallible measuring stick for good and evil that he can measure all the fleeting and confused facts with it?[48]

Mann refutes this abstract and metaphysical way of thinking, this nearly defeatist attitude of non-participation. "Political freedom, in contrast to metaphysical freedom, means nothing other than the freedom of the patriot to take part in politics, his freedom to work

---

[48] Thomas Mann, *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* (New York; Fredrick Ungar Publishing Co, 1983) 163-164

on and in the state."[49] This statement, though not necessarily explicit at first, underlines Mann's position on participation. Freedom requires active engagement in the state, a natural investment in the common good and of course, Mann is eager to point out the German aspects of this involvement:

> It had to do with something more spiritual. It had to do with the German spirit's rediscovery of itself, with something like reanimation, a redirection to an earlier path...revitalization of philosophy, a seeking and finding of contact with the idealistic traditions of German through, an urgent self-searching in religion, new possibilities in mysticism itself.[50]

Mann assumes a firm tone, harkening back to the precedent of *Death in Venice* in which is he foresaw a coming upheaval. The pressures of a national state, ordered and secure, set against the "idealistic traditions of German thought" made this conflict inevitable. What arises however, is something entirely new and something entirely German. Mann himself admits to the success of democracy in different forms and that it is "scarcely struggling anymore."[51] Yet, as Mann advocates this change, this smelting of forms, he is certain to point out the differences between the intellectual being and the political being, "Only mass politics, democratic politics, that is, a politics that has little or nothing to do with the higher intellectual life of the nation, is possible today— this is the knowledge that government of the German *Reich* has acquired in the course of the war."[52] He continues on, arguing that in fact "a hundred forces are working on the disintegration of national culture and on the internationalization of life."[53]

The fears that Mann carries with him are of utmost importance. He understands that with democracy, a forced democracy at that, comes the forces of internationalization.

---

[49] Ibid, 169
[50] Ibid, 173
[51] Ibid, 174
[52] Ibid, 180
[53] Ibid.

There is nothing more that could scare him than the diluting of German *Kultur* through this muddying influence. He forcefully asserts that, "...intellectual life is *national* life..."[54] Yet he is willing to fight the intellectual upon a higher sphere and leave the politics to their own separate devices. Mann is not yet finished with the artist and the intellectual, for he writes "...the intellectual and the artist who...moved by it [national sympathy], [must] advocate a democratic form of government in Germany today."[55] One can be an artist, but one must have the state to "...set definite limits to human activity..."[56] and thus protect the interest of the artist and non-artist alike. Even more striking Mann declares that

> Every nonrhetorical person who loves truth and embraces a respectable pessimism will calmly recognize the irrevocable conflict between individual and society...He will declare it to be an unctuous betrayal of the people when positivistic enlightenment promises the realization of a harmony of individual and social interests by means of that impossible delineation of the "rights" of the individual in relation to the same "rights" of the others, that therefore promises "freedom", "individual prosperity," and "happiness."[57]

One must stop for a moment and reread this last statement. Is Mann advocating a sense of personal responsibility, that in fact the welfare state, the democratic state, should not be solely responsible for the share of the quoted rights? Is Mann then challenging those who find "Political opinions on the street: Pick one up and attach yourself to it...the fact that a person is a conservative says nothing about his rank and worth; any idiot can be a conservative."?[58] There is within these last two quotes a definite challenge to those who would prophesy and heckle without taking action.

---

[54] Ibid, 195
[55] Ibid, 196
[56] Ibid, 182
[57] Ibid, 185
[58] Ibid, 184

Mann continues to attack those who would so readily apply labels to others. In doing so he again affirms his love of that German *Geist*. He writes, "Being conservative does not mean wanting to preserve everything that exists…Being conservative means: wanting to keep Germany German— and this is not exactly democracy's will."[59] Here a clear understanding is drawn; Mann knows the changes, not necessarily the forms they will take, but rather their *modus operandi*. Again he states his need for German-ness in this new order; "If it is German, than in God's name I want to be called a German…"[60]

In a direct response to those who believed Germany incapable of crafting her own democracy, Mann writes "If Germans do not possess enough political ability to create their own original [modified political system]…what is freedom anyway?"[61] He pleads with his fellow Germans to not think the same tired ideas, the treaded pathways and deep ruts, for this process can add nothing to the situation. Instead he argues that "Evolution, development, originality, manifoldness, and richness of individuality have always been the basic law of German life."[62] The change therefore is inherently German; the thought presented is then the continual progression of *Kultur* and to then take heart in that strength of soul.

Mann is also quick to caution against the nostalgia that eventually did overtake Germany in the early thirties. He writes, "In the thought of leading Germany back to her previous nonpolitical, suprapolitical condition, there is a deep, emotional temptation for every intellectual German that we must neither misjudge or underestimate. What

---

[59] Ibid, 189
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid, 200.
[62] Ibid, 202.

advantages for the spirit the restitution of this old condition would entail!"[63] The duality of Apollo and Dionysus stands up again and demands to be considered. The emotional and the intellectual caught up in the roar of God and country and the false belief that yesterday was a better day than today or what tomorrow might offer. Mann is no more turning his back on the past than he is denouncing it. This statement is an acceptance of change although a strong desire, perhaps even a relentless hunger for this past glory of Kaiser's grand imperialism may exist, yet the unfeasible and unconscionable nature begets nothing. The only choice that remains is to press onward into the unknown future.

Mann in relating to his earlier writings understands the core aspects of what it means to be German. This strange mixture of examination, self-pity and depression underscores the birth of the German state as a national entity. Mann writes,

> The fact remains that German self-criticism is baser, more malicious, more radical and spiteful than that of any other nation, a cuttingly unjust kind of justice, an unbridled degrading without sympathy or love for one's own country, together with fervent, uncritical admiration of others...[64]

Nearing the end of his chapter "Politics" Mann leaves one last parting shot to the liberalist cries to separate politics entirely from any other function within the culture of the state; "Liberalism errs when it believes it can separate religion from politics: Without religion, politics— domestic, social politics, that is— is in the long run impossible."[65] Mann continues; expressing his belief that religion is socially compatible and not just essential, but right as well. "Happiness is a chimera," he says, "Never will the harmony of the individual interest come down to that of the community..."[66] The point here being that for liberalism, to separate the communal nature of the German political landscape is

---

[63] Ibid, 208.
[64] Ibid, 216
[65] Ibid, 237
[66] Ibid.

to shortchange not only the process, but the participants. A true republic, a truly German democratic system is all encompassing; religion, such an integral piece of the culture cannot be removed.

In 1923 Mann gave a speech entitled "The German Republic" in which, he faced down the criticism he had been subjected to over the previous five years. Since the publication of *Reflections*, Mann had been savaged by both the left and right, calling him both a hypocrite and a liar; they assaulted his character and his German-ness. In a biting and strong rebuttal Mann both declared his allegiance to the Weimar, and he responded directly to the propagated notion that his patriotism was somehow unfit because of his support of President Friedrich Ebert. This speech is fervent, filled with strong imagery and a sense of urgency that Mann seems to showcase so well in the character of Gustav Aschenbach. Here though, higher stakes are involved and the cost greater.

Mann begins with an impassioned plea for the youth of Germany to rise up, take hold of the opportunity offered them; for truly this was a first not only in their history but in the history of the world. When had a country made such a radical shift and when had a people be so unwilling to play a part? Asking the youth for this step forward and a refutation of the past decade's excess Mann stands up sharply for the superiority of the German *Kultur*; "Whatever Europe may say, we have never lost the sense of *humanitas* as idea and as feeling, as a moral and spiritual regulating principle."[67] While defending the humanist tenets that are in Mann's belief inherent in German-ness, he also acknowledges the lure that war has upon the populace as a unifying and uniting theme, "War is romantic. No one has ever denied the mystic and poetic element residing in it."[68]

---

[67] Thomas Mann, *Order of the Day* (Freeport; Books For Libraries Press, 1969) 7.
[68] Ibid, 8.

In response to shuffling of feet Mann states unequivocally "I am no pacifist, of either the unctuous or the ecstatic school. Pacifism is not my dish."[69] He follows up immediately with the crux of his argument, the core element into which he has placed the whole of his effort,

> My aim, which I express quite candidly, is to win you— as far as that is needed— to the side of the Republic; to the side of what is called democracy, and what I call humanity, because of a distaste which I share with you for the meretricious overtones of the other word. I would plead with you for it…For I could wish that the face of Germany, now so sadly drawn and distorted…which yet displays so many traits of that high trustworthiness which we connect with the German name.[70]

This is the combination of the intellectual and the political that Mann was so unresolved over in his *Reflections*. The wavering and at times, contradictory nature of his former introspection are cleared up here. This statement harkens back to his prior document where he stated that a return to the Imperialistic and wholly romantic past would provide an illusionary healing for the German soul. Responding to accusations of hypocrisy he states, "It was conservative, not in the service of the past and reaction, but in the service of the future."[71] Yet Mann, in all of his shame and frustration at a lost war, at the calamity that has been the past decade (1914-1924), he is still beholden to the Germanic spirit; that is, the "high trustworthiness."

In seeming frustration Mann presents the uneasy audience with the reality of the situation; "…the Republic, the democracy, constitute today such internal facts…to deny it is to tell a lie."[72] Mann continues, asserting that the Republic is the said destiny of the Germanic Spirit, both politically and culturally. The very essence of choice, the ability to

---

[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid, 11.
[71] Ibid, 23.
[72] Ibid, 13.

choose whether one sits beneath authoritarianism or responds to the suffrage afforded and makes the best of it; that, Mann believes it the now the crux of the matter, not whether the Republic is in existence. Yet Mann knows that to simply have the ability, to effectively own the choice is not enough, "Freedom, so called, is no joke, I do not say that. Its other name is responsibility; the word makes it only too clear that freedom is truly a heavy burden, most of all for the intellectual."[73] Making use of the former battle between the intellectual and political figure, Mann now reconciles the former position and states that for democracy to be viable, to exist and flourish, the weight is upon the intellectual man.

Throughout the speech Mann refers to the President as "Father Ebert" and conveys in loving and thoughtful tones the important position that he has played. He describes the attributes, in effect, laying a case for his support; "A fundamentally sympathetic man, possessing both dignity and modesty..."[74] The President for Mann is the undeniable figure of German triumph. "...it is possible" Mann states, "for democracy to be more German than imperial grand opera."[75] If Ebert is the incarnation of this new German man, this figure both reviled and disdained in many quarters of society, how could he or his position ever eclipse the spectacle of Wagner? This new Republic is becoming as Mann states "a union of State and culture!"[76]

Mann refers to the rugged individualism of the Germanic heritage, the superman who rises above the situation to triumph in the romantic sense. It is not incompatible with the new democratic system, it is essential to a strong foundation. "But it is a

---

[73] Ibid, 14.
[74] Ibid, 20.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Ibid, 21.

Germanic instinct to cherish the idea of a state-shaping individualism, the idea of association which recognizes humanity in each of its single members."[77]

As Mann draws to the conclusion of his speech he returns to the thrust of his argument; European decline and decadence. His patriotism is tied only to what will further, what will benefit and be toward the betterment of the Germanic peoples. The Weimar Republic for Mann is the next step in this journey. Without denying his conservative nature, which he has more than amply stated, Mann is able to embrace the nature of the Republic, both through its leadership and its very existence. Mann certainly recognizes the unprecedented changes that are taking place, especially within his beloved homeland. To place himself squarely behind a man with the vision and will to lead the unpopular Republic is to climb out onto a thin limb. What Thomas Mann did in attempting to venerate the Republic, is to win Germany another chance to claim her glory. All around him the world was roaring, the changes unstoppable, but here, here Germany had a chance to own her destiny. Surely she had been beaten and humiliated, but she was strong, her character undiminished; here was her second chance. "Humanity…." Mann says, "is truly the German mean, the Beautiful and the Human, of which our finest spirits have dreamed. We are honouring its explicit, legal form…when we yield our still stiff and unaccustomed tongues to utter the cry: 'Long live the Republic!'"[78]

The progression from monarchist to republican does not appear to be a general trend during the Weimar period. More often than not, the general populace was driven away from the Republic because of their own unwillingness to let go of the past. The

---

[77] Ibid, 29.
[78] Ibid, 45.

battle that Friedrich Ebert and others waged for the future of Germany could not overcome the lingering resentment over the war and the lack of previous parliamentary reforms. Mann's affirmation both lent credibility and moral support to the cause, however useless it would eventually prove to be.

Thomas Mann was a visionary, a man whose perspicacious ruminating allowed him to see events as they were in motion. His ability to act rather than react is seen in *Death in Venice*, as he portrays the coming upheaval that Europe and specifically Germany will face. Through his love of the German culture Mann was able to see that a new cataclysm was possible and thus he spoke out in favor of the Weimar idealism.

Throughout the entirety of Mann's life and his writings this unabashed patriotism stands out for its ability to adapt to the differing political and social climates without losing its base nature. Mann's patriotism is important because it provides a stark contrast to the nameless and often faceless armies of the Third Reich. Those who would categorize all patriotic Germans as Nazi's or imperialists fail to mention that there were others who stood against the indiscretions committed by their brothers. Thomas Mann's life and commitment to his "German-ness" provide a lesson and a warning to current generations who would confuse patriotism with national ambition.

And so perhaps we can all understand the hunger beneath those words that Mann so proudly and desperately uttered "Long live the Republic!"[79]

---

[79] Ibid.

Bibliography

Bolkosky, Sidney. "Thomas Mann's "Disorder and Early Sorrow'; The Writer as Social Critic." *Contemporary Literature* 22, no. 2 (1981): 218-233.

Corngold, Stanely. "Mann as a Reader of Nietzsche." *Boundary* 2, no. 9(1980):47-74.

"Friedrich Ebert, 1871/1971." (Bonn-Bad Godesberg; Inter Nationes, 1971)

Gallery of Historians at the Institute of History. "Friedrich Meinecke." http://www.geschichte.hu-berlin.de/galerie/texte/meinecee.htm

Herzfeld, Hans. "Germany After the Catastrophe." *Journal of Contemporary History* 2, no. 1 (1967)

Hollingdale, R.J. *Thomas Mann: A Critical Study* (Lewisberg; Bucknell University Press, 1971)

Mann, Thomas. *Death in Venice* (New York; Dover Publications Inc., 1969)

Mann, Thomas. *Diares* (London; Robin Clark, 1984)

Mann, Thomas. *Order of the Day* (Freeport; Books For Libraries Press, 1969)

Mann, Thomas. *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* (New York; Fredrick Ungar Publishing Co., 1982)

Needler, Martin. "The Theory of the Weimar Presidency." *The Review of Politics* 21, no. 4 (1959)

Pross, Harry. "On Thomas Mann's Political Career." *Journal of Contemporary History* 2, no. 2 (1967)

Reed, T.J. *Death in Venice: Making and Unmaking a Master.* (New York; Twayne Publishers, 1994)

Spartacus Educational, (16, May 2006), "Friedrich Ebert." http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/GERebert.htm

The History Learning Site, (9, May 2006), "Friedrich Ebert." http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/friedrich_ebert.htm