

Title	Between East and West : Thomas Mann's quest for a German community after World War I
Sub Title	
Author	速水, 淑子(Hayami, Yoshiko)
Publisher	Global Center of Excellence Center of Governance for Civil Society, Keio University
Publication year	2013
Jtitle	Journal of political science and sociology No.18 (2013. 3) ,p.137- 161
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	Mann after 1922 is often called a 'republican by reason' who reluctantly supported the Weimar Republic as an inevitable development, while he personally would have preferred the monarchy to have been preserved. In this paper, however, I will show that Mann made efforts for several years to restructure the whole complex of his ideal world in order to establish emotional foundations for the newly-born republic. Firstly, I will look at how the experience of the Russian and German revolutions defined Mann's attempt as a quest for an original German political culture, which would be distinct from those of France and Russia, focusing on his double image of Russia (Dostoevsky's and Tolstoy's). Then I will argue that in The Magic Mountain the main protagonist, Hans Castorp, finds his own intellectual position between west (Settembrini) and east (Dostoevsky's Russia represented by Chauchat and Tolstoy's Russia represented by Naphta). Lastly, I will argue that the position Hans Castorp gained enabled Mann both to become an advocate of the republic on emotional grounds and to invent a new relationship between the state and individual minds.
Notes	
Genre	Journal article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AA12117871-20130300-0137

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the Keio Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Between East and West: Thomas Mann's Quest for a German Community after World War I

Yoshiko Hayami

Abstract

Mann after 1922 is often called a 'republican by reason' who reluctantly supported the Weimar Republic as an inevitable development, while he personally would have preferred the monarchy to have been preserved. In this paper, however, I will show that Mann made efforts for several years to restructure the whole complex of his ideal world in order to establish emotional foundations for the newly-born republic. Firstly, I will look at how the experience of the Russian and German revolutions defined Mann's attempt as a quest for an original German political culture, which would be distinct from those of France and Russia, focusing on his double image of Russia (Dostoevsky's and Tolstoy's). Then I will argue that in *The Magic Mountain* the main protagonist, Hans Castorp, finds his own intellectual position between west (Settembrini) and east (Dostoevsky's Russia represented by Chauchat and Tolstoy's Russia represented by Naphta). Lastly, I will argue that the position Hans Castorp gained enabled Mann both to become an advocate of the republic on emotional grounds and to invent a new relationship between the state and individual minds.

I. Introduction

The aim of this article is to provide an analysis of the changing process in the thinking of Thomas Mann (1875-1955) after the First World War with particular focus on his views of Germany, Russia and France.¹

The current scholarship on Mann's political thought during this period is primarily preoccupied with two issues. The first concerns his purported conversion from a conservative monarchist to a democratic republican. Since Mann's speech 'On German Republic' ('Von deutscher Republik', 1922) the question of whether such a conversion actually oc-

curred was hotly debated.² However, after Mann's diaries became available to the public in 1975, scholarly interest shifted from the question of continuity versus conversion to the investigation into the specifics of Mann's changing thought processes. In line with the broader trend in current scholarship, in this paper, I will explore the changes in Mann's thinking process by drawing on his diaries and letters.

Secondly, after 1922, Mann is often viewed as a 'republican by reason' ('Vernunftrepublikaner'), that is, as one who reluctantly supported the Weimar Republic as an inevitable development, while he personally would have preferred the monarchy to have been preserved. The term 'Vernunftrepublikaner' was first employed by Friedrich Meinecke (1862-1954) in 1919,³ and was used to describe intellectuals, politicians and business men who accepted the republic because they did not have any other choice.⁴ It includes foremost Friedrich Meinecke, Gustav Stresemann (1878-1929), Ernst Troeltsch (1865-1923), Walter Rathenau (1867-1922) and Thomas Mann. This view of Mann as a republican by reason has also been offered in Thomas Mann studies.⁵

Thomas Mann's ideal world consisting of two polar opposite sets of concepts has been explored by scholars. Reason, enlightenment, life, health, democracy and liberalism were identified on the one side, and emotion, irrationality, romanticism, death, sickness, conservatism on the other. Mann attempted to achieve a synthesis of these two sets of concepts. The question whether Mann is to be regarded as a republican by reason is related to another question of how to evaluate his attempt of synthesis between polar opposite ways of thinking. It is sometimes argued that Mann's attempt of synthesis failed; he kept his sympathy for conservative, romantic and irrational ideas, which were influenced by Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) and Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), and his democratic attitude remained superficial.⁶ And the views which regard Mann as a republican by reason are often overlapped with the negative evaluation of Mann's attempt of synthesis. In Mann's ideal world, the spheres of emotion and reason remained split and his endorsement for the republic was only a matter of the sphere of 'reason' not of the 'emotion'.

In this paper, however, I will stress that after 1918 Mann abandoned his insistence on separation of individual minds from politics and became critical of dispassionate republicans. In my view, he rather attempted to establish emotional foundations for the newly-born republic, in other words, republican or democratic ethos. Mann's attempt to find emotional foundations for the republic was accompanied by his quest for a German community which should be found between east and west. Since his image of east and west were almost overlapped with above mentioned polar opposite sets of concepts, his quest for a German community and its ethos was at the same time a path to achieve a synthesis of the contrastive concepts in his ideal world. I will argue that in his novel *The Magic Mountain* Mann completed this double task of finding a philosophical, ethical and political position for Germany as a country between east and west and calling for emotional foundations for the republic.

Contrary to the above mentioned common understanding of the term 'republican by reason', Andreas Wirsching argues that 'Vernunftrepublikanismus' was not a merely

pragmatic attitude, but a political principle whose foundation was “eine kritisch-rationale, zivilgesellschaftlich basierte Vernunftethik, die weniger auf die Verwirklichung eines konkreten politisch- gesellschaftlichen Modells zielte als auf die Bildung freier, vernunftbegabter und damit kritischer und diskursfähiger Menschen.”⁷ In this paper I follow this line of argument as I believe that 1) Mann’s support for the republic was not a passive acceptance but accompanied with his own political thoughts and; that 2) Mann shared the above mentioned ideal image of humans. While sympathizing with Wirsching’s view, I would like to argue further that Mann emphasized the need for an emotional foundation of the republic, which he himself searched for, besides and beyond his ‘Vernunftrepublikanismus’.⁸

In the second section, I will look at the problem that faced Mann in the period from the publication of his *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* (*Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*, 1918) to the beginning of his continued writing of *The Magic Mountain* (*Der Zauberberg*, 1924) in 1920. The experiences of the Russian and German revolutions made Mann define the issue at hand as a quest for an original German political culture, which would be distinct from those of France and Russia. In this regard, I will place special emphasis on his double image of Russia.

In the third section, I will examine how this problem is tackled in *The Magic Mountain*. I will argue that the contrast between France (west) and Russia (east) is repeated in the figures of Chauchat, Settembrini and Naphta, and the main protagonist Hans Castorp’s intellectual position provides a model for the German community, which is located between west and east. It has been rightly pointed out that Hans Castorp tends to occupy the middle ground. Nevertheless, the concrete ideal position he achieved between them often remains unclear; or otherwise he is viewed as a person who oscillates between his educators, Settembrini and Naphta.⁹ Going a little further than such approaches, I will suggest that Hans Castorp concretely defines his own intellectual position vis-à-vis Settembrini and Naphta.

Lastly, in the fourth section, I will show that the intellectual position Hans Castorp attained is repeated in ‘On German Republic’ and enabled Mann to abandon his former insistence of separation of individual minds from politics and become an advocate of the republic not only on rational but also emotional grounds.

Before going into the main argument, I would like to explain the methodological standpoint of this article, especially concerning the analysis on *The Magic Mountain*. In the following argument, at first, I will try to reconstruct the task Mann imposed on himself during the writing of the novel by referring to his essays, diaries, lectures and letters. And then, by looking at the correspondence between his issue at hand -- finding an original form of German community between east and west -- and the novel, I will shed light on a certain aspect of the author’s intentions. Namely, I will interpret *The Magic Mountain* as Mann’s attempt to answer the task question imposed on him during his writing the novel. How could Germany find its own philosophical, ethical and political way between east and west?

What was the proper way to unite individual minds with a community? Which kind of ethos was to be excavated and promoted in Germany after the First World War? Since I adopt such a methodological standpoint, I will not be offering a comprehensive interpretation of the whole novel. For example, many important figures will not be mentioned. Moreover, the interpretations of Chauchat, Settembrini and Naphta, which I will deal with, are going to be limited by the angle of the article. In order to compensate for such a limitation of this article, in the footnotes I will mention earlier literature on each subjects unexamined here, as much as I can.

II. Germany between France and Russia: From *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* to the Return to Writing of *The Magic Mountain*

In 1918 Mann finished his *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, which he had been writing since 1915.¹⁰ In this huge polemical essay, Mann insisted on a sharp separation between the spiritual realm of the individual and matters of state power (XII 149, 269). He criticized ‘democracy’ for politicizing all human issues, especially spiritual concerns (XII 232ff., 303). Mann had been feeling an antipathy against Prussia’s disciplinarian mentality since his youth (I 721f.; X 199). Already in 1915 he suggested that the epoch of the monarchy was coming to an end and that democratization in Germany was inevitable.¹¹ In *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, however, in order to protect the spiritual realm from being drawn into politics, Mann expressed his support for the German Empire in which, according to his understanding, only professional politicians and bureaucrats dealt with politics, while the other segments of society did not have to worry about politics and could enjoy their spiritual liberty (XII 30).

After the defeat in the First World War and the subsequent downfall of the monarchy, Mann still believed that the spiritual sphere of the individual person should be strictly separated from politics. In expectation for the advent of the republic, Mann wrote in his diary as follows:

Mein Standpunkt ist der, daß der Welttriumph der demokratischen Civilisation auf politischem Gebiet eine Tatsache ist und daß folglich, wenn es sich um die Erhaltung des deutschen Geistes handeln soll, die Trennung des geistigen und nationalen Lebens vom politischen, die vollkommene Gleichgültigkeit des einen gegen das andere zu empfehlen ist. (1918.10.5)

A similar description appears one week later (1918.10.12). He argues here that both spheres should be strictly separated. Separating the two spheres, Mann himself would remain in the spiritual sphere as a nonpolitical man. As long as Mann adhered to the notion of a separation between the spiritual realm and politics, he could not completely support the republic.

For, according to him, the words ‘democracy’ or ‘republic’ always implied a union between politics and individual minds (XII 386). Thus, in the post-war days, the formation of the republic was an undesirable event for Mann. In order to fully approve the republic, Mann would have had to either abandon his insistence on the separation between politics and individual minds or to revise his understanding of ‘democracy’ or ‘republic’. After several years’ considerations, however, Mann totally abandoned his insistence on the separation, so that he became an advocate of the ‘democracy’ and ‘republic’. Let us see now, what made it possible for him to make such a drastic turn.

In the course of the domestic revolutions in Germany since 3 November 1918 Mann began to hope that the newly-born republic would be something positive (1918.11.12). At the same time he started to look for a philosophical foundation which would justify a new relationship between politics and spiritual spheres of individuals. In this context, an important factor existed in his attempt, which I would like to examine below, to define an original form of German politics which would lie in the middle between French and Russian politics.

The germs of this approach can already be discerned in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*. In the first chapter Mann introduced Dostoevsky’s argument on Germany (XII 42ff.).¹² According to Dostoevsky, the civilization of Europe was based on the Roman ideal of the universal integration of humankind. This ideal was connected to Christianity. After the split between Roman Catholic and Greek-Orthodox Christianity or between Western and Eastern Europe, this ideal was inherited by and further developed in Western Europe. In Dostoevsky’s view, what brought about the French Revolution in Western Europe was precisely this Roman ideal. In Germany, by contrast, there had always been protests against the universal integration. The history of this protest which could be traced back to Arminius and was further instantiated in the Reformation of Luther continued until Dostoevsky’s time.

Agreeing with Dostoevsky’s view Mann regarded the confrontation between the *entente* and Germany as a further manifestation of the conflict between Roman and Germanic values, or as a German protest against the imperialism of Roman civilization. This framework of analysis, however, in which Russia is classified with the non-Roman nations, could not account for the Franco-Russian Alliance. To evade this difficulty Mann had to offer an interpretation which would align Russia with the *entente* as “das Werkzeug des Westens,” which was spiritually “westlich liberalisiert” (XII 48).

The problem over the definition of what ‘Russian’ is became increasingly difficult with the outbreak of the Russian Revolution.¹³ After the bourgeois revolution under the leadership of Kerensky in February and March, Mann expressed his surprise in a private letter dated 25 March 1917: “eine bürgerliche Revolution in Rußland? Wie konnte das überhaupt geschehen? Es giebt ja keine Bourgeoisie!”¹⁴ Mann’s perplexity also emerges in his *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*. In the chapter ‘Politik’ written in June 1917 and ‘Einiges über Menschlichkeit’ written in July and August 1917, Mann decided to leave “Rußland als Staat, Gesellschaft, Politik” (XII 299) as it was and discuss only Russia “bis zum Jahre

1917, da es sich zur demokratischen Republik erhob” (XII 298). Russia here was still the one represented by Dostoevsky, the one with “eine Humanität mit religiösen Vorzeichen, die auf christlicher Weichheit und Demut, auf Leid und Mitleid beruht” (XII 438). On the contrary, in contemporary Russia, Dostoevsky was forgotten (XII 441). Mann argued as follows:

[N]iemand wird uns weismachen, daß die bevorstehende Erklärung Rußlands zur *république démocratique et sociale* mit russischer Nation irgend etwas Ernstliches zu schaffen habe. -- Nein! wenn Seelisches, Geistiges überhaupt als Grundlage und Rechtfertigung machtpolitischer Bündnisse dienen soll und kann, so gehören Rußland und Deutschland zusammen. (XII 441)

In this way Mann marginalized Russia after the revolution in order to emphasize the kinship of Russia and Germany. As is seen in the citation above, he had hoped for an alliance between them. This attitude was not going to change until the end of the last chapter ‘Ironie und Radikalismus’ written until the middle of December 1917 (XII 587). Mann tried to preserve his dichotomous constellation of three countries: ‘France’ versus ‘Germany and Russia’. He regarded the Russian Revolution as a non-Russian occurrence.

On the other hand, he started to discuss the difference between Russia and Germany by drawing a comparison between Tolstoy and Goethe in the second half of *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* written in the period from some months after the February Revolution to the establishment of the Soviet Union. In the chapter ‘Vom Glauben’ written in September and October 1917, Tolstoy’s anarchic tendency was emphasized and related to the rising Soviet Union (XII 519, 529, 532f.). While Dostoevsky represented ‘genuine Russia’, Tolstoy shared many ideas such as the ‘promotion of social welfare’ and ‘enlightenment’ with *Zivilisationsliterat* and therefore was categorized into the side of *entente* or the Roman ideal (XII 533). For Mann, however, it was impossible to regard a great Slavic author, Tolstoy, as a *zapadniki*. For that reason, Tolstoy was conceived as a representative of another Russia, which was distinct from Dostoevsky’s Russia (XII 533).

At the same time, through the comparison between Goethe and Tolstoy, Mann stressed an original German characteristic: the concept of *Bildung*. Here *Bildung* is defined as a process in which 1) every position and idea which is proclaimed as an absolute should be doubted and 2) a position or idea is chosen from various possibilities and will be cultivated, though its non-absoluteness and limitations are realized (XII 505f.). Such a concept of *Bildung* was, on the one hand, distinct from the *Zivilisationsliterat*’s belief which lacked self-doubt because it displayed awareness of the limitations of its position (XII 507ff.). On the other hand, it was also distinct from Tolstoy’s relativism, in which every position and idea was doubted and even rejected to admire absolute liberty: for in the process of *Bildung*, a position or an idea is chosen and cultivated (XII 502ff.).

An image of Germany as distinct from both west (France and Rome) and east (Russia), which was taking shape during the writing of *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, became more important with the experience of the German revolution after finishing the book. In Munich on 7 November 1918 the leader of *Unabhängige Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands* (USPD), Kurt Eisner (1867-1919), assumed the office of prime minister of Bavaria and declared the abolishment of the Wittelsbach dynasty. In Berlin on 9 November Philipp Scheidemann (1865-1939) proclaimed the German Republic. On the next day a provisional government consisting of USPD, *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands* (SPD) and *Deutsche Demokratische Partei* (DDP) was formed, and the leader of SPD, Friedrich Ebert (1871-1925), assumed its representation. Eisner, the prime minister of the Bavarian republic, did not abolish the private property system and adopted a system which combined a parliament with a soviet (*Räte*). In Berlin as well there were double authorities consisting of a parliament and a soviet. These conciliatory political systems must have appeared to Mann as attempts to combine western and Russian elements, a parliament and a soviet. Mann wrote in his diary: “Die deutsche Revolution ist eben die deutsche, wenn auch Revolution. Keine französische Wildheit, keine russisch-kommunistische Trunkenheit” (1918.11.10).

Furthermore, on 12 November, Mann made the following comment on the newly-born republic: “die soziale Republik ist etwas über die Bourgeois-Republik u. Plutokratie des Westens hinaus und hinweg Gehendes, zum ersten Male wird Frankreich Deutschland politisch nachzufolgen haben” (1918.11.12). Thus Mann viewed the birth of the republic as a great opportunity for Germany to get ahead of France in terms of politics. At the same time, Mann expressed his hope that the nascent republic was not going to be a ‘Russian’ one. In fact, he voiced his hatred for “d[ie] Anarchie, d[ie] Pöbelherrschaft, d[ie] Proletarierdiktatur nebst allen ihren Begleit- und Folgeerscheinungen à la russe” (1918.11.19). Between his hatred for the French-style bourgeois parliamentary system and his fear of a proletarian dictatorship, Mann considered that the issue in Germany was “zwischen Bolschewismus und westlicher Plutokratie »in politicis etwas Neues zu erfinden «” (1918.12.3).

Mann remained aware of the issue from the time of the suppression of the riot of *Spartakusbund* in January 1919 to the establishment of the Weimar Republic in February 1919 and also during the period of the soviet revolution in Bavaria from April to May 1919. He responded favorably to the *Räte* because he wanted to avoid a simple parliamentary system and wished for “ »etwas Neues in politicis [...] « und zwar etwas Deutsches” (1919.3.3, see also 1919.5.2). On the one hand, Mann expressed his hope for communism. He was deeply convinced that the idea of socialism or even communism contained a future, while the idea of western style democracy did not (1918.11.29, see also 1919.3.22, 1919.3.24, 1919.4.20). Yet on the other hand, his hatred of a proletarian dictatorship had not abated (1919.1.9, 1919.1.11, 1919.2.2, 1919.4.20). His hope for communism was motivated by his repugnance of the *entente* and only because it would amount to a ‘negation of what to

be negated', namely negation of the *entente* (1919.2.5, 1919.4.15).

His concern had much in common with his contemporary thinkers. As far as his call for a German socialism went, it was almost a self-evident object for every intellectual throughout the Weimar period, as Robert Curtius (1886-1956) pointed out in 1932.¹⁵ Furthermore, if we focus on the more particular argument that German-style politics should be found between western-style liberalism and Russian communism, similar arguments can be found in popular books of the time. For instance, Oswald Spengler's *Preußentum und Sozialismus* (1919),¹⁶ Hermann Keyserling's *Deutschlands wahre politische Mission* (1921)¹⁷ and Moeller van den Bruck's *Das dritte Reich* (1923)¹⁸ made the same point. The symbolic phrase itself which Mann repeated in his diary, »in politics etwas Neues zu erfinden « (1918.12.3; 1919.3.3), was a citation from *Europäische Zeitung*. This newspaper was founded by Heinrich Michalski and Heinrich von Gleichen (1882-1952), who also published the magazine of the *Ring-Kreis*, *Das Gewissen* (1919-1920) and *Der Ring* (1928-1933).¹⁹ I will not go into details regarding the influences of these intellectuals on Thomas Mann because scholars have already laboriously explored them.²⁰ Here, I will limit myself to mentioning that Mann's concern had much in common with his contemporary intellectuals.

To summarize, in the period of transition from the second half of 1918 to the first half of 1919 Mann observed in Russia, on the one hand, a dictatorial proletarian communism, whose foundation consisted in anarchism, and on the other hand in France, an individualistic parliamentary system, and expected the realization of something new and different from them in Germany. With this hope in his mind, Mann decided to go back to writing of *The Magic Mountain* (1919.4.17). In the next section I would like to examine how Mann dealt with his task by writing the novel.

In analyzing this novel, I will try to reconstruct the thinking of each figure in the novel as an intellectual stance. Such an approach to figures of a novel and a novel itself must be questioned both by Germanists and scholars of history of thoughts. In the case of Thomas Mann study, however, an exception could be made. As I discussed in another article, Mann considered story-telling significant because it represents universal and everlasting truths each time in a different way.²¹ Putting his view into practice, Mann used the same phrases frequently and expressed the same views repeatedly in his works. In his essays, lectures, diaries and letters, they appear as Mann's own or his opponent's views. And in his novels, they are formulated as views of a figure or a narrator of the novel. Such repetitions of certain patterns of ideas are a great help in understanding Mann's thoughts. Since Mann was primarily a novelist, he depicted various ideas much more vividly in his novels than in his essays and lectures.

As will be seen in the following argument, Mann formulated the contrast between west and east, which he had employed since *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, into the figures of Chauchat, Naphta and Settembrini. Furthermore, the narrator imposes the main protagonist, a young German, Hans Castorp, a task to find his own position. Given such corre-

spondences, in the last part of the following section, I will examine Hans Castorp's thinking, assuming that it offers a possible answer to Mann's attempt of finding an original German community distinct from Russia and France. Again, it must be noted that the following analysis is intended only to find an answer to the task which Mann had formulated before the writing of the novel and not to offer an overview of the whole novel.

III. Quest for a German Community in *The Magic Mountain*

1. West and East 1: Settembrini and Chauchat

The main protagonist of *The Magic Mountain* is a young German, Hans Castorp, who by the end of the novel had spent seven years in a sanatorium in Davos, high up in the Swiss Alps. While socializing with the international community of patients and doctors at the sanatorium, Hans Castorp reflected on life, death and humanity. In the novel, the contrast between west and east is expressed firstly in the characters of the Italian, Lodovico Settembrini and the Russian, Clavdia Chauchat. Settembrini is a humanist, a strong believer in the enlightenment and progress of humankind. In his eyes, reason and a critical spirit are man's supreme traits (III 92f.). Like his politically active grandfather, who had been a revolutionary and a member of the Carbonari, Settembrini has a political agenda: the establishment of a universal democratic republic based on the ideal of civilization (III 214ff.).

The contrast between Settembrini and Madame Chauchat is conspicuously clear in the case of their views of 'morality'. For Settembrini, morality consists of the effort to relieve humankind from all kinds of suffering. This is also the goal of the society he belongs to, the 'League for the Organization of Progress' which promotes social activities for the sake of the evolution of civilized humanity. Settembrini is working on an enormous project launched by the league: an encyclopaedia entitled *The Sociology of Suffering*. In this encyclopaedia, every suffering in the world is classified and ascribed to specific causes. The encyclopaedia also provides recommendations to get rid of the causes of every suffering (III 341ff.).

By contrast, a Russian, Madame Chauchat, takes a very different view of morality. According to Settembrini, when confronted with suffering, Russians tend to display patience and tolerance (III 340). Apparently confirming Settembrini, Madame Chauchat tells Hans Castorp that morality is not found in virtue but "dans le péché, en s'abandonnant au danger, à ce qui est nuisible, à ce qui nous consume" (III 473). This phrase is found almost verbatim in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* (XII 390, 399, 402). In Hans Castorp's eyes, the contrast between Italian and Russian attitudes seems comparable to the contrast between day and night and makes him recall his sentiments "als säße er im Kahn auf jenem holsteinischen See und blicke aus der glasigen Tageshelle des westlichen Ufers vexierten und geblendeten Auges hinüber in die nebeldurchspinnene Mondnacht der östlichen Himmel" (III 226).

While Settembrini is critical of Madame Chauchat, Hans Castorp madly falls in love with her. Castorp's passionate feelings for Chauchat are reminiscent of his love for his high school classmate, Hippe, whose facial features are described as being similar to Chauchat's. (III 174, 176) In addition, and more importantly, in both cases there is an 'irrational' aspect to Castorp's passionate love in that it can never contribute to human reproduction (III 182f.). In the case of Hippe it was directed towards a person of the same-sex while in the case of Chauchat towards a patient of tuberculosis (III 182f.).²² Even before his visit to the sanatorium, Hans Castorp had been prepared for such an irrational love, a love which we may term a love for the nocturnal world. In contrast to Settembrini's grandfather, who had devoted himself to the ideal of progress, Hans Castorp's grandfather had served the world of past and death. Not only because he was a conservative man (III 38), but also because of the impression that he gave to his grandson. In Hans Castorp's memory, his grandfather is related to the sound of 'Ur', of the crypt and buried time, which implies the connection of the present life to things now sunk deep beneath the earth (III 36). Additionally, in little Hans Castorp's eyes, his grandfather lived in the form of a temporary adapted improvisation and finally with death returned to his authentic form, something which Hans Castorp found in the portrait of his grandfather with a traditional costume which citizens had carried with them through the years (III 41ff., 216f.). In this way, his grandfather symbolizes a reverence for death and the structure of time: past returns repeatedly to present, entailing eternal recurrences. In particular, the idea that death and sickness make us noble is familiar to Hans Castorp. This 'sympathy for death' appears in the seventh chapter in which, significantly, Castorp's love for Franz Schubert's *Lindenbaum* is also mentioned (III 906ff.). Because of his affection for death and the nocturnal world, in other words, because of his attitude of opening mind to something dangerous and harmful, Hans Castorp falls in love with Madame Chauchat and feels uncomfortable with Settembrini's view of morality.

The contrast between the two protagonists corresponds very closely to the contrast which Mann developed in his *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* between the Roman ideal, which aims toward universal integration of the world by enlightenment, democracy and politics, represented by *Zivilisationsliterat*, and the 'genuine' Russian traits, represented by Dostoevsky.²³ Of course, Settembrini is not completely identified with *Zivilisationsliterat*.²⁴ And Chauchat has also other features than the representative of Dostoevsky's Russia.²⁵ Nonetheless, it seems unquestionable that Mann represents the contrast between east and west through these two figures, when we refer to Settembrini's explanation. Settembrini explains this contrast in absolute terms: two principles are locked in combat for world hegemony: might and right, tyranny and freedom, superstition and knowledge, obduracy and progress (III 221ff.). The former are 'Asiatic' principles and are associated with inertia, inactivity and a conception of time in terms of eternal recurrence (III 339).²⁶

In the first half of *The Magic Mountain* Hans Castorp is strongly affected by Dostoevsky's genuine Russia and adopts a critical stance towards the Roman notion. His inclination also corresponds to Mann's attitude in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, which we

saw in the second section. However, after his love for Madame Chauchat reaches its culmination in the last section of the fifth chapter, ‘Walpurgis Nacht’, she suddenly leaves Hans Castorp and the sanatorium. In the second section of the sixth chapter, as if replacing her, a new protagonist, Naphta, appears in the novel.

2. West and East 2: Settembrini and Naphta

Naphta is introduced by Settembrini as a person with ‘eastern’ views and tendencies toward quietism and mysticism which he shares with Madame Chauchat (III 522). Naphta was born into a Jewish family in a small village near the border between Poland and Austria. In his childhood, his father was brutally murdered by his neighbours and his mother died early, too. Due to his keen critical spirit and attraction to revolutionary ideas, Naphta got into a disagreement with his rabbi. When he was sixteen, he fell under the spell of an abbot, entered a Jesuit boarding school and converted to Catholicism. Naphta even aspired to become a padre. As his sickness did not allow him to return to work, Naphta left the sanatorium to live in Davos as a teacher of Latin at a local gymnasium (III 608ff.). Naphta stays at a renting-house, where Settembrini, who becomes resigned to the prospect of being completely healed and leaves the sanatorium, also lodges. The two housemates enjoy debating and try to draw Hans Castorp to their own sides. Since the details of their disputation, their views on the world, life and politics, help us to define Hans Castorp’s intellectual position, I would like to devote a whole sub-section to describe them.

The most significant difference between Settembrini and Naphta is that whereas the former advocates a monistic view of the world, the latter has a drastically dualistic view. In Naphta’s opinion, the world consists of two hostile parts, nature and spirit. He considers that the daily world of phenomena, nature, is completely divided from spirit, a transcendental god (III 519f.). Because of his dualistic view, Naphta is critical of modern natural sciences. Natural sciences are based on the premise that nature exists by itself. As a result, in natural sciences there is no room for a transcendental existence outside of the world. Naphta casts doubt on a basic notion of natural sciences, that atoms compose the world. This doubt leads him to insist that every form of human knowledge is voluntary. Naphta argues that since there is no objective truth, all knowledge should be based on a specific faith, a belief in the unique position of humankind between nature and spirit (III 551f.). This privileged position of humankind is bound to the notion of salvation. Humankind is capable of “bewußte Emanzipation des Geistes vom Natürlichen” (III 548) by refusing obedience to nature. According to Naphta, the mission of humankind is to relieve themselves from nature through asceticism. In his eyes, the body is a negative element that has to be repudiated by the spirit. This view of his corresponds to his preference for the Gothic style, in which nature and body are represented in a distorted form (III 546).

In contrast, Settembrini propounds a monistic view of the world: nature consists in spirit. He recognizes neither metaphysics nor transcendental existence outside of the world.

Every metaphysical way of thinking, including the notion of god, is evil because it disturbs the human effort for social development. Truth can be grasped, according to Settembrini, by dividing the whole world into its elements and reconstructing them into the whole. Settembrini places emphasis on controlling nature and on contributing to progress and enlightenment by applying the knowledge of truth (III 713).

Just as they disagree on the relationship of nature and spirit, Naphta and Settembrini also take issue on 'sickness' and 'death'. According to Naphta, humankind had originally been immortal: humans became mortal after their Fall (III 627). Therefore, the very state of being human is a kind of sickness. Humans can never return to nature or healthiness. The only possible way for humans is to ennoble themselves through their spirit which makes them aware of the confrontation with nature (III 642f.), namely, to obey the spirit which demands the repudiation of the body (III 627f.). Settembrini points out that Naphta divides death from life. If death and life have an antagonistic relationship and death is isolated from life, then death becomes real in actual fact, a force of its own, opposed to life, a great seduction which loosens morals and morality, delivers humans from discipline and self-control and liberates them toward lust (III 569f.). Contrary to Naphta, Settembrini has no doubts that healthiness and life make humankind noble (III 643f.). Naphta criticizes Settembrini's position for implying that life is an end unto itself, a banal view which fails to appreciate the aim and relevance of humankind beyond life (III 604f.).²⁷

The contrast between the two worldviews escalates into a fierce political confrontation. Settembrini clings to the goal of the perfection of humankind on the basis of democracy and scientific knowledge. He insists that impediments to this goal should be radically eliminated (III 712). On the contrary, the Jesuit Naphta aspires to a return to "eine[] ideale[] Urzustand der Menschheit, eine[] Zustand[] der Staat- und Gewaltlosigkeit, unmittelbaren Gotteskindschaft, worin es weder Herrschaft noch Dienst gab, nicht Gesetz noch Strafe, kein Unrecht, keine fleischliche Verbindung, keine Klassenunterschiede, keine Arbeit, kein Eigentum, sondern Gleichheit, Brüderlichkeit, sittliche Vollkommenheit" (III 555), "d[ie] staats- und klassenlose[] Gotteskindschaft" (III 559). Naphta's communist idea can be also found in Madame Chauchat, who has sense of sharing and naturalness, at once both savage and tender, in the act of giving and taking (III 824). Nevertheless, while the idea remains apolitical with Madame Chauchat, Naphta has a unique proposal to realize the idea. Naphta calls for "eine[] zeitweilige[] Aufhebung" (III 559) of the dualistic conflict between nature and spirit through terror, which scraps all secular moral orders. He argues that the Proletariat should bear this terror (III 557ff.).²⁸

Naphta's political thoughts have been interpreted in various ways. I will not deny other possible interpretations of Naphta: as an ancestral fascist, a conservative revolutionist, a nihilist, or a medieval communist. In this article, however, I will shed light on only one aspect of "eine äußerst vielschichtige Figur"²⁹ in order to clarify Hans Castorp's position between east and west. Naphta is depicted both as opposing western ideas as well as representing the East in a different manner from Madame Chauchat, whom he succeeds in the novel.

Naphta's thinking, which combines Christianity with communist terror and whose brutality betrays its fascistic feature, can be seen as Mann's interpretation of the Russian Revolution. The 'genuine Russia' denoted by Dostoevsky in *Reflections of Nonpolitical Man* is represented by Madame Chauchat in *The Magic Mountain*. By contrast, Naphta exemplifies the revolutionary Russia or another Russia represented by Tolstoy. Settembrini forces Hans Castorp to choose between east and west.

Caro amico! Entscheidungen von unüberschätzbarer Tragweite für das Glück und die Zukunft Europas, und Ihrem Lande werden sie zufallen, in seiner Seele werden sie sich zu vollziehen haben. Zwischen Ost und West gestellt, wird es wählen müssen, wird es endgültig und mit Bewußtsein zwischen den beiden Sphären, die um sein Wesen werben, sich entscheiden müssen. (III 714)

The constellation of western and eastern political thoughts in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* is once more repeated in the novel. And here, the two positions are supported by the respective views on world and life. In this way, Mann not only represents but also develops his task at issue in his novel: to find something new in politics between western-style parliamentary democracy and eastern-style dictatorship.

3. Germany as Middle: Hans Castorp

From the analogy of the contrastive constellations of ideas in the novel and the essays, it can be speculated that Mann entrusted Hans Castorp with the task to find something new in politics for Germany between east and west. Based on this speculation, now, I would like to trace how Hans Castorp developed his ideas. Since before the debates between Naphta and Settembrini, Hans Castorp has been building his position in his own unique way. Firstly, let us focus on "[das] heilig-unreine[] Geheimnis" (III 382) of life, spirit, material, death and sickness, which has been puzzled Hans Castorp since his childhood.

Hans Castorp, who lost his parents and grandfather in his childhood, has been feeling an intimate connection to death since his youth and nurtures two kinds of sentiments about it. On the one hand, the sentiment of solemnity, majesty and sacredness which he finds in funeral rites and in people's somber attitudes around the dead; on the other hand, a sentiment of profanation and obscenity symbolized by the feeble stench of the decomposing corpse of his dead grandfather (III 44f.).

Hans Castorp often experiences both kinds of sentiments at the sanatorium and is puzzled by them. When looking at the inside of his own body in an X-ray room, he feels "die zerrende Lust der Indiskretion" and "Gefühlen der Rührung und Frömmigkeit" (III 306). When he later catches sight of sexual decorations on a coffee-mill in the room of the German medical doctor Behrens, he observes that the ancients decorated their sarcophagi with

the same art of sexual ornaments. And he suggests that for the ancients, the obscene and the sacred were more or less one and the same (III 366). Above all, it is the phenomenon of 'sickness', which affects everyone in the sanatorium in different ways, evoking these two kinds of sentiments in him. On the one hand, the more serious the patient case is, the more likely he is to be held in great respect. To use Hans Castorp's term, this atmosphere is in a sense "aristokratisch" (III 286) and this corresponds with his old opinion: 'sickness ennobles man' (III 137f.). On the other hand, he assumes that the deviation from moral or civil reason, the nonchalance, immorality and lasciviousness, which are very common in the sanatorium, is due to the patients' sicknesses (III 131, 318f.).³⁰

Castorp first gains knowledge about the relationship between life, death and form through a conversation with the German doctor Behrens (III 370ff.). He learns from him that death is a phenomenon of decomposition and corruption, which dissolves the body into simpler chemical compounds, inorganic matter. In other words, death is a kind of oxygen binding, oxidation (III 371). Life is primarily the oxidation of cell proteins, a kind of oxidation as well. In this sense, life is dying (III 371). Even so, there is still a distinction between life and death. The distinction lies in where only with life form is retained even though matter is being transformed (III 372). In the concept of form, Hans Castorp found the common foundation of every humanistic profession (III 362f.).³¹

Not entirely satisfied with his conversation with Behrens, Hans Castorp acquires after a while a pile of books on biology, anatomy and physiology to learn more about the secrets of the emergence of life from inorganic nature and of the material from the immaterial (III 382ff.). His reading leads him to reaffirm Behrens' view: life is 'a fever of matter', which retains form through the ceaseless dissolution and renewal of protein molecules. Castorp further conceives of life as "die Schamlosigkeit der selbstempfindlichreizbar gewordenen Materie, die unzüchtige Form des Seins" (III 385) because it is "ausgebildet von der auf unbekannt Art zur Wollust erwachten Substanz" (III 385), even if it is unclear how the first emergence of life from inorganic matter was possible. Concurrently, Hans Castorp finds that 'sickness' means an excess of the activity of life to the extent that form is not retained any more (III 397f.).

Based on this insight, he reaches the following conclusions. 1) Transition from the immaterial to the material is the first spontaneous generation. Here the immaterial or spirit increases in density, creating a pathologically rank growth of tissue. What causes this generation is a cancerous stimulation, a tickling by some unknown incursion, namely illness. 2) Transition from the inorganic material to life is the second spontaneous generation. Here the inorganic material enhances its corporeality to gain consciousness. This is an infectious disease of matter. 3) Disease in an organism is the intoxicating enhancement and crude accentuation of its own corporeality, life's lascivious form. 4) All these transitions are on the path toward evil, lust and death, a path of spirit turned disreputable (III 398). By way of summary, we can say that material means an excess of the spirit's lasciviousness, life (or form, body) conveys an excess of the material's lasciviousness, while sickness (or death)

means an excess of life's lasciviousness. This is precisely "[das] heilig-unreine[] Geheimnis" of life, spirit, material, death and sickness (III 382).³²

Hans Castorp achieves these views by the fifth chapter before Naphta's appearance. His view that spirit, material, life and death (sickness) are arranged on a single scale of the impulse towards lust harmonizes neither with Settembrini's nor Naphta's view. For instance, on the one hand, Hans Castorp's view on life and disease, that both of them are results of excess of lust, shows a certain similarity to Naphta's understanding which considers life to be a kind of disease. Concerning his understanding which considers spirit and phenomenal world (material, life, nature) as a single process of increase in lust, on the other hand, Hans Castorp is different from Naphta and rather akin to Settembrini. This is why he remains unsatisfied with both Naphta's and Settembrini's views while he listens to the debates between them in the following chapter. It seems to him that what one might, in a spirit of conciliation, declare human or humane has to lie somewhere between their positions (III 722). In order to find his own position on the issues he ventures into the mountain and is lost.

In the midst of a snowstorm he falls asleep and sees the well-known 'snow-dream' (III 677ff.). He sees, at first, happy, polite people in a sunny land. Invited by a wink of one of them, Hans Castorp enters a temple behind the sunny landscape and watches a bloody banquet, in which two ugly, half-naked, old women are devouring a child. In this dream Hans Castorp wakes up to a totally new distinction. He has already gained the knowledge in the fifth chapter that an impulse which causes an emergence of life from simple matter and retains its form and an impulse which causes a collapse of form and death are actually the same 'oxidation'. In the snow-dream, however, he distinguishes between the two impulses and calls the former 'Liebe' and the latter 'Lust' or 'Wollust' (III 686).

Through this distinction, the status of human life is more closely defined. Like other life forms, humans create and preserve themselves thanks to 'love' and destroy themselves through 'lust'. Hans Castorp holds the view that the status of Homo Dei is located in the middle, "inmitten zwischen Durchgängerei und Vernunft" (III 685). Just before this sentence, he states that reason is only virtue, and death is "Durchgängerei," chaos and lust (III 685). In this context, the status of Homo Dei is, so to say, an organic activity which emerges from 'spirit' or 'reason' that has nothing to do with either material or organic nature and results in death due to lust; and which exists just for a fleeting moment in-between.³³

With this distinction between lust and love, Hans Castorp's distance from Settembrini and Naphta becomes clearer. Naphta's concept of humanity results in the liberation towards chaos, lust and death. And Settembrini's humanity consists only in spirit and reason. Different from both, Hans Castorp reaches the view that humanity exists in organic activities between lust and reason.

Furthermore, Hans Castorp's quest for the status of human life develops into a quest for appropriate status and community for humankind. He compares the image of the status of humans between reason and lust to an image of a state "zwischen mystischer Gemeinschaft und windigem Einzeltum" (III 685).³⁴ Here it is obvious that the mystical

community and the windy individualism correspond to Naphta's communist terror for the sake of the realization of the kingdom of God and to Settembrini's optimistic, liberalistic individualism. What Hans Castorp dreams of is distinct from both: the "Form und Gesittung verständig-freundlicher Gemeinschaft und schönen Menschenstaats" (III 686). He assumes that the form and cultivated manners of the 'fair state' are possible only because people there know about the bloody banquet behind them (III 686). Just as a human person distinguishes lust from love and suppresses the former in order to preserve his form, a community tends to easily give in to lust, licentiousness and chaos. Since people in the 'fair state' know the irresistible seduction of the death banquet, they attach great importance to cultivated manners in order to preserve the form of their community.

In this way, in *The Magic Mountain* Mann characterizes the communist terror as eastern political form and the liberalistic parliamentary system as western. Putting forward a view of the world and of life, at the same time, he drew the image of a community between them. Significantly, Mann made a young German the bearer of this hope for such a community.

In the first and second sub-sections of this section we saw that the task Mann had imposed on himself is represented in *The Magic Mountain*. Namely, a young German faces a task of finding an original German community distinct from east and west. This resemblance brought us to speculate that an answer to the task might be found in the figure of Hans Castorp. As we have examined, Hans Castorp gains his worldview distinct from Settembrini's and Naphta's and develops them into his own view of an ideal political form and community. Judging from his particular way of thinking, now, it can be said that Hans Castorp is providing an answer to the task which Mann had.

Yet, we cannot jump to conclude that Mann took the same position as Hans Castorp. It must be simplistic to identify an opinion of a figure of a novel immediately with an opinion of the author, even if they have the same task in common. In the next section therefore I would like to discuss 'On German Republic', in which Mann declared his support for the republic. For, in this lecture Mann used Hans Castorp's views on life, humanity and community as foundations of his own new political thoughts.

IV. 'Sympathy with Organic Matter' as Democratic Ethos

When he held the lecture 'On German Republic' in Berlin, Mann was still regarded as a supporter of conservatism due to his *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*.³⁵ At the beginning of the lecture, however, Mann declared clearly that his purpose was to bring the young German audience on the side of the republic (XI 819).

As is often pointed out, there were some significant incidents that made him decide to support the republic. In January 1922 Mann reconciled with his brother Heinrich.³⁶ This made it possible for him to support a republic which Heinrich had strongly insisted on. In March 1922 Mann met the President Friedrich Ebert (1871-1925) and had a favorable im-

pression of him (XI 827). In September 1922 a government official Arnold Brecht, Interior Minister Adolf Köster and some others sympathetic to the republic visited Mann to persuade him to support the republic.³⁷ Additionally, Mann was disappointed by the group of Arthur Moeller van den Bruck (XI 314), for which Mann had held sympathy for the time being.³⁸ Especially after the assassination of the Foreign Minister Walter Rathenau, which he also mentioned in the lecture (XI 824), he became acutely conscious of the danger of the anti-republican conservative movements.³⁹

Besides these external causes, whose importance should not be dismissed, I would like to focus on the internal logic of his turn, namely: how he kept consistency with his previous insistence, in what ways he modified his previous ideas and what kind of new ideas he added to his views. To start with the conclusion, the most critical change may consist in that Mann abandoned his persistence in the separation between individual minds and politics and started to insist a reunion of them. The union of two spheres was, according to Mann's view since *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, the hearts of democracy and republic. After endorsing the reunion, therefore, Mann could fully support a democratic republic. And what made it possible for him to make such a drastic turn was not only his practical or opportunistic decision, but also his new political thoughts that he gained in *The Magic Mountain*.⁴⁰

In the lecture Mann indicated that in Germany there was a prevalent antagonism against the republic. Those who rejected the republic, Mann analyzed, regarded it as something against the German nature. Mann traced the reason of this antagonism in the typical attitude of *Bürgertum* to the era of the German empire. The citizens had tended to separate the matters of the state from the spiritual sphere and had been indifferent to politics. He criticized the citizens for this attitude and insisted that now destiny gave people responsibility for the republic (XI 821f.). In this criticism we can already see Mann's appeal for the reunion between individual mind and politics. The motifs of the reunion of state and individual minds and his criticism against the political indifference among the German citizens were going to be emphasized after 1922.⁴¹ When looking back at his assertion of the separation between them in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*, this was a drastic turn of his thoughts. Then, how could Mann justify his new position in front of his audience? To summarise at first, Mann's logic was that he had found that democracy was another name of humanity, which represented the German middle (XI 830). Then, what did he mean with the word humanity here? And why was democracy equated with humanity?

Referring to Walt Whitman, Mann argued that democracy did not function only with systems and institutions, but functioned also and necessarily with "seine eigenen ewigen Quellen [...], die je und je aus dem Mittelpunkt fluten" (XI 832).⁴² He found this spring of democracy in the thoughts of Novalis (XI 832), whom Mann called "einen wollüstigen Denker" (XI 844). Employing Novalis' phrases, Mann reiterated the very idea which provided the basis for Hans Castorp's image of the state in *The Magic Mountain*: 1) both life and death were oxidation, which was initiated and promoted by "Liebe" and "Wollust" (XI 844), and 2) life (organic matters) was a result of the duty to preserve form against the im-

pulses of elements tending toward chaos (XI 851).⁴³ And this “Sympathie mit dem Organischen” (XI 845) was what Mann called “Humanität” in this lecture. It is also the same as Hans Castorp’s view that the sympathy for organic matter, the humanity, was accompanied by sympathy for death, sickness and lust (XI 844).

In this lecture, it was not well demonstrated how the ‘sympathy with organic matter’, the humanity, could be a spring of democracy, or a democratic ethos.⁴⁴ This might be the reason for criticism that Mann’s attempt to combine the republic to the German romanticism was aborted, criticism that it was even deceptive advertising when Mann employed his conservative image of Germany as if it would be a republican one.⁴⁵

In order to understand which logic brought the sympathy with organism and democracy together, let us remember at first, an organism was found between east and west in *The Magic Mountain*. According to Hans Castorp, an organism is what lies between reason and lust retaining its form with love. And reason and lust are the features of western Settembrini and eastern Naphta, respectively, so that organic matters are something between west and east, a German concept. And just as an organism, a community retains its form between reason and lust; it is neither the atomic individualism of Settembrini, nor the mystical totalitarianism of Naphta. Because of this parallel structure of an organism and a community, the sympathy with organism can be related to the image of an ideal German community between east and west.

For example, let us see how Mann expressed dichotomous ideas, between which the German Republic should be located.

Zwischen ästhetizistischer Vereinzelung und würdelosem Untergange des Individuums im Allgemeinen; zwischen Mystik und Ethik, Innerlichkeit und Staatlichkeit; zwischen todverbundener Verneigung des Ethischen, Bürgerlichen, des Wertes und einer nichts als wasserklar-ethischen Vernunftphilisterei ist sie [(humanity)] in Wahrheit die deutsche Mitte [...]. (XI 852)

“Ästhetizistischer Vereinzelung”, “Ethik” and “Vernunftphilisterei” would be explained as western and Settembrini’s features; and “Untergange des Individuums im Allgemeinen”, “Mystik” and “todverbundener Verneigung des Ethischen, Bürgerlichen, des Wertes” would be attributed to Naphta and described as eastern features. And ‘humanity’, which is identified with democracy, was placed between them. In the citation, however, Mann inserted the combination of “Innerlichkeit und Staatlichkeit”, which did not correspond with the contrast between east and west. Here, the same as in the snow dream, achievement of the middle ground between west and east was seemingly abruptly synchronized with the reunion of the matter of state and individual emotional spheres. What made this possible was the parallel understanding of an organism and a community.

In a community based on the sympathy with organic matter, on the one hand, individu-

ality within the community would be kept because the sympathy with organism would hold the form of the community against chaos, negation of individuality. And on the other hand, social consciousness of each member, consciousness to devote himself to the community, which Mann called “soziale Erotik” (XI 833) would be kept because people there would know that an organism is not possible only with reason. Just like love makes simple reason an organism and keeps its form, with the sympathy with organism atomic individuals can develop a community and retain its form.

Mann had criticized democracy and republic in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* because he feared in a democratic state the individual spiritual sphere would be totally occupied by politics. With the view on the parallel structure of an organism and a community between reason and lust, however, Mann found the way to make individuality compatible with the social consciousness. Moreover, in Mann’s new thoughts, social consciousness was not only compatible with individuality but rather necessary to retain a community. In this way, Mann could abandon his insistence of separation and appeal for the reunion, which made it possible for him to support the republic. In other words, Mann found an ethos, a spiritual attitude, with which individuality and social consciousness are compatible and inseparable, so that he became an advocate of democracy and republic, which was, in his definition, the reunion of state and individual minds.

In the republic lecture, he rarely discussed a concrete political system of the republic. Even quoting Novalis’ phrase, he said, no king could exist without republic, and no republic without king (XI 812). His remark provides enough reason to suspect he would actually remain a monarchist, or at least his understanding of ‘democracy’ and ‘republic’ was problematic.⁴⁶ Indeed, on various occasions Mann described his ideal democracy as an enlightened dictatorship instead of a government by the people.⁴⁷ Mann had seemingly no trust on people’s ability of self-government, which might be an important condition of democracy. Yet, or even therefore, in the course of his quest for the German community, Mann’s attention was paid mainly to finding and cultivating the ethos with which individual minds and community could be united. And especially when the antagonism against the constitution of a state was widespread among the people, as was true in the Weimar Republic, cultivation of the ethos which enabled the republic and the democracy to function was a most critical issue.⁴⁸

V. Conclusion

For Mann, the problem to be tackled in the wake of the revolutions in Russia and Germany consisted of the quest for an original form of German politics between eastern communism and western parliamentary democracy. He hoped that the newly born republic would embody this original form. However, he still adhered to his insistence of the separation of individual minds from politics, which had led him to protest against democracy and republic in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man*. Therefore, the quest for a German community fol-

lowed a path which led him to reconsider the relationship between politics and individual minds.

This quest was developed in *The Magic Mountain*. The main protagonist gained a vision of human life and of community. A human life as same as an organism consists in form restrained by organic activities for a fleeting moment between the emergence from reason and the decomposition into lust; a human community consists in form which is restrained by sympathy with organic matters and resists the seduction of lust and chaos. This conception of community was located between Chauchat or Naphta and Settembrini, between east and west, mystical community without dignity of individuality and atomic individualism.

Since Mann worked out these views of the community and organism or humanity, he no longer needed to adhere to his former insistence on the separation between politics and the private sphere. For, in a community based on the sympathy with organism, individuality could be conserved even without separating it from politics. Moreover, the reunion of two spheres was even necessary in his new view. Thus in 'On German Republic' Mann criticized his own former attitude of political indifference and called for the union between two spheres, which led him to advocate the republic. Until he declared his support for the republic, Mann had taken a long way to reconstruct the whole complex of his ideal world. Led by the task of finding a German community between east and west, Mann found the sympathy with organic matters as a German ethos, and with this intellectual and emotional foundation he could totally abandon his former idea of the separation and support the republic.

Notes

¹ Texts of Thomas Mann (except diary entries and letters) are quoted from: Thomas Mann, *Gesammelte Werke in dreizehn Bänden* (Frankfurt a. M. 1974f.). The volume number is indicated by Roman numerals and page numbers by Arabic numerals in parentheses. I also refer to the English translation of *Der Zauberberg*: Thomas Mann, translated by John E. Woods, *The Magic Mountain* (New York/ London/ Tronto 2005). Quotations from diary entries are from: Peter de Mendelssohn (Hersg.), *Thomas Mann. Tagebücher 1918-1921* (Frankfurt a. M. 2003). The date of entry is in the order of Year.Month.Day in parentheses.

² Concerning the grouping of the two sides, see: Frank Fechner, *Thomas Mann und die Demokratie. Wandel und Kontinuität der demokratierelevanten Äußerungen des Schriftstellers* (Berlin 1990), S. 291ff.; Berndt Herrmann, *Der heitere Verräter. Thomas Mann, Aspekte seines politischen Denkens* (Stuttgart 2003), Amk. 34, S. 29f.

³ Friedrich Meinecke, Verfassung und Verwaltung der deutschen Republik in: *Die Neue Rundschau* 30 (Berlin Januar 1919), S. 2.

⁴ For example see: Peter Gay, *Die Republik der Außenseiter. Geist und Kultur in der Weimarer Zeit 1918-1933* (Frankfurt a. M. 1970), S. 44; Walter Laquer, *Weimar. Die Kultur der Republik* (Frankfurt a. M. 1976), S. 235; Hagen Schulze, *Weimar. Deutschland 1917-1933* (Berlin 1982), S. 130.

⁵ Keith Bullivant, Thomas Mann: Unpolitischer oder Vernunftrepublikaner? in: Bullivant

(Hersg.), *Das literarische Leben in der Weimarer Republik* (Königstein 1978), S. 17; Hermann Kurzke, *Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Irrationalität. Thomas Mann und der Konservatismus* (Würzburg 1980), S. 177; Hermann Kurzke, *Thomas Mann, Das Leben als Kunstwerk* (München 1999), S. 350; Reinhard Mehring, Thomas Manns Bekenntnis zur Demokratie. Skizze einer philosophischen Gesamtbetrachtung, in: Christoph Gusy (Hersg.), *Demokratisches Denken in der Weimarer Republik* (Baden-Baden 2000), S. 145; Reinhard Mehring, *Thomas Mann: Künstler und Philosoph* (München 2001), S. 189f.; Manfred Görtemaker, *Thomas Mann und die Politik* (Frankfurt a. M. 2005), S. 48, 51; Horst Möller, Meinecke-Stresemann-Mann. Drei Wege in die Weimarer Republik, in: Andreas Wirsching/Jürgen Eder (Hersg.), *Vernunftrepublikanismus in der Weimarer Republik, Politik, Literatur, Wissenschaft* (Stuttgart 2008), S. 265ff.; Yasuhiro Hamada, *A Study of Thomas Mann's Political Thought [1914-1955]* (Tokyo 2010), p. 163.

⁶ Walter Boehlich, Zu spät und zu wenig. Thomas Mann und die Politik, in: Heinz Ludwig Arnold (Hersg.), *Text + Kritik, Sonderband Thomas Mann* (München 1976), S. 55; Martin Walser, Ironie als höchstes Lebensmittel oder: Lebensmittel des Höchsten, in: Arnold (Hersg.), *ibid.*, S. 10; Børge Kristiansen, *Unform-Form-Überform, Thomas Manns Zauberberg und Schopenhauers Metaphysik* (København 1978), S. 285ff.; Kurzke, *Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Irrationalität*, S. 177; Kurzke, *Thomas Mann. Das Leben als Kunstwerk*, S. 350; Hans Wisskirchen, *Zeitgeschichte im Roman. Zu Thomas Manns Zauberberg und Doktor Faustus* (Bern 1986), S. 101ff.; Wisskirchen, Nietzsche-Imitatio. Zu Thomas Manns politischem Denken in der Weimarer Republik, in: *Thomas Mann Jahrbuch Band 1* (Frankfurt a. M. 1988), S. 57; Klaus Harpprecht, *Thomas Mann. Eine Biographie* (Reinbek 1995), S. 507ff.

⁷ Andreas Wirsching, „Vernunftrepublikanismus“ in der Weimarer Republik. Neue Analysen und offene Fragen, in: Wirsching/ Eder (Hersg.), *Vernunftrepublikanismus in der Weimarer Republik*, S. 15.

⁸ The following researches also suggest that Mann's position is beyond the Vernunftrepublikanism. Georg Lukács, *Auf der Suche nach dem Bürger* (1945), in: *Georg Lukács Werke Bd. 7* (Berlin 1964), S. 522f.; Kurt Sontheimer, Thomas Mann als politischer Schriftsteller, in: *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, 6. Jahrgang, Heft 1, Januar* (München 1958), S. 13; T. J. Reed, *Thomas Mann: The Uses of Tradition* (Oxford 1976), pp. 292-298; Kazuhide Tomoda, *Thomas Mann und die Zwanziger* (Kyoto 2004), p. 153f.; Wolf Lepenies, *Kultur und Politik: Deutsche Geschichten* (Frankfurt a. M. 2008), S. 153.

⁹ For example see: Lukács, *Auf der Suche nach dem Bürger*, S. 528f.; Stuart Hughes, *Consciousness and Society: the Reorientation of European Social Thought, 1890-1930* (London 1959), p. 411; Sontheimer, *Antidemokratisches Denken in der Weimarer Republik: die politischen Ideen des deutschen Nationalismus zwischen 1918 und 1933* (München 1962), S. 395; Reinhard Baumgart, *Das Ironische und die Ironie in den Werken Thomas Manns* (München 1964), S. 144f.; Sontheimer, *Thomas Mann und die Deutschen* (Frankfurt a. M./ Hamburg 1965), S. 81f.; Helmut Jendriek, *Thomas Mann. Der demokratische Roman* (Düsseldorf 1977), S. 312; Hans Mayer, *Thomas Mann* (Frankfurt a. M. 1980), S. 121f.; Fechner, *Thomas Mann und die Demokratie*, S. 336f.; Joachim Fest, *Die unwissenden Magier. Über Thomas und Heinrich Mann* (Berlin 1985), S. 54; Wolfgang Michael, *Thomas Mann auf dem Weg zur Politik* (Bern/ New York 1985), S. 59f.; Hamada, *A Study of Thomas Mann's Political Thought*, p. 129ff., 167ff.

¹⁰ Concerning the time when each chapter of *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* was written, see: Kurzke, *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*, in: Helmut Koopmann (Hersg.), *Thomas Mann Handbuch* (Stuttgart 1990), S. 681ff.

- ¹¹ Herbert Wegener (Hersg.), *Thomas Mann. Briefe an Paul Amann* (Lübeck 1959), S. 27f.
- ¹² For further information on Mann's Dostojewsky image, see: Kurzke, Dostojewski in den *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen*, in: Eckhard Heftrich/ Koopmann (Hersg.), *Thomas Mann und seine Quellen: Festschrift für Hans Wysling* (Frankfurt a. M. 1991), S. 138-151; Wißkirchen, „...die Wahrheit, die niemand vernachlässigen darf...“. Thomas Manns politische Entwicklung im Spiegel seiner Dostojewski-Rezeption, in: *Thomas Mann Jahrbuch Bd. 13* (Frankfurt a. M. 2000), S. 9-26.
- ¹³ On Mann's reaction to the Russian Revolution see: Kurzke, Thomas Mann und die russische Revolution, in: Heftrich/ Hans Wysling (Hersg.), *Thomas Mann Jahrbuch Bd. 3* (Frankfurt a. M. 1990), S. 86-94.
- ¹⁴ Wegener (Hersg.), *Thomas Mann. Briefe an Paul Amann*, S. 52.
- ¹⁵ “Wer die Verantwortung für deutsche Zukunft auf sich nimmt, muß das Nationale und das Soziale mit eisernem Willen zusammenbiegen. Wir können gar nichts anderes wollen. [...] Es ist, wie gesagt, selbstverständlich wie alles Notwendige”. Robert Curtius, Nationalismus und Kultur, in: *Die Neue Rundschau 12* (Berlin Dezember 1931), S. 740.
- ¹⁶ Oswald Spengler, *Preußentum und Sozialismus* (München 1919).
- ¹⁷ Hermann Keyserling, *Deutschlands wahre politische Mission* (Darmstadt 1921), S. 34, 52f.
- ¹⁸ Moeller van den Bruck, *Das dritte Reich* (Berlin 1923), S. 68.
- ¹⁹ Thomas Mann, *Tagebücher 1918-1921*, Amk. 94, S. 610.
- ²⁰ Regarding Mann's relationship to Spengler, see: Herbert Lehnert/ Eva Wessel, *Nihilismus der Menschenfreundlichkeit. Thomas Manns »Wandlung« und sein Essay »Goethe und Tolstoi«* (Frankfurt a. M. 1991), S. 45ff. On his relationship to Keyserling, see: Lehnert/ Wessel, *ibid.*, S. 36; Wisskirchen, *Zeitgeschichte im Roman*, S. 92ff. On his relationship to Bruck and *Ring-Kreis*, see: Lehnert/ Wessel, *ibid.*, S. 61ff., Tomoda, *Thomas Mann und die Zwanziger*, pp. 96-116.
- ²¹ Yoshiko Hayami, Thomas Mann on Irrationality and Truth, in: *Journal of Political Science and Sociology 14* (Tokyo March 2011), S. 81-98.
- ²² In ‘Über die Ehe’ (1925), Mann also argues that homosexual love belongs to the world of death because it does not contribute human reproduction (X 198f.). And in ‘Von deutscher Republik’, he also regards Whitman's homosexual love as a romantic love, a kind of ‘sympathy for death’ (XI 849).
- ²³ Neumann points out that Bruck's introduction to the German edition of Dostojewsky's works provided Mann a Slavic and Asian image of Chauchat. Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, Die Voraussetzungen Dostojewskis. Zur Einführung in die Ausgabe, in: F. M. Dostojewski, *Rodion Raskolnikoff (Schuld und Sühne)* (München/ Leipzig 1909), S. XII; Michael Neumann, *Der Zauberberg Kommentarband, 5-2* (Frankfurt a. M. 2002), S. 78f.
- ²⁴ As the models of Settembrini, Luigi Settembrini (1813-1887), Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872), Franz Müller-Lyer (1857-1916) and Paolo Enrico Zandrini (1879-) are indicated. Daniel Jütte, “Placet experiri”. Ein unbekanntes Vorbild für Lodovico Settembrini, in: *Thomas Mann Jahrbuch Bd. 20* (Frankfurt a. M. 2007), S. 209-215; Neumann, *Der Zauberberg Kommentarband, 5-2*, S. 83-88; Wißkirchen, “ich glaube an den Fortschritt, gewiß.” Quellenkritische Untersuchungen zu Thomas Manns Settembrini-Figur, in: Thomas Sprecher (Hersg.), *Das “Zauberberg”-Symposium 1994 in Davos* (Frankfurt a. M. 1995), S. 81-116. On the sources of Settembrini's thoughts, see also: Rainer Scheer/ Andrea Seppi, Etikettenschwindel? Die Rolle der Freimaurerei in Thomas Manns Zauberberg, in: Wisskirchen (Hersg.), *Neue Studien zum Werk Thomas Manns* (Würzburg 1991), S. 54-84.
- ²⁵ One of the most important roles of Chauchat is that like Beatrice she leads a man to the

descent into hell, into the nocturnal world, the world of death. Neumann, *Zauberberg Kommentarband*, 5-2, S. 80f.

²⁶ These principles are attributed to the fact that Asia is a vast land. Inhabitants of Asia, Settembrini reasons, have not only too much space; they have too much time as well. Therefore, they can afford to wait. The latter are European principles characterised by a critical spirit, reformation activities, reason, enlightenment and science which are promoting progress toward perfection. The land of Europe is divided into many small parts. Europe is poor with time as well as space. As a consequence, Europeans have to manage and utilize time and space very carefully. This lack of time and space provides the motivation for progress (III 339ff.).

²⁷ As the sources of Naphta's thoughts, Sergej Bulgakow (1871-1944), Erich von Kahler (1885-1970) and Heinrich von Eicken (1846-1890), as well as Nietzsche and Novalis, are listed. Wisskirchen, *Zeitgeschichte im Roman*, S. 56ff.; Wysling, *Der Zauberberg*, in: *Thomas Mann Handbuch*, S. 408f.; Neumann, *Zauberberg Kommentarband*, 5-2, S. 93-97. Neumann's commentary provides detailed information about the sources of almost every remark of Naphta. Neumann, *ibid*, S. 267ff.

²⁸ As is indicated, regarding Naphta's medieval communism, there is a similarity to Moeller, Gustav Landauer (1870-1919) and Ernst Bloch (1885-1977). Wisskirchen, *Zeitgeschichte im Roman*, S. 81.

²⁹ Wysling, *Der Zauberberg*, S. 408.

³⁰ Mann explains the same two kinds of sentiments in the following article as well. 'Vom Geist der Medizin', 1925 (XI 591-597).

³¹ As the sources of the idea that life is a kind of sickness of the spirit, Georg Brandes's interpretation on Novalis is pointed out. Georg Brandes, *Die romantische Schule in Deutschland* (Berlin 1900); Neumann, *Zauberberg Kommentarband*, 5-2, S. 234f, 401ff. On Mann's Brandes reception, see: Hans Joachim Sandberg, *Tradition oder Fortschritt? Zum Problem der Wandlung Thomas Mann im Lichte der Brandes-Rezeption des Dichters*, in: *The Activist Critic* (Copenhagen 1980), S. 169-190; Steven R. Cerf, *Georg Brandes' View of Novalis: A current within Thomas Mann's Der Zauberberg*, in: *Colloquia Germanica 14* (Tübingen/ Basel 1981), S. 114-129; Lehnert/ Wessel, *Nihilismus der Menschenfreundlichkeit*, S. 84-86.

³² As sources of natural scientific views in the chapters "Humaniora" and "Forschungen", besides Novalis, following his contemporary scientists are pointed out: Osker Herwig, Ludimar Hermann, Alexander Lipschütz, Paul Kammerer, Ernst Heckel, Max Wilhelm Meyer and Wilhelm Bölsche. Malte Herwig, *Bildungsbürger auf Abwegen, Naturwissenschaft im Werk Thomas Manns* (Frankfurt a. M. 2004), S. 75, 307.

³³ Hans Castorp forgets his snow vision immediately after he comes back to the sanatorium. As if he goes against what he has learned in the snow dream, his inclination to surrender himself to death and lust increases again; especially since Madame Chauchat returns to the sanatorium with Mynheer Peepkorn, who also has Asian traits. Even the narrator abandons to make efforts to distinguish love and lust in front of a kiss between Madame Chauchat and Hans Castorp (III 831f.). In tandem with Hans Castorp's dissolute attitude, the atmosphere in the sanatorium becomes more and more depraved. Guided by Dr. Krokowski, who also comes from the east and does not care about the distinction between love and lust, occult attempts prevails in the sanatorium (III 907ff.). The narrator describes the atmosphere of the sanatorium as 'life without time', 'dead life', 'the great stupor' (III 872). This stupor delivers a love of quarrels, acute petulance and impatience (III 947ff.), which ends up with the beginning of the First World War at the end of the novel (III 984ff.). In this paper, however, I would like to focus on the view of life that

Hans Castorp achieved in the snow dream. For, this snow view is repeated in 'On German Republic' and provides the foundation of Mann's support for the republic.

³⁴ Herwig points out that the analogy between cell binding and human state can be also seen in popular romantic writings and in monism. He indicates the similarity to Wilhelm Bölsche. Herwig, *Bildungsbürger auf Abwegen*, S. 116, 125.

³⁵ Mann himself mentioned that he was taken as a conservative, an anti-republican intellectual because of his essay (XI 828). Astonishment and criticism at the change of his thoughts from his contemporaries can be seen in: Klaus Schröter (Hersg.), *Thomas Mann im Urteil seiner Zeit: Dokumente 1891-1955* (Frankfurt a. M. 2000), S. 99ff. Mann should add an introduction to apology for his turn when he first published his lecture in *Die Neue Rundschau* (XI 809ff., 1172).

³⁶ Kurzke, *Thomas Mann: das Leben als Kunstwerk*, S. 271.

³⁷ Paul Egon Hübinger, *Thomas Mann, die Universität Bonn und die Zeitgeschichte* (München 1974), S. 84.

³⁸ Thomas Mann an Arthur Moeller van den Bruck, undatiert 1919, cite from Barbara Beßlich, *Wege in den >Kulturkrieg<. Zivilisationskritik in Deutschland 1890-1914* (Darmstadt 2000), S. 120.

³⁹ Thomas Mann, Brief vom 8 Juli 1922 an Ernst Bertram, *Thomas Mann an Ernst Bertram. Briefe aus den Jahren 1910-1955* (Pfullingen 1960), S. 112.

⁴⁰ Herwig also focuses on the significant role of Hans Castorp's natural studies in Mann's republic lecture. Herwig, *Bildungsbürger auf Abwegen*, S. 122-128.

⁴¹ In almost all his essays and lectures after 1922, Mann mentioned of "das Humane" which contains "beide Bereiche, das des Persönlich-Innerlichen sowohl wie die äußerliche Ordnung menschlichen Zusammenlebens" ('Bekenntnis zum Sozialismus', 1933, XII 679). In the 1930's, Mann developed his argument for the reunion. He discussed that the rise of the Nazis could be partly attributable to the political indifference and naïveté of the German people. Since they had been accustomed to separate politics from internal matters and disesteem the former as a barbaric sphere, they felt that they could and must behave like devils, once they tried to be political. The clearest expressions of the connection between the tide of political apathy and the rise of the Nazis can be seen in: 'Maß und Wert. Vorwort zum ersten Jahrgang', 1937 (XII 803f.); 'Denken und Leben', 1941 (X 367); 'Deutsche Hörer! August 1941' (XI 1013); 'Schicksal und Aufgabe', 1944 (XII 926); 'Deutschland und die Deutschen', 1945 (XI 1140f.).

⁴² Mann made remarks that he found the bound between humanity and democracy through Whitman. 'Hans Reisigers Whitmans-Werk', 1922 (X 626f.); 'Von deutscher Republik', 1922 (XI 831); 'Briefe aus Deutschland. Vierter Brief', 1924 (XIII 297). Wisskirchen suggests, however, Whitman reading played only a secondary role, indicating the fact that Mann had already mentioned Whitman in his private letter in 1909. Thomas Mann an Walter Opitz, 26. 8. 1909, in *Die Briefe Thomas Manns, Bd. 1*, S. 78; Wisskirchen, *Zeitgeschichte im Roman*, S. 87f..

⁴³ This motif is seen also in some other essays of Mann in the Weimar Era. 'Okkulte Erlebnisse', 1924 (X 135-171), 'Rede vor Arbeitern in Wien', 1932 (XI 898).

⁴⁴ As a source of the motif of sympathy with organic matter, besides Brandes's Novalis interpretation, Albert Bielschowsky's Goethe interpretation is indicated. Herwig, *Bildungsbürger auf Abwegen*, S. 57-59.

⁴⁵ Wisskirchen, *Zeitgeschichte im Roman*, S. 101ff.

⁴⁶ Fechner, *Thomas Mann und die Demokratie*, S. 95; Kurzke, *Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Irrationalität*, S. 175; Möller, Meinecke-Stresemann-Mann. Drei Wege in die

Weimarer Republik, S. 266; Tomoda, *Thomas Mann und die Zwanziger*, p. 161; Wisskirchen, *Zeitgeschichte im Roman*, S. 86.

⁴⁷ Mann sketched out in *Reflections of a Nonpolitical Man* a plan for a desirable democracy as something that would come from the top, not from the bottom (XII 485). The plan for enlightened dictatorship was repeated in 'Pariser Rechenschaft' (1926) (XI 26). Mann first officially endorsed the parliamentary system in his 'Deutsche Ansprache' (1930) (XI 876) only because there were no other choice to avoid a totalitarian regime. In his *Joseph, der Ernährer* (1936), Mann discribed "die Gedankenwelt des demokratischen Idealismus" as a combination of enlightened dictatorship and planned economy (V 1582, 1759), which was inspired from New Deal program. Also in 1943 Mann repeated that ideal democracy would come from the top, not from the bottom (XII 933).

⁴⁸ I would like to thank the two anonymous referees for carefully reading my manuscript and making valuable comments. I would also like to thank my colleagues for patiently correcting the English.