

Verbundkatalog Kalliope

"France and Germany, can they be friends?"

Mann, Klaus

Nutzungsbedingungen

Bei zahlreichen Dokumenten auf monacensia-digital.de sind die Urheberrechte bereits abgelaufen. Sie sind gemeinfrei und dürfen ohne weitere Rücksprache mit der Monacensia weiterverwendet werden.

Bei den Dokumenten, bei denen noch Urheberrechte bestehen, müssen für eine Weiterverwendung stets die Rechteinhaber*innen angefragt werden sowie eine Publikationsgenehmigung der Monacensia eingeholt werden. Das Zitatrecht bleibt hiervon unberührt.

Zur Erteilung einer Publikationserlaubnis wenden Sie sich bitte an:

Monacensia im Hildebrandhaus
Literaturarchiv
Adresse: Maria-Theresia-Straße 23, 81675 München
E-Mail: monacensia.literaturarchiv@muenchen.de

Terms of use

The copyrights for numerous documents on monacensia-digital.de have already expired. They are in the public domain and may be reused without further consultation with Monacensia. In the case of documents for which copyrights still exist, the copyright holders must always be contacted for further use and publication permission must be obtained from the Monacensia. The right to quote under copyright law remains unaffected by this. To obtain permission for publication, please contact:

Monacensia im Hildebrandhaus:
Literaturarchiv
Address: Maria-Theresia-Straße 23, 81675 München
E-Mail: monacensia.literaturarchiv@muenchen.de

"France and Germany, can they be friends?"

(1030C 32d)

When I was a boy, the names of the cities "Paris, Nice, Marseille" posed a very strong fascination for me. At the word "Paris" I used to start, as one later starts - as a grown man - at the mere mention of a beloved name. The names of those cities, in which the great adventure stories of childhood usually take place, namely: Cairo, San Francisco or Rio de Janeiro, left me rather cold and I had no fantastic dreams concerning them. Nor did I dream often of Rome, Venice or Athens. My boyish ⁿfantasy pictured the country-side of southern France - the "Cote d'Azur". Tirelessly and ever and again enthused, my imagination tried to visualize the Champs Elysées, the Grands Boulevards and the quais of the Seine. With Paris, Marseille and Nice - places where I have spent much of my life - I was somewhat acquainted, even before I myself ^{went} came there for the first time. (Kae)

During the war - and at this time I was a child - we were not permitted to have a French governess; she would have been stoned on the streets of the city of München. It was, therefore, first at the Gymnasium or secondary school that I learned French. The Gymnasium which I attended in München was of the humanistic type. We read the original texts of Homer and Xenophon; but the instruction in English and French was ^{very bad} wretched. ~~Our French instructor - may God rest his soul, for he is~~

~~probably dead - had a horrible pronunciation. Only with difficulty~~
~~we were able to say: "La maison de ma grande-mère est très belle."~~
~~The house of my grandmother is very beautiful.~~

~~- but really not much more than that.~~ For the most part, I learned even less in school than was actually required. But with regard to French, I was an ambitious and eager student. ~~La maison de ma grande-mère~~ ^{did not satisfy me.} On my own and without anyone's assistance, I began to occupy myself with French literature. ~~With zealous use of~~

a dictionary, I read the poetry of Arthur Rimbaud and Paul Verlaine. I was carried away by the strength and power of Rimbaud, who regarded all literature as a prison and who escaped from this prison into the freedom of life; I was moved and fascinated by the melancholy and the problematic piety of Verlaine - the great sinner, who sings of his sins ^{so seductively} and who regrets and repents them all. ~~Several years later, when I was seventeen years old, I published my first essay, and the subject of this essay was Rimbaud and his trying friendship with Paul Verlaine. At that time, I was already somewhat better acquainted with the ^{crain} of French spirit, and it was no longer necessary for me to use a dictionary quite as frequently, when I read Baudelaire or Mallarmé, Stendhal or Flaubert, Balzac or Victor Hugo.~~

^{get} ~~A few years later, ^{in memory} it was about this time, that I first went to France. The first advance of money, which a publisher gave me, I used for a journey to Paris, South France and French North Africa. This first encounter with a country and with a people, which were so foreign to me, and yet, in an odd way, so familiar, will always remain in my memory. It was as when one finally sees a region, with which one is already familiar through dreams and visualizations. ~~When I sat at the table with a glass of vermouth for the first time at the table of a Parisian sidewalk café, I seemed to be very much at home. To actually behold for the first time - from the window of a hotel room, the view of the Vieux Port of Marseille - the magnificent view from the Place de la Concorde, down the Champs Elysées - for the first time; the beautifully rounded curve of the promenade des Anglais in Nice... I shall never forget the happiness with which I greeted all these splendors.~~~~

Then came the encounters with French people; the meeting with simple

folk, with patrons of small hotels, with waiters in the restaurants, with sailors on the ships, with chauffeurs of taxis and buses. I loved to speak with all these people; I was proud that I understood their language and that I was already able to express myself in it to some degree; I was interested in the circumstances of their lives; I took delight in their intelligence, their wit, and their natural affability. A little later, there came relations with the intellectual élite of France. I have known many representatives of modern French literature, and with some of them I was even connected by friendship. To men like André Gide, Jules Romains, Edmond Jaloux, Jean Cocteau, Julien Green, André Malraux, I owe the most significant intellectual stimulation and inspiration. Figures like Romain Rolland and Henri Barbusse, I have always regarded with great respect - not only for the sake of their work, but also and above all for the sake of their human bearing. ~~For many years one of my best friends was a young French poet. His work and his person were beloved and had their effect in a circle of young people, which was comparatively small in number, but which had its representatives, nevertheless, in all European countries. I do not know whether the books of this young poet also found readers in the United States. One of his last intentions was to come to America and to seek contact with the youth of this great country land. However, this plan could not be carried into effect. My French friend tragically went to ruin. At this point, I shall mention the name of my French friend, in honor and in memory of him - and by so doing, my speech will remain entirely within the bounds of inner continuity; for the friendship between a young German and a young French writer really proves after all, that a~~

~~friendship between these two nations is possible - ; the name of the young poet, who no longer lives, is René Crevel.~~

I love France. And this is a very personal love - related to the love for a very definite person. I love the French people, and I love the French country. I love the cities of France and I love the earth of France. I love the great French art and I love the great political traditions of French statesmanship. I have always believed, that a German - and I am a German - can and should love France, his western neighbor. I have always believed that a German has much to learn from France - and, as I must also add, a Frenchman has perhaps also something to learn from Germany. - I personally learned a great deal, when I lived in France and when I occupied myself with French things. This is - as mentioned - a personal matter and my own personal experience.

But it is nevertheless an indication of something of vaster importance. It proves what a great ^{educative} ~~pedagogical~~ influence the wealth of French culture can exert upon a young German intellectual, who has been brought up on Luther, Goethe and Nietzsche, if he allows himself to receive a little of his education from Voltaire, Victor Hugo and Zola. Young Germans easily succumb to fanciful and wild romanticism. From the French they might be able to acquire - among other things - the sense for social reality and the spirit of social criticism - a spirit in which none of our great men was especially strong, not even Goethe, who otherwise embraced all great characteristics in his universal nature and with his cosmopolitan spirit.

Therefore, when I speak of my own love for France - a love which has accompanied me through life, even to this very day, and which will accompany me even further - I do not do it, because I believe,

that my personal experience might prove so specially interesting to you - ladies and gentlemen. I mention my own love for France - as an indication, as a symbol - and I mention it in order to be able to say in addition: that many young people in Germany have felt as I - and not only the young. The Germans, who are my contemporaries, who are of the same age or even younger than I, either have not lived through the great war - or they were merely children during the World War and therefore unable to comprehend its seriousness and dreadfulness. When we first began to think, the first point that we made clear to ourselves, was that the war had been something gruesome - something s o h o r r i b l e, that it must, by no means, be allowed to repeat itself. We vowed that there must be no more war; that we would not take part in any. We hated war, and we hated the men, who, in our belief, were personally responsible for the outbreak of the World War. But we hated no particular nation, which had taken part in the war. And above all, we could not be induced ~~be persuaded~~ to hate France, which was represented to us in school - when we were still children - as our "arch-enemy". We did not believe that there could possibly be an "arch-enemy". ~~We made merry over this conception, this notion. Because of our love for France there was also some show of opposition toward those instructors, who had told us so much about this so-called "arch-enemy".~~

But it was not only we young people, who desired and strove for an absolute, unconditional reconciliation, a real friendship with France. Many older people taught as we; some ~~of them~~ had already ^{thought} so ^{even} during the ~~time~~ midst of the war. These few had always regarded the war with France as an unhappy misunderstanding - as an tragic battle between brothers. To this ^{group} of clear-sighted individuals, of which

there were not many, - my uncle, Heinrich Mann, had belonged. His first literary work during the war was ^{and enthusiastic} a long essay on the French novelist Emile Zola. ~~It is a clever and thorough analysis, which at the same time paid such rapturous homage to this great naturalist - the real hero of the Dreyfus-Affair.~~ One may well imagine, that the publication of this study, in the year 1915, struck like a bomb and was regarded by almost the entire public as a monstrous affront, for which Heinrich Mann was never entirely forgiven. During the war only few writers possessed the clear and courageous conviction of Heinrich Mann. But after the war - from about 1918 to 1925 - almost all German intellectuals were Pacifists as well as pro-French - or, at least, they asserted to be such. ~~Later it became apparent that in many cases these assertions were lies.~~ - At this time all thinking Germans desired a complete reconciliation with France and they believed that this was possible. ~~The standard newspapers of the democratic German bourgeoisie - the "Vossische Zeitung", for example, or the "Berliner Tageblatt" - showed a thoroughly friendly attitude toward France.~~ We were confirmed in our European convictions, in that we knew that in France an enlightened élite thought and felt just as we. This élite of France loved German culture - just as we loved and admired French culture and civilization. ~~The outstanding authors of modern France occupied themselves with problems concerning Germany and the reconciliation with Germany. I call to mind Giraudoux's famous drama "Siegfried", which had as its theme German and French relations. The best French intellectuals loved German music - one may well recall Romain Rolland and his Beethoven-biography or his great novel "Jean Christophe", patterned after the German "Erziehungsroman". Leaders of the~~

French moderns endeavored to familiarize French youth with German classicists. André Gide translated parts of the novel "Der Grüne Heinrich" by the German-Swiss Gottfried Keller, and also chapters from Goethe's novel "Die Wahlverwandtschaften". - A truly European spirit seemed to be on the point of ascendancy. This European spirit was possible only if Germany and France could finally be reconciled - after so much misunderstanding; after so many quarrels.

The work of the statesmen corresponded to the eager efforts of the intellectuals - to bring about an understanding between the two great nations, which - at that time - seemed to promise success. It was the era of Stresemann and Briand; it was the Locarno-period. One believed, that the moment was near, in which Europe would finally become a harmonious unity. ^{you} We were filled with enthusiasm for ~~the~~ Pan-European ~~ideas~~. We all knew, that the first and most important basis for the regulation of European affairs would have to be a ^{genuine} and unconditional friendship between our two countries - between France and Germany. Germany would have to renounce the idea of "Revanche" against France. France would have to accustom itself to regard its eastern neighbor without distrust - a distrust, for which ^{unfortunately} Germany was, a few years later, to give the French nation just cause....

We believed, a German-French friendship and, ^{the} therewith, a confederation of Europe was possible, we did not ^{reckon} ~~reckon~~ sufficiently with the unrelenting hate, with the activity and the formidable skill of the nationalists in our own land. They sang "Deutschland Deutschland über alles!" - and ~~they~~ ^{they} thereby they meant to say - "Deutschland gegen Frankreich!" - "Germany against France!" They did not wish to hear of reconciliation, only of ~~revanche~~ ^{revenge}.

~~were paving the way - first of all psychologically, but, altho in se-~~
cret, there was even then an actual and real preparation - for the ~~next~~
~~next war, the war of revenge.~~ The so-called "Schandver=
trag von Versailles" - the infamous treating of Versailles - was to
be torn to bits. The German nation must regain its honor; what the
nationalists understood by "honor" of the German people, was that we
would have to possess Europe's strongest army, colonies and all re=
gions, in which German was spoken to a greater or lesser ~~note~~ extent.

~~With this attitude of mind all Nationalists wrote and spoke, to~~
whom the idea of a "Grossdeutschland" - that is ^a German Union -
meant approximately, what the idea of a Pan-Europe meant to us ~~us~~

We all know, ^a who gradually became the spokesman of all
ultra-nationalists, imperialistic and anti-pacifistic tendencies
in Germany. We all know, who has preached implacable hatred toward
France at thousands of gatherings and in ^a thousands of newspaper
articles. The author of that famous book "Mein Kampf" - Mr. Adolf
Hitler - hated France probably just as much as he hated the Jews.
His demagogical rhetoric was directed just as much against France
as against the Jews; in any case, - much more against France than
against the ^{Soviet} ~~Soviet~~-Union. His hatred toward Soviet-Russia he dis=
closed much later; namely, when the French Republic concluded its
defensive military treaty with the Soviet Republic. ~~When Hitler was~~
~~not yet in power, but still fighting to gain it, he won over the~~
nationalistic, ignorant masses by very means of these violent
~~galls~~ which he directed against France - the "arch-enemy" ~~the~~

I do not know, whether or not I may presuppose a knowledge of
the book "Mein Kampf" on your part; but you all probably know the
essential points of the program contained in this book - a book

which the present German Chancellor and Dictator has never revoked and which to-day has become the official bible of the ~~Third~~ Third Reich. To-day, all school-children, all public officials, all soldiers have to read again and again in this Führer-bible, what Adolf Hitler thinks about France. His opinion - to summarize it briefly - is, that the most important ^{task} ~~task~~, which ~~has~~ lies before the German nation, is to destroy, ~~to annihilate~~ France. Please, understand me: France - as it is repeated again and again in the book "Mein Kampf" - should not be weakened or made harmless; it is to be destroyed. Hitler's whole program ^a culminates in this demand. His theory is that France and Germany can never thrive side-by-side. One of these two countries must vanish from the map of Europe. It is a life and death struggle. For Hitler, it is a matter of course, that Germany alone has the right to live; that France, therefore, must die. For - as Hitler ^a argues - the German nation is the chosen one, from which all good proceeds; the French nation, however, is the inferior... It is inferior for the very reason, that it mixes with Jews and Negroes. It is inferior, furthermore, because of its predilection for democracy. All this makes France ripe for decay. In order to hasten this inevitable decay, this inevitable ruin, Germany must do everything in her power to isolate France politically; that is: to sever her from her allies. The whole wisdom of Hitler's foreign policy outline ^d in "Mein Kampf" may be summed up in the demand, that France must be isolated. ~~Germany must form alliances with England and with Italy. She must even become reconciled with the hated and detestable Poland - which means a hard sacrifice for all German Nationalists. All this must be done - ; only that France may stand~~

~~alone~~ As soon as the "arch-enemy" stands isolated ^{and} alone, the at-
tack against her can begin. Only ~~if~~ when France is "^{de}stroyed"
can Germany be free for other necessary enterprises, such as - the
attack on the East. ^{one} perceives, that the ~~hatred~~ toward Jews and
Marxists in Hitler's internal politics becomes in his foreign policy
~~hatred toward France.~~

Whenever Hitler and his followers desired to ruin ~~the~~ career
of a statesman, author or journalist, they would cast suspicion on him
for harbouring a friendly attitude not only toward Jews, but also
toward the French. - The Foreign Minister Gustav Stresemann had to
suffer terribly under the blame of being ~~too~~ friendly disposed
toward France, and, as we know, he was literally worried to death by
the nationalists and particularly by the Nazis. - Writers who pro-
pagated the idea of friendship with France fared no better. ~~Georg~~
Bernhard, for example, the head of the "Vossische Zeitung", or Theo-
dor Wolff, the political editor of the "Berliner Tageblatt", were
characterized at least once daily by Hitler, G^obbels and Rosenberg
as traitors ^{to} of their country. - Especially disliked by the Nazis
and by all who sympathized with them - was the Mann-family; and this
because we were in favor of democracy and because we desired peace
and also friendship with our French neighbors. He who was hated
most ~~unrelent~~ ^{single} most bitterly was Heinrich Mann. - The nationalist
campaign against Thomas Mann began, when he first acknowledged ^{publicly} ~~indee~~
~~from~~ the German Republic - of which Ebert, ^{at that time} ~~at this moment~~, was Pre-
sident. This incitation against my father was intensified, when he
visited Paris in order to give lectures there. He then published a
small book, concerning this trip - entitled "Pariser Rechenschaft".

This pamphlet - a rather non-political traveler's-diary - was attacked perhaps even more ⁱfiercely than his speech concerning the German Republic. There was nothing which could enrage the Nationalists more, than when someone proclaimed a ^afriendly attitude toward France.

- I also had to feel this ^awrath; for instance - when I dedicated one of my first books to my French friend René Crevel. This dedication was regarded and held up by the Nazi¹ press as an example of treason to our ¹country.

It was very wrong of us, of course, to ^amerely ^Ajest about attacks of this kind. We should have taken them far more seriously. How earnestly they were indeed to be regarded, was first to make itself apparent after January 1933. Then suddenly all those possessed power, who for years had reviled and defamed ^{as} as traitors. Suddenly there could no longer be any other opinion but theirs, and all who were of a different opinion from that of the new masters, had to deny it or leave the country; and the majority of us left the country. Many, who had accomplished more for the world renown of Germany than any one of the Nationalists, had to go into exile. ~~Many, of whom it was said - on account of their love for France - that they did not love Germany sufficiently, were now forced to lay claim to French hospitality.~~

There is no possibility for an understanding between the German Europeans - and the Nazis. We do not speak the same language. Never do I feel this more clearly, more distinctly, than when the Nazis attempt to speak our - the European - language. This they attempt of course, now and then, and the purpose of this undertaking is obvious - : the others are to be tricked, are to be ^{you}duped. Whenever the Führer makes his speeches concerning peace, one might believe

Chimself
to be listening to a pacifist man of letters. He misuses conceptions and ideas which to us are sacred and deadly earnest. At the microphone, in the present so-called "Reichstag" or in the sports-stadium he swears, that he loves peace and only peace; but in reality he allows the youth of Germany to be brought up in military spirit - ~~the German boy no longer has to read Goethe and Schiller; all that he has yet to do is march -~~; the whole country finds itself in a state of permanent mobilization; that terrible book "Mein Kampf" is distributed in millions of copies even to the smallest village; the real German pacifists, however, are living in exile or the sit in concentration camps, as Carl von Ossietzky - the ^{ah} martyr for his cause, who is being proposed as candidate for the Nobel Peace Price by countless societies all over the world, and whom, in the meantime, Hitler's brown-shirts are permitted to torture as much as they please.

The Nazis do not love peace, and the Nazis do not love France. This fact we must establish, coolly and objectively. The Nazis are counting, however, on the love of peace of the other nations, and, above all, they ^{are} counting on France's love ^{of} peace. The German warlords know very well, that France and England do not want war; that they have firmly decided to avoid it - and one might well say: to avoid it at any price. This knowledge, and this alone, gives the Nazis the courage to all their provocative acts, to all their treaty violations. ~~whether it concerns the Treaty of Versailles or the Locarno Treaty or the Treaty with Danzig or the Concordat with the Vatican~~ They are always certain, that the others do not want to risk war. If they were

not so firmly convinced of this, the Nazis would certainly take fewer chances. At the present moment the Nazis have undoubtedly still great fear of war - perhaps even greater fear than all the others. They are determined to begin war only when the risk for themselves seems at a minimum: ^{that is:} when their own armament preparations have reached the culminating point and when France is absorbed with internal political difficulties and is externally as politically isolated as possible. Even to this very day the "Führer" accompanies every one of his provocative actions with a conciliatory speech. ~~He speaks of Germany's~~ "equal right", which is - ^{as} alleged - the only thing, that he demands. Instead of "equal rights", however, he means the Germanic hegemony of Europe. He speaks of an "honorable peace", and he does not mean peace, but that state of affairs, in which preparations can be made for the ~~great war of revenge and conquest.~~

Do the French believe these lovely speeches of the German "Führer", who ^{holds} ~~conceals~~ a revolver behind the palm branch of peace? Many of the French try to believe him. Naturally it is among ^{of} the French Left, ^{isto} that ^{mis} distrust for the "Führer" is very strong - How could democrats and socialists sympathize with one, who daily tramples under foot, in the land where he rules, all ~~sacred~~ sentiments and principles, which are sacred to them? - But on the otherhand, the French Left is so strongly pacifist, and the conviction, that France must become reconciled with Germany, is so very much a constituent part of their principles, that French pacifists and radicals are inclined to believe - more than is good for them - Hitler's protestations of peace; they simply do not want to admit, that one must deal here with tactical and easily discernible tricks.

The situation is different with regard to French Rightists, Nationalists and all them who are friendly disposed toward Fascism. It is a part of the essential tradition of the French Nationalists to be opposed to the Germans, ~~whom one still characterizes in these circles as "les boches"~~. But one ^e admires the personality of Hitler, and one regards the political system which he introduced into Germany as the only one, that is correct and worthy of imitation. "France ought to have a Hitler!" This dangerous declaration one may often hear on the part of French Nationalists. People who ~~then~~ think and speak thus, forget their old antipathy toward Germany, for the sake of their new sympathy with Hitler and National Socialism. They are, in their own manner, prepared for a / c o o p e r a t i o n with Germany - with F a s c i s t Germany. It is, of course, n o t quite this sort of international confederation, which we considered desirable. We were in favor of an "international" composed of démocraties - a "Democratic International" - ; not an "international" composed of Fascist countries, ~~but without regard to whether or not this "Fascist" International is desirable, which is propagated mainly in Germany and Italy, but also in some extent in France - ; we wonder, if it can really be possible.~~

A "Fascist International" - can it really come to pass? And if it were to take place: could it be lasting? - Fascism may be ^{ei} defined as national egoism, set up as a principle. Fascism is always eager for expansion - : it m u s t be so, according to its conception, to its principles. It desires power - as much power as possible - for its own country. All pacts, which a Fascist state concludes, can signify only the m e a n s t o a n e n d ; and

this end will always be extension of its own national territory. It is self-evident, that all alliances of Fascist states must always be directed against a third, non-Fascist state. The alliance of a Nazi-Germany with a France, that one might represent in this case as being also Fascist, would of necessity stand in opposition to a third state - and this third state could only be Russia.

One knows, that the idea of a European crusade against Russia has gone to many people's heads. Conservative statesmen ~~like von Papen~~ and German as well as French industrial magnates propagate this idea. ~~They are of the opinion, that a European war may be averted in that they form an alliance against the "common enemy" - against the Soviet-Union.~~ - I leave the matter undecided - whether or not the French people - might be won over this plan; my own personal conviction is, that they would rebel against it. But even presuming, that this project has prospects of being realized, - would European peace, after this so-called "crusade" against Russia, be any safer than it is to-day? Would a Nazis-Germany, which had been victorious in a campaign against Russia, be able to live in peace - would it want to live in peace with France? The avaricious desire of a Fascist state is boundless. If Germany were to gain possession of the Ukraine - to which possession Herr Hitler so suprisingly believes himself to be entitled - it would then demand ~~SP~~ Alsace, Lorraine, German Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and, of course, Austria. After a victorious war, Germany would enforce the hegemony of Europe - the hegemony which it already demands to-day.

~~A "Fascist International" - which seems to many the only possible~~

~~Remedy - is in truth a product of imagination, a fantastic dream, which possesses, moreover, the characteristic of being a rather s o r r y one. A "Fascist International" will never be realized - will never come into being. The national greed for power, the boundless egoism of Fascist states will always make this kind of "International" an impossibility.~~

The question: "Is a friendship between Germany and France possible?" - we must answer thus: It is n o t ~~only~~ possible, as long as one of the two states is Fascist. ⁿ Since France is not Fascist and since - according to human judgment - it is ~~not~~ likely to become Fascist, our answer may be modified as follows: ⁱ A friendship is n o t possible, as long as Germany is National Socialistic. The extremely nationalistic feeling of the Germans will always direct itself chiefly and above all against France. ^{tie} ~~This nationalism sentiment can be diverted for a time and can be put into motion against another power - namely against the Soviet Union. It will always turn again - in the long way - against France.~~ ^{run} With a Nationalist Germany, France can never live in peace. The German Nation must first and above all be educated so as to develop a European, international attitude, before it can really come to an understanding with France. It is evident, that Herr Hitler and his Nazis are n o t exactly the fittest instructors - are not the best representatives types for the cultivation of such an attitude.

~~In Germany to-day the nationalistic ^{vor} upheaval is t o o great. Only people, who know - or at least sense - that they have really reached the end, cry out so loudly. National Socialism is not only the caricature of Nationalism; it is also its funeral dirge. When the Nazis are~~

overthrown - and at some time or other ~~they~~ they will be overthrown - an enormous antipathy toward Nationalism - yes, even disgust for Nationalism will set in in Germany. At the present moment, Nationalism has reached a sort of hysterical climax. Suddenly it will be completely over - just as an attack of fever passes suddenly and completely. After all excesses, after all dissipation there comes self-consciousness. A German nation, which has finally tired of the distasteful excesses of its own Nationalism, will finally be ready for a real and lasting understanding with France.

Friendship between Germany and France is not only possible; it is necessary. Europe will remain diseased - and indeed to a dangerous and acute degree - as long as this friendship does not come to pass. - The European nations are one family. Apart from England - which represents all too much a world for itself - France and Germany are the two most important members of this family. How can this family live happily together, if both of these "big brothers" (as one might call them) cannot get on well with one another? They will have to learn to live peaceably with one another; or the whole family will go/deplorably to ruin.

Can it really be so difficult for both of these brothers to come to an understanding with one another? We admit, that they are very different, one from the other. But just for this reason do they supplement and complete each other. - Everyone who has a knowledge of economic matters, knows that an understanding between Germany and France is possible as well as necessary; everyone who understands something of political conditions, is aware of this; and we - who at least hope to have a knowledge of cultural matters, are certain of it.

- 17a -

It is impossible in this discussion - which is, after all, pre-
dominantly, a political discussion - to take into account the
wealth of instances, in which German culture has been enriched
by French culture - or vice versa. - But one can never speak
of the cultural contact between Germany and France without
mentioning one great mediator between Germanic and Gallic culture: I refer to Heinrich Heine -

Schiller is that on Nietzsche, who so often lamented the fact, that he might be not possibly write in French. He was of the opinion, that in France he would find ^{stronger} ~~threwader~~ and wiser readers than in the land, which was his home and against which one finds so many bitter complaints in his writings. In reality Nietzsche already had ^{advocates} and admirers in France, at the time when he was known in Germany only to a small élite.

There are German writers, who were even more beloved in France than in their own country. To this group - E.T.A. Hoffmann belongs: the most fascinating and most remarkable narrator of German Romanticism. On the whole, German Romanticism has always held a special power of attraction for French minds; one may well recall the studies of Madame de Staël concerning this great topic. - May we not also include Richard Wagner among the German Romanticists? In any case, he has distinct romantic traits, and it was just these traits, which delighted the finest, most cultivated Parisien minds. You remember perhaps, that one of the first and most enthusiastic advocates of Richard Wagner in Europe was Charles Baudelaire, the great singer of the "Fleurs du Mal", the ^{my} ~~cobba~~ ^{con}noisseur and admirer of all difficult, precious and dangerous things - Baudelaire, who discovered for France not only Richard Wagner, but also Edgar Allen Poe.

Between German and French culture there have always been great mediators - just such a mediator was Baudelaire, and such is André Gide at present. The classic mediator between Germanic and Gallic culture is Heinrich Heine - the German poet, who has sung, besides thousands of other lovely melodies, the song of the "Loreley", and who lies buried in the cemetery "Père Lachaise" in Paris. To the French he related a great deal concerning Germany, and to the Germans just as much

concerning France. In both languages he had the ability to express himself in the clearest, most ^{si} precise and most delicate manner. He became well loved in both countries; but in Germany he was also hated by many - and is ^{si} hated even to the present day.

Why then has Heinrich Heine been the object of such an implacable and bitter hatred in our country? Because he was a German-Jewish poet and composed not only new German folk songs, but also "Hebrew Melodies"? Or is it because he loved France - his French wife Mathilde, and his last French friend, "la mouche" - so very much? Must those who ² France loves, ¹ always be hated in Germany?

This I do not believe. I love Germany too much and I have too much faith and confidence in Germany's future, in order to be willing to believe this. ~~Germany, which has finally awakened to its better nature, will also call to mind, that she and France must be friends - for the sake of their own well and the well-being of Europe.~~

The German Republic, which we desire, will extend its hand to the French Republic. The land of Goethe and the land of Voltaire will find themselves, will become reconciled. This is no vague ^{you} Utopian notion, but a hope, a wish, that is based entirely on sound arguments and which, therefore, must some day be fulfilled. - Germany and France together - two allied nations - will form the vital core of a free, united Europe. This much is certain: Europe will have only this future, or none at all. It has only to choose between suicide - and unification; (a unification, which is not possible under Fascism.)

France and Germany have only one future. And this will be either ^{common} mutual destruction - or ^{for both} a ~~mutual~~ rich, grand and noble life. ^{for}

"France and Germany, can they be friends?"

When I was a boy, the names of the cities "Paris, Nice, Marseille" ^{pq=} ~~ssed~~ a very strong fascination for me. At the word "Paris" I used to start, as one later starts - as a grown man - at the mere mention of a beloved name. The names of those cities, in which the great adventure stories of childhood usually take place, namely: Cairo, San Francisco or Rio de Janeiro, left me rather cold and I had no fantastic dreams concerning them. Nor did I dream often of Rome, Venice or Athens. My boyish ~~fantasy~~ ^{fantasy} pictured the country-side of southern France - the "Cote d'Azur"; tirelessly and ever and again enthused, my imagination tried to visualize the Champs Elysées, the Grands Boulevards and the quais of the Seine. With Paris, Marseille and Nice - places where I have spent much of my life - I was somewhat acquainted, even before I myself ~~came~~ ^{went} there for the first time.

During the war - and at this time I was a child - we were not permitted to have a French governess; she would have been stoned on the streets of the city of München. It was, therefore, first at the Gymnasium or secondary school that I ~~learned~~ ^{learned} French. The Gymnasium which I attended in München was of the humanistic type. We read the original texts of Homer and Xenophon; but the instruction in English and French was wretched. Our French instructor - may God rest his soul, for he is probably dead - had a horrible pronunciation. Only with difficulty were we able to say: "La maison de ma grande-mère est très belle."

- but really not much more than that. For the most part, I learned even less in school than was actually required. But with regard to French, I was an ambitious and eager student. "La maison de ma grande-mère" did not satisfy me. On my own and without anyone's assistance, I began to occupy myself with French literature. With zealous ^{us} use of ~~it~~

a dictionary, I read the poetry of Arthur Rimbaud and Paul Verlaine. I was carried away by the strength and power of Rimbaud, who regarded all literature as a prison and who escaped from this prison into the freedom of life; I was moved and fascinated by the melancholy and the problematic piety of Verlaine - the great sinner, who sings of his sins and who regrets and repents them all. - Several years later, when I was seventeen years old, I published my first essay, and the subject of this essay was Rimbaud and his trying friendship with Paul Verlaine. At that time, I was already somewhat better acquainted with the realm of French spirit, and it was no longer necessary for me to use a dictionary quite as frequently, when I read Baudelaire or Mallarmé, Stendhal or Flaubert, Balzac or Victor Hugo.

⁴ ~~It was about this time, that~~ ^{few years later} I first ^{went to} France. The first advance of money, which a publisher gave me, I used for a journey to Paris, South France and French North Africa. This first encounter with a country and with a people, which were so foreign to me, and yet, in an odd way, so familiar, will always remain in my memory. It was as when one finally sees a region, with which one is already familiar through dreams and visualizations. ~~When I sat at the table with a glass of vermouth for the first time at the table of a Parisian sidewalk café, I seemed to be very much at home. I actually beheld for the first time - from the window of an hotel room, the view of the Vieux Port of Marseille - the magnificent view from the Place de la Concorde, down the Champs Elysées - for the first time: the beautifully rounded curve of the promenade des Anglais in Nice...~~ I shall never forget the happiness with which I greeted all these splendors.

Then came the encounters with French people; the meeting with simple

folk, with patrons of small hotels, with waiters in the restaurants, with sailors on the ships, with chauffeurs of taxis and buses. I loved to speak with all these people; I was proud that I understood their language and that I was already able to express myself in it, to some degree; I was interested in the circumstances of their lives; I took delight in their intelligence, their wit, and their natural affability. A little later, there came relations with the intellectual élite of France. I have known many representatives of modern French literature, and with some of them I was even connected by friendship. ~~So men like André Gide, Jules Romains, Edmond Jaloux, Jean Cocteau, Julien Green, André Malraux, I owe the most significant intellectual stimulation and inspiration.~~ ^{you} Figures like Romain Rolland and Henri Barbusse, I have always regarded with great respect - not only for the sake of their work, but also and above all for the sake of their human bearing. For many years one of my best friends was a young French poet. His work and his person were beloved and had their effect in a circle of young people, which was comparatively small ^e in number, but which had its representatives, nevertheless, in all European countries. I do not know whether the books of this young poet also found readers in The ^{U.S.} United States. One of his last intentions was to come to America and to seek contact with the youth of this great ~~country~~ land. However, this plan could not be carried into effect. My French friend tragically went to ruin. At this point, I shall mention the name of my French friend, in honor and in memory of him - and by so doing, my speech will remain entirely within the bounds of inner continuity: for the friendship between a young German and a young French writer really proves after all, that a

friendship between these two nations is possible - ;the name of the young poet, who no longer lives, is René Crevel.

I love France. And this is a very personal love - related to the love for a very definite person. I love the French people, and I love the French country. I love the cities of France and I love the earth of France. I love the great French art and I love the great political traditions of French statesmanship. I have always believed, that a German - and I am a German - can and should love France, his western neighbor. I have always believed that a German has much to learn from France - and, as I must also add, a Frenchman has perhaps also something to learn from Germany. I personally learned a great deal, when I lived in France and when I occupied myself with French things. This is - as mentioned - a personal matter and my own personal experience.

But it is nevertheless an indication of something of vaster importance. It proves what a great pedagogical influence the wealth of French culture can exert upon a young German intellectual, who has been brought up on Luther, Goethe and Nietzsche, if he allows himself to receive a little of his education from Voltaire, Victor Hugo and Zola. Young Germans easily succumb to fanciful and wild romanticism. From the French they might be able to acquire - among other things - the sense for social reality and the spirit of social criticism - a spirit in which none of our great men was especially strong, not even Goethe, who otherwise embraced all great characteristics in his universal nature and with his cosmopolitan spirit.

Therefore, when I speak of my own love for France - a love which has accompanied me through life, even to this very day, and which will accompany me even further - I do not do it, because I believe,

that my personal experience might prove so specially interesting to you - ladies and gentlemen. I mention my own love for France - as an indication, as a symbol - and I mention it in order to be able to say in addition: that many young people in Germany have felt as I - and not only the young. The Germans, who are my contemporaries, who are of the same age or even younger than I, either have not lived through the great war - or they were merely children during the World War and therefore unable to comprehend its seriousness and dreadfulness. When we first began to think, the first point that we made clear to ourselves, was that the war had been something gruesome - something so horrible, that it must, by no means, be allowed to repeat itself. We vowed that there must be no more war; that we would not take part in any. We hated war, and we hated the men, who, in our belief, were personally responsible for the outbreak of the World War. But we hated no particular nation, which had taken part in the war. And above all, we could not be induced ~~or persuaded~~ to hate France, which was represented to us in school - when we were still children - as our "arch-enemy". We did not believe that there could possibly be an "arch-enemy". ~~We made merry over this conception, this notion. Because of our love for France there was also some show of opposition toward those instructors, who had told us so much about this so-called "arch-enemy".~~

But it was not only we young people, who desired and strove for an absolute, ^{unconditional} ~~unconditional~~ reconciliation, a real friendship with France. Many older people ^{thought} ~~taught~~ as we; some ^{few} ~~of them~~ had already ^{thought even} ~~so~~ during the ~~very~~ midst of the war. ~~These few had always regarded the war with France as an unhappy misunderstanding - as a tragic battle between brothers.~~ ~~To this group of clear-sighted individuals, of which~~ ^{clear-sighted}

there were not many, - my uncle, Heinrich Mann, had belonged. His first literary work during the war was a long essay on the French novelist Emile Zola - a clever and thorough analysis, which at the same time paid such rapturous homage to this great naturalist - the real hero of the Dreyfus-Affair. One may well imagine, that the publication of this study, in the year 1915, struck like a bomb and was regarded by almost the entire public as a monstrous affront, for which Heinrich Mann was never entirely forgiven. During the war only few ^{writers} possessed the clear and courageous conviction of Heinrich Mann. But after the war - from about 1918 to 1925 - almost all German intellectuals were Pacifists as well as pro-French - or, at least, they asserted to be such. ~~Later it became apparent that in many cases these assertions were lies.~~ - At this time all thinking Germans desired a complete reconciliation with France and they believed that this was possible. ~~The standard newspapers of the democratic German bourgeoisie - the "Vossische Zeitung", for example, or the "Berliner Tageblatt" - showed a thoroughly friendly attitude toward France.~~ We were confirmed in our European convictions, in that we knew that in France an enlightened élite thought and felt just as we. This élite of France loved German culture - just as we loved and admired French culture and civilization. ~~The outstanding authors of modern France occupied themselves with problems concerning Germany and the reconciliation with Germany. I call to mind Giraudoux's famous drama "Siegfried", which had as its theme German and French relations. The best French intellectuals loved German music - one may well recall Romain Rolland and his Beethoven-biography or his great novel "Jean Christophe", patterned after the German "Erziehungsroman". Leaders of the~~

French moderns endeavored to familiarize French youth with German classicists. André Gide translated parts of the novel "Der Grüne Heinrich" by the German-Swiss Gottfried Keller, and also chapters from Goethe's novel "Die Wahlverwandtschaften". - A truly European spirit seemed to be on the point of ascendancy. This European spirit was possible only if Germany and France could finally be reconciled - after so much misunderstanding; after so many quarrels.

The work of the statesmen corresponded to the eager efforts of the intellectuals - to bring about an understanding between the two great nations, which - at that time - seemed to promise success. It was the era of Stresemann and Briand; it was the Locarno-period. One believed, that the moment was near, in which Europe would finally become a harmonious unity. We were filled with enthusiasm for the Pan-European ideas. We all knew, that the first and most important basis for the regulation of European affairs would have to be a genuine and unconditional friendship between our two countries - between France and Germany. Germany would have to renounce the idea of "Revanche" against France. France would have to accustom itself to regard its eastern neighbor without distrust - a distrust, for which Germany was, a few years later, to give the French nation just cause...

We believed, a German-French friendship and, therewith, a confederation of Europe was possible, we did not reckon sufficiently with the unrelenting hate, with the activity and the formidable skill of the nationalists in our own land. They sang "Deutschland Deutschland über alles!" - and thereby they meant to say - "Deutschland gegen Frankreich!" - "Germany against France!" They did not wish to hear of reconciliation, only of revenge. They

were paving the way - first of all psychologically, but, altho in secret, there was even then an actual and real preparation - for the next war, the war of revenge. The so-called "Schandvertrag von Versailles" - the infamous treating of Versailles - was to be torn to bits. The German nation must regain its honor; what the nationalists understood by "honor" of the German people, was that we would have to possess Europe's strongest army, colonies and all regions, in which German was spoken to a greater or lesser extent. With this attitude of mind all Nationalists wrote and spoke, to whom the idea of a "Grossdeutschland" - that is a German Union - meant approximately, what the idea of a Pan-Europe meant to us.

We all know, who gradually became the spokesman of all ultra-nationalistic, imperialistic and anti-pacifistic tendencies in Germany. We all know, who has preached implacable hatred toward France at thousands of gatherings and in thousands of newspaper articles. The author of that famous book "Mein Kampf" - Mr. Adolf Hitler - hated France probably just as much as he hated the Jews. His demagogical rhetoric was directed just as much against France as against the Jews; in any case, - much more against France than against the Soviet-Union. His hatred toward Soviet-Russia he disclosed much later; namely, when the French Republic concluded its defensive military treaty with the Soviet Republic. When Hitler was not yet in power, but still fighting to gain it, he won over the nationalistic, ignorant masses by very means of those violent oaths which he directed against France - the "arch-enemy".

I do not know, whether or not I may presuppose a knowledge of the book "Mein Kampf" on your part; but you all probably know the essential points of the program contained in this book - a book

which the present German Chancellor and Dictator has never revoked and which to-day has become the official bible of the ~~Third~~ Third Reich. To-day, all school-children, all public officials, all soldiers have to read again and again in this Führer-bible, what Adolf Hitler thinks about France. His opinion - to summarize it briefly - is, that the most important ^{task} ~~task~~, which ~~has~~ lies before the German nation, is to destroy, to annihilate France. Please, understand me: France - as it is repeated again and again in the book "Mein Kampf" - should not be weakened or made harmless; it is to be destroyed. ^aHitler's whole program culminates in this demand. His theory is that France and Germany can never thrive side-by-side. One of these two countries must vanish from the map of Europe. It is a life and death struggle. For Hitler, it is a matter of course, that Germany alone has the right to live; that France, therefore, must die. For - as Hitler ^aargues - the German nation is the chosen one, from which all good proceeds; the French nation, however, is the inferior. It is inferior for the very reason, that it mixes with Jews and Negroes. It is inferior, furthermore, because of its predilection for democracy. All this makes France ripe for decay. In order to hasten this inevitable decay, this inevitable ruin, Germany must do everything in her power to ^{is} isolate France politically; that is: to sever her from her allies. The whole wisdom of Hitler's foreign policy outline ^din "Mein Kampf" may be ^asummed up in the demand, that France must be isolated. Germany must form alliances with England and with Italy. She must even become reconciled ^{is} with the hated and detestable Poland - which means a hard sacrifice for all German Nationalists. All this must be done - : only that France may stand

alone. As soon as the "arch-enemy" stands isolated ^{and} alone, the attack against her can begin. Only ~~if~~ when France is "~~d~~e s t r o y e d" can Germany be free for other necessary enterprises, such as - the attack on the East. One perceives, that the ~~H~~atred toward Jews and Marxists in Hitlers internal politics becomes in his foreign policy ~~a~~ hatred toward France.

Whenever Hitler and his followers desired to ruin the ^ecareer of a statesman, author or journalist, they would cast suspicion on him for harbouring a friendly attitude not only toward Jews, but also toward the French. - The Foreign Minister Gustav Stresemann had to suffer terribly under the blame of being ~~t~~oo friendly disposed toward France, and, as we know, he was literally worried to death by the nationalists and particularly ^{by} by the Nazis. - Writers who propagated the idea of friendship with France fared no better. Georg Bernhard, for example, the head of the "Vossische Zeitung", or Theodor Wolff, the political editor of the "Berliner Tageblatt", were characterized at least once daily by Hitler, Göbbels and Rosenberg as traitors ^{to} of their country. - Especially disliked by the Nazis and by all who sympathized with them - was the Mann-family; and this because we were in favor of democracy and because we desired peace and also friendship with our French neighbors. He who was hated most unrelent^{ingly} most bitterly was Heinrich Mann. - The nationalist campaign against Thomas Mann began, when he first acknowledged ^{publicly} ~~indee~~ ^{at that time} ~~for~~ the German Republic - of which Ebert, ~~at this moment~~, was President. This incitation against my father was intensified, when he visited Paris in order to give lectures there. He then published a small book, concerning this trip - entitled "Pariser Rechenschaft".

This pamphlet - a rather non-political traveler's-diary - was attacked perhaps even more ⁱfiercely than his ^espeech concerning the German Republic. There was nothing which could enrage the Nationalists more, than when someone proclaimed a friendly attitude toward France.

- I also had to feel this ^awrath; for instance - when I dedicated one of my first books to my French friend René Crevel. This dedication was regarded and held up by the Nazis press as an example of treason to our ^dcountry.

It was very wrong of us, of course, to ^{merely}jest about attacks of this kind. We should have taken them far more seriously. How earnestly they were indeed to be regarded, was first to make itself apparent after January 1933. Then suddenly all those possessed power, who for years had reviled and defamed ^{as} as traitors. Suddenly there could no longer be any other opinion but theirs, and all who ^were of a different opinion from that of the new masters, had to deny it or leave the country; and the majority of us left the country. Many, who had accomplished more for the world renown of Germany than any one of the Nationalists, had to go into exile. Many, of whom it was said - on account of their love for France - that they did not love Germany sufficiently, were now forced to ~~say~~ ^{lay} claim to French hospitality.

There is no possibility for an understanding between the German Europeans - and the Nazis. We do not speak the same language. Never do I feel this more clearly, more distinctly, than when the Nazis attempt to speak ^{o u r} - the European - language. This they attempt of course, now and then, and the purpose of this undertaking is obvious - ^{vi}: the others are to be tricked, are to be ^{you}duped. Whenever the Führer makes his ^espeeches concerning peace, one might believe

(himself)

to be listening to a pacifist man of letters. He misuses conceptions and ideas which to us are sacred and deadly earnest. At the microphone, in the present so-called "Reichstag" or in the sports-stadium he swears, that he loves peace and only peace; but in reality he allows the youth of Germany to be brought up in military spirit - the German boy no longer has to read Goethe and Schiller; all that he has ^yet to do is m a r c h - ; the whole country finds itself in a state of permanent mobilization; that terrible book "Mein Kampf" is distributed in millions of copies even to the smallest village; the real German pacifists, however, are living in exile or the sit in concentration camps, as Carl von Ossietzky - the ^ymartyr for his cause, who is being proposed as candidate for the Nobel Peace Price by countless societies all over the world, and whom, in the meantime, Hitler's brown-shirts are permitted to torture as much as they please.

The Nazis do not love peace, and the Nazis do not love France. This fact we must establish, coolly and objectively. The Nazis are counting, however, on the love of peace of the other nations, and, above all, they ^{are} counting on France's love ^{of} peace. The German war-lords know very well, that France and England do n o t w a n t w a r ; that they have firmly decided to avoid it - and one might well say: to avoid it a t a n y p r i c e . This knowledge, and this alone, gives the Nazis the courage to all their provocative acts, to all their treaty violations - whether it concerns the Treaty of ~~Versailles~~ Versailles or the Locarno Treaty or the Treaty with Danzig or the Concordat with the Vatican. They are always certain, that the others do not want to risk w a r . If they were

not so firmly convinced of this, the Nazis would certainly take fewer chances. At the present moment the Nazis have undoubtedly still great fear of war - perhaps even greater fear than all the others. They are determined to begin war only when the risk for themselves seems at a minimum; that is: when their own arm^ament preparations have reached the culminating point and when France is absorbed with internal political difficulties and is externally as politically isolated as possible. Even to this very day the "Führer" accompanies every one of his provocative actions with a conciliatory speech. He speaks of Germany's "equal right^g", which is - ~~as~~ ^{as} alleged - the only thing, that he demands. Instead of "equal rights", however, he means the Germanic hegemony of Europe. He speaks of an "honorable peace", and he does not mean peace, but that state of affairs, in which preparations can be made for the great war of revenge and conquest.

Do the French believe these lovely speeches of the German "Führer", who conce^{als}ls a revolver behind the palm branch of peace? Many of the French t r y to believe him. Naturally it is among st the French Left, ^{ists} that ^{mis}instruct for the "Führer" is very strong - How could democrats and socialists sympathize with one, who daily tramples under foot, in the land where he rules, all ~~sacred~~ sentiments and principles, which are sacred to them? - But on the otherhand, the French Left is so strongly pacifist, and the conviction, that France must become reconciled with Germany, is so very much a constituent part of their principles, that French pacifists and radicals are inclined to believe - more than is good for them - Hitler's protestations of Peace; they simply do not want to admit, that one must deal here with tactⁱcal and easily discernible tricks.

The situation is different with regard to French Rightists, Nationalists and all them who are friendly disposed toward Fascism. It is a part of the essential tradition of the French Nationalists to be opposed to the Germans - whom one still characterizes in these circles as "les boches". But one admires the personality of Hitler, and one regards the political system which he introduced into Germany as the only one, that is correct and worthy of imitation. "France ought to have a Hitler!" This dangerous declaration one may often hear on the part of French Nationalists. People who ~~think~~ think and speak thus, forget their old antipathy toward Germany, for the sake of their new sympathy with Hitler and National Socialism. They are, in their own manner, prepared for a c o o p e r a t i o n with Germany - with F a s c i s t Germany. It is, of course, n o t quite this sort of international confederation, which we considered desirable. We were in favor of an "international" composed of democracies - a "Democratic International" - ; not an "international" composed of Fascist countries. But without regard to whether or not this "Fascist International" is desirable, which is propagated mainly in Germany and Italy, but also ^{to} in some extent in France - ; we wonder, if it can really be possible.

A "Fascist International" - can it really come to pass? And if it were to take place; could it be lasting? - Fascism may be ^{to} defined as national egoism, set up as a principle. Fascism is always eager for expansion - ; it must be so, according to its conception, to its principles. It desires power - as much power as possible - for its own country. All pacts, which a Fascist state concludes, can signify only the means to an end; and

this end will always be extension of its own national territory. It is self-evident, that all alliances of Fascist states must always be directed against a third, non-Fascist state. The alliance of a Nazi-Germany with a France, that one might represent in this case as being also Fascist, would of necessity stand in opposition to a third state - and this third state could only be Russia.

One knows, that the idea of a European crusade against Russia has gone to many people's heads. Conservative statesmen - like von Papen - and German as well as French industrial magnates propagate this idea. They are of the opinion, that a European war may be averted in that they form an alliance against the "common enemy" - against the Soviet-Union. - I leave the matter undecided - whether or not the French people - might be won over this plan; my own personal conviction is, that they would rebel against it. But even presuming, that this project has prospects of being realized, - would European peace, after this so-called "crusade" against Russia, be any safer than it is to-day? Would a Nazis-Germany, which had been victorious in a campaign against Russia, be able to live in peace - would it want to live in peace with France? The avaricious desire of a Fascist state is boundless. If Germany were to gain possession of the Ukraine - to which possession Herr Hitler so suprisingly believes himself to be entitled - it would then demand Alsace, Lorraine, German Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and, of course, Austria. After a victorious war, Germany would enforce the hegemony of Europe - the hegemony which it already demands to-day.

A "Fascist International" - which seems to many the only possible

remedy - is in truth a product of imagination, a fantastic dream, which possesses, moreover, the characteristic of being a rather s o r r y one. A "Fascist International" will never be realized - will never come into being. The national greed for power, the boundless egoism of Fascist states will always make this kind of "International" an impossibility.

The question: "Is a friendship between Germany and France possible?" - we must answer thus: It is n o t ~~only~~ possible, as long as one of the two states is Fascist. ^{Since} France is not Fascist and since - according to human judgment - it is not ^t likely to become Fascist, our answer may be modified as follows: A friendship is n o t possible, as long as Germany is National Socialistic. The extremely nationalistic feeling of the Germans will always direct itself chiefly and above all against France. This nationalism ^{tie} sentiment can be diverted for a time and can be put into motion against another power - namely against the Soviet Union. It will always turn again - in the long ^{run} ~~way~~ - against France. With a Nationalist Germany, France can never live in peace. The German Nation must first and above all be educated so as to develop a European, international attitude, before it can really come to an understanding with France. It is evident, that Herr Hitler and his Nazis are n o t exactly the fittest instructors - are not the best representatives types for the cultivation of such an attitude.

In Germany to-day the nationalistic ^{roar} upheaval is t o o great. Only people, who know - or at least sense - that they have really reached the end, cry out so loudly. National Socialism is not only the caricature of Nationalism; it is also its funeral dirge. When the Nazis are

overthrown - and at some time or other ~~any~~^{they} w i l l be overthrown - an enormous antipathy toward Nationalism - yes, even d i s g u s t for Nationalism will set in in Germany. At the present moment, Nationalism has reached a sort of hysterical climax. Suddenly it will be completely over - just as an attack of fever passes suddenly and completely. After all excesses, after all dissipation there comes self-consciousness. A German nation, which has finally tired of the distasteful excesses of its own Nationalism, will finally be ready for a real and lasting understanding with France.

Friendship between Germany and France ^{is} ~~is~~ not only possible; it is necessary. Europe will remain diseased - and indeed to a dangerous and acute degree - , as long as this friendship does not come to pass. - The European nations are o n e family. Apart from England - which represents all too much a world for itself - France and Germany are the two most important members of this family. How c a n this family live happily to-gether, if both of these "big brothers" (as one might call them) cannot get on well with one another? They will have to l e a r n to live peaceably with one another; or the whole family will go ~~to~~/deplorably to ruin.

Can it really be so difficult for both of these brothers to come to an understanding with one another? We admit, that they are very different, one from the other. But just for this reason do they ^{sup}plement and complete each other. - Everyone who has a knowledge of economic matters, knows that an understanding between Germany and France is possible as well as necessary; ~~even~~^{even} one who understands something of political conditions, is aware of this; and we - who at least h o p e to have a knowledge of cultural matters, are certain of it.

~~French cultur and German cultur nead one another. Each of these~~
two great cultures has always become even richer and more extensive,
when it came in contact with the other. This difference in nature of
~~of~~ both of these cultures has always made their communion so fruitful.
How could they have nothing to say - nothing to give to one another?
- Germany, the land of Music and Romanticism, and France, the land of
the most highly developed, - and, one might well say, the most articu-
late language. But they have e v e r y t h i n g to say, one another!
The spiritual, intellcual ^{of} intercourse between these two nations is
truly-European interc^{of}course par excellence.

Moreover, the great men of the one country are almost always at=
tracted and fascinated bay the cultur and the geniuses of the other.
Goethe admired Napoléon as well as Voltaire. He was charmed and fas=
cinated by the landscapes of Claude Lorrain - a French peint^r, of
whom Friedrich Nietzsche was later one of the most imp^rassed
and devoted admirers. If one reads Goethes "Conversations with Ecker=
mann" - a book, which Nietzsche called the finest among all German
books - one finds in almost every section a passage, which treats
of the greatness and the charm of French cultur. - Schiller and Beet=
hoven, who were both contempor^{of} ^{travely} of the French Revolution, were deep=
ly affected, deeply impressed by the spirit of freedom, which came
from Paris. Schiller - to whom Paris sent the decoration of the
"Legion of Honor" - was influenced as a dramatist not only by the
French dramatists; in his enthusiasm for freedom French traits may
be recognized - Jacobin characteristics, traces of the great revo=
lution - notes, which at times remind of Victor Hugo - ; the great
singer of freedom, who lived so much later - the bitter enemy of
Napoleon Third. - Even more distinct than the French influence on

French culture and German culture need one another. Each of these two great cultures has always become even richer and more extensive, when it came in contact with the other. This difference in nature of both of these cultures has always made their communion so fruitful. How could they have nothing to say - nothing to give to one another?

- Germany, the land of Music and Romanticism, and France, the land of the most highly developed, - and, one might well say, the most articulate language. But they have e v e r y t h i n g to say, one another! The spiritual, intellectual intercourse between these two nations is truly-European intercourse par excellence.

Moreover, the great men of the one country are almost always attracted and fascinated by the culture and the geniuses of the other. Goethe admired Napoléon as well as Voltaire. He was charmed and fascinated by the landscapes of Claude Lorrain - a French painter, of whom Friedrich Nietzsche was later one of the most impassioned and devoted admirers. If one reads Goethe's "Conversations with Eckermann" - a book, which Nietzsche called the finest among all German books - one finds in almost every section a passage, which treats of the greatness and the charm of French culture. - Schiller and Beethoven, who were both contemporaries of the French Revolution, were deeply affected, deeply impressed by the spirit of freedom, which came from Paris. Schiller - to whom Paris sent the decoration of the "Legion of Honor" - was influenced as a dramatist not only by the French dramatists; in his enthusiasm for freedom French traits may be recognized - Jacobin characteristics, traces of the great revolution - notes, which at times remind of Victor Hugo - the great singer of freedom, who lived so much later - the bitter enemy of Napoleon Third. - Even more distinct than the French influence on

Schiller is that on Nietzsche, who so often lamented the fact, that he might be not possible to write in French. He was of the opinion, that in France he would find shrewder and wiser readers than in the land, which was his home and against which one finds so many bitter complaints in his writings. In reality Nietzsche already had advocates and admirers in France, at the time when he was known in Germany only to a small élite.

There are German writers, who were even more beloved in France than in their own country. To this group - E.T.A. Hoffmann belongs: the most fascinating and most remarkable narrator of German Romanticism. On the whole, German Romanticism has always held a special power of attraction for French minds; one may well recall the studies of Madame de Staël concerning this great topic. - May we not also include Richard Wagner among the German Romanticists? In any case, he has distinct romantic traits, and it was just these traits, which delighted the finest, most cultivated Parisian minds. You remember perhaps, that one of the first and most enthusiastic advocates of Richard Wagner in Europe was Charles Baudelaire, the great singer of the "Fleurs du Mal", the connoisseur and admirer of all difficult, precious and dangerous things - Baudelaire, who discovered for France not only Richard Wagner, but also Edgar Allen Poe.

Between German and French culture there have always been great mediators - just such a mediator was Baudelaire, and such is André Gide at present. The classic mediator between Germanic and Gallic culture is Heinrich Heine - the German poet, who has sung, besides thousands of other lovely melodies, the song of the "Loreley", and who lies buried in the cemetery "Père Lachaise" in Paris. To the French he related a great deal concerning Germany, and to the Germans just as much

concerning France. In both languages he had the ability to express himself in the clearest, most precise and most delicate manner. He became well loved in both countries; but in Germany he was also hated by many - and is ^ha ^te ^d even to the present day.

W h y then has Heinrich Heine been the object of such an im=placeable and bitter hatred in our country? Because he was a German-Jewish poet and composed not only new German folk songs, but also "Hebrew Melodies"? Or is it because he loved France - his French wife Mathilde, and his last French friend, "la mouche" - so very much? Must those who ^{love} France ~~love~~, always be ~~h~~ated in Germany?

This I do not believe. I love Germany too much and I have too much faith and confidence in Germany's future, in order to be willing to believe this. A Germany, ~~she~~ which has finally awakened to its better nature, will also call to mind, that she and France must be friends - for the sake of their own well-^{being} and the well-being of Europe.

The German Republic, which we desire, will extend its hand to the French Republic. The land of Goethe and the land of Voltaire w i l l f i n d themselves, w i l l become reconciled. This is no vague ^{you} Utopian notion, but a hope, a wish, that is based entirely on sound arguments and which, therefore, m u s t some day fulfilled. - Germany and France to-gether - two allied nations - will form the vital core of a free, united Europe. This much is certain: Europe will have only this future, or none at all. It has only to choose between suicide - and unification; (a unification, which is not possible under Fascism.)

France and Germany have only o n e f u t u r e . And this will be either ^{Common} ~~mutual~~ destruction - or a mutually rich, grand und noble life.

France and Germany

2.) Ladies and Gentlemen - :

You have the fortune of being citizens of a great united country.

When you think of Europe, it must seem strange and unreasonable, that so many small countries, which compose our continent, are so absolutely unbearable to each other. Above all it was always told you, that France and Germany cannot endure one another. There is - as you have been assured - no cultural and no political contact between these countries. There are no Frenchmen who ^{love} Germany, and there ^{are} no Germans who ^{love} France.

Well - this is a mistake. In order to prove ^{to} you, that it is a misunderstanding, I must ^{tell you something of my own life} adapt a more personal attitude.

as a German

3.)

I have the honor to speak to you - a s a G e r m a n - ;
for the family, from which I come, is, in every respect, a very
t y p i c a l G e r m a n Family - even tho it must, at pre=
sent, live in exile. - My father is the descendant of an old
North German merchants family of the patrician class. All
th^ose, who are familiar with his works, regard him as the
representative of a German liberal bourgeoisie. The atmosp^h=
phere of my childhood home was there fore thoroughly German
bourgeois. - However - when I was, ^a boy, all
Fund things and even

Ladies and Gentlemen - :

You have the fortune of being citizens of a great united country. When you think of Europe, it must seem strange and unreasonable, that so many small countries, which compose our continent, are so absolutely unbearable to each other. Above all, it was always told you, that France and Germany cannot endure one another. There is - as you have been assured - no cultural and no political contact between these countries. There are no Frenchmen who love Germany, and there no Germans who love France.

Well - this is a mistake. In order to prove you, that it is a misunderstanding, I must adapt ^{tell you something of my (own) life, as a German} a more personal attitude.

Is it possible for Germany and France
to be friends?

When I was a boy, the names of the cities
"Paris, Nice, Marseille" possessed a very strong
fascination for me. At the word "Paris" I
used to start, as one later starts - as a grown
man - at the mere mention of a beloved
name. The names of those cities, in which
the great adventure stories of childhood
usually take place, namely: Cairo, San
Francisco, Bagdad or Rio de Janeiro, left
me rather cold and I had no fantastic
dreams concerning them. Nor did I dream
often of Rome, Venice or Athens. My boyish
fantasy pictured the country-side of southern
France, the Cote d'Azur; tirelessly and
ever and again enthused, my imagination
tried to visualize the Champs Elysees, the
grand boulevards and the quais of the
Seine. With Paris, Marseille and Nice
— places where I have spent much of my life
— I was somewhat acquainted, even before
I myself came there for the first time.
During the war — and at that time I was
a child — we were not permitted to have
a French governess; she would have been
stoned on the streets of the city of ^(Munich) München.
It was, therefore, first at the Gymnasium or

secondary school that I learned French. The Gymnasium which I attended in München was of the humanistic type. We read the original texts of Homer and Xenophon; but the instruction in English and French was wretched. Our French instructor — may God rest his soul, for he is now probably dead — had a horrible pronunciation. Only with difficulty were we able to say: "La maison de ma grande-mère est très belle", but really not much more than that. For the most part, I learned even less in school, than was actually required. But with regard to French, I was an ambitious and eager student. ^{"La maison de ma grande-mère"} ~~my grandmother and her lovely house~~ did not satisfy me. On my own and without anyone's assistance, I began to occupy myself with French literature. With zealous use of a dictionary I read the poetry of Arthur Rimbaud and Paul Verlaine. I was carried away by the strength and power of Rimbaud, who regarded all literature as a prison and who escaped from this prison into the freedom of life; I was moved and fascinated by the melancholy and the problematic piety of Verlaine — the great sinner, who sings of his sins so seductively and who regrets and repents them all. Several years later, when I was seventeen years old, I published my first essay, and the subject of this essay was Rimbaud and his trying friendship with Verlaine.

At that time, I was already somewhat better acquainted with the realm of French spirit, and it was no longer necessary for me to use a dictionary quite as frequently, when I read Baudelaire or Mallarmé, Stendhal or Flaubert, Balzac or Victor Hugo.

It was about this time, that I first went to France. The first advance of money, which a publisher gave me, I used for a journey to Paris, South France and French North Africa. This first encounter with a country and with a people, which were so foreign to me, and yet, in an odd way, so familiar, will always remain in my memory. It was as when one finally sees a region in reality, with which one is already familiar through dreams and visualizations. When I sat with a glass of vermouth for the first time at the table of a Parisian sidewalk café, I seemed to be very much at home. To actually behold for the first time — the magnificent view from the Place de la Concorde down the Champs Elysées to the Arc de Triomphe; for the first time — from the window of a hotel room, the view of the Vieux Port of Marseille; for the first time — the beautifully rounded curve of the Promenade des Anglais in Nice I shall never forget the happiness with which I greeted all these splendors.

Then came the encounters with French people, the meeting with simple folk, with patrons of the hotel, with waiters in the restaurants, with sailors on the ships, with chauffeurs of taxis and buses. I loved to speak with all these people; I was proud that I understood their language and that I was already able to express myself in it to some degree; I was interested in the circumstances of their lives; I took delight in their intelligence, their wit, and their natural ~~amicability~~ ^{affability}. A little later ^{came} relations with the intellectual élite of France. I have known many representatives of modern French literature and with some of them I was even connected by friendship. To men like André Gide, Edmond Jaloux, Jean Cocteau, Julien Green, Jean Giraudoux, André Malraux I owe the most significant intellectual stimulation and inspiration. Figures like Romain Rolland and Henri Barbusse, I have always regarded with great respect — not only for the sake of their work, but also and above all for the sake of their humane bearing. For many years one of my best friends was a young French poet. His work and his person were beloved and had their effect in a circle of young people, which was comparatively small in number, but which had its representatives, nevertheless, in all European countries. I do not know whether the books of ^{this} young poet also found readers

in the United States. One of his last intentions was to come to America and to seek contact with the youth of this great land. However, this plan could not be carried into effect. My French friend tragically went to ruin. At this point, I shall mention the name of my French friend, in honor and in memory of him — and by so doing, my speech will remain entirely within the bounds of inner continuity: for the friendship between a young German and a young French writer really proves after all, that a friendship between these two nations is possible —; the name of the young poet, who no longer lives, is René Crevel.

I love France. And this is a very personal love — related to the love for a very definite person. I love the French people, and I love the French country. I love the cities of France and I love the earth of France. I love the great French art and I love the great political traditions of French statesmanship. I have always believed, that a German — and I am a German, can and should love France, his western neighbor. I have always believed that a German has much to learn from France — and, as I must also add, a Frenchman has perhaps also something to learn from Germany. I personally learned a great deal, when I lived in France and when I occupied myself with

French things. This is — as mentioned — a personal matter and my own personal experience.

But it is nevertheless an indication of something of vaster importance. It proved what a great pedagogical influence the wealth of French culture can exert upon a young German intellectual. It cannot possibly harm any young German, who has been brought up on Luther, Goethe and Nietzsche, if he allows himself to receive a little of his education from Voltaire, Victor Hugo and Zola. Young Germans easily succumb to fanciful and wild romanticism. From the French they might be able to acquire, among other things, the sense for social reality and the spirit of social criticism — a spirit, in which none of our great men was especially strong, not even Goethe, who otherwise embraced all great characteristics in his ~~cosmopolitan~~ ^{universal} nature and ~~his~~ ^{with} ~~universal~~ ^{cosmopolitan} spirit.

Therefore, when I speak of my own love for France — a love, which has accompanied me throughout life — even to this very day and which will accompany me even further — I do not do it, because I believe, that my personal experiences might prove ~~so~~ ^{as} especially interesting to you — ladies and gentlemen. I mention my own love for France — as an indication, as a symbol — and I mention it in order to be able to say in addition: that many young people

in Germany have felt as I — and not only the young. The Germans, who are my contemporaries, who are of the same age or even younger than I, either have not lived through the World War — or they were merely children during the great war and therefore unable to comprehend its seriousness and dreadfulness. When we first began to think, the first point that we made clear to ourselves, was that the war had been something gruesome — something so horrible that it must by no means be allowed to repeat itself. We vowed that there must be no more war, that we would not take part in any. We hated war, and we hated the men, who, in our belief, were personally responsible or participating in the responsibility for the outbreak of the World War. But we hated no particular nation, which had taken part in the war. And above all, we could not be induced or persuaded to hate France, which was represented to us in school — when we were still children — as our arch-enemy. We did not believe that there could possibly be an arch-enemy. We made merry over this conception, this notion. Because of our love for France there was also some show of opposition toward those instructors, who had told us so much about this so-called "arch-enemy". — But it was not only we young people, who desired and strove for an absolute, unconditional reconciliation, a real friendship with France. Many older

people thought as we; some few had already thought so even during the very midst of the war. These few had always regarded the war with France as an unhappy misunderstanding — as a tragic battle between brothers. To this group of clear-sighted individuals, of which there were not many — my uncle, Heinrich Mann, had belonged. His first literary work during the war was a long essay on the French novelist Emile Zola: — a clever and thorough analysis, which at the same time paid such rapturous homage to this great naturalist — the real hero of the Dreyfus Affair. One may well imagine that the publication of this study concerning the French novelist in the year 1915, struck like a bomb and was regarded by almost the entire public as a monstrous affront, for which Heinrich Mann was never entirely forgiven. During the war only few writers possessed the clear and courageous conviction of Heinrich Mann. But after the war — from about 1918 to 1925 almost all German intellectuals were Pacifists as well as pro-French — or at least, they asserted to be such. (Later it became apparent that in many cases these assertions were lies.) At this time all ~~thinking~~ ^{thinking} Germans desired a complete reconciliation with France and they believed that this was possible. The standard newspapers of the democratic

German bourgeoisie — the "Vossische Zeitung", for example, or the "Berliner Tageblatt" — showed a thoroughly friendly attitude toward France. We were confirmed in our European convictions, in that we knew that in France an enlightened élite thought and felt just as we. This élite of France loved German culture — just as we loved and admired French culture and civilization. The outstanding authors of modern France occupied themselves with problems concerning Germany and the reconciliation with Germany. I call to mind Giraudoux's famous drama "Siegfried", which had as its theme German and French relations. The outstanding French intellectuals loved German music — one may well recall Romain Rolland and his Beethoven biography or his great novel "Jean Christophe" patterned after the German "Erziehungsroman". Leaders of the French moderns endeavored to familiarize French youth with the German classicists. André Gide translated parts of the novel "Der grüne Heinrich" by the German-Swiss, Gottfried Keller, and also chapters from Goethe's novel "Die Wahlverwandtschaften". A truly European spirit seemed to be on the point of ascendancy. This European spirit was possible only if Germany and France could finally be reconciled — after so much misunderstanding — after so many quarrels.

The work of the statesmen corresponded to the eager efforts of the intellectuals — to bring about an understanding between the two great nations, which at that time seemed to promise success. It was the era of Stresemann and Briand; it was the Locarno period. One believed that the moment was near, in which Europe would finally become a harmonious unit. We were filled with enthusiasm for the Pan-European ideas of Count Coudenhove-Kalergi. We all knew that the first and most important basis for the regulation of European affairs would have to be a genuine and unconditional friendship between our two countries — between France and Germany. Germany would have to renounce the idea of "Revanche" against France. France would have to accustom itself to regard its eastern neighbor without distrust — a distrust for which Germany was a few years later to give the French nation just cause.

We believed a German-French friendship, ~~was possible~~ and, therewith, a confederation of Europe was possible. However, we did not reckon sufficiently with the unrelenting hate, with the activity, and the formidable skill of the nationalists in our own land. They sang "Deutschland, Deutschland über alles!" and thereby they meant to say — "Deutschland gegen Frankreich" — "Germany against France".

"

They did not wish to hear of reconciliation, only of revenge. They were paving the way — first of all psychologically, but, altho in secret, there was even then an actual and real preparation — for the next war, the war of revenge. The so-called "Schandvertrag zu Versailles" — the infamous Treaty of Versailles — was to be torn to bits. The German nation must regain its honor; what the nationalists understood by "honor" of the German people was that we would have to possess Europe's strongest army, colonies, and all regions in which German was spoken either to a greater or lesser extent. With this attitude of mind all nationalists wrote and spoke, to whom the idea of a "Grossdeutchland" — that is, — a Germanic Union — meant approximately what the idea of a Pan-Europe meant to us. We all know, who gradually became the spokesman of all ultra-nationalistic, imperialistic and anti-pacifist tendencies in Germany. We all know, who has preached implacable hatred toward France at thousands of gatherings and in thousands of newspaper articles. The author of that famous book "Mein Kampf" — Adolf Hitler — hated France probably just as much as he hated the Jews. His demagogical rhetoric was directed just as much against France as against the Jews; in any case — much more against France than against Soviet Russia. His hatred toward Soviet Russia he disclosed much later;

namely, when the French Republic concluded its defensive military treaty with the Soviet Republics. When Hitler was not yet in power, but still fighting to gain it, he won over the nationalistic, ignorant masses by very means of those violent oaths which he directed against France — the "arch-enemy". I do not know whether or not it may presuppose a knowledge of the book "Mein Kampf" on your part; but you all probably know the essential points of the program contained in this book — a book, which the present German Chancellor and Dictator has never ~~revoked~~ and which to-day has become the official bible of the Third Reich. To-day all school children, all public-officials, all soldiers have to read again and again in this Führer-bible, what Adolf Hitler thinks about France. His opinion — to summarize it briefly — is that the most important task, which lies before the German nation is to destroy, to annihilate France. Please understand me: France — as it is repeated again and again in the book "Mein Kampf" — should not be weakened or made harmless: it is to be destroyed. Hitler's whole program culminates in this demand. His theory is that France and Germany can never thrive side-by-side. One of these two countries must vanish from the map of Europe. It is a life and death struggle. For Hitler

it is a matter of course that Germany alone has the right to live, that France therefore must die. For, as Hitler argues, the German nation is the chosen one, from which all ~~that is~~ good proceeds; the French nation, however, is the inferior. It is inferior for the very reason that it mixes with Jews and negroes. It is inferior, furthermore, because of its predilection for democracy. All this makes France ripe for decay. In order to hasten this inevitable decay, this inevitable ruin, Germany must do everything in her power to isolate France politically, that is - to sever her from her allies. The whole wisdom of Hitler's foreign policy outlined in "Mein Kampf" may be summed up in the demand, that France must be isolated. Germany must form alliances with England and with Italy. She must even become reconciled with the hated and detestable Poland - which means a hard sacrifice for all German nationalists; all this must be done - only that France may stand alone. As soon as the "arch-enemy" stands isolated and alone, the attacks against her can begin. Only when France is "destroyed" can Germany be free for other necessary enterprises, such as - the attacks on the East - One ~~sees~~ ^{perceives} that the hatred toward Jews and Marxists in Hitler's internal politics becomes in his foreign policy - hatred toward France.

Whenever Hitler and his followers desired to ruin the career of a statesman, author, or journalist, they would cast suspicion on him for harbouring a friendly attitude not only toward Jews but also toward the French. The Foreign Minister Gustav Stresemann had to suffer terribly under the blame of being too friendly disposed ~~toward~~ toward France, and as we know, he was literally worried to death by the nationalists and particularly by the Nazis. Writers who propagated the idea of friendship with France fared no better. Georg Bernhard, for example, the head of the "Vossische Zeitung", or Theodor Wolff, the political editor of the "Berliner Tageblatt" were characterized at least once daily by Hitler, Göbbels and Rosenberg as traitors to their country. Especially disliked by the Nazis and by all who sympathized with them — was the Mann family — and this, because we were in favor of democracy and because we desired peace and also friendship with our French neighbors. He who was hated most unrelentingly, most bitterly was Heinrich Mann. The nationalist campaign against ~~my father~~ ^{Thomas Mann} began when he first acknowledged in due form the German Republic — of which Ebert was President. This incitation against ~~my father~~ ^{Thomas Mann} was intensified when he visited Paris in order to give lectures there.

He then published a small book concerning this trip - entitled "Pariser Rechenschaft". This pamphlet - a rather non-political traveler's diary - was attacked perhaps even more fiercely than his speech concerning the German Republic. There was nothing which could enrage the nationalists more than when someone proclaimed a friendly attitude toward France. I also had to feel this wrath; for instance - when I dedicated one of my first books to René my French friend René Cravel. This dedication was regarded and held up by the Nazi press as an example of treason to one's country.

It was very wrong of us, of course, to merely jest about attacks of this kind. We should have taken them far more seriously. How earnestly they were indeed to be regarded, was first to make itself apparent after January 1933. Then suddenly all those possessed power, who for years had reviled and defamed us as traitors. Suddenly there could no longer be any other opinion but theirs and all who were of a different opinion from that of the new masters, ~~had to~~ ~~leave the country~~, had to deny it or leave the country; and the majority of us left the country. Many, who had accomplished more for the world renown of Germany than any one of the nationalists, had to go

into exile. Many, of whom it was said — on account of their love of France — ^{that} they did not love Germany sufficiently, were now forced to lay claim to French hospitality.

There is no possibility for an understanding between the German Europeans and the Nazis. We do not speak the same language. Never do I feel this more clearly, more distinctly, than when the Nazis attempt to speak our — European — language. This they attempt of course, now and then, and the purpose of this undertaking is obvious: — The others are to be tricked, are to be duped. Whenever the Führer makes his speeches concerning peace, one ~~may~~ might well believe to be listening to a pacifist man of letters. He misuses conceptions and ideas which to us are sacred and deeply earnest. At the microphone, in the present so-called "Reichstag", or in the sports stadium he swears that he loves peace and only peace, but in reality he allows the youth of Germany to be brought up in military spirit — the German boy no longer has to read Goethe and Schiller; all that he has yet to do is march —; the whole country finds itself in a state of permanent mobilization; that terrible book "Mein Kampf" is distributed in millions of copies even to the smallest village;

The real German pacifists, however, are living in exile or they sit in concentration camps, as Carl von Ossietzky - the martyr for his cause, who is being proposed as candidate for the Nobel Peace Prize by countless societies all over the world, and whom, in the meantime, Hitler's Brownshirts are permitted to torture as much as they please. — The Nazis do not love peace and the Nazis do not love France. This fact we must establish, coolly and objectively. The Nazis are counting, however, on the love of peace of the other nations, and above all, they are counting on France's love of peace. The German warlords know very well, that France and England do not want war, that ~~they have~~ ^{they have} firmly decided to avoid it — and one might well ~~say~~ ^{say} — to avoid it at any price. This knowledge and this alone gives the Nazis the courage to all their provocative acts to all their treaty violations — whether it concerns the Treaty of Versailles or the Locarno Treaty or the Treaty with Danzig or the Concordat with the Vatican. They are always certain that the others do not want to risk war. If they were not so firmly convinced of this, the Nazis would certainly take fewer chances. At the present moment the Nazis have undoubtedly still great fear of war — perhaps even greater fear than all the others. They are

determined to begin war only when the risks for themselves seemed at a minimum, that is — when their own armament preparations have reached the culminating point and when France is absorbed with internal political difficulties and is externally as politically isolated as possible. Even to this very day the "Führer" accompanies every one of his provocative actions with a conciliatory speech. He speaks of Germany's "Equal rights", which is — as alleged — the only thing, that he demands. Instead of "equal rights", however, he means the Germanic hegemony of Europe. He speaks of an "honorable peace" and he does not mean peace, but that state of affairs, in which preparations can be made for the great war of revenge and conquest.

Do the French believe these lovely speeches of the German "Führer", who conceals a revolver behind the palm branch of peace? Many of the French try to believe him. Naturally it is amongst the French Left that mistrust for the German "Führer" is very strong — how could democrats and socialists sympathize with one, who daily tramples under foot, in the land where he rules, all sentiments and principles, which are sacred to them? But on the other hand the French Left is so strongly and unconditionally pacifist, and the conviction, that France must become

reconciled with Germany, is so very much a constituent part of their principles, that French pacifists and radicals are inclined to believe, more than is good for them, — Hitler's protestations of peace; they simply do not want to admit that one must deal here with tactical and easily discernible tricks.

The situation is different with regard to French Rightists, nationalists and ^{all} those who are friendly disposed toward Fascism. It is a part of the essential tradition of the French nationalists to be opposed to the Germans — whom one still characterizes in these circles as "les boches". But one admires the personality of Hitler, and one regards the political system which he introduced into Germany as the only one that is correct and worthy of imitation. "France ought to have a Hitler!" This dangerous declaration one may often hear on the part of French nationalists. People who think and speak thus, forget their old antipathy toward Germany for the sake of their new sympathy with Hitler and National Socialism. They are, in their own manner, prepared for a coöperation with Germany, with Fascist Germany. It is, of course, not quite this sort of international confederation which we considered desirable. We were in favor of an "International" composed of democracies — a "Democratic International" — not an "International" composed of Fascist countries. But without regard to whether or not this "Fascist International" is desirable, which is propagated mainly in Germany and Italy, but also to some extent in France, we wonder if it can really be possible.

A "Fascist International" — can it really come to pass? And if it were to take place, could it be lasting? Fascism may be defined as national egotism, set up as a principle. Fascism is always eager for expansion — it must be so, according to its conception and according to its principles. It desires power —

as much power as possible — for its own country. All pacts, which a Fascist state concludes, can signify only the means to an end; and this end will always be the extension of its own national territory. It is self-evident that all alliances of Fascist states must always be directed against a third, non-Fascist state. The alliance of a National Socialist Germany with a France, that one might ^{represent} ~~imagine~~ in this case as being also Fascist, would of necessity stand in opposition to a third state — and this third state could only be Russia. One knows that the idea of a European crusade against Russia has gone to many people's heads. Conservative statesmen like von Papen and German as well as French industrial magnates propagate this idea. They are of the opinion that a European war may be averted in that they form an alliance against the "common enemy" — against the Soviet Union. — I leave the matter undecided — whether or not the French people might be won over to this plan; my own personal conviction is that they would rebel against it. But even presuming that this project has prospects of being realized, would European peace, after this so-called "crusade" against Russia, be any safer than it is to-day? Would a National-Socialistic Germany, which had been victorious in a campaign against Russia, be able to live in peace — would it want to live in peace with France? The avaricious desire of a Fascist state is boundless. If Germany were to gain possession of the ^{you} Ukraine — to which possession Herr Hitler so surprisingly believes himself to be entitled — it would then demand Alsace, Lorraine, German Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, and, naturally,

2
Austria. After a victorious war Germany would enforce the hegemony of Europe — the hegemony which it already demands to-day. It would do everything in its power in order to make France ^{merely} one of its followers.

A "Fascist International" — which seems to many to be the only possible remedy — is in truth a product of the imagination, a fantastic dream, which possesses, moreover, the characteristic of being a rather sorry one. A "Fascist International" will never be realized, will never come into being. The national greed for power, the boundless egoism of Fascist states will always make this kind of "International" an impossibility.

The question: — "Is a friendship between Germany and France possible?" — we must answer thus: — it is not possible, as long as one of the two states is Fascist. Since France is not Fascist and since, according to human judgment, it is not likely to become Fascist our answer may be modified as follows: — a friendship is not possible as long as Germany is national Socialistic. The extremely nationalistic feeling of the Germans will always direct itself chiefly and above all against France. This nationalistic ~~pathos~~ ^{sentiment} can be diverted for a time and can be put into motion against another power, namely — against the Soviet Union. It will always turn again — in the long run — against France. With a nationalist Germany, France can never live in peace. The German nation must first and above all be educated so as to develop a European, international attitude, before it can really come to an understanding with France. It is evident that Herr Hitler and the National Socialists

are not exactly the fittest instructors, are not ~~the~~ the best representative types for ^{the cultivation of} such an attitude.

In Germany to-day the nationalistic uproar is too great. Only people, who know — or at least sense — that they have really reached the end, cry out so loudly. National Socialism is not only the caricature of nationalism; it is also its funeral dirge. When the Nazis are overthrown — and at some time or other they will be overthrown — an enormous antipathy toward nationalism, yes — even disgust for nationalism will set in in Germany. At the present moment nationalism has reached a sort of hysterical climax. Suddenly it will be completely over — just as an attack of fever passes suddenly and completely. After all excesses, after all dissipation there comes self-consciousness. A German nation which has finally tired of the distasteful excesses of its own nationalism, will finally be ready for and capable of a real and lasting understanding with France.

Friendship between Germany and France is not only possible; it is even necessary. Europe will remain diseased — and indeed to a dangerous and acute degree — as long as this friendship does not come to pass. The European nations are one family. Apart from England — which represents all too much of a world for itself, France and Germany are the two most important members of this family. How can this family live happily together, if both of these (one might call them) big brothers cannot get on well with one another? They will have to learn to live peaceably with

one another, or the whole family will go deplorably to ruin.

Can it really be so difficult for both of these brothers to come to an understanding with one another? We admit that they are very different, one from the other. But just for this reason do they supplement and complete each other. Everyone who has a knowledge of economic matters, knows that an understanding between Germany and France is possible as well as necessary; everyone who understands something of political conditions, is aware of this; and we, who at least hope to have a knowledge of cultural matters, are certain of it.

French culture and German culture need one another. Each of these two great cultures has always become even richer and more extensive, when it came in contact with the other. This very heterogeneousness, this difference in nature of both of these cultures has always made their ~~communion~~ ~~encounters~~ so fruitful. How could they have nothing to say & nothing to give to one another? — Germany, the land of Romanticism and ~~music~~ and France, the land of the most highly developed — and one might well say — the most articulate language. But they have everything to say to one another! The spiritual, intellectual intercourse between these two nations is truly-European intercourse ~~and communion~~ ~~par excellence~~.

Moreover, the great men of the one country are almost always attracted, and fascinated by the culture and the ^{geniuses} of the other. Goethe admired Napoleon as well as Voltaire. He was charmed and fascinated by the landscapers of Claude Lorrain — a French painter.

of whom Friedrich Nietzsche was later one of the most impassioned and devoted admirers. If one reads Goethe's "Conversations with Eckermann" — a book, which Nietzsche called the finest among all German books — one finds in almost every section a passage, which treats of the greatness and charm of French culture. Schiller and Beethoven, who were both contemporaries of the French Revolution were deeply affected, deeply impressed by the spirit of freedom which came from Paris! Schiller, to whom Paris sent the decoration of the ^{Légion of Honor} ~~Pégion d' Honneur~~, was influenced as a dramatist not only by the French dramatists; in his great enthusiasm for freedom — French traits may be recognized — Jacobin characteristics, tracks of the great Revolution — notes, which at times remind one of Victor Hugo, who lived so much later than Schiller — Victor Hugo — the great singer of freedom, the ^{bitter} ~~irreconcilable~~ enemy of Napoleon III (Third). Even more distinct than the French influence on Schiller is that on Nietzsche, who so often lamented the fact, that he might not possibly write in French. He was of the opinion, that in France he would find shrewder and wiser readers than in the land, which was his home and against which one finds so many bitter complaints in his writings. In reality Nietzsche already had ^{advocates} ~~admirers~~ in France, ~~even~~ at the time when he was known in Germany only to a small élite.

There are German writers, who were even more beloved in France than in their own country; to this group — E. T. A. Hoffmann

belongs — the most fascinating and most remarkable
 narrator of German Romanticism. On the whole,
 German Romanticism has always held a special power of
 attraction for French minds; one may well
 recall the studies of Madame de Staël concerning
 this great topic. May we not also include
 Richard Wagner among German Romanticists?
 In any case, he has — ~~among others~~ — distinct
 romantic traits and it was just these traits
 which delighted the finest, most cultivated Parisian
 minds. You remember perhaps that one of the
 first and most enthusiastic advocates of
 Richard Wagner in Europe was Baudelaire, the
 great singer of "Fleur du Mal", the connoisseur
 and admirer of all difficult, precious and
 dangerous things — Baudelaire, who discovered
 for France not only Richard Wagner, but also
 Edgar Allen Poe. Between German and French
 culture there have always been great mediators
 — just such a mediator was Baudelaire, and
 such is André Gide at present. The classic
 mediator between Germanic and Gallic culture
 is Heinrich Heine — the German poet, who has
 sung, besides thousands of other lovely melodies,
 the song of the "Loreley" and who lies buried
 in the Père Lachaise ^{cemetery} in Paris. To the French
 he related a great deal concerning Germany
 and to the Germans just as much concerning
 France. In both languages he had the ability to
 express himself in the ^{clearest} most precise, ^{and} most delicate
 and ~~clear~~ manner. He became well loved
 in both countries; but in Germany he was
 also hated by many — and is hated even to the
 present day.

Why then has Heinrich Heine been the object of such an implacable and bitter hatred in our country? Because he was a German - Jewish poet and composed not only new German folk songs, but also "Hebrew melodies"? Or is it because he loved France - his French wife, Mathilde, and his last French friend, ~~the~~ "Mouche" - so very much? Must those whom France loves, always be hated in Germany?

This I do not believe. I love Germany too much and I have too much faith and confidence in Germany's future, in order to be willing to believe this. A Germany, which has finally awakened to its better nature, will also call to mind that she and France must be friends - for the sake of their own well-being and the well-being of Europe. The German Republic, which we desire, will extend its hand to the French Republic. The land of Goethe and the land of Voltaire will find themselves, will become reconciled; this is no vague ^{your} Utopian notion, but a hope, a wish, that is based entirely on sound argument and which therefore must some day be fulfilled. Germany and France together - two allied nations - will form the vital core of a free, united Europe. This much is certain: Europe will have only this future or none at all. It has only to choose between suicide and unification (a unification which is not possible under ^{fascism}) France and Germany have only one future and this will be either mutual destruction or a mutually rich, grand and noble life.

Ladies and Gentlemen^{en}

You have the fortune of
You are ~~fortunate~~ in being citizens
of a great united country. When you think
of Europe it must seem strange and unreason-
able, that so many small countries, ~~of~~ which
compose our continent, ~~is composed~~ are so absolutely
unbearable to each other. Above all it was
always told ~~to~~ you, that France and
Germany cannot ~~live~~ ^{endure} one another.

There is - as you have been assured -
no cultural and no political contact between
these ~~set~~ countries. There are no
Frenchmen who love Germany and there
are no Germans who love France.

Well, this is a mistake, in order to
prove to you that this is a ~~mista~~
misunderstanding, I must ~~become~~ ^{adapt} a more
personal attitude.

Pardoe

V - ^{as in} but ✓

a - as in fat

a - as in ape

o - as in get

If they were not so firmly convinced of this, the Nazis would take fewer chances. At the ^{present} moment the Nazis have undoubtedly still a ~~great~~ ^{great} fear of war — perhaps even greater fear than all the others. They are determined ~~not~~ to begin war only when the risk for themselves seems ^{at a minimum} as small as possible. That is — when their ^{armament} ~~own~~ preparations ~~for~~ have reached their height and when France is absorbed by internal political ^{difficulties} ~~difficult~~ and ~~is~~ ^{is} externally ^{politically} isolated as possible. Even to this very day the "Führer" accompanies every one of his provocative actions with a conciliatory speech. He speaks of Germany's equality "equal rights", which is — as alleged — the only thing, ~~that~~ he demands. Instead of "equal rights" — however — he means — the Germanic hegemony of Europe. He speaks of an "honorable peace" and he does not mean peace but that state ^{of affairs} in which the great war of revenge and conquest ^{preparations can be made} ~~can be made~~ ^{can be made} ready. French believe these lovely speeches "Führer" who ~~hides~~ ^{conceals} the revolver under such of peace? Many French naturally it is amongst the mistrust for the German "Führer" how could democrats and fight with one, who daily in the land, where he rules principles, which are sacred on the other hand. The French left

I have the honor to speak to you —
as a German ; for the family, from
which I come, is, in every respect —
a very typical German family, even
tho it must ~~be~~ at present live in
exile. My father is the descendant of an
old North German merchants ^{family}
the patrician class. All those, who are
familiar with his works, regard him as
the representative of a ^{German} liberal bourgeoisie.
The atmosphere ~~of the house~~ ^{of my childhood}
home was therefore ~~was~~ thoroughly
German bourgeois. — However, —
(in spite of this, however)

it is impossible in this discussion, which
is After all, ~~is a~~ predominantly a political
discussion — to take into account the
wealth ~~mass~~ of instances in which German culture
has been enriched by ^{French culture} ~~the culture of France~~
or vice versa) on the other hand, the ~~of French~~
~~by the German~~. — But one can never
speak of the cultural contact between
Germany and France without mentioning
one great mediator between Germanic
and Gallic culture: I refer to Heinrich
Heine

I must begin with a confession — and with
a request for consideration. The confession is
that I am ~~of~~ ^{glad} happy — really very ^{glad} happy
to be in this country and to be permitted
to speak here before you. You; perhaps
can hardly comprehend what it means
for a European — and especially for a German
exile — to breathe ~~in~~ the air of the United
States. Here we are permitted to speak
— freely and publicly of that which fills
our hearts ^{& minds} ~~and concerns us most~~. In
which European country is this freedom of
speech yet possible? — and when I
speak this — I refer not only to Fascist
countries but also to those which are still
considered liberal. Freedom of speech in
Europe is ^{fast} becoming a rather dubious
matter. You, — ladies & gentlemen,
may well be proud and happy, that
you still possess this right. ~~and~~
(and ~~protect it~~!)

I sincerely hope that you will always
protect it.)

my request for consideration — concerns
a manner in which I express myself.
may perhaps be somewhat ^{difficult} ~~troublesome~~
for you to understand my ^{English} pronunciation

~~It is not~~ ^{isn't} so very simple to speak
of ~~the most personal~~ matters, which are of such importance to
one's own being — in a language, which
^{continues to be} remains foreign, no matter how much one may
love it.
