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Max Mohr (1891-1937), an Almost Forgotten Dramatist and Novelist of the 1920s, in Exile in Shanghai 1934-37

Max Mohr, the subject of this essay, was one of the rising stars of the German theater in the 1920s, but was almost completely forgotten soon after he went into exile and in the post-war years, as well. Only recently have there been signs of a renewed interest in him and his literary works. This essay will emphasize three aspects: first of all, with the help of some short biographical notes, it wants to make Max Mohr better known to students of German literature in America where only little, if any, notice has been taken of him. Secondly, it presents a short review of Mohr’s literary oeuvre and his place in the German literature of the 1920s and early 1930s. Lastly, it is intended to throw some light on Shanghai as an important, but less well-known place of exile for German and Austrian Jews during the years of National Socialist rule in Central Europe.

The extent to which Max Mohr was forgotten can be seen from a short perusal of biographical handbooks as well as histories and encyclopedias of German literature. Vol. 17 of the *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (containing the letter M) which appeared in 1994 does not mention him at all; neither does the authoritative *Lexikon der deutschsprachigen Gegenwartsliteratur*, 2nd edition, of 1987. The same is true of two shorter encyclopedias of literature popular with students, i.e., Kröner’s *Deutsche Schriftsteller der Gegenwart* and Rowohlt’s *Autorenlexikon deutschsprachiger Literatur des 20. Jahrhunderts*. The widely used *Metzler Lexikon Autoren* does not contain his name in its 4th edition of 2010. This may be seen as atypical considering the very recent publication date of this reference work and the renewed interest in Mohr mentioned above. The *Deutsche Literatur-Lexikon*, 3rd edition, of 1986 has
a very short article of about 10 lines on Mohr; Killy Literatur-Lexikon, 1st edition, of 1990 devotes one column (with, however, a factual error) to Mohr and the same Lexikon in its 2nd edition of 2010 has an article of 2 ½ columns on him; the author is Barbara Pittner who also wrote her doctoral dissertation on Mohr. It is probably due to her research as well as the endeavours of Carl-Ludwig Reichert, Stefan Weidle, Albrecht Joseph and Mohr’s grandson Nicolas Humbert, more recently the studies of Florian Steger, Thomas Cronen, and Ralf Beer that some notice is taken of Max Mohr nowadays and that some of his plays have been staged again in the 1990s and in 2002. On the internet there is an excellent website for him presented by the city of Munich. The Monacensia archive and library in Munich keeps his papers and supports research on him. A fairly recent biographical article in volume 3 of the Geschichte der Stadt Würzburg, published in 2007, hints at Mohr’s biography: Würzburg was his birthplace.

Max Ludwig Mohr was born in Würzburg, capital of the Bavarian “Regierungsbezirk” (administrative region) of Unterfranken then as it is now, on October 17, 1891. He was the son of Leon and Johanna Mohr; Leon was the co-owner of a malt factory which his father had founded. Max’s mother, fittingly for the wife of a malt producer, was the daughter of a hops merchant. Max was his parents’ only son and youngest child. His eldest sister Irma died in childhood, his second sister Hedwig was married to Joseph Reuss, “Oberlandesgerichtsrat” (judge) in Augsburg. This background shows that Mohr was the scion of a well-to-do and assimilated German Jewish family. His father Leon died in 1910; the family business had changed hands in 1900 already. The Mohrs owned a large house in a good part of town right outside the former city walls. Max’s mother went on living there until 1933, then moved to Munich where she died in 1941. She was listed as the owner of the old family home until 1939 and may have sold it under political pressure.

Max Mohr received his primary and secondary education in Würzburg. We don’t know whether he started his school life at the Jewish “Volksschule” (elementary school) which existed in Würzburg with its large Jewish community of about 2,500 around 1900, or at a public “Volksschule.” He then attended the “Königliche Neue Gymnasium,” a modern language and natural science college which still exists, albeit under a new name. He did very well at school, in most academic subjects as well as in “Turnen” (gymnastics), as his term reports show. He was the only Jewish student in his class. In 1909, one year before leaving school, a strong rebellious streak in his personality may have manifested itself for the first time: in the summer vacations, he took a mountain climbing trip in the Alps on his own, without his parents’ knowledge. His father even felt compelled to run a newspaper search advertisement to find out what had happened to his son. After some
days, a stranger sent him a cable informing him that Max had signed his name into the visitors’ book of a hostel in the Italian Alps. A few weeks later, Max returned home safely. In the following autumn, i.e., in November 1910, after having passed his “Absolutorium” (school leaving examination) quite easily, he took up his studies at the medical school of the University of Würzburg. At the same time, he did the voluntary abbreviated one year army service as an “Einjährig-Freiwilliger” which was offered to people who had higher education than the “Volksschule”; it was actually even shorter than one year. He was stationed with the 2nd Bavarian field artillery regiment in Würzburg where, after three months of basic training, he could pursue his studies at the university and did not have to live in the barracks or wear a uniform.

After this short stint in peacetime military life, he went to Munich in the summer of 1911 to continue his medical studies there. He probably did so to get away from the humdrum small town life in Würzburg. However, it may not only have been the bright city lights of Munich which attracted him, but also the closeness to Southern lands. Between semesters of the years 1911 to 1913, he took three extended trips to the Middle East, i.e., to Iran, Syria, and North Africa. For one semester, he studied at Beirut. From letters and short autobiographical articles Mohr wrote for play-bills we know that he took a job as a circus rider in Egypt for some time, that he had a love affair with a Jewish girl in Damascus, and that he had a very dangerous encounter in the Balkans coming home from one of these Oriental travels. Robbers in Montenegro shot him through the hand which also put paid to an idea he had been playing with, i.e. of becoming a violin virtuoso. Mohr’s repeated independent journeys in faraway, exotic countries, with practically no money as he tells it and thus not at all as a pampered tourist, hint at a pronounced yearning for adventure and experiences outside of the established bourgeois norms.

The outbreak of World War I on August 1, 1914, changed his life as it did that of countless other Europeans. He was called up for service as a “supernumerary” medical corporal right away and sent to the Western front. He showed unusual courage by saving wounded soldiers under fire on several occasions. He himself was wounded four times and was highly decorated: he received the “Eiserne Kreuz” (Iron Cross) 1st and 2nd class as well as some Bavarian medals. He was also promoted in rank to a “Feldhilfsarzt” (assistant field physician) before having finished his medical studies, but that was not unusual at that time. Early in 1917, he had the chance to complete his medical education in fast-track courses and passed his final examinations with good grades. He was now a licensed doctor who could practice medicine anywhere in Germany. In the summer of 1917, he was back at the front as a regular assistant physician and, at the end of September, was taken prisoner.
by the British in the third battle of Ypres. The official army report on that incident explains that his position was overrun and that he had no chance to escape capture. He was taken to a POW camp close to Southampton, where he narrowly escaped execution, was released at the end of September of 1918 in exchange for some British prisoners of war in Germany, and returned to Munich on October 4, 1918. He was officially dismissed from military service at the end of March 1919. But only a few weeks later, he served as regimental medical officer with the 8th regiment of dragoons which had joined the “Freikorps” (free corps) suppressing the communist-inspired revolt of the “Arbeiter- und Soldatenräte” (workers’ and soldiers’ councils). This seems to indicate that politically he was quite conservative. He left his unit in the summer of 1919; his last military rank was that of an “Oberarzt der Reserve” which corresponds to the rank of a first lieutenant.

In the winter of 1918–19, when Mohr had already started practising his profession as a physician he accomplished two other things: he published his doctoral dissertation on fever therapy in infantile gonorrhea and at the end of February 1919, he passed his doctoral examination “cum laude” (a middling grade). He kept his practice until the end of April 1920. In 1921, he published a practical book on the best ways to treat rheumatism under the title Die Rheumatiker-Fibel (The rheumatic’s primer). It must have sold well as four more editions appeared in the course of the 1920s. He co-authored it with a Dr. Singer, as the title says. An article on Mohr’s website plausibly suggests this may have been a fiction and that Mohr may have produced that book all by himself. It was written in a popular tone and advertised some new-fangled electrical appliances useful in the treatment of rheumatism.

On March 20, 1920, Mohr married Käthe Westphal, who was one year his junior, the daughter of a wealthy protestant merchant family of Hamburg. The wedding took place in Käthe’s home town. No mention is made on how they met, but we know that some members of her family had some reservations about this union because his plans for a career as a writer seemed vague. One month later, Mohr gave up his medical practice in Munich and the couple moved South to the Alps to a small farm at Rottach, on the Tegernsee. It seems that Mohr had seen and taken a liking to that particular spot of land in 1914 already. Their farm, called the Löblhof, was part of a large former manor of the Tegernsee monastery called the “Wolfsgrub” (wolf pit). Most of the literature uses “Wolfsgrub” as the name of Mohr’s farm, but in a printed greeting card the couple sent out to advise their friends about the change of address it is given correctly as Löblhof, Wolfsgrub, post Rottach on Tegernsee. A detailed modern road map will show Wolfsgrub as the name of a “Weiler” (a hamlet), about one kilometer southeast of Rottach-Egern. The Löblhof was bought for the young couple by Käthe’s mother.
The move to the shores of the Tegernsee was motivated by Mohr's love for the enjoyment of the quiet countryside which was shared by his wife and by the closeness of the mountains for mountaineering tours; on the other hand, it should not be understood as a flight from society as quite a few prominent authors lived close by and many other authors and theater people liked to spend their vacations there, thus offering Mohr a good chance of keeping contact with the literary and theater scene. The Löblhof has stayed in Mohr's family; after his wife and daughter it is now owned and lived in by his grandson Nicolas Humbert.

As early as 1914, Mohr had started on a literary career; his first published works are the Sonette nach durchlesenen Nächten aus dem Unterstand (Sonnets after nights spent reading in the shelter). Most of them were written 1914–17 under the working title Sonette des Infanteristen (Sonnets of the infantryman), but when Mohr published them in addition to several new ones somewhat later he chose the new title. Except for seven other sonnets, Die Sonette vom neuen Noah, which appeared in 1932, and the poem Mondvogel ("moon bird") dedicated to D.H. Lawrence they were his only poetic productions and thus deserve some attention. Unlike many other youthful authors of the time Mohr never glorified the war and never denigrated the war enemies. Instead, he denounces the war as insane, irrational, and devoid of any heroism; his poetic images decry the cruelty, ugliness, and the loss of human individuality concomitant to it. Stylistically, these early sonnets belong to expressionism.

The Sonette vom neuen Noah (the number of seven was probably chosen for its biblical and mythical connotations) appeared more than 15 years later when Mohr was a well-known author; here, Mohr contrasts the rottenness of modern civilization which "enslaves" the whole globe, which is doomed and does not deserve to be saved with a coming new world of justice, brotherly love and no more alienation between humans, especially between men and women, where truly creative work under humane conditions will again be possible.

Between 1915 and 1921, Mohr wrote seven dramas which remained unpublished and were never staged; in 1920, he was able to bring out in print the novel Frau Maries Gast as well as the drama Die Dadakratie; it was never produced on stage, either. Mohr did not agree to the ideas of Dadaism; he thought that its anarchism, contempt of bourgeois values, and nonsensical texts tried to hide some very real confusion, lack of intellectual direction, and discipline.

After Mohr and his wife had moved in at the Löblhof in the spring of 1920, Käthe ran the farm and Mohr began to write furiously for the stage which he wanted to conquer. At the same time, Mohr who was not only courageous, as we have seen, but is also described as physically strong and fit,
often felt the need to conquer the mountains as well. In January 1922, soon after he had sent the manuscript of a new comedy to Munich, he went on a climbing tour, alone, on the Großenvenediger glacier in Tyrol which rises up to 11,500 feet. On this tour, he got into a snowstorm and nearly froze to death. He was taken home with severe frostbite on his feet and legs and for several days after his return his life hung in the balance as Käthe’s lively report on this incident describes. He had to have several toes amputated; he probably did not operate on himself as has been asserted, but had the operation done at a hospital. What helped immensely in improving his health was the exciting news that his comedy *Improvisationen im Juni* had been accepted and that the renowned Residenztheater in Munich was staging it.

On the surface, the play tells the story of an American billionaire’s son who is severely depressed and cannot see any meaning in life. After various treatments, applied in February, March, April, and May have failed to improve his condition, he is finally saved in June by the “Improvisator” (improviser) Zappe, Zappe’s daughter Olga, and the animal keeper Tomkinov. There is, however, more to the drama than this somewhat improbable, simplistic storyline. It also takes up the old topic of generational conflict which is treated in a dual way: in the first place, there is the father-son conflict between the extremely materialistic billionaire who thinks money can solve any problem and his son who is desperately looking for something essential in life that cannot be bought for money. He does not rebel violently against his father (Mohr avoids patricide even though that was quite fashionable in the expressionist drama of the time) but instead shows his rejection of his father’s views by retreating into mental depression. Olga reproaches him for this, as she sees it, feeble attitude and demands that he should take a more active role. Secondly, there is a father-daughter conflict between Olga and her father; she strongly disapproves of his utilitarianism and takes escape into her love for the romantically heroic Tomkinov, the only person in the play who can be considered completely self-determined. Self-determination was one of the things Mohr valued most highly and strove for in his own life as well as in the protagonists he put on the stage or described in his novels. In addition to the generational conflict there is the discrepancy between the old European way of life symbolized by the old princess Orloff who will commit suicide at the end of the play and the new materialistic American way; however, Mohr never trusted in materialism and technological progress as he did not believe that they would be able to solve the perennial problems of the human condition.

On the other hand, it seems significant that Mohr contrasts the Old World and the New one in this particular manner. The billionaire’s secretary describes the old princess Orloff as the perfect embodiment of a European
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civilization which is in irreversible decline. Her world is defined by values like love, loyalty, honour, and feudalism; money by itself is of no value to her. Her outmoded lifestyle will be replaced by the new, aggressive, energetic American world of money and profit. This dichotomy lets us see that Mohr was very much a man of his time. For the first time in the 1920s, America had taken the lead in cultural as well as economic development; many German intellectuals and large parts of German society saw it as the model to be followed in cultural and social matters. America was seen as a land of pragmatism and matter-of-factness, of economic efficiency and technical progress as well as of a vastly superior standard of living; its democracy seemed to be fully in accordance with the political demands of the American people and it apparently had been able to develop a “mass culture” corresponding perfectly to popular needs and expectations. Admiration of the American way of life as it was understood in Germany lead to the rejection of expressionism in favor of the “Neue Sachlichkeit” (new realism or functionalism) in the arts and architecture. Sporting events such as boxing matches, car and bicycle races, dance shows like those of the Tiller girls, and American movies became popular with the cultural elites as well as a broader public. In the eyes of many, America embodied the future. As mentioned above, Mohr had some reservations about the value of materialism and mere technical progress, but there can be no doubt that America was a very important cultural reference point for him, too. There will be several other instances to show how American ideas and literature influenced his thought.

Because Mohr was still unable to walk he could not personally appear at the première of Improvisationen on March, 25, but sent Käthe instead. She exuberantly describes the première night which was a major success and made Mohr’s name known all over Germany. His play had a run of over 50 performances at the Residenztheater which at a repertory theater, especially one like the Residenztheater with its 60 annual productions in those years, meant a remarkable success. Furthermore, from 1922 to 1924 the play was staged by dozens of other theatres in the country. Unfortunately this happened at the height of the German post-war hyperinflation. Mohr became famous, but not wealthy from the Improvisationen as might have been expected with so many productions. In the end, he had hardly made any money at all. As it was important for him to feel that he could provide for his family the success of his drama at least let him see that under normal economic circumstances he would now be able to fulfil this role.

Six years later, Improvisationen was produced in the US as well; it would seem that the play’s critical acclaim in Germany had made a favorable impression on the directors of the Civic Repertory Theater in New York City. However, the New World was completely baffled by Mohr’s comedy and did
not appreciate it. It will be sufficient to quote passages from two reviews to let us see that this attempt at a cultural transfer was a failure. “Still it was a long and baffling night, last night among the deep thinkers of the seriously factious drama. Perhaps performance in the country of its birth brought out qualities which were not visible last night, though we doubt it,” was Percy Hammond’s reaction. “The ancient quarrel between the dollars and the dreamers is the main motive of the play, but a motive so distorted by a multitude of curious twists, wilful decorations, and pale mauve epigrams that we cannot tell where the author is trying to be serious and where he is simply kicking the words around for his own amusement,” is what Robert Littel opined.

The success of *Improvisationen* in Germany gave Mohr the impetus to follow it up with several new plays. However, his four next pieces, *Das Gelbe Zelt* (The yellow tent), *Der Arbeiter Esau* (The worker Esau), *Sirill am Wrack* (Sirill at the wreck), and *Die Karawane* which all appeared in 1923 and 1924 and, such was Mohr’s reputation now, were immediately staged, were not very successful. None of them had a long run and there were hardly any parallel productions; Mohr had the bitter experience of seeing them rejected by many literary critics as mere copies of his successful first play. That is why only cursory mention is made of them here. Common to all of them is Mohr’s criticism of modern civilization which he sees as artificial, materialistic, degrading, and basically inhuman. There are more descriptions of conflict between the generations, there is a tendency to deal with people at the edge of society or people who have fled society. There is the expectation of a new world of truly human values which needs to be born from the ruins of the old world. These are some of the topics and aspects which were to recur in Mohr’s oeuvre. Another common denominator is the striving for freedom and self-determination in many of his protagonists, especially the female ones, and their attempts at overcoming empty social conventions. Some of them could almost be seen as con men, out to take advantage of a world wanting to be deceived.

In spite of only mixed success at the theater and some financial difficulties, the years 1922 to 1925 were an active and, it seems, happy time for the Mohrs. Mohr was in a very productive phase as an author, and he was often invited to supervise the stage production of his plays, as well. This gave him and his wife a chance to get away from country life. It is another constant in Mohr’s life that, on the one hand, he strongly criticized big cities and modern civilization and yearned for nature and the loneliness of the mountains, but that, on the other hand, he needed a teeming metropolis like Berlin in the 1920s and early 1930s for new ideas. Käthe gives us a pleasant description of how she and Mohr went to Berlin for several weeks to watch over a new production of *Improvisationen*. There they met two of the most famous German actors
of their day, Elisabeth Bergner and Heinrich George, who became their close friends; the two couples spent most of those days together, going to different rehearsals, going out to eat or simply for a walk. In later years, Heinrich George visited them several times at the Löblhof and collaborated with Mohr on plans for recitals, movies, and radio shows.

In 1925, Mohr had another spectacular success with his serious drama *Ramper*. It tells of a polar explorer who gets caught in the icy desert of Greenland after his airplane has crashed. 20 years later (by then the loneliness and harsh conditions have turned him into an animal, he has lost his memory and even his speech) whalers find him and take him to a simple hospital. But the doctors there cannot help him and he is dismissed as incurable. Circus artists buy him from the hospital and use him in a freak show. Then a noted psychiatrist who wants to acquire world fame with this case releases him from the circus and finally succeeds in turning him back into a normal human being. The psychiatrist's wife for some time is ready to take up living with Ramper even in his animal state because the fact that he only follows his instincts is attractive to her who is bored by the accoutrements of civilization. In the end, Ramper, motivated by love, renounces his wish to return to Greenland and the "natural" life and stays in the world of civilization.

The reviews ranged from the most laudatory praise to devastatingly negative opinions. But, clearly, the praise prevailed as several German theaters staged it almost simultaneously. Paul Wegener, another famous actor of the time, played the title role at the “Deutsches Theater” in Berlin. That was not all, as two years later *Ramper* was made into a silent movie with some of the location shots actually filmed in Greenland and again with Wegener in the title role. It was first shown in October, 1927. Mohr and Wegener became close friends. That the movie was to be produced by a German company had not been clear from the outset. The lively correspondence between Mohr and Wegener shows that originally Paramount Pictures had had an option to acquire the rights to it, but eventually let it drop. Wegener advised Mohr against doing business with the Austrian producer-director Joe May because he thought that May was planning to turn Mohr’s serious drama into a burlesque. It is not quite clear whether May was pursuing the *Ramper* project for Paramount or for himself. Anyway, in 1928 an English version of the movie was produced, and, at about the same time, the drama came out as a radio play in Britain and in the USA. The stage play was revived several times after WW II, e.g., at the Volksbühne in Berlin in 1997 and at the Theater Chaminzky in Würzburg in 2002.

We can assume that, this time, Mohr really made some money, too. “Money-maken” was an English phrase with a German ending which he used in letters and in conversation quite often, mostly in jest, but sometimes
in earnest, as he felt responsible for earning the livelihood of the family. The repeated use of this phrase seems to show that Mohr had adopted some quite American ways of thinking as he could have talked of “Geld verdienen” instead. Incidentally, Mohr spoke English very well; English idioms and phrases crop up quite often in his letters. That, of course, was very useful to him in his exile in Shanghai.

In 1926, the birth of his daughter Eva brought about a major change in Mohr’s family life. On the one hand, Mohr seems to have been a good father to his only child, but, on the other hand, having a real family and living at the Löblhof in general made him feel unduly fenced in. He began to spend more and more time in Berlin on his own, looking for inspiration, networking in theater and literary circles, and, once, having an affair with the actress Bertha von Arnim-Zichow.

Mohr’s next work may perhaps be seen as a harbinger of his complete break with drama and the theatre which came about in 1931; it was a medium-sized novel, *Venus in den Fischen* (Venus in Pisces; the second noun in the title should, as I understand it, not be translated as “fishes” even though D.H. Lawrence did so). It came out in 1927 in weekly instalments in the magazine “Die Dame.” It is a narrative about two young German medical doctors, a man and a woman, who have been fired from their assistant jobs and an older (supposedly 111 years old), but somehow ageless, black American astrologer who found a clinic. Again, it seems significant for Mohr’s understanding of the modern world and America’s role in it that the American takes most of the initiative in the founding of the clinic although he remains the social outsider, in the end. This is not so much due to the fact that he is an American, but rather that he is black, and this was still characteristic for social life in the 1920s. The new clinic to be founded is meant for people worn down or at least feeling to be, “burnt-out” as we would say today, by big city life. A mixture of medical treatment and astrology is meant to get them back on an even keel and, at the same time, to enrich the curious trio of entrepreneurs. Astrology was one of Mohr’s hobbies; the topic of making money by fleecing the idle rich, as we have seen before, turns up quite often in Mohr’s writings. As in his dramatic work Mohr describes and criticizes man’s alienation from nature and from true humanity in modern urban society. Mohr saw his contemporary society defined by a heartless technology which was revered like a fetish and by the relentless and equally heartless pursuit of profit. One wonders what he would have said about life today.

*Venus in den Fischen* is also what is called a “Großstadtroman” in German literary history, a novel which gives a special place, almost as one of the protagonists, to the big city, Berlin, where it is set. Some passages are modeled on Theodor Fontane’s *Frau Jenny Treibel*. By its style, the novel belongs to
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functionalism which had, by then, replaced expressionism as the prevailing literary style. Many of Mohr's observations and descriptions such as the architect's new furnishings of a high-society dining-room or the various crazes that some of the protagonists pursue for a while and then quickly exchange for new ones are both hilarious and timeless. Another topic which pervades Mohr's novels even more than his plays is the role of the genders: in his view, women are the stronger and more independent sex, many of his men are insecure searchers for their proper role in the world.78

Mohr's view of his contemporary civilization as unhealthy may explain his penchant for protagonists from and for social settings at the edges of bourgeois society. However, he never just deplores the disappearance of older, nicer ways of social life in the romantic mould, instead he hopes for and sets out to seek a new and better world which is to follow the inevitable collapse of the current civilization of his day. Although Mohr was and remained quite conservative politically, his social criticism never took the shape of what is described as "Deutschtümelei" (Germanomania) or "Blut und Boden" (blood and soil) in German literature, i.e. an excessively nationalistic and romantic point of view in which only "good old" German ways would have any value and anything suspected of being foreign would be disdained. He never fell for this kind of thinking which was quite widespread in some of the German literature of his day; his criticism is more reminiscent of the beatniks of the 1950s and 1960s like Jack Kerouac and others. His thought is both romantic and magical, he proposes a new paganism and matriarchy as the way in which humanity will be moving.79

To digress a little at this point: Mohr was Jewish and never took the official steps to leave his religion; on the other hand, he proclaimed himself to be without any religious ties and he was not in the least interested in practising Judaism in a formal way.80 As far as we know, he never went to the synagogue, and he may not even have informed his wife about his religious affiliation. But he was familiar with Jewish and Christian religious ideas and often made use of biblical language and images, both of the Old and New Testament.

Mohr's last dramas appeared between 1927 and 1931. In 1927, his new comedy, Platingruben in Tulpin (Platinum Mines in Tulpin) which again satirized the contemporary worship of the golden calf was staged; it met with middling success.81 In 1930, he completed another comedy, Die Welt der Enkel oder: Philemon und Baucis in der Valepp (The Grandchildren's world: or Philemon and Baucis in Valepp [a fictitious mountain valley]) which he considered to be one of his best works.82 His last drama to be staged (quite successfully) was a "Volksstück," a piece for the Tegernsee dialect theatre called Kalteisergeist which came out in 1931. This actually was a revised version of
the Platingruben in Bavarian dialect; here, for once in Mohr's works, the old world was seen as superior to any new one.83

Mohr's dramatic oeuvre was definitely less important than, say, that of his contemporary Bert Brecht. On the other hand, as his success with pieces like Improvisationen and Ramper shows he was one of the better known authors of the German stage in the 1920s. In style and by the content of his plays he could be compared to Carl Zuckmayer whose plays have withstood the test of time somewhat better; like him he did not want to revolutionize the theater, but wanted to express, in a form suited for his time, thoughts and feelings which determine the human condition. Ramper exhibits some close parallels to Eugene O'Neill's The Hairy Ape and some of Mohr's other plays resemble Pirandello's works; but, unlike Pirandello, he never blurs the distinction between the stage and the auditorium, and thus proves to be more conservative in the formal structure of his dramas.84

In 1927, Mohr made the acquaintance of D.H. Lawrence, who was to become a very close friend; at the same time, Mohr saw himself as Lawrence's disciple. At first, Lawrence did not think much of Mohr and remained critical of many of his works,85 but it did not take long before his opinion took a decisive turn towards the better. Mohr saw in Lawrence a man who held very similar views on society, civilization, and the role of men and women in the world as he himself did; he also admired "Lorenzo's" (as he called him) literary accomplishments. In the summer of 1929, the Lawrences visited with the Mohrs at the Wolfsgrub for several weeks. Mohr was not afraid of letting his three-year old daughter play with Lawrence even though Lawrence suffered from open tuberculosis. But Mohr was convinced that nothing bad could come to her from "Lorenzo." And he was right, Eva wasn't infected. Lawrence was inspired to his famous poem Bavarian Gentians at the Wolfsgrub, Käthe had placed a vase with gentians close to his bed.86 In the fall, Mohr accompanied the Lawrences when they went off to Southern France; he hoped that a new fruit cure that he believed in would help Lawrence. It didn't have the desired effect, however, and he left them in Bandol (between Marseille and Toulon). Lawrence wrote a letter to Käthe telling her how sad he was at Mohr's departure.87 The two men had planned that Mohr should translate Lady Chatterley's Lover into German, but nothing came of it.88 Mohr wrote a roman à clef about his friendship with Lawrence, Die Freundschaft von Ladiz, which appeared in German in 1931; an English translation came out one year later.89 It starts with a scene of the two men having a fistfight, and it is quite ironic that after a second edition had appeared in 1932, a minor political scandal arose in 1934 about the fact that the publishing company (which, in 1931, had been bought by a strongly right-wing salesmen's union) had brought out this new edition of a Jewish author's work. The publishing
company went ahead with the publication and advertised it as a folksy tale about rugged mountain people; it could support this decision with the fact that the head of the “Reichsstelle zur Förderung des deutschen Schrifttums” (Reich office for the promotion of German literature) who didn't know or understand who the two friends in that novel really were, had come to the conclusion that the content of the book was in full accordance with the National Socialist view of friendship between men. 

Mohr was busy writing and publishing from 1929 to 1933, but he felt more and more strongly that he wasn't coming up to the standards he had set for himself and wasn't achieving anything new and noteworthy. He again saw that his financial situation wasn't satisfactory, that he was struggling to make ends meet. Also, his marriage seems to have been at a problematic stage. So there are reasons to assume that he left Germany as early as he did not so much because he foresaw serious problems for the German Jews in general and Jewish writers in particular, but more because he felt hemmed in by his situation; his yearning for far-away, romantic places may have made him decide to go to Shanghai as much as the practical considerations that his exams would be accepted there without question, that he didn't have to deposit a large amount of money, and didn't have to have an affidavit (as he would have had in the U.S.) to get in. Moreover Käthe's brother Eduard who had lived in China for several years and had a leading position in the Westphal family's tea trading firm was able to provide him with a very useful contact in the person of Dr. Werner Vogel who was established as a lawyer in Shanghai and was a correspondent of several German newspapers; he also worked for the local German Chamber of Commerce and was an influential member of the German community. Mohr had decided with Käthe that he would give up literature altogether and would set up as a medical doctor again. After he had established himself firmly (he thought it would take two or three years) Käthe and Eva were to follow him.

It should be remembered that the conditions of immigration remained unchanged and very lenient in Shanghai even after the pogroms of November 1938 when other countries were putting up new obstacles for Jewish refugees from Germany and Austria. Shanghai has thus earned a special place in the history of the Jewish flight from Central Europe under National Socialism as an unexpected safe haven where most of the refugees survived. It should be remembered, however, that Mohr's life as an exile in Shanghai differed quite markedly from that of the Jewish refugees who arrived after 1938. He almost fully succeeded in becoming a normal, socially accepted member of the community of foreigners living in Shanghai. As he not only changed his country of residence, but also his professional life (away from literature and back to medicine) he evaded some of the typical disappointments of the
expatriate man of letters, such as being cut off from the medium of his own language or the absence of any kind of echo to his literary production.

After having taken the necessary preparations for his emigration Mohr left Käthe and Eva at the Löblhof and, having paid a visit to his mother in Munich and then to the families of his brothers-in-law in Hamburg, went on board the SS "Saarbrücken" at Hamburg on October 27, 1934. He would never see any of them again. On December 18, 1934, Mohr arrived at Shanghai. Werner Vogel met him at the dock, took him in for the first few weeks, and introduced him to the local German community. From Mohr's letters to his wife we can see that he started setting up a medical practice right away, but it took him several weeks to find suitable quarters. By the end of February 1935, he was settled in his own office-cum-apartment at 803, Bubbling Well Road (Yates Apartments). Bubbling Well Road was the main thoroughfare and shopping street of the so-called International Settlement; so it would seem that Mohr, doubtlessly with Vogel's help, had been able to secure a very good location for his office. His visiting card rather grandly claimed that he was a General Practitioner and Specialist in Nervous and Mental Diseases. At Yates Apartments, he had an office room, a waiting room, a bedroom, and a bathroom. By the standards prevailing for the Jewish exiles from Germany and Austria who fled to Shanghai after the pogrom of 1938 this was a princely abode for a single person. In 1939 or 1940, even more so after the setting up of the "Ghetto" in 1943, two families might have been crowded into three rooms. Again we have to remember that Mohr came to Shanghai four to five years before the great wave of Jewish exiles and that his life in exile differed markedly from theirs.

Very quickly, Mohr met two other German-Jewish doctors who had recently arrived in Shanghai as refugees with whom he collaborated at public hospitals and with whom he spent a lot of time studying tropical diseases and generally getting his medical knowledge back up to acceptably high standards. We have to remember that he hadn't worked in his medical profession for several years. The way he describes this collaboration in a letter to his wife again shows that American literature was a natural point of reference in his thought. He talks about "... furchtbar viel mit Kollegen Falle studieren und Mikroskopieren und Arrowsmithen [sic] ..." (doing awfully many case studies with my colleagues, microscope work and "arrowsmithing"), i.e., in describing his work he refers to Sinclair Lewis's novel Arrowsmith which had come out in 1925 (both in the U.S. and in Germany). Arrowsmith describes the career of a medical doctor in private practice and later in medical research.

The Shanghai that Mohr arrived at late in 1934 was a fast-growing city of about three and a half million inhabitants and the busiest port in East Asia, as it is today. Following the treaty of Nanjing of 1842 which had opened
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Shanghai up to international trade, several extraterritorial areas had been set up there, first the so-called French Concession, founded in 1849, then in 1863 the International Settlement where British influence prevailed. These extraterritorial areas were self-governing, Chinese law applied only to a limited extent, the Chinese government could not interfere in their administration or judiciary, and Chinese military forces did not have the right of entry. Foreigners who lived in these areas paid only customs duties on imports, but were otherwise practically tax-free, one of the main economic attractions of Shanghai and one of the reasons for its spectacular growth. In the French Concession, the General Consul of France had the most important political position. In the International Settlement, the Shanghai Municipal Council was the decisive power; it was elected by the “meeting of ratepayers,” i.e., the individuals who paid property tax. Fewer than 3 percent of the foreigners living in the Settlement did so, still they were the dominant social group; Chinese ratepayers, the large majority of those who paid property tax, first received the right of vote for the Council in 1926; in 1938, five Council seats were reserved for them. The Council was in charge of taxation, public works, the police force and the fire brigade, the schools as well as public health and hospitals; it had some British troops at its disposal. The Chinese city of Greater Shanghai which completely surrounded the extraterritorial areas was governed by a mayor who answered directly to the Chinese national government at Nanjing. Claims of the national government to full national sovereignty over all of Shanghai were thwarted by the Municipal Council which considered the area’s extraterritorial status, and particularly the independent, nationally mixed courts of justice for legal disputes between members of all nationalities as too important an economic advantage to be given up.

Although the city of Shanghai was thus politically divided its inhabitants were not so much segregated by nationality or ethnicity as by economic stratification. People lived in better or poorer parts of town according to their income and social status. Foreigners living in Shanghai were called “Shanghailanders,” irrespective of their nationality, Chinese residents were known as “Shanghai，“. Most of the “Shanghailanders” were well-to-do Westerners working in China were paid much more than natives who did the same or similar work and also more than they would have back home. There are good reasons to include Mohr (with considerable qualifications as far as his income is concerned, but quite unlike the Jewish refugees who arrived after 1938) among the “Shanghailanders.” The International Settlement, one of the most expensive parts of town, had almost one million inhabitants, about 36,500 of them foreigners, the French Concession had approximately 480,000 inhabitants, about 18,900 foreigners among them, the Chinese city
was home to more than 2 million people with about 11,600 foreigners living there.\textsuperscript{111}

When Mohr arrived in 1934 the city’s economy was doing quite well. This was especially true for the German community; it numbered almost exactly 2,000 and its business volume was fast expanding. Whereas Germany’s share of Western imports to China had only been 5.2% in 1930, it had reached 17.25% in 1937 and had surpassed Britain’s position; Germany trailed the US by only about half a percentage point.\textsuperscript{112} Most of this trade, almost two thirds of the imports and about one third of the exports, passed through Shanghai.\textsuperscript{113} There is no room here for a detailed discussion of the causes of this upswing. One reason probably was that the Germans had renounced their colonial privileges in China and were respected for that by the Chinese.\textsuperscript{114} It is interesting to note that the German businessmen in China, most of all the “taipans” (literally “supreme leader”; the term was applied to the leading merchants of the long-established trading companies), did not see any need for an aggressive nationalism and at first were not eager to take up NS ideas, in fact, even resisted them for some time. That slowly changed as it was seen as helpful to be backed by a strong national government and Hitler was viewed as the politician who had prevented a Communist takeover in Germany.\textsuperscript{115}

In 1935, Mohr complained in a letter that even Jews in Shanghai did not consult German-Jewish doctors but stuck to their “Aryan” ones, and that “Aryan” Germans avoided Jewish doctors as well, “da selbstverständlich auch hier ein starker Druck in dieser Beziehung ausgeübt wird” (as strong pressure was exerted on them in this respect here, too).\textsuperscript{116} In 1934, there were 15 old-established German doctors working in Shanghai as well as 26 “non-Aryan” newcomers who had immigrated in 1933 and 1934.\textsuperscript{117} It would seem that even 15 doctors were more than enough for a community of 2,000 people or maybe 3,000 if residents from other German-speaking countries are included. This alone might explain some of the problems facing the new immigrants. There can be no doubt that the NSDAP and the German consulate tried to suppress Jewish immigrants economically and socially, but it seems that in Mohr’s time they were not very successful at that, at least not yet. Shanghai’s cosmopolitanism precluded excesses of the racist NS ideology for quite a long time. To give but one example, the HJ (“Hitlerjugend,” Hitler Youth) was very popular with adolescent German boys in Shanghai and the NSDAP exerted pressure on German parents to enrol their children with the HJ or BdM (“Bund deutscher Mädel,” Union of German Girls); on the other hand, the children of Sino-German marriages as well as purely Chinese or Russian or Polish children were welcome to take part in their activities, if only as guests and not as regular members. That would have been impossible almost anywhere else.\textsuperscript{118}
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When the Japanese occupied the city in 1937 they took over the customs, post and telegraph administrations, but otherwise did not change the political structures. That only happened after Pearl Harbour when they occupied the extraterritorial areas as well. Only then were "enemy aliens," i.e., British subjects or American citizens, interned or expelled. The Japanese occupiers did not exert any pressure on the Jewish exiles until 1943. Only then were they relocated, at the behest of German diplomats, into what became known as the Ghetto; the word "Ghetto" was never used officially, the Jewish district in the Hongkou area was named "restricted area." Moving into that part of town which had been severely damaged by bombing in 1937 meant even worse housing conditions for the Jewish refugees; it meant a strict limitation of their freedom of movement, but luckily it did not mean extermination. The death rate among the Jewish exiles in Shanghai for the years 1939-45 has been calculated at 13 per thousand per year; in Germany it is 10.9, in the US 8.4 today. One negative consequence of the Japanese occupation of Shanghai was that the city was cut off from its natural hinterland, which meant that it was getting more and more difficult for newly arrived refugees to find work. This very much concerned the approximately 15,500 German and Austrian Jews who fled to Shanghai between November 1938 and the beginning of 1941. In spite of the terrible housing conditions and the absence of a reliable income, the religious, cultural and social life of the exiled Jews flourished. As we have seen, most of them survived although Shanghai was considered a poor man's place of exile where one only went if nothing better was available. Some people who spent their teens in Shanghai later went on to become famous. One of them is Werner Michael Blumenthal, Secretary of the US Treasury under President Carter, and today Director of the Jewish Museum in Berlin.

Mohr sent many letters home to Käthe and Eva and they present a very lively picture of his situation, his activities, and his plans. It has already been mentioned, that he had hoped to establish himself within two or three years' time as a medical doctor and have them join him in Shanghai. Reading his letters one gets the impression that by the end of 1935 he was on the point of being financially able to have them come, but he never felt quite sure that he could afford that move. On the other hand, he had some prominent patients, such as the Austrian writer Vicki Baum, some Chinese government ministers, and the Persian consul, as well as a fairly large number of wealthy British businessmen, so after having had his office for about a year and a half he made enough money to be able to rent a car with chauffeur when going out to visit patients and to move in the city's society; this is evidenced by the fact that he felt compelled to buy a tuxedo even though he did not particularly like the type of social life which required formal dress. As we
have seen, he had his office in one of the best parts of town, and, in 1937, may have had a love affair with Agnes Siemssen, who worked as a nurse and was the daughter of one of the wealthiest and most influential of the German "taipans" in Shanghai.\(^{127}\) Of course, Mohr with his talent to see and depict the comical aspects of situations, described social life in Shanghai in a very ironic tone to his wife: "Aber der Arme, diese sozialen Pflichten, die die Company von ihm verlangt . . . 11-1 Cocktail, 1-3 Tiffin (steifes Hemd!), 5-6 Tee, 8-10 Dinner." (But the poor guy, these social duties which [polite] company expects of him . . . 11-1 [o’clock] cocktail [hour], 1-3 tiffin (starched shirt!), 5-6 tea, 8-10 dinner.)\(^{128}\)

Mohr’s correspondence also lets us see how easily and naturally references to American life and literature were inserted into his texts. It may be sufficient to quote three such instances from one long letter Mohr wrote home in January, 1936.\(^{129}\) We have to assume, as well, that his wife was able to understand his allusions. First of all, he informs Käthe that he will join the YMCA to be able to use their library and, most of all, their swimming pool and sports facilities. He wrongly tells her that the Y is "ein riesiges amerikanisches Unternehmen über die ganze Welt" (a huge American company operating world-wide) when, in fact, it was founded in the UK. But Mohr naturally assumed that it must be American because it operated world-wide and had its center of gravity there. He goes on to tell her that joining the YMCA was "ein bisschen Babbitt" (a little bit Babbitt) and that taking exercise regularly there was "richtig Babbitt" (truly Babbitt) instead of using the German word “spießig” which probably was what he had in mind. Again, Mohr refers to a novel by Sinclair Lewis and its eponymous protagonist to express his idea instead of using an equally fitting German word. Finally, he lets Käthe know that he will send her a copy of the latest “Esquire”; Esquire magazine had started up in 1933 and Mohr had evidently been impressed of its literary qualities very soon. This was not the only time he sent a copy of Esquire home even though they sometimes were seized by the German censors.\(^{130}\)

Up to the end of 1935, he showed himself relieved by his move away from literature and he pitied the people who were still caught up in it.\(^{131}\) But then we hear that he and his wife will enjoy the time when he will be financially independent and can write freely, without any considerations of “money-maken.”\(^{132}\) In 1936, he started to rewrite a manuscript he had taken with him to Shanghai, *Das Einhorn* (The Unicorn). He occasionally corresponded with Thomas Mann who appears to have been a good acquaintance (he had visited the Mohrs at the Löblhof once) and other literary figures.\(^{133}\) Also, in 1935, he gave a public speech in English, "a language not my own,” on D.H. Lawrence.\(^{134}\)

At the same time he was mostly caught up in his “Arzterei” [doctor’s
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work] and complained about having to write and send off his quarterly bills.\textsuperscript{135} His situation was still unsettled when, in the summer of 1937, the Japanese bombed Shanghai. He describes how he, together with other doctors, nurses, and hospital personnel, put in long hours of work to help the wounded.\textsuperscript{136} The war with Japan impaired his financial position as some of his wealthy patients left the city.\textsuperscript{137} But in spite of that he took a trip to Japan in August of 1937, accompanied by the above-mentioned Agnes Siemssen; she had worked with him in the aftermath of the bombing of the city.

Soon after his return to Shanghai, on November 13, 1937, Max Mohr suddenly and unexpectedly died of a heart failure. It was probably caused by his heavy smoking and overindulgence in strong coffee, combined with overwork and lack of sleep, especially in the aftermath of the bombing in the summer of 1937, and the murderous climate of his place of exile.\textsuperscript{138} He had just turned 46 and only two years before had written to Kathe that “das Leben ist lang, glaub’ es mir” (life is long, believe me).\textsuperscript{139} He was cremated and the urn with his ashes was taken back to Europe on a German ship together with his papers. When the urn was discovered in a ship’s inspection it was not permitted to be taken into Germany (as it contained the ashes of a Jew). So the ship’s captain dropped it into the North Sea off the German island of Helgoland, marked the exact spot on a chart and took the chart to Kathe.\textsuperscript{140}

Max Mohr was definitely not a writer whose importance and literary influence could be regarded as being on the same level as that of contemporary figures like Bert Brecht, Thomas Mann, or Stefan George. On the other hand, he had a notable impact on the German literature of the 1920s and early 1930s, both as a dramatist and as a novelist. In many ways, he adapted himself to contemporary literary trends and styles, but he cannot be considered as a trendsetter. On the other hand, it would not do him justice to see him merely as a talented dilettante. He also does not quite fit into the category of the many German men of letters in exile who had to leave their homeland as victims of National Socialist persecution. As an exile, he made the conscious decision to return to his medical profession and to give up literature completely, and when, in spite of this resolution, he took up literature again and started to rewrite his last manuscript he continued working as a doctor. His exotic place of exile adds an unusual note to the life of a man who, as I hope to have been able to show, was an interesting personality and man of letters worth remembering today.
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Steger, Max Mohr. Korrespondenzen, 394 (Mohr to his wife on Mar 18, 1935).

Freyeisen, Shanghai, 21; by 1938, it had reached 3.8 million inhabitants.

Ibid., 20.

Ibid., 18–19.
Mohr lived in one of the best parts of town, moved in society without any problems, his medical business was doing quite well. Even if he probably did not earn as much as most other "Shanghailanders" he could afford a hire car and small luxuries. Finally, he was not only very good friends with, but even distantly related to, one of the wealthiest and most influential German "taipans," Fred Siemssen; Fred S.'s son Hermann was married to one of Kathé Mohr's sisters (see Steger, Max Mohr. Korrespondenzen, 210, 416, 438). Fred S.'s daughter Agnes may have been Max Mohr's lover in 1937 (ibid. and below 18 with fn. 127).


For the Jewish death rate in Shanghai 1939-1945 see ibid., 41; for today's death rate in the US or in Germany look under http://www.ipicture.de/daten/demographie_deutschland and http://www.ipicture.de/daten/demographie_USA. The difference between the German and the American rates given there seems very questionable, however, considering the higher life expectancy in Germany.

Cf Michael Blumenthal's lively memories about the different countries of exile and their rankings in popular Jewish opinion of the time, in: Hochstadter, Flucht ins Ungewisse, 29.

For that probable love affair see Beer/Steger, Max Mohr, 211; for Fred Siemssen's, Agnes' father's, social and economic standing cf. Freyeisen, Shanghai, 36–37. She and Mohr took a trip to Japan in the summer of 1937.

Letter of July 13, 1936, quoted by Freyeisen, Shanghai, 53. Tiffin is pidgin English for a meal, specifically lunch.


There are several other mentions of copies of "Esquire" being sent home to Kathé in Steger, Max Mohr. Korrespondenzen.

132 C.-L. Reichert, *Lieber keinen Kompafś*, 105–6, where Mohr tells his wife that the novel is his life-saver and remarks to her “Die armen, armen Menschen, die das [die Literatur] nicht haben” (the poor, poor people who do not have this [literature]).

133 Ibid., 106–7 (with reprints of two letters to Th. Mann).

134 The speech was given on April 8, 1935; its beginning is quoted in C.-L. Reichert, *Lieber keinen Kompafś*, 91.

135 E.g., in the letter of Oct. 9, 1935 (see note 117).


140 Ibid., 110.