

in the beyond, but here on earth, his acts became consequential. But as secular politics became absolute, historical events began to depend ever more closely on the circumstances of reigning families themselves, and the bourgeois townsmen took them as their model. The significance of the heir, however, which determined rules of female conduct in both cases, affected families directly in only one way. It brought strict order but no love. The appearance of love as a social phenomenon is probably the result of the negation of discipline, the rebellion against the interests of the family, against an order of relationships which had taken on the glow of sanctity. As the exclusiveness of sexual surrender was no longer imposed from without but desired for the sake of the partner, sexuality was freed from a means-end nexus that had been transfigured as eternal custom, and it was only now that the person acquired on earth the infinite value it had lost in the beyond after the importance of theology had receded. The mortal danger which recurred every time the taboo was broken, the mastery of the fear of the sacrosanct, and of external resistance, lent sexuality the sublime quality that turned it into love. As fear and resistance dwindle, as the social bases of the family change, sexuality in the form of love becomes less and less able to structure the entire life in all its detail toward one end, the tie with a single other person. The bond thus created loosens; the past is no longer carried as fully into a future, and the future becomes more nuanced as a result. A motive for sublimation, an element of civilization, falls by the wayside. The increasing likeness and changing functions of dress among the sexes are an outward sign. They symbolize the liquidation of the sexual taboo itself. The backward nations, the bushmen of Africa who are about to repeat this process at greater speed, dress up; the whites undress. They are moving toward a kind of monogamy which probably differs from promiscuity by its greater convenience under prevailing conditions, not because it is a more intense experience. It will be easy to make it an element in the controlled traffic in which the Chinese are being trained in our time. The only difference is that it is a beginning there, a regressive phenomenon here. What seems a circle when viewed in isolation and from this continent may be a moment in a development. The European Enlightenment might be fulfilling a historical function which is no longer visible from Europe where we seem to have come full circle.

Pro Patria: That one should be ready to die for one's country is no general moral commandment. It is valid only if the order there makes the equal treatment of all a principle, and grants each as much freedom as is compatible with the rights of others. When that sentence refers to war, it is valid if one's own country is threatened by others who wish to endanger that condition. This can be inferred from the state of their own institutions and the intent to conquer and subject they may prompt. The citizens of totalitarian states at war with free countries are not obliged to fight. The fatherland in abstracto is no true idea. Of course, what man is meant to be also remains abstract and untrue unless developed. Depending on the degree of technological maturity and the amount of tension between nations, the condition of general freedom tends to limit the power and the pleasure it brings to an ever smaller circle of persons while the rest are kept under control by food for body and spirit. If, on lower technological levels, freedom must be restricted for its own sake, i.e., to attain higher skills, it is also mandatory to do so on the highest if regression is to be prevented. It is not merely power in the hands of a few that augurs it. The poverty in the hearts of nations with a high standard of living is also a symptom. The smaller the number of those that hunger impotently, the less voice they have, the more strongly they repudiate the few at the top and the many that forget them. Freedom in abstracto is no truer than the fatherland.

If a good cause demand that men risk their lives, there are usually those ready to do their share. More often than not, the good cause fails. Later, very much later, a historical situation develops where the survivors are to be rewarded. Then it is the wrong ones, for the right ones are rarely around when things go well, otherwise they wouldn't be the right ones. Reality, even the better reality, passes them by. Like the worse reality in which they risked their life, it is friendlier to those that have a greater affinity with power than it is to the just that become its victims.

On the Capture of Eichmann: A minion of National Socialism called Eichmann who had been specifically assigned to exterminate Jews in Germany and the countries occupied by the Germans was seized by Israeli citizens in Argentina and taken to Israel. The inten-

tion is to place him on trial there. Estimates of the number of Jews murdered at Eichmann's orders range from three-quarters of a million to four or five million. He was proud of his role in the "final solution" and in the right, according to prevailing law. If the court in Israel wants to be just, it will disqualify itself. The formal grounds for the trial are obviously untenable. Eichmann did not murder in Israel, nor can Israel wish that the seizure of political criminals in the asylum they should or should not have found become the general rule. Punishment is a means by which a given state enforces respect for the laws within its territory. Its purpose is deterrence. All other theories of punishment are bad metaphysics. It is madness to assume that the punishment in Israel could deter possible successors of Eichmann. Whatever may happen to him in Israel will prove the impotence, not the power of Jews conscious of themselves and their right, the arrogance, not the customary conduct of governmental authority in Israel. Everyone knows that it is with an eye to New York that the Israelis' totalitarian airs, which are reminiscent of Mussolini and the Russians, were let pass once more. The reasons given for this legal action are no less inadequate. Allegedly, the trial is to enlighten the youth of Israel and foreign nations about the Third Reich. But if such knowledge cannot be communicated through the pertinent information available in scientific and generally accessible works in all civilized languages; if the relevance it should have for present and future generations has to be created through an outpouring of accounts of the trial and international sensationalism, it is in bad shape. The consciousness which needs new headlines to be impressed with the death of the Jews under Hitler has little depth. It will not remember. The real consequences of the publicity given the extermination by the trial, the political and socio-psychological effects on peoples in our time, are unpredictable. Both among Israel's youth and the sympathetic masses in other nations which one hopes to win over, the unconscious suspicion that the slain are being used for political means, that they serve tactical and propagandistic ends, will constitute an obstacle, however legitimate the national purpose may be. The resistance of the good against the destructive powers will be paralyzed if it must avail itself of weapons which the enemy uses as a matter of course. Criminal trials based on political calculation are

part of the arsenal of anti-Semitism, not of Jewry.

The calculations of the Israeli authorities are false. Persecution and mass murder are pervasive themes of world history. For a brief span, and after they had been defeated by internal or external enemies, political systems which used them to acquire or retain power were abominated by the nations of the world, and then they returned in similar form. For decades, no one was free to declare his loyalty to Bonaparte, not to mention the great Revolution. At the time of the economic miracle under Louis-Philippe, the coffin was brought to Paris in triumph, and finally the infamous Napoleon ascended the restored throne. There were countless victims, yet toward the end of the century, France was considered the guardian of freedom. The power of oblivion is all-inclusive, it has grown with growing intercourse among nations, and the trial won't be able to change that. One news story succeeds another in the limelight of press and radio, and meanwhile the ominous effect builds up in the dark. Expiation is referred to as the ultimate or the primary reason for the trial, as if it were a perfectly human need. I have a profound mistrust of the term. It seems to be a screen for impulses that fear the light, that come from an alien world, it reminds one of the Teutonic past, ages and ages ago, and of the Inquisition. But the notion that a human judgment, a sentence, could make Eichmann expiate his deeds is a mockery of the victims, a horribly grotesque mockery. It would be easier for me to understand the frank desire for revenge, however inadequate that would necessarily be in view of the crimes committed. If someone who had lost his father and mother under Hitler had tracked down the villain in Argentina and murdered him on the street, he would be no tactician but a human being everyone could understand.

But however ingenious its preparation, the trial in Israel is simpleminded and shocking at one and the same time. The intent to eliminate Eichmann if he participated in plans of international fascist agencies would be perfectly legitimate. But the desire to get at him not only betrays a lack of political know-how but insensitivity. No people has suffered more than the Jews. Suffering is its destiny's basic motif, and it has made that suffering a moment of permanence and unity. Instead of creating malice and viciousness, suffering trans-

formed itself into a kind of collective insight and experience. Suffering and hope have become inseparable for the Jewish people. At one point in its history, the European peoples sensed this and by professing the tortured Redeemer, they made the torment the Jews suffered because of that eternal future they would not let go of a part of history. Jews are not ascetic, they did not worship suffering, they experienced it. But more than is true of others, it is connected for them with the memory of their dead. It does not make saints of them but imparts to them that infinite tenderness which can dispense with the consolation of eternal life.

The Jew who sees Eichmann and understandably looks forward to seeing him suffer has not yet become conscious of himself, not because his desire offends against his religion, but because it contravenes his entire heritage. To punish Eichmann without need amounts to inflicting on him a measure of what ennobles the dead. The Israeli politicians are not only short of intelligence but also of heart. They neither know nor feel what they are doing. I plead the incompetence of the tribunal and for the return of Eichmann to the country from which he was taken. Nothing good will come of this trial, neither for the security and position of Jews in the world, nor for their self-consciousness. The trial is a repetition: Eichmann will do harm a second time.

Spirit: The substantive moment in a spiritual whole is abstract. Taken by itself, the doctrine of a religion tells us little about it. Torquemada and Victor Hugo professed the identical faith which was yet something else, its own contradiction. For one believer, religion in today's Germany means allegiance to a strong cause, having a roof over his head now that Nazism has collapsed. With another, it is a substitute for independent thought, a reason not to bother too much with the suffering of others and the world at large but to stick to his own business. With a third, it is the motive for self-righteousness. There are a few where attachment to religion is the same as the memory of childhood, the love for dead parents, a kind of gratitude. Such people come from protected bourgeois homes, from an affluence still recent enough not to turn into hardness and routine. In their case, it is difficult to distinguish religion from

kindness. Because of their religion, the Jews in imperial Germany whose wrathful God was like that of the others in demanding an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, not infrequently developed a sense for the splendor of kindness which was certainly as pronounced as that of the German Christians whose god, after all, is love.

But it is no less untrue to deny that content has significance in the meaning of an intellectual structure. The child that does not experience the happiness of having its mother's words and gestures impart to it a teaching for which heaven is not merely a space for rockets but a promise of salvation will get to know new friends and substitutes only in atrophied embodiments. Expression cannot truly be detached from what is expressed. Only in abstract science, and even there only where it is mere execution whose meaning is tacitly presupposed, can form and content be separated without becoming something else. Logic in itself is untrue, as is everything that merely needs but lacks it. What is true is the whole, which ultimately eludes us, thus making all the work of the mind both abstract and untrue, however true it may be.

Permanent Education: Mankind is still being educated. Education means learning, submitting to rules which are first imposed and ultimately to be internalized. Once that has happened, they will be followed automatically, like walking erect, adding and subtracting, observing the laws. In our time, it is being demanded of Euro-American society that it compete with other nations and civilizations and finally become a member in the world. As this occurs, it must eradicate individualism within its own borders, for world-historically, individualism was merely a means toward technicalization which ultimately benefits all. Increasingly, the reason for an individual's culture disappears for it carries a hint of Pharaohs and slave owners. The freer mankind becomes, the less meaning individual freedom will have. Not to see this was the error of Karl Marx. His system is undialectical. During the final change, the last great change from quantity into quality where the freedom of part of society is to become that of all, the quality remains the same in spite of all his ambiguous talk. The freedom of all men is that of the citizen who can develop his abilities, much as Goethe already envisaged it. The