

Translation from Part of Red Perimeter
the German
Published in Germany in 1924

Incomplete

1958

of 1917-1918 remained far away. And as a result they suffered no post-war injustices. The Americans, however, thirst after justice. Every American knows that justice exalts a people. But he knows too that no state embodies justice, and he hopes that every man may act in the spirit of the "Founding Fathers" as a new founder of the state. So does the American conceive of his country. The internal crises of the nation have been mastered by bold fighters for justice, fighters of a type unknown in Germany, a type to which neither Michael Kohlhaas nor Secretary Wurm give a clue. These fighters had to replace the continuous awareness of a conscientious staff.

After the Russian Revolution of 1917 no professorship of Russian was established in any American university. Today the lack of teachers of Russian and of experts on Russia is felt everywhere. Foreign Policy has only now become really serious in the United States. The second World War forced them to get going. The whole of the Western World stands today before the fact that the Russians have an advantage in political vision though not in political reality. The Russians see in World Wars I and II one and the same event. In America and Germany, on the contrary, the second World War has been strongly emphasized as a unique event bearing no similarity to World War I. President Roosevelt never uttered the name of Wilson. But Wilson's mistakes were day and night before his soul. Likewise in Germany the talk was apparently never about Ludendorff. But this made us lose continuity. And he who loses continuity loses time. In reality

Gottmann

Krebs

the two World Wars are one single event which, while it was going on, was intentionally disguised as two completely different happenings.

Now we must gain time. The true University will exist where this time is won. Meanwhile the Privatdozent has become powerless. The young scholars have no means and they are impatient. This impatience also blinds those who consider the University. Their interest is concentrated either on the students or on the professors. But twenty-year-olds are too young and fifty-year-olds are too set in their ways for us to expect a push from either one of them. Today in order to get a headstart we need another framework within the University. This time the individual Privatdozent can't provide the solution. Perhaps the relation between Prometheus and Epimetheus must be reversed. How would it be if we organized the relation between prophecy and reflection in another way, if we turned it around? The adult who learns has already lived. He takes possession of his life by reflecting on it. If it is possible to show that in the life of the adult a bit of future is lodged, then it will be possible to discover a new internal combustion engine of thought.

Modern science lives from the fiction that the past is better known than the future and that nature provides more exact data than society. Therefore thought which proceeds from the end to the beginning is regarded as unscientific. In 1931 Mr. Nicolai Hartmann headed a conference on "The Role of Philosophy"; I recently came across a report of the proceedings. Obviously the subterranean rumblings of the rising power had provoked a deep

excitement among the members of the conference. But at no time in the discussion was this openly mentioned. The conference proceeded as if our human sorrow and our human anxiety have nothing to do with our search for the truth. Here you have truth and science placed at an utter parity. Science of course, since she only generalizes what has already been revealed to the sufferer as the truth, dares not use political motives as evidence. But on the other hand the great philosophers who in each generation re-created the universities grew out of suffering and more exactly out of war. Henrik Steffens has pointed out that philosophers repress the cause of their philosophy; he wanted to uncover it.¹⁾ No philosopher ever sat down as if in a classroom to answer the questions of his predecessor. To consider the history of philosophy in this way is insanity. Descartes grew out of the Thirty Years War. He has remained its eternal Privatdozent. Kant became a philosopher after the Seven Years War. Schopenhauer came to meditation on the battlefields of Napoleon. The Franco-Prussian War forced Friedrich Nietzsche out of mere philology. Wars are parts of the future whose meaning must first be brought to light in the ensuing peace. For Wars bring unheard-of suffering. And everything unheard-of belongs to the future. War destroys the "present" of the previous peacetime. In war and in nature there is no present, only future and past. The next "present" is created after the war. This creature is called

1) See my biography in *Schlesische Lebensbilder*, IV, 1931.

peace. Because people take "the present" for granted, they can't make peace.

Today we must ask totally new questions of method. The past never determines what must be taught. What we teach here today, ladies and gentlemen, makes sense only if our lesson still holds good in the year 2000, that is to say when our students are 70 years old. I teach "Dialectic of Thought from 1100 to 2000" because the year 2000 already sits in my classroom. Insofar as we teach we wish to impart to our students something which they will be able to pass on to their grandchildren. Through the act of teaching the scholar becomes the ancestor of his own great-grandchildren. For this task he requires a continual self-purification, for he must take care to place his own transient thoughts on the same level with that Truth which must be taught ever and again through the centuries. Since women have attended the universities this has become exceptionally clear. When a mother decides whether or not her child shall pray she determines the future of the entire race. To a child we dare say only those things which are so true that the child himself must one day repeat them to his own children. If we compare the Communist girl who has been fanaticized in the party-school with the girl student whom we must desire as our best type, we discover suddenly that in both cases the future is the decisive fact of our own existence. There are obviously two different futures. One comes into existence because the present ruler determines it. There you have the party-school. The other comes into existence because true teaching

enters in between the leadership of today and the leadership of tomorrow. The truth allows tomorrow's leader to become independent of today's.

Next to the women, who embody the free future, stand the adults who embody suffering already born. Thus in every lawyer, in every teacher, in every worker, in every businessman the questions which must be answered in the future stand already before us. "Thou com'st in such a questionable shape" we are forced to say to every specialist because his existence denotes a question of society, to which his function tries to put an end. But it is an uphill fight. The patients who remain incurable, the cases which remain undecided, the slums that remain uncleared, the race riots that recur are our food for thought. Therefore, the various classes of adults who already suffer under the ruling regime or pattern of life represent the future. That our thought may serve this future, these adults belong within the frame of the University in the place of the Privatdozenten. You all know how our veterans have helped free us from that embarrassment which arises when one attempts to speak of suffering in the presence of those who have never experienced it. One can speak about the problems of higher politics in front of students but not to them. The error in method of the last 60 years consists exactly in the fact that no one has wanted to believe this. When Heinrich von Treitschke spoke about politics before the Berlin students, he certainly did not lecture; although in many things he spoke the truth, methodically he was only a demagogue.

For, politics can only be taught in the presence of those who already suffer, in the presence of those who are already responsible, in the presence of those whom we attack.

People are now thinking of establishing professorships of politics in Germany. But, gentlemen, I speak here today to members of the University about the University although I also speak in front of students. This is the only meaningful way of speaking for only this method goes beyond exams and papers, beyond the unimportant and arbitrary subjects of our scientific research. Today I hope for your presence, not for your applause. Only thanks to the presence of adults can the University hope to hold its ground as the go-between between genius and routine. Learning is certainly the middle ground between God's truth and the usages of every day. Recently a Professor of Medicine wrote, "It can no longer be doubted that babies require motherly care." This Professor had lost his reason. He had forgotten that science is subordinate, that she is only the generalized form of truth. The source of truth is not science. But science is the teachable form of truth. Science becomes worthless when she regards herself as the fountainhead of truth. Science becomes worthy when she displays herself in the presence of adults. For in every adult truth lives without science. Mothers always knew that children require motherly care.

Here in Göttingen I was unfortunately completely dependent upon students. Therefore I went for a week to Berlin where I led a professors' discussion in the "Hochschule für Politik."

There I was forced to maintain that every war must be answered by a change in the structure of the University. In Paris in 1871, the defeat of France was answered by the founding of a political academy. In Berlin in 1919 this was imitated; the founder was a National Liberal and wanted to see only the national aspect of the event so that the World War might continue to be considered a national war. Five times after 1918 I myself attempted to incorporate the World War as World War in an institution. The German University wanted to hear nothing of it. In America as a Privatdozent I again spoke of the World War as World Revolution. But the American people were still satisfied with the "American Way." They talk about "Free Enterprise" and "States rights" although already we have a labor government and centralism over there. This conservatism is most pleasant and I don't conceal the fact that the American way of life is very dear to me. But unfortunately this lack of forethought has expensive consequences for other countries. It is a broad problem for now the future requires the same of both Europe and America. Because we are confronted by Stalin, every institution which seeks to master the World Wars must speak with adults, for adults and from the adult point of view. The toughest people in history sent its adults to school during their entire lifetime. The Jewish school was not a school for children or young people. It was the home of adult learning. Today the Jews of Europe have been exterminated. But the Europeans may not so simply dispose of the Jewish spiritual function. On the contrary, it has now become

necessary for every European to follow Israel's example, to treat the future as a fact.

Whoever does treat the future as a fact must abandon his own present over and over again. As soon as we do this we find ourselves confronted by a completely different set of questions. At Harvard University, for instance, over 200 language courses are offered in the catalogue. In the list of Göttingen lectures I counted 153 such courses. But there is not one single course on speech itself. At the same time the German in the East Zone already speaks differently from the German in the West Zone. Are you so sure that the German language will still exist in the year 2000? Is Rilke not perhaps the end? Does the word still call to life? I suffer from the loss of really potent speech among the young.

A second example is history. Only for the sake of the future are we clothed with history instead of running about naked. In 1870, when Treitschke came to Berlin instead of Jakob Burckhardt, world history ceased to exist for Germany. Today the simple possibility of universal history is denied. As a result people are forced to devour Spengler and other geniuses from outside the University. I must confess that I have a personal interest; right now I am publishing a history. But I don't do it out of scholarly curiosity. As an impecunious Privatdozent I have written a universal history in opposition to the chairs of national histories which the 19th century so richly endowed. Otherwise we cannot reach the year 2000. Only thanks to history may our grandchildren recognize us as their ancestors.

Mr. Chancellor, Ladies and gentlemen, fellow students!

I have tried to point out that the present-day university works with biological fictions. There is no living creature which does not believe in the future. When the university speaks to students about human society in the absence instead of the presence of adults she operates with sociological fictions. When the university expects us old sinners, each for himself and without necessity, to be ready every day to begin to learn all over again, she operates with moral fictions.

"But," you will object, "is what you demand here really necessary? Can't the individual live in joyous presence of mind like the blissful, upright man of the first Psalm"? Do we really need the University? Do we not read for our comfort in the first Psalm of the man "qui in cathedra pestilentiae non sedet" and who speaks of the law of the Lord day and night? He is like a tree planted by running waters that yields its fruit in due season. Certainly there are such souls inside and outside the University. The United States is nourished by the Psalms. There are many there who take it upon themselves to speak of the law of God. I have had the good fortune to know such men at the University. They have lived truthfully in spite of their scientific activity. But, ladies and gentlemen, a corporation, an institution cannot reckon with giants like Rudolf Sohm or Adolf Wagner or William James. The University must do something definite, must do it ever and again so that with its help she may express her secret. If there were no injustice in the world the first Psalm

would be enough. But because of injustice the Reformation created the University. Through injustice we always lose time, and against this threatened loss of time we must secure our own forethought.

Under what conditions can we succeed? Consider the veterans whom you now teach. They provide the element of forethought and you make them reflective. We cannot succeed in our task if our ex-soldiers only reflect on "something." They must rather be allowed to reflect on their own previous headstart over the civilians when they were in the trenches. If this is asked of him we may then hope to achieve a scientific doctrine concerning the war. This has not yet been done. Next to her lack of a doctrine of language and of a meaningful historical frame of reference, the greatest need of the contemporary university is for a genuine "Polemology", and empirical doctrine of War. The University provides civilian thought for civilians. But she must also teach the truth to those who govern. And in modern life we all find ourselves in the position of rulers; rulers, however, are immersed in both, peace and war. The Judge in Goethe's "The Natural Daughter" studied the law of states only at their "middle height." However, without that astronomy of the peoples which embraces both war and peace, law and all other university learning is worthless. The suffering of war and revolution is a part of truth¹⁾ and every truth must one day become science.

1) Therefore my works on World Revolution concern both: "Die Europäischen Revolutionen" 1931, "Die Hochzeit des Kriegs und der Revolution" 1920, "Out of Revolution" 1933.

Here, having followed a course through university-rich European history and university-poor American history, this speech reaches its objective. Let us look back once more. In Europe each war gave birth to a new philosophy. Paracelsus, Cartesius, Locke, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche are not the natural men Theophrastus von Hohenheim, Descartes, etc. They are the sons of the catastrophes through which they suffered, of the revolutions which towered above the wars and peaces of their times. Therefore when we are confronted by a subsequent catastrophe their philosophy must be changed, must be lived down.

As long as a philosophy represses its true source it threatens the schools which carry it on with obsolescence. Every new war should lead to the conscious burial of the philosophies of previous war epochs. Germany, overloaded with philosophies and rich in universities, lacks exactly this power to bury. Today there are still Hegelians, Cartesians, Kantians. This state of affairs has no rhyme or reason inside a "Polemology" of war. The first commandment of the new science runs: the modes of thought of every previous catastrophe must be buried. For otherwise those who fought the war cannot discover their own language. In the United States the situation is exactly opposite. No new philosophies were built into the American universities after each war and no ossified thought distorted her spirit. But for this very reason the war philosophies in America never became fruitful in their own time. Not once have they achieved even as much as their

transitory validity. They have never entered the realm of speech. Too little abstraction of war occurred in America. German history succumbed to abstractions of single wars which were mistaken for eternal truth. The little eternity of a peaceful period was mistaken for eternity herself. Consequently our Polemology demands a new working through of catastrophes for the entire Western World. Catastrophes force upon us time-nourished, time-germinated, transitory truths. "Sense to nonsense, health to plague" is the methodical principle of the new Polemology, the lesson of thought born of sorrow.¹⁾

May we recognize in the two World Wars one single fratricidal struggle! And may this War enter that realm of truth whence the University derives her teachable science! Then we will no longer have to condemn the Russians 12 kilometers away from here, for then our own mastery of the future will have forced us beyond that future which the Communists envisage. And then, thanks to the presence of the future within the walls of the University, we will no longer stand in need of the Privatdozent. How willingly would we Privatdozents then be superfluous! For why should we not go out of existence when the University, in all her multiformity, once again faces toward the future?

"Universitas" means exactly the union of present diversions in the face of one unique future. In the beginning "Universitas" meant only the corporation. Later it meant "Universitas Litterarum."

1) See Franz Rosenzweig, *Das Neue Denken*, in *Kleinere Schriften*, Berlin, 1935.