

rights, working conditions were eagerly discussed and debated.

The economy was slowly getting on its feet. Everyone wanted to be on the streets together. . . .

Return of the Russians

At dawn on November 4, 1956, Soviet Russia attacked Hungary with 6,000 tanks, thousands

of guns and armored cars, squadrons of light bombers, 200,000 soldiers—and a tidal wave of lies.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How did Milovan Djilas characterize the “new class”? What were its qualities? How did it wield its power?
2. Why, according to Djilas, would the communist governments in Eastern Europe sooner or later declare their independence from the Soviet government?
3. What would you say was the climax of the Budapest demonstration on October 23?
4. What was at stake for the workers and farmers of Hungary in the anti-Soviet uprising?
5. How did the Hungarians in those crucial October days assert their freedom? What evidence of nationalism did you observe in the anti-Soviet demonstrations?

4 Germany Confronts Its Past

In the years immediately following World War II, Germans were too preoccupied with rebuilding their devastated country to reflect on the horrific crimes committed by the Third Reich and bring the criminals to justice. Indeed, many Germans either failed to comprehend the enormity of these crimes or found the subject uncomfortable, for only a few years earlier they had faithfully served the Nazi regime and embraced its ideology. They simply wanted to sweep the extermination of European Jewry from memory. However, the public trials of war criminals starting in the 1960s and the greater attention given to the topic in books and the media, including an American television miniseries that dramatized and personalized the Jewish tragedy, stimulated open discussion and reflection within Germany.

Hannah Vogt *THE BURDEN OF GUILT*

Until the 1960s, German secondary school history courses generally ended with the beginning of the twentieth century. Few teachers discussed the Nazi regime, and appropriate books about Nazism and the Holocaust were lacking. Moreover, teachers who had previously endorsed Hitler were not eager to discuss

the Holocaust with their students. Distressed by a sudden outburst of anti-Semitic incidents that afflicted Germany in 1959, notably desecrated cemeteries and swastikas smeared on the walls of synagogues, German educational authorities made a concerted effort to teach young people about the Nazi past. These same anti-Semitic outrages moved Hannah Vogt, a civil servant concerned principally with education, to write a book for students about the Nazi past. Published in 1961, *The Burden of Guilt* became a widely used text in secondary schools. In the Preface, Vogt stated the book's purpose:

[S]elf-examination and a repudiation of false political principles are the only means we have of winning new trust among those peoples who were forced to suffer fearful things under Hitler's brutal policy of force. . . . Only if we draw the right conclusions from the mistakes of the past and apply them to our thought and action can we win new trust. . . . Anyone who makes an effort to understand recent political history will learn that in politics not every means is just [and] that law and the dignity of man are not empty phrases.

The book's conclusion, excerpted below, showed a sincere effort of German schools to come to grips with the darkest period in German history.

A nation is made up of individuals whose ideas—right or wrong—determine their actions, their decisions, and their common life, and for this reason a nation, too, can look back at its history and learn from it. As Germans, we should not find it too difficult to understand the meaning of the fourteen years of the Weimar Republic and the twelve years of the Hitler regime.

The ancient Greeks already knew and taught that no state can remain free without free citizens. If the citizens of a commonwealth are not prepared to make sacrifices for their liberty, to take matters into their own hands and participate in public affairs, they deliver themselves into the hands of a tyrant. They do not deserve anything but tyrannical rule: “A class which fails to make sacrifices for political affairs may not make demands on political life. It renounces its will to rule, and must therefore be ruled.” These words of a German liberal about the educated class are valid for people everywhere.

The Greeks called a man who abstained from politics “idiotēs.” The Oxford English Dictionary translates this as “private person,” “ignorant,” “layman,” or “not professionally

learned.” And what are we to call those who have learned nothing from our recent history but the foolish slogan “without me” (*Ohne mich*)? Are they not like fish who expect to improve their condition by jumping from the frying pan into the fire?

We have paid dearly once before for the folly of believing that democracy, being an ideal political arrangement, must function automatically while the citizens sit in their parlors berating it, or worrying about their money. Everybody must share in the responsibility and must be prepared to make sacrifices. He must also respect the opinions of others and must curb his hates, which are too blinding to be good guides for action. In addition, we need to be patient, we must have confidence in small advances and abandon the belief in political miracles and panaceas.

Only if the citizens are thoroughly imbued with democratic attitudes can we put into practice those principles of political life which were achieved through centuries of experience, and which we disregarded to our great sorrow. The first such principle is the need for a continuous and vigilant control of power. For this, we need not only a free and courageous press but also

some mechanism for shaping a vital political opinion in associations, parties, and other organizations. Equally necessary are clearly drawn lines of political responsibility, and a strong and respected political opposition. Interest groups must not be diffused too widely but must aim at maximum cohesiveness. Present developments appear to indicate that we are deeply aware of at least this necessity.

More than anything else we must base our concept of law on the idea of justice. We have had the sad experience that the principle "the law is the law" does not suffice, if the laws are being abused to cover up for crimes and to wrap injustices in a tissue of legality. Our actions must once again be guided by that idea which is the basis of just life: no man must be used as a means to an end.

This principle must also be applied to our relationships with other nations. Although, on the international scene, there is as yet no all-inclusive legal body that would have enough power to solve all conflicts peacefully, still there are legal norms in international affairs which are not at all the "sound and smoke" (Faust) Hitler had presumed them to be. In no other matter was he as divorced from reality as in his belief that it was shrewd to conclude treaties today and "to break them in cold blood tomorrow," and that he could undo 2000 years of legal evolution without having such action recoil upon him. He considered force the one and only means of politics, while, in reality, it had always been the worst. Hitler's so-called *Realpolitik* was terrifyingly unreal, and brought about a catastrophe which has undone the gains Bismarck had made through moderation. Bismarck gave Germany its unity. Hitler, goaded by his limitless drive for world power, divided Germany and destroyed the work of generations.

Thus we are now faced with the difficult task of regaining, by peaceful means, the German unity that Hitler has gambled away. We must strive for it tirelessly, even though it may take decades. At the same time, we must establish a new relationship, based on trust, with the peoples of Europe and the nations of the

world. Our word must again be believed, our commitment to freedom and humanity again be trusted. Our name has been used too much for lies and treachery. We cannot simply stretch out our hands and hope that all will be forgotten.

These are the questions which should touch the younger generation most deeply: What position could and should we have among the nations? Can we restore honor to the German name? Can we shape a new and better future? Or shall we be burdened with the crimes of the Hitler regime for generations to come?

However contradictory the problem may look at first sight, there can be no shilly-shallying, but only a clear Yes to these questions. The past cannot be erased, but the future is free. It is not predetermined. We have the power to re-examine our decisions and mend our wrong ways; we can renounce force and place our trust in peaceful and gradual progress; we can reject racial pride. Instead of impressing the world with war and aggression, we can strive for world prestige through the peaceful solution of conflicts, as the Swiss and the Scandinavians have done for centuries to their national glory. For us, the choice is open to condemn Hitler's deluded destructiveness and to embrace Albert Schweitzer's message—respect for life.

If we are really serious about this new respect for life, it must also extend to the victims of the unspeakable policy of extermination. Ever since human beings have existed, respect for life has included respect for the dead. Everywhere it is the duty of the living to preserve the memory of the dead. Should we listen to insinuations that the time has come to forget crimes and victims because nobody must incriminate himself? Is it not, rather, cowardly, mean, and miserable to deny even now the dead the honor they deserve, and to forget them as quickly as possible?

We owe it to ourselves to examine our consciences sincerely and to face the naked truth, instead of minimizing it or glossing over it. This is also the only way we can regain respect in the world. Covering up or minimizing crimes

will suggest that we secretly approve of them. Who will believe that we want to respect all that is human if we treat the death of nearly six million Jews as a "small error" to be forgotten after a few years?

The test of our change of heart should be not only the dead but the living. There are 30,000 Jewish fellow-citizens living among us. Many of them have returned only recently from emigration, overwhelmed with a desire for their old homeland. It is up to all of us to make sure that they live among us in peace and without

being abused, that their new trust in us, won after much effort, is not destroyed by desecrated cemeteries, gutter slogans, or hate songs. Those who will never learn must not be allowed to take refuge in the freedom of opinion. A higher value is at stake here, the honor of the dead, and respect for the living. But it is not up to the public prosecutor to imbue our lives with new and more humane principles. This is everybody's business. It concerns us all! It will determine our future.

Richard von Weizsäcker "WE SEEK RECONCILIATION"

In recent decades there has been an open and frank discussion among Germans of the nation's crimes against the Jews during World War II. In a speech during a commemorative ceremony on May 8, 1985, the fortieth anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe, Richard von Weizsäcker (b. 1920), president of the Federal Republic of Germany from 1984 to 1994, reflected on the Holocaust and the need for remembrance.

May 8th is a day of remembrance. Remembering means recalling an occurrence honestly and undistortedly so that it becomes a part of our very beings. This places high demands on our truthfulness.

Today we mourn all the dead of the war and tyranny. In particular we commemorate the six million Jews who were murdered in German concentration camps. . . .

At the root of the tyranny was Hitler's immeasurable hatred of our Jewish compatriots. Hitler had never concealed this hatred from the public, and made the entire nation a tool of it. Only a day before his death, on April 30, 1945, he concluded his so-called "will" with the words: "Above all, I call upon the leaders of the nation and their followers to observe painstakingly the race laws and to oppose ruthlessly the poisoners of all nations: international Jewry." Hardly any country has in its history always remained free

from blame for war or violence. The genocide of the Jews is, however, unparalleled in history.

The perpetration of this crime was in the hands of a few people. It was concealed from the eyes of the public, but every German was able to experience what his Jewish compatriots had to suffer, ranging from plain apathy and hidden intolerance to outright hatred. Who could remain unsuspecting after the burning of the synagogues, the plundering, the stigmatization with the Star of David, the deprivation of rights, the ceaseless violation of human dignity? Whoever opened his eyes and ears and sought information could not fail to notice that Jews were being deported. The nature and scope of the destruction may have exceeded human imagination, but in reality there was, apart from the crime itself, the attempt by too many people, including those of my generation, who were young and were not involved in

planning the events and carrying them out, not to take note of what was happening. There were many ways of not burdening one's conscience, of shunning responsibility, looking away, keeping mum. When the unspeakable truth of the Holocaust then became known at the end of the war, all too many of us claimed that they had not known anything about it or even suspected anything.

There is no such thing as the guilt or innocence of an entire nation. Guilt is, like innocence, not collective, but personal. There is discovered or concealed individual guilt. There is guilt which people acknowledge or deny. Everyone who directly experienced that era should today quietly ask himself about his involvement then.

The vast majority of today's population were either children then or had not been born. They cannot profess a guilt of their own for crimes that they did not commit. No discerning person can expect them to wear a penitential robe simply because they are Germans. But their forefathers have left them a grave legacy. All of us, whether guilty or not, whether old or young, must accept the past. We are all affected by its consequences and liable for it. The young and old generations must and can help each other to understand why it is vital to keep alive the memories. It is not a case of coming to terms with the past. That is not possible. It

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. According to Hannah Vogt, what lessons should Germans learn from the Nazi era?
2. How did she suggest that Germans now confront the Holocaust?
3. What did Richard von Weizsäcker have to say about collective guilt, about the implications of forgetfulness and remembrance, and about the possibility of redemption, reconciliation, and salvation?
4. In your opinion what is the meaning of the Holocaust for Western civilization? For Jews? For Christians? For Germans?

cannot be subsequently modified or made undone. However, anyone who closes his eyes to the past is blind to the present. Whoever refuses to remember the inhumanity is prone to new risks of infection.

The Jewish nation remembers and will always remember. We seek reconciliation. Precisely for this reason we must understand that there can be no reconciliation without remembrance. The experience of millionfold death is part of the very being of every Jew in the world, not only because people cannot forget such atrocities, but also because remembrance is part of the Jewish faith.

"Seeking to forget makes exile all the longer; the secret of redemption lies in remembrance." This oft quoted Jewish adage surely expresses the idea that faith in God is faith in the work of God in history. Remembrance is experience of the work of God in history. It is the source of faith in redemption. This experience creates hope, creates faith in redemption, in reunification of the divided, in reconciliation. Whoever forgets this experience loses his faith.

If we for our part sought to forget what has occurred, instead of remembering it, this would not only be inhuman. We would also impinge upon the faith of the Jews who survived and destroy the basis of reconciliation. We must erect a memorial to thoughts and feelings in our own hearts.

5 Reversing Britain's Economic Decline

By the late 1970s it had become evident that, under a series of lackluster right-wing Conservative and left-wing Labor governments, the country was in a state of decline. The Labor party's support for the welfare state, while giving Britons a measure of security, had failed to promote economic initiative, prosperity, and well-being. In addition, the trade unions that provided financial support for the Labor party had increased their power. Frequent work stoppages in public utilities, called for by the unions, caused widespread misery. Other European nations were enjoying higher standards of living and becoming economically and politically powerful, while Britain's economy was in the doldrums and the country no longer played a role in world politics. In 1979, a Conservative government led by Margaret Thatcher was elected with a mandate for change.

Margaret Thatcher THE FREE MARKET VERSUS STATE INTERVENTION

Margaret Thatcher (b. 1925), a lower-middle-class grocer's daughter, was an anomaly in the upper-class, male-dominated Conservative party, of which she became leader in 1975. The Conservative victory in the 1979 election made Thatcher the first woman prime minister in British history. Thatcher aspired to overcome economic stagnation by crushing the power of the trade unions, decreasing public spending, and privatizing government-owned utilities and industries. (This last measure was successfully copied by several countries throughout the world.) She aroused hostility by her personal style and by her willingness to increase unemployment in order to expand economic growth, yet under "Thatcherism" the country prospered. Because it fostered individual responsibility, the free market, according to Thatcher, would also contribute to Britain's moral renewal. These ideas were powerfully expressed in a lecture she gave at Cambridge University on July 6, 1979. Excerpts of this lecture, entitled "The Renewal of Britain," appear below.

Theorists of Socialism, like Laski, Tawney and their followers, motivated by a genuine desire for social justice, elevated the State as an instrument of social regeneration. Simultaneously, Keynes and later various schools of neo-Keynesian economists, exalted the role of Government and humbled the role of the individual in their pursuit of economic stability

and prosperity. The events that we witnessed last winter mark, I believe, the failure of these collectivist approaches.

The desire to bring about a society which promotes greater human fulfillment is not the monopoly of any one political party. I acknowledge, readily, the sincerity and generosity of some Socialists. However, I believe that the