

Petar Bojanić
Franz Rosenzweig's *Ground of War*

*Und da bin ich nun (ohne sagen zu können j'y suis j'y reste).*¹

J'y suis j'y reste.
“Here I am and here I remain.”

This saying, attributed to a celebrated French general, has many meanings. First, according to legend, the general does not even remember pronouncing these words; second, if he did pronounce them, it was directly following a great victory at the Battle of Malakoff at Sebastopol where he took an important “position” (the Tower of Malakoff); and third, if he did finally pronounce them, it was in response to warnings that the general’s position was vulnerable and that an explosion could occur at any moment (the retreating Russian troops had mined the tower). In the end, if these brave words ever even came close to being pronounced, they were simply a manifestation of a great general’s surprise at being entrapped and unable to retreat. In contrast to the general who declares that he is staying where he is, at a place he had only just conquered, Franz Rosenzweig says, in Belgrade in October of 1918, that he cannot, or is incapable of repeating the famous general’s actions during the Crimean War, which Rosenzweig had just recently written about.² I am here in Belgrade, writes Rosenzweig to his mother, yet I cannot postpone defeat and say: “*j'y suis j'y reste.*” I am here, but I cannot remain here, I do not accept being where I am.

I dare put aside the future capitulation of Germany, the almost certain peace (these are the introductory words of the letter: “*Der Frieden ist ja nun ganz sicher*”³), the malaria which forced Rosenzweig to spend nearly a month in a military hospital in Belgrade, Rosenzweig’s problems with sending mail to his mother in Kassel and his daily hopes of hearing news of a train dedicated to taking away the last of the empire’s wounded from the hated and barbaric Serbia.⁴ Rosenzweig’s haste – today it is relatively simple to show that it was unjustified and that the malaria, which he contracted South of Niš, saved him from certain death⁵ – and the defeat of the soldier and German intellectual Rosenzweig, are all overshadowed by one much larger defeat, which Rosenzweig finally concedes in Belgrade. In letters to his mother on the 13th and 19th of October, Rosenzweig writes that the recently declared peace has definitely put an end to his unpublished,

as he calls it, war opera [“*unveröffentlichte Kriegsopera*”] or *das blonde Putzanium*. Of further interest are two assertions Rosenzweig adds to the fact that the war has ended and that the “position” which he tirelessly “defended” during 1917 has been completely lost: the first being the end of the idea of “Central Europe” (“*Mitteleuropa ist Essig*”) and the irrelevance of the theories of Friedrich Naumann, a subscriber to the idea of Central Europe,⁶ and the second being the altogether surprising assertion that he, Rosenzweig, only then realized how much he favoured a king and to what degree he had been, in fact, a monarchist during the war!⁷

This position is so untenable, Rosenzweig deduces, that it does not allow him to remain where he is, to defend it and say: “*j’y suis j’y reste.*”

What occurred, then, in 1917, and of what does Rosenzweig’s unsuccessful and impossible project consist? Is it necessary to consider it along with Rosenzweig, yet completely in conflict with Rosenzweig, in an attempt to save or perhaps correct his intentions? Is it even possible to reconstruct this attempt and continue a book which remains unfinished? Or does a book about war [“*ein Buch über den Krieg*”] remain to be written?

There remain other questions or other groups of questions that lead to even greater uncertainties related to Rosenzweig’s project. One direction leads to the assumption that this sort of project is strictly tied to the occurrence of war. It seems that peace is the perfect enemy of writing about the cause and purpose of war. In that case, it is of great importance to pay attention to Rosenzweig’s patriotic games, to the influence of war propaganda on his texts,⁸ to his analysis of newspaper articles and his never-ending attempts to anticipate movements on the front and in world politics, that is, to reconcile his texts with the rhythm of the war. How do we understand Rosenzweig’s utter despair and complete loss of faith in the outcome of the war (or the faith of his own text) when he finds out about the resignation of *Reichskanzler* Bethmann-Hollweg, a moderate patriot who was, according to Rosenzweig, aware of the importance of war in shaping the world?⁹ How do we understand his numerous brutal, reckless comments, his rage towards the outcome of the war [*Kriegsausgang*] (“*Es [the English people] ist ein barbarisches Volk. Is it truly a misfortune that they [the English] have won the war*”¹⁰)? And how do we understand his impatient anticipation of whether America and Japan would join the war, and his urgent change of paradigm in the construction of his texts (the text *Thalatta: Hegemony on the sea and freedom of the sea*, comprising over 40 typed pages, was written between the 23rd and 27th of December, 1917)?

The method and speed of Rosenzweig's writing leads us to one more complicated problem concerning the status of a text written but not destroyed, and to the issue of its delayed publication. Here I am not only referring to the unclear, fundamentally unacceptable and always obscure "politics of archives" [*der Dunkelheit der Archive*]¹, but rather to a number of technical difficulties in the reconstruction of certain texts, as well as what I would call "archival fiction." It is impossible to reconstruct texts correctly, when these are written on postcards and small pieces of cardboard paper, nor is it possible to print additional notes Rosenzweig made in the margins of his manuscripts, in already published texts.¹² Furthermore, it is virtually impossible to put together a critical edition of Rosenzweig's "war" texts, because they are frequently inspired by unquoted newspaper articles and comments. Finally, texts that were never published and never became public constantly inspire fantasies of their "fictional influence" on contemporary authors and their works.

Rosenzweig calls his war project,¹³ and let us call it a "war" project, let us also accept that it was and remains simply a brilliant "project" by several different names. Apart from the names *Kriegsopera* and *Putzianum* (inspired by his cousin Victor Ehrenberg called Putzi, with whom Rosenzweig made a plan concerning a book), he also calls it *Hansiaca* (because he had a similar project with his friend Hans Ehrenberg, for a joint book), furthermore, *Kriegsausgang* and *Kriegsgrund*, but also *Theatrum Europaeum. Ein Versuch über den Schauplatz der Weltgeschichte*.¹⁴ In three letters addressed to three different destinations, in the first half of 1917,¹⁵ Rosenzweig explains in detail the source of his idea for a great book on war and finally declares that he has begun writing, aware that he cannot do what he wished on the front.

It is certainly necessary for us to accept that the text "Globus," a text which is noticeably longer than all of the other ten texts, composes the primary part of the initially imagined book, in the same way as the miniature additions and parts of other texts compose that same great book. Rosenzweig says that he intended, in 1910 or 1911, while he was writing his doctorate on Hegel and the state, to write a history of the ground for war [*Kriegsgrund*]. He hurried to finish his doctorate, so that he could completely devote himself to this new paper because on November 25th, 1910, Carnegie had established a foundation intended to finance projects, which deal precisely with the sources and causes of wars.¹⁶ In these three fragments from January, March, and May of 1917, Rosenzweig points out several additional things:

that he wanted to analyze all of the wars after 1494 and up to 1917; that he was particularly interested in the differences between the ground (source) of war [*Kriegsgründen*] and the beginning of war [*Kriegsanfängen*]; that he now primarily writes about the present [*des aktuellen Ausgangs*]; that he had earlier planned to work in diplomatic archives and examine everything that served as a catalyst for war; that he cannot write this sort of book; that if he were to write such a book today it would have to be a part of a larger book [*als Teil eines grösseren*], which requires more time; and that this is why he again must “abort” the book ...

Today, it is impossible to precisely reconstruct the “beginning” of the project Rosenzweig refers to. There are no notes or any sort of definite indications from the period of his doctoral thesis that prove that Rosenzweig intended to write a book concerning the ground of war, nor is there any mention of *Kriegsgrund* in his published doctorate (he writes the preface to the doctoral thesis *Hegel and the State* after the war, in May of 1920, in Kassel).¹⁷ Several months after his dissertation Rosenzweig excitedly speaks about a new war, about a world war, which has yet to come, which is on the horizon, and whose mores and form we have yet to learn:

We do not face one war [*einen Krieg*], rather an epoch of wars [*Epoche von Kriegen*], and from the European point of view – we are already within this epoch [*und europäisch gesehen sind wir sogar schon drin*].¹⁸

That is all. Nevertheless, there is no reason to exclude the possibility that Rosenzweig could have envisioned this project as a perfect addition to Hegel’s theory of war. Furthermore, in several of his war correspondences Rosenzweig places his project on war in the same orbit as his doctorate (his “Hegel”).¹⁹ Rosenzweig even compares his position during the war with Hegel’s position in Jena. However, perhaps it is necessary to preventively insist on a certain degree of reserve when viewing Rosenzweig’s self-interpretation concerning the “identical” register of his two completely differing conceptions. Namely, in his doctorate Rosenzweig, as probably no one before him, deconstructs (and simultaneously demolishes) several key points of Hegel’s Theory of Law which protect the meaning of war and the meaning of the state “established under arms” [*Staat auf Waffen gestellt*]:²⁰ the concept of violence and legitimacy through violence, sacrifice and sacrifice for one’s homeland, the connection between patriotism and sovereignty, the analogous nature of sovereignty and the organism, and

so on. It is interesting to note that Rosenzweig returns to these themes in only one text from 1917, where he analyzes sacrifice for one's homeland, but in a fairly different context and without any sort of anti-Hegelian enthusiasm.²¹ After all, isn't Rosenzweig's project concerning war envisioned to do precisely what Hegel didn't do – to think war, to give it and find in it meaning, nevertheless not to war as an essential element which constitutes a state (or any state, even just one state in the world), rather war as a key factor in the creation of peace and a world without states and borders?²² In this sense, his project, in its foundations and its intentions, is absolutely Hegelian, but its actualization, or Rosenzweig's search for the reasons and aims of war, introduces completely un-Hegelian results and definitely distances Rosenzweig from his mentor Meinecke.

Thus, this war was not politically unproductive and without aim [*zwecklos*], as Meinecke contends. [...] Meinecke's fundamental mistake [*Grundfehler*] is that *malgré tout* he still thinks of states [*Staaten*], and not unions of states [*federations, Staatenverbänden*]. He says: unions of states make wars useless, they introduce nothing politically creative, by this Meinecke means that wars creatively influence only the single state. However, states are no longer the carriers of history, rather it is unions of states, and it is precisely on them that war, this war in fact, has a creative influence. The truly *realpolitik* source [*realpolitisch berechtigte Kern*] of the idea of pacifism is: to overcome the national within the federal state [*die Überwindung des Nationalen im Verbandsstaat*].²³

This fragment, from a letter to his parents, is only part of Rosenzweig's impassioned and anxious reaction to Meinecke's pacifism and to a text from September 1917 *Demobilmachung der Geister*.²⁴ This was not simply a good opportunity for Rosenzweig to repeat his reservations towards pacifism and show in detail its limitations and militaristic (and profane) background, nor was it simply an opportunity to accent the mistrust he felt towards the conservatism of his teacher. Rather, it was also an opportunity to explain that there would be no world peace, even if states and "spirits" (intellectuals) were to completely pacify and "demobilize." It is as if Rosenzweig counts on the war not being over yet, because if it were to end its main role would not be complete – the creation of a unified world space, the union of peoples, the end of states and the movement and transformation of borders.²⁵ Perhaps this short "manifesto" by Friedrich Meinecke forces and anticipates the future end of hostilities between states, and a quick end to World War I. One thing is certain: it is now possible to compare the anxiety Rosenzweig feels after reading this pamphlet with two

epilogues found in his text “Globus”. I am referring to the final chapter of the first part (“Oekumene”) called “World,” in which Rosenzweig says that “the greatest conflicts, the greatest battles for the true idea of the world [*die wirkliche Weltidee*] are yet to come” (in the final sentence he concludes that the world is *a priori* one, because God “the warrior” [*Kriegsmann*] created it thus),²⁶ and to the conclusion of the second part (“Thalatta”). It seems that Rosenzweig wrote both during those three days at the end of 1917.

Thus, at the end of “Thalatta” – the end of this text that is simultaneously the end of the text “Globus”, and the end of Rosenzweig’s attempt, the end and cessation of this war project and of any trace of this never published, “aborted book” – Rosenzweig claims that there are still borders and divisions in the world, that there are still regions which are separated and do not belong to the world (regions which are too far, which are in the world, but are simultaneously not part of it). He asserts that “mankind is still not gathered under a single roof [*nicht im einem Hause*].”²⁷

Perhaps we must discard and leave behind that final paradoxical sentence concerning Europe still not being the soul of the world [*die Seele der Welt*], as well as Rosenzweig’s numerous thoughts on Turkey, Islam, the Far East and so on, which appear from time to time in his political texts. Rosenzweig’s vision of the world and of the globe (not just Europe) – which, formulated as it is, far surpasses seductive analogies and comparisons with Schmitt’s *Nomos* concept or Schmitt’s differentiation between Earth and Sea – remains unfinished because the war “thing” is not over, because the war did not meet his expectations. In other words, Rosenzweig is not pleased with his text because he is not satisfied with the way the war was “completed,” the way it ended and the way it interrupted and concluded his own writings.²⁸

This is not simple discontent with the war’s end, common in the years following World War I. The disappointment with the end of the war, as a consequence of constant exhaustion or mobilization, or perhaps patriotism, could be a shared sentiment among Schmitt, Meinecke, Naumann as well as Franz Rosenzweig. All of them wrote about the war.

How are Rosenzweig’s “uses of war” different? Why does the philosopher’s writing on the history of the ground of war suddenly, over the space of mere months, transform into writing about the current war? Why does writing about *Kriegsgrund* and *Kriegsziel* change to writing as if anticipating the results of war [*Kriegsausgang*]?

Rosenzweig’s recollections of the beginning of his project in January of 1917, as he prepares to begin anew (or as he again returns to the project),

are of particular importance to us. Recalling his initial thoughts regarding the project implies the great dilemma of how and why work on on both the large and small books on war will be interrupted, and in both cases completely forgotten. Is it then possible to suppose that studying Jewish texts obstructs Rosenzweig's geopolitical construction in both cases? The first occasion falls on the years between his doctorate and World War I, when he initially introduces himself to these texts and the second at the end of the war, or rather the end of 1917, when he becomes unsatisfied with what he has written on war and again abandons this project in favour of Judaic books.²⁹ Rosenzweig marks both of these interruptions in the same way within the space of five or six years, by explaining the place of war in the Jewish tradition, and explaining why the war that has begun is, in fact, not his problem or his worry.

On October 9th, 1914, Rosenzweig writes the following in his journal:

Differentiating between the right to war in a religious and profane war is the essence of Judaism. Christianity knows only religious war. Judaism knows them as contrary to one another, and in the [case of the] second [religious war] does not put itself above the ethics of its century. This also means that religious war serves as the affirmation of existence, while the rest of the world remains "very faraway from you".³⁰

Rosenzweig changes several words in the book *The Star of Redemption*, written shortly after the end of the war.

Belonging to the most significant passages of our ancient law is the distinction [*Unterscheidung*] between the usual war [*gewöhnlichen Kriegs*] against a "very faraway" people [*gegen ein "sehr fernes" Volk*], which was waged according to the universal rules of martial law for which war is a usual expression of like form of the State, and the war of faith [*Glaubenskriegs*] against the "seven peoples" of Canaan, by which the people of God captured the necessary living space for it. [...] The people of the Christian era [*der christlichen Weltzeit*] can no longer uphold the distinction. In conformity with the spirit of Christianity that tolerates no borders [*Grenzen*], there are no "very faraway" peoples for them. [...] That which Jewish law could separate as concerns its public law, war of faith and political war [*bloss weltlicher Krieg*], is blended into one for them. Precisely because they are not real peoples of God, but only on the way to becoming so, they cannot draw those distinct borders; they cannot at all know how far God's will is realized in the war-like destinies of their States [*in den kriegerischen Geschicken ihres Staates verwirklicht*]. Somehow – the how remaining puzzling [*Irgendwie – das Wie bleibt rätselhaft*]; [...] the war alone decides [*entscheidet*], which rages on above the consciousness of the individual.³¹

“Somehow – the how remaining puzzling [*Irgendwie – das Wie bleibt rätselhaft*].”

How [wie] is the will of God realized, how does God decide and command states (Christian states)? How [wie] does war (God) decide? How [Wie]? This puzzle and this question alone explain Rosenzweig’s efforts and his project during those years. There is not a single word in this famous fragment from Rosenzweig’s book that is not found in one way or another in his daily journal entries, letters or texts during the war years. Furthermore, this puzzle which so disturbs Rosenzweig, and is the secret of his “war engagement” (a puzzle comprised of an inexplicable “connection” between Christian people and states – which risk perishing in the war – and God, who decides and controls them), is immediately put aside by the philosopher. Namely, the following two paragraphs are clear instructions to the Jewish people, but to the Jew as well, to Rosenzweig, to us or anyone else who plans to investigate the ground of war. Just as Rosenzweig’s war project is “pressured” by Jewish texts from before and after the war, so, within the text *The Star of Redemption*, is this puzzle found “between” the knowledge of differentiating wars (“Jewish substance,” as Rosenzweig calls it) and Rosenzweig’s message to the Jewish people:

And since it [Jewish people] possesses the concept of the war of faith, it therefore can not take them seriously [*ernst nehmen*] [. . .] Of course, the Jew is really the only man in the Christian world who cannot take war seriously [*nicht ernst nehmen kann*], and therefore is the only genuine “pacifist” [*der einzige echte « Pazifist »*]³². [...] the Jewish people stands outside the world [*steht es ausserhalb der Welt*] [...] by living eternal peace, it stands outside of a warlike temporality [*steht es ausserhalb einer kriegerischen Zeitlichkeit*].³³

It seems that the sudden and intense resistance to the time of the world and to war can better explain the strength of Rosenzweig’s efforts from previous years. The unwritten book about war [*ein Buch über den Krieg*] is simply the epilogue of a complicated “messianic investment” undertaken by Rosenzweig. There are several conditions for the solution to this puzzle, which Rosenzweig works on intensely as he waits for war or God’s Judgment [*göttliches Gericht*].³⁴ it is necessary, insists Rosenzweig, to think (“this”) war as if [*als ob*] it is the final war;³⁵ avoiding naïve chauvinism; developing catastrophic thoughts [*katastrophale Gedanken*], not simply “differential” [*differentielle*] ones;³⁶ the difference and unity between war, “the father of all things” [*Vater aller Dinge*] and peace, “the mother of all things” [*Mutter aller Dinge*], is fulfilled in the destiny of the world [*Schicksal der Welt*]; the

secret reason (ground) of (world) war [*der geheime Grund*]³⁷ and history is that people are in search of their souls, for a world without borders and for a world without (distant) peoples; the ground of war [*Kriegsgrund*] always corresponds with the aim of war [*Kriegsziel*];³⁸ the Messiah appears only in the warlike course of World history [*nur im kriegerischen Ablauf der Weltgeschichte*]; the Messiah appears “today” [*“Heute” kommt der Messias*].

But, today “is not yet the true ‘Today’” [*es ist noch nicht das rechte “Heute”*]³⁹.

Notes

- 1 Franz ROSENZWEIG: Letter to his mother, 13.10.1918: *Der Mensch und sein Werk, Gesammelte Schriften, 1. Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1918–1929, Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1979, vol. 2, 613.
- 2 Rosenzweig writes about the Crimean War nearly a year prior to this letter, in the text titled “Oekumene.” *Der Mensch und sein Werk, Gesammelte Schriften, 3. Zweistromland, Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken*, Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1982, 333.
- 3 ROSENZWEIG: Letter to his mother 13.10.1918: *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1918–1929, 612.
- 4 In the text “Deutschland und der Weltkrieg” (29.08.1914) Friedrich Meinecke says that Austria and Germany were provoked into war because the country and people of Serbia were unable to lead an honorable and loyal war [*loyale Krieg*]. Rather, they instigated fanatical, barbarian and criminal politics. Meinecke insists that he understands entirely the Serbian wish to establish a nation state, but contends that for a people to be able to do so successfully they must prove that they are a cultured people [*Kulturvolk*]. Friedrich MEINECKE: *Politische Schriften und Reden, Werke*, Darmstadt: S. Töche-Mittler Verlag, 1958, vol. 2, 96–97.
- 5 I am referring to the crimes committed against defeated Austrian and German soldiers on Serbian territory in the final months of the war.
- 6 “A Central European cannot create Central Europe; rather Central Europe creates the Central European.”: *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1918–1929, 612. Friedrich Naumann is definitely the main inspiration for Rosenzweig’s geopolitical thoughts from the very beginning of the war, to his final years. Throughout the war Rosenzweig reads Naumann’s newspaper articles and frequently refers to the ideas of (German) “new orientation”, “war aims”, “Central Europe”, “the necessary war as the source of a Central European soul” as well as the first chapter of NAUMANN’s book *Mitteleuropa* “Der gemeinsame Krieg und seine Folgen”, Berlin: G. Reimer Verlag, 1915, 1–32. Cf. ROSENZWEIG: “Nordwest und Südost”, *Zweistromland. Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken*, 304–305; “Mitteleuropa”, “Globus”, ROSENZWEIG: *Zweistromland*, 344–346.
- 7 ROSENZWEIG: Letter to his mother, 19.10.1918: *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1918–1929, 614.

- 8 Cf. Marc CRÉPON and M. DE LAUNAY: “Preface” in F. ROSENZWEIG: *Confluences. Politique, Histoire, Judaïsme*, Paris: Vrin, 2003, 15.
- 9 ROSENZWEIG: Letter to his parents, 20.07.1917 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900-1918 (Haag: Martinus Nijhoff, 1979), vol. 1, 422-423. Cf. P. MENDES-FLOHR: *Divided Passions: Jewish Intellectuals and the Experience of Modernity*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1991, 323-325.
- 10 This comment is written by Rosenzweig during a visit by family [*die Londoner*] members he had not seen in nine years, and in which he notices a “slight change in their being” [*Englischkeit des Wesens*]. ROSENZWEIG: Letter to Gritli, 06.07.1920. *Die Gritli-Briefe: Briefe an Margrit Rosenstock-Hussey*, Tübingen: Bilam Verlag, 2002, 621.
- 11 Kant writes about the “obscurity of archives” in the book *Metaphysics of Morals* in § 61. Several interesting fragments from Rosenzweig’s “Journal” have unnecessarily been set aside, unpublished. However, the most important document for understanding Rosenzweig’s “war” writings is a never published list of books Rosenzweig read from February 1916 to August 1918, “Bücherliste.” This document is marked with the symbol “V” and is comprised of 7 pages. Franz Rosenzweig Collection; AR 3001; box 1; folder3; Leo Baeck Institute at the Center for Jewish History, New York. The books are listed in order of the months in which Rosenzweig read them. There are over 300 titles listed.
- 12 One of the most important texts by Rosenzweig concerning war, written in December 1917, “Cannae und Gorlice. An explanation of the strategic concept of space.” is a great example. Within the manuscript, Rosenzweig systematically erases the word “*Vernichtungsstrategie*” replacing it with “*absolute Krieg*”. This change is quite unusual, as is the long text concerning Clausewitz in the margin of page two (*GS*, Zweistromland, 284). Franz Rosenzweig Collection; AR 3001; box 2; folder 34, Leo Baeck Institute at the Center for Jewish History.
- 13 Eleven of Rosenzweig’s texts from 1917 which “comprise” this project were not initially published with the name of their author (four were published under pseudonyms). In *Gesammelte Schriften* these texts are classified under “Zur Politik”, while in the “Leo Baeck Institute” they are found under three groups: 1. “Globus”, 2. “Vox Dei?” and “Cannä und Gorlice” under a large group of texts named “Other”, and the other eight texts are found under 3. “Prolegomena zur Politik”.
- 14 Francesco Paolo Ciglia, the editor of the Italian edition and translation of the text: *Globus. Per una teoria storico-universale dello spazio*, S. Carretti, Genova: Marietti 1820, 2007, prepared, as an addition to a study on Rosenzweig, a detailed survey of letters and notes which reconstruct Rosenzweig’s project. Cf. “Sezione documentaria. Lettere e appunti personali sul Globus”, 113-140.
- 15 Letters to his parents, 11.01.1917, Letters to Rudolf Ehrenberg from 29.03.1917 and Gertrud Oppenheim” from 01.05.1917. ROSENZWEIG: *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900-1918, 334-335, 375, 395.
- 16 The Carnegie Foundation was organized into three sections at this time. The second section was meant “*to study the causes and impact of war*”.
- 17 ROSENZWEIG: *Hegel und der Staat*, Aalen: Scientia Verlag, 1962 (1920), vol.1, V-XIII.
- 18 ROSENZWEIG: Letter to Hans Ehrenberg, the end of November 1912, 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900-1918, 124.

- 19 In the letter to Mawrik Kahn, probably written in the autumn of 1919, Rosenzweig calls his text "Globus" and his "Hegel" dead manuscripts [*gestorbene Schriften*]. ROSENZWEIG: *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1918–1929, 652.
- 20 ROSENZWEIG: *Hegel und der Staat*, vol. 1, 133.
- 21 Cf. "Vox Dei ? Die Gewissensfrage der Demokratie", ROSENZWEIG: *GS, Zweistromland*, 267–282.
- 22 "[...] a state at war has a form which would lead it outside of its borders during peacetime, without as within; a state at war has the form of a future state yet to come about during peacetime" [*das Werdebild eines zukünftigen Friedensstaats*]. ROSENZWEIG: "Cannä und Gorlice" *GS, Zweistromland*, 294.
- 23 ROSENZWEIG: "Letter to his parents", 01.10.1917, 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*; 1900–1918, 459. His comments regarding Meinecke continue in several letters from this period.
- 24 In his correspondence Rosenzweig never mentions the title of this text, published in *Frankfurter Zeitung und Handelsblatt* beginning in 23.09.1917 (the text is again published in MEINECKE's: *Politische Schriften und Reden*, Werke, vol. 2, 195–200). Meinecke is the second most important reference point in Rosenzweig's geopolitical texts. In a letter to his parents, 30.01.1917 (342) Rosenzweig notes, apart from Naumann and Meinecke, the names: Kjellen, Leusch, Tröltsch, Simmel, Ranke, as the authors which have had the most influence on his war project. Ranke's text from 1833 "Die grossen Mächte" is especially significant for Rosenzweig (F. Meinecke prepared a special edition of Ranke's text published in 1916). I would add the titles of several books to the above mentioned authors, which Rosenzweig read and without which his work would not be possible: during July 1916, Rosenzweig reads Julius Kierst's short book *Die antike Idee der Oekumene in ihrer politischen und kulturellen Bedeutung* (1903); during January 1917, he reads Eugen Schiffer's book: *Vom Kriegsgrund zum Kriegsziel* (1889); and during May 1917 he reads Clausewitz's *Vom Kriege* (1816–1830). Franz Rosenzweig Collection; AR 3001; box 1; folder 3; Leo Baeck Institute at the Center for Jewish History.
- 25 In the introduction to "Globus," which he writes at the end, after the whole project has been completed, Rosenzweig says: "To be enclosed [*Begrenzbarkeit*] by borders is the nature of a state, the lack of all borders [*Unbegrenztheit*] is its final aim." ROSENZWEIG: *Zweistromland: Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken*, 313.
- 26 ROSENZWEIG: *Zweistromland: Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken*, 348. In a letter to his parents, dated 17.02.1917, Rosenzweig discovers that he has cited Luther's translation, "*der rechte Kriegsmann*" (Moses 2, 15:3), while "Jews refer to God with *Meister der Kriege, Schöpfer des Neuen*, in their morning prayers." ROSENZWEIG: 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900–1918, 350.
- 27 ROSENZWEIG: *Zweistromland. Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken*, 368.
- 28 This "drama" between war and writing is manifested in Rosenzweig's frequent uncontrolled outbursts. During 1917 he is quite happy and excited with the way the text is moving forward. A day before writing "Thalatta" he admits how important the preparations for this text are [*Arbeit sehr wichtig*], yet only four days later he tells his parents that he no longer likes the text at all [*dass mir Thalatta garnicht mehr gefällt*]. With time Rosenzweig has complaints concerning the form of the text, and then concerning the unscientific "objectivism" of text, etc. ROSENZWEIG: 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*; 1900–1918, 497, 502, 504. Hilary Putnam's point, that Rosenzweig did not wish to pub-

- lish his *Das Büchlein vom guten und kranken Menschenverstand* while alive, because it was anti-philosophical can in part also refer to “Globus.” Hilary PUTNAM: *Jewish Philosophy as a Guide to Life*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008, 19.
- 29 Cf. ROSENZWEIG: Letter to Hans Ehrenberg 26.12.1917, 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900–1918, 501–503.
- 30 “*In der Scheidung des Kriegsrechts in Religions- und Profankrieg (5. Mose 20, 15-16) steckt das ganze Wesen des Judentums. Das Christentum kennt nur den Religionskrieg. Das Judentum kennt beide nebeneinander und erhebt sich in der Ethik des zweiten nicht über die Ethik des Zeitalters. Auch bezeichnend, dass der Religionskrieg nur der Existenzbegründung dient, die übrige Welt bleibt.*”
 “So tue allen Städten ‘sehr entfernt von dir’ [heraym harchokot mimecha me’od]. Moses, V, 20:15.” ROSENZWEIG: 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900–1918, 175–176.
 Cf. others who write of this differentiation, which, with the existence of the state of Israel, is today more active than ever, are: J. D. Bleich, “Preemptive War in Jewish Law”, *Tradition*, 21, n. 1, 1983, 3–41; G. B. Levey, “Judaism and the Obligation to Die for the State”, *AJS Review*, 12, n. 2, 1987, 175–203; M. Walzer, “The Idea of Holy War in Ancient Israel”, *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 20, n. 2, 1992, 215–228; M. Walzer, “War and Peace in the Jewish Tradition”, (ed.) T. Nardin, *The Ethics of War and Peace*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996, 95–113.
- 31 ROSENZWEIG: *The Star of Redemption*, translation by Barbara E. Galli, Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 350–351, ROSENZWEIG: *Der Stern der Erlösung*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1996, 367.
- 32 The quotation signs around the word “*Pazifist*” exist in the first edition of the book *Der Stern der Erlösung*, Frankfurt am Main: J. Kauffmann Verlag, 1921, 416. I write about the nature of this Rosenzweigian construction “authentic ‘pacifist’” [der einzige echte “*Pazifist*”], and about his interpretation of pacifism in his journal and correspondence in another text which is being prepared for publication. ROSENZWEIG: 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900–1918, 183, 204, 210–214, 326–328.
- 33 ROSENZWEIG: *The Star of Redemption*, 351; *Der Stern der Erlösung*, 368.
- 34 “*Der Krieg ist ein “göttliches Gericht”, aber kein einfaches Strafgericht, sondern “Krisis”, Scheidung, Böcke und Schafe*”. ROSENZWEIG: Letter to parents, 17.02.1917. 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900–1918, 350.
- 35 ROSENZWEIG: Paralipomena, 3. *Zweistromland. Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken*, 90. Cf. F. P. Ciglia argues that these fragments, found thirty years ago, were written in 1917, and not 1916. ROSENZWEIG: “Globus. Per una teoria storico-universale dello spazio”, 126.
- 36 ROSENZWEIG: “Paralipomena”, 72.
- 37 ROSENZWEIG: Letter to his mother, 03.07.1918, 1. *Briefe und Tagebücher*, 1900–1918, 586. I used Daniela Toti’s book in the construction of Rosenzweig’s “messianic” investment, Daniela TOTI: *Franz Rosenzweig: possibilità di una fondazione della nuova filosofia nella storia*, Roma: Gregoriana, 2000, 202–209.
- 38 ROSENZWEIG: “Globus”, *Zweistromland. Kleinere Schriften zu Glauben und Denken*, 366.
- 39 ROSENZWEIG: “Paralipomena”, 91.