

physician, artist or artisan, does or makes something for us, we are happy to pay him as much as we can, often indeed beyond our real capacities: on the other hand, we will pay someone unknown to us as little as we can get away with; this is a struggle in which everyone fights for every foot of land and for which he makes everyone fight him. In the case of work done *for us* by someone we know there is something *beyond price*, the feeling and invention he has put into his work *on our account*: we believe we can express our sensibility of this in no other way than through a kind of *sacrifice* on our part. – The highest tax is the *respect-tax*. The more the competitive market dominates and we buy from strangers and work for strangers, the lower this tax will be: whereas it is in fact the standard of measurement of the degree of *commerce* between human souls.

284

✓ *The means to real peace.* – No government nowadays admits that it maintains an army so as to satisfy occasional thirsts for conquest; the army is supposed to be for defence. That morality which sanctions self-protection is called upon to be its advocate. But that means to reserve morality to oneself and to accuse one's neighbour of immorality, since he has to be thought of as ready for aggression and conquest if our own state is obliged to take thought of means of self-defence; moreover, when our neighbour denies any thirst for aggression just as heatedly as our state does, and protests that he too maintains an army only for reasons of legitimate self-defence, our declaration of why we require an army declares our neighbour a hypocrite and cunning criminal who would be only too happy to *pounce upon* a harmless and unprepared victim and subdue him without a struggle. This is how all states now confront one another: they presuppose an evil disposition in their neighbour and a benevolent disposition in themselves. This presupposition, however, is a piece of *inhumanity* as bad as, if not worse than, a war would be; indeed, fundamentally it already constitutes an invitation to and cause of wars, because, as aforesaid, it imputes immorality to one's neighbour and thereby seems to provoke hostility and hostile acts on his part. The doctrine of the army as a means of self-defence must be renounced just as completely as the thirst for conquest. And perhaps there will come a great day on which a nation distinguished for wars and victories and for the highest development of military discipline and thinking, and accustomed to making the heaviest sacrifices on behalf of these things, will cry of its own free will: *'we shall shatter the sword'* – and demolish its entire military machine down to its last foundations. *To disarm while being the best armed*, out of an *elevation* of sensibility – that is the means to *real peace*, which must always rest on a disposition for peace: whereas the so-called armed peace such as now parades about in every country is a disposition to fractiousness which trusts neither itself nor its neighbour and fails to lay down its arms half out of hatred, half out of fear. Better to perish than to

hate and fear, and *twofold better to perish than to make oneself hated and feared* – this must one day become the supreme maxim of every individual state! – As is well known, our liberal representatives of the people lack the time to reflect on the nature of man: otherwise they would know that they labour in vain when they work for a 'gradual reduction of the military burden'. On the contrary, it is only when this kind of distress is at its greatest that the only kind of god that can help here will be closest at hand. The tree of the glory of war can be destroyed only at a single stroke, by a lightning-bolt: lightning, however, as you well know, comes out of a cloud and from on high. –

285

*Can property be reconciled with justice?* – If there is a strong feeling that the possession of property is unjust – and the hand of the great clock has again come round to this point – two ways of remedying the situation are proposed: firstly an equal distribution, then the abolition of property and its reversion to the community. The latter remedy is especially beloved of our socialists, who bear a grudge against that Jew of antiquity for saying: thou shalt not steal. In their view the seventh commandment should read rather: thou shalt not possess. – Attempts to act in accordance with the first recipe were often made in antiquity, always only on a small scale, to be sure, yet with a lack of success from which we too can still gain instruction. 'Equal allotment of land' is easily said, yet how much acrimony is produced by the divisions and separations this necessitates, by the loss of ancient valued property, how much reverence is injured and sacrificed! One digs up morality when one digs up boundary-stones. And how much more acrimony among the new owners, how much jealousy and enviousness, since two allotments of land have never been truly equal, and even if such a thing were possible human envy of one's neighbour would still not believe in their equality. And for how long would this equality, unhealthy and poisoned at the roots as it is, endure! Within a few generations inheritance would here have divided one allotment among five people, there given one person five allotments: and if stern laws of inheritance obviated such improper arrangements there would still be equal allotment of land, to be sure, but at the same time an abundance of the unprovided-for and discontested who possessed nothing except feelings of envy towards their neighbours and relations and a desire that all things should be overturned. – If, however, one wishes to follow the *second* recipe and restore property to the *community*, with the individual as no more than a temporary tenant, then one will destroy the land. For upon that which he possesses only in passing man bestows no care or self-sacrifice, he merely exploits it like a robber or a dissolute squanderer. When Plato opines that with the abolition of property egoism too will be abolished the reply to him is that, in the case of man at any rate, the departure of egoism would also mean the departure of the four cardinal virtues – for it has to be said that the foulest pestilence could not do so much harm to mankind as would be done him if his vanity