

Meet the Press: The Sueddeutsche Zeitung

A Simultaneous Online Review by Anis Hamadeh

September 2004

www.anis-online.de/1/m/pz/01/e.htm (German and English)

Content:

Chapter 1:	Page 1-12
Frontal and Free Public	1-3
9/2/2004: Terror Analysis?	3-5
9/6/2004: Debate Free from Rulers	5-7
Self-Analysis	7-8
9/7/2004: Relativity of Terror?	8-9
9/8/2004: We and the Others	9-12
9/9/2004	12
Chapter 2:	13-23
9/10/2004: Terror as a Field for Projections	13-14
9/11-12/2004: Leviathan	14-15
9/13/2004: "Eyes Shut, Eyes Open"	15-16
9/14/2004: The <i>German Angst</i>	16-17
9/15/2004: God and Gods	17-18
9/16/2004: Da da Didacticism	18-19
9/17/2004: Isolated Community	19-21
9/18-19/2004: Be the Change you Want	21-23
Chapter 3:	24-25
9/20/2004: Dream Sequence	24
9/21/2004: Epilogue	25

CHAPTER 1

- Frontal and Free Public -

(September 5, 2004) There are things more pleasant than to analyze the Sueddeutsche Zeitung. Like to listen to Chuck Berry records, for example. Or to stroll over a market-place in a foreign country. Or to go out on a sled in winter. But this here is about the Sueddeutsche Zeitung from Munich. The task is to accompany and to observe this newspaper for a while. In former times it had hardly been possible to have a discussion with a newspaper on eye level. Where should one have done that? Of course, you could stand on a box in the park, yet this would presumably impress the press only limitedly. There also is the possibility of expressing your opinion in another media, only that first you have to enter this media. Remember that until recently we had lived in an almost pure frontal public. This means that everybody, who wanted to say or do something publically, (with some exceptions) needed somebody else's permission for this, this somebody belonging to those people who decide who may enter the public to begin with, and as what? For example the editor of a newspaper decides that. Or the sponsor of a performance. Or the politician who supports that an individual or an opinion is heard. The publisher who accepts or refuses a book. Or the boss of a record company who provides a contract and a retail system for a band. The organizer of a public event. Or the professor who favors a certain individual or opinion. In other countries, partly also in Germany, there are clerics who give their blessings for an individual or an opinion to be heard so that it appears in the public. This is how it used to be.

Today there is the internet and with it everybody has the opportunity to build his or her own public, without anybody else to give a permission. This is only since a few years. It is a social revolution which in its effects has not yet become clear to many people. Today, two fundamentally different publics live together in one world: the frontal public and the free public. When you put a melon next to an apple you can make new statements about the apple. When you put a free public next to a frontal public you can make new statements about the frontal public.

I stood in front of the desk and stretched my shoulder muscles. Another book! And again not the one I have been intending to write the whole time through. I opened the window. In any case, I will not suffer, I said to the blackbird on the terrace and lifted my forefinger in affirmation. The blackbird looked at me and did not understand what I meant. I went to the mirror and looked into it. You are bad, said the face in the mirror, you are complacent. This is the free public, my friend, I replied, and I may do that. Vain you are, said the voice, a populist! But I did not listen. This was none of my business. I had a task to accomplish. Gotham City was in danger. I put on my cape and pulled the mask over my face. Of course there would be some villains unhappy about the fact that I was back in town, after all those years. That I have come to discuss things. You gotta be crazy, said the voice in the mirror and I gave it a sharp, silencing look. - The story with the Sueddeutsche Zeitung started with Lawrence of Arabia. It went something like this:

Sueddeutsche Zeitung, Aug 30, 2004, p. 11, "Faded Myths: The Arab. The Wrong Pillar of Wisdom" by Petra Steinberger

This article is a good example for how to use clichés to give a direction to aggressions und thereby to support camp thinking. Ms. Steinberger reproaches "many Arabs" of believing they were Omar Sharif in the film "Lawrence of Arabia" (big colored photo) and that this would be "the problem". The thing is that Ms. Steinberger sees in those many Arabs a "wrongly conceptualized pride" and a "stubborn persistence in a doubtlessly great cultural past". She quotes that the Arabs are "an artificially generated people", as if one could not say this about any people. She also warns about a "historical consciousness", for this would bear "the danger of retrogression". In Steinberger's analysis the Arabs have simply failed in their identity finding. "- and only the cliché remained". She also criticizes that demonstrations against suicide bombers end up in

proclamations against Israel and the USA, who would be seen as guilty, "as they are guilty of everything". So here a conspiracy theory is insinuated.

In the same way that this allusion to a conspiracy theory is a conspiracy theory itself, behind the talk about clichés are clichés themselves, and rather simple ones, too. "For quite some of the ideologists", this is how the article ends, "there only remains religion. In its most intolerant form". One can beautifully observe here how the German press is writing about itself and just accuses "the other", because it could not bear to face this truth in a different way. Maybe a wrongly conceptualized pride, I don't know. Maybe the journalists should watch a little less telly and take a walk in the real world, for a change. The wrong pillar of wisdom...

This is a clear and increasing tendency in the Sueddeutsche Zeitung, and I have been observing it for some time. It goes together with statements like the one of Yusuf, a Palestinian student, reported by Thorsten Schmitz on August 26, 2004 in der SZ (p.3): "He said he could not understand the struggle about soil and independence in his homeland", as if there was one individual in the world who could not understand the struggle for independence. And of course the conspiracy theory about the UN which I have analyzed in the book "Kings We Are, with Wings of Dust" (Chapter 6, On Criticism of the Tour, paragraph 9).

This behavior, dear SZ editors, is not acceptable. You are using your power to promote stereotype images. And you do not even want that. You want peace, too. Have a relaxed thought about that. - A media review by Anis Hamadeh

Sueddeutsche Zeitung. Chief editors: H.W.Kilz, Dr. G. Sittner, vice: E. Fischer, Foreign politics: S. Kornelius, Dr. P. Münch, Home politics Dr. H. Prantl, Dr. J. Käppner, leading political editors: H. Leyendecker, K. Podak, M. Stiller.

(Here is the mentioned passage from chapter 6 of the book before: "The cause of the conflict between Israelis and Palestinians/Arabs is the fact that rights of Jews stand higher than the human right which in turn is due to the horror of the Holocaust. Arab aggressions are not the cause. It is rather so that the public mainstream distrusts the complaints about the human rights, suspecting anti-Israeli affairs behind them. This means a devaluation of the human rights and the UN. Here is an example out of the Süddeutsche Zeitung from the same day on which it had reported about "Crossing Borders" (July 10, 2004). There it calls the UN General Assembly on the front page "philo-Palestinian in tendency". In order to keep the narrative and the camp thinking established the SZ judges according to the measure of groups, not the measure of the situation. A narrative needs an ego perspective, the human right needs a universal perspective. Stefan Ulrich writes on July 22, 2004 in the same paper on page 4 in the article: "Demanding, but fair. Why Israel in the wall controversy this time must not complain about the United Nations" the words: "Indeed does the General Assembly like herself in the role of ritually punishing the small country. It is easy to find majorities for this among the 191 UN member states. For in blaming Israel one can so wonderfully bundle anti-American, anti-Western, anti-colonial anti-capitalist prejudices." It is easy to detect who is the one with the prejudice. The SZ, after all the biggest of the quality papers in Germany with more than a million daily readers, apparently believes in a global diplomatic conspiracy or plot against Israel and against the West with its capitalism. Such assessments like the one of the SZ are inevitable whenever the decisions are based on a specific camp and not on the democratic order and international law.")

Meanwhile this was some days ago. The respective article with the beautiful photo of Peter O'Toole and Omar Sharif now hangs at the wall of my office and I am looking at it every morning and every evening in order to not forget what this is all about. Actually, I was even considerate in my criticism, because I thought it would be enough like this. For I had forwarded the text to the complete Arab internet community, all over the world. The Arabs should know what the German press writes about them, they have a right to

know. Considerate, because I spared the SZ the elementary analysis. For the skeleton of the argumentation in the respective article was: there is the Arab as Sherif Ali Ibn al-Kharish (i.e. Omar Sharif in this film) and there is the Arab as Bin Laden/Saddam. As the Arab is not Omar Sharif he accordingly is Bin Laden. The minute you get really aware of the level of this article you will understand why the free public has the responsibility to veto here. Otherwise they will next time write something likewise about women, black people, or Jews. We do not want any of this. We had this before.

- 9/2/2004: Terror Analysis ? -

When I had forwarded the media review in two languages I sat down for a moment. Such an article shortly before the Frankfurt Bookfair (Guest of Honor: The Arab World)... Don't people in newspaper offices consider these things? Then the terrible hostage taking in Beslan happened. On Thursday, September 9, 2004, the SZ editors were completely overcharged. The top article in the SZ always is on page 4 left above, it is the commentary of the day. Stefan Kornelius wrote it on that day. "The unchained terror" was the name of the story, like causing panic. Some journalists use their titles in a way that gives them a personal psychic relief. This man felt better when he saw his own title. As if saying: I show you the truth, the unchained terror. Let's have a small read in the final paragraph:

"The victory over terror will not be through sheer power alone. Yet the contrary softness leads to even more terror. Effective have been vigilance and the work of the police and the intelligence services. A change will only then be noticeable when fanaticism decreases and when terror will be seriously banned also in Muslim societies. Three years after September 11 there is no alliance which has really committed itself to this aim. The states of the victims of terror are seeing the new wonder-weapon, but it does not find together in order to build up an effective deterrence."

You can observe here how a difference is made between "us" and "the others". The others, this is not only the terrorists, but also Muslim societies. Almost the whole page 2 (Issues of the day) shows that. In the current "Lexikon" different kinds of terror are named, purposes and etymologies. An article about "Black Widows", suicide women, talks about vendetta, drugs, blackmailings and destroyed souls. In the big article in the middle of the page the more and more boundlessly growing "lore of al-Qaida" is taught (with three photos of the terror), while Israel's South in the article below remains an "open flank". In this context the Israelis also give some guilt to Syria, not only to the Palestinians. On the bottom another photo of a muffled up Palestinian terrorist from Olympia 1972, a bit out of context, in an article about the dissent between New York's ex-mayor Giuliani and Germany. But an article at the side also shows Muslims who are in solidarity against terror and who publically say that (with two small photos).

Was terror a "wonder weapon", as Herr Kornelius wondered? I had known this word only from a different context. -Deterrence... On page 6 Thorsten Schmitz, the Israel deputy at the Sueddeutsche, recounted that Israel now would return to the targeted killing and that the decrease (oh, a decrease) of terror was due to the wall. At that I turned on the computer and in thoughts wrote a mail to leserbriefe@sueddeutsche.de. I sent it straight away which originally was not planned:

At SZ September 2, 2004

Dear SZ editors, your issue of today (subject: terror) is very emotional and full of meta-messages. I can clearly feel your perplexity and the resulting aggressions. You obstinately try to avoid the question what the roots of terror are. It is conspicuous that you have done completely without this plausible question, in Chechenia, in Palestine, and in al-Qaida. At this point you could become a bit startled and notice yourself that you are lacking something fundamental in your argumentation. Instead, you know start to justify the meaning of the official killings and of the wall by lack of commentary and you paint

the terror in all colors, as if you would love it. You are focussing on terror and thus follow exactly the impulse of destructive camp thinking. And when it all gets too much for you you crawl away into the evil past and there you look for justifications of your behavior. The fact that you are not capable of discussing issues with real critics, either, shows that you are building a wall around yourselves which is not adequate for a bearer of public acting. It is my duty to clarify this point to you and to the concerned, because you are not only doing harm to our own society, but also to others. This is completely unintelligible. From now on I will have an even closer read in your newspaper, later on will analyze it in a bundle and publish the analysis and translate it. If you cannot discuss in a different way then I have basically no choice, because I have a responsibility, too. - A media review by Anis Hamadeh

In the commentary on Sep. 3 Daniel Brössler did write about the roots of terror and he admonished Putin to find a peaceful solution to the Chechenia conflict. Tomas Avenarius on the next day, in the weekend edition after the horrible massacre, is even more direct: Russia will have to separate itself from Chechenia. Still it sounded helpless. Of course, what can journalists do about it? They are supposed to map the world, to communicate it and, if possible, be a bit gifted, but they are not the ones who can end the terror. Can't they really? I am not so sure about this. Besides, the newspaper surely is mapping a world, but which world? The SZ does not believe in the war against terror, "every school kid in Israel" (Kornelius) would know that this war cannot be won. Still the SZ continuously is talking about the struggle against terrorism, having deterrance in mind. What do they think they are imagining? And how do they define terror at all? Other newspapers like the junge Welt at least bother to deal with this subject, there you can currently find a terror analysis by Noam Chomsky, an important thinker who lives in the USA, in New England, I think. - Also, this was not the first time that the SZ attracted my attention because of its fascination for terror. In March I wrote this article:

"Fear of Terror Rules the Policy of the West"
Anis Hamadeh, 28 March 2004

"Fear of terror rules the policy of the West", this was the headline of the German left-liberal newspaper Sueddeutsche Zeitung on March 25. Before that we witnessed, among other things, the canceled journey of German President Rau, the Madrid assaults, and the killing of Hamas Sheikh Yassin and the people who surrounded him, after which the West, especially Israel, was afraid of attacks. On the same day the tz headlined: "Islam Terror. Every second German is afraid!" (www.tz-online.de)

At the UN resolution because of Yassin, which was as usual vetoed by the US, Germany abstained, in solidarity with the (right-wing extremist) Israeli government. In the German press the murder of Yassin has - despite criticism which was also there - mostly led to attacking the Arab countries, as they are not doing anything against "the terrorism". Susanne Knaul writes in the left taz on March 27: "Again and again the Arab states try to reach a condemnation of Israel in the World Security Council. And again and again they fail in front of the veto of the USA. This is the Arab states' own fault." In the Sueddeutsche Richard Chaim Schneider writes on the 26th: "Meanwhile, the hatred of the Islamic World against Israel has changed into a hatred of Jews in general. In this way the occidental and the Muslim hostility towards Jews are combining, and even the last optimist will admit that Europe has a massive problem here. At the moment it is not easy to be a Jew in Munich or Berlin, in Istanbul or Paris, in Athens, Rome or London; and Jews do not live safely anymore in Europe." The TV cultural magazine Aspekte showed a report on the 26th about the economical side of terrorism, starting with Bin Laden and ending with the PLO. No word about non-Arab/Muslim economical aids e.g. of the occupation, as if it did not exist. For Michael Wolffsohn in the conservative paper Die Welt on the 27th it is already a fact that Palestine will be in Jordan, anyway, and that the settlers could stay in the Westbank, for there are Jews also in other countries, like in the USA or in Germany. Leon de Winter is printed in the Welt: "Islamofascism was how Josef Joffe called the thinking of the Islamists last week. But this is a term from a familiar

set of concepts. Islamism is more alien. Islamism is apocalypticism." (March 27) In the renowned TV program Weltspiegel (Channel 1, March 28) there was a report about Palestinian children who build themselves primitive weapons in order to kill "Jews". The report ended with the appeal that Palestinians should better hold themselves back after the killing of Yassin. These are only examples.

And the occupation continues. The killing of civilians, also children, continues. Of course, Moshe Zimmermann is printed also, Jossi Beilin, too, who both are shocked about the Israeli escalations. Who both clearly say that the Israeli government does not want peace, but need an enemy to show "strength" and to divert from the own shattered society. Avraham Burg uttered similar thoughts. Uri Davis. Uri Avnery. Felicia Langer. All crazy people? After the election of Sharon the German press to a far extend agreed that with this violent man there cannot be peace. Today they justify him to a far extend, directly and indirectly. In fear of "worse" things, of received violence. This would be much worse than exerted violence.

But is not Hamas really mean? Why is it so hard for Palestinians, Arabs, and Muslims to condemn the terrorism within their own lines? Or is it a wrong perception? Acts of terror against civilians are always to be condemned and most of the Palestinian and Arab politicians think the same and they also say it. Not all of them, no. Harsh criticism and also measures within the parameters of the human rights and the Geneva Conventions are completely in order, as long as they are not confined to one party only. Yet the respective quotations from the current Israeli government or from radical settlers are not reported in the West. The details of the occupation, neither. It is known that in these cases the reproach of antisemitism comes up. Also, Hamas does not occupy Israel. Moreover, Hamas fills a humanitarian gap, especially in Gaza, one of the most densely populated and poorest areas of the world. Hamas in its constitutional phase had massively been supported by Israel, like Saddam and Bin Laden had been built by the West. The Frankenstein effect. After the murder of Yassin German newspapers and TV programs are full of Hamas, Rantissi, oaths of revenge, Hamas, Hamas. As if Yassin had killed Sharon and not the other way round.

The only way to get out of the times of terror is to lead a real dialogue, and this is still not being done. Causes of terror? Not an issue. To overcome enemy thinking? Rather not. The West "wants" terror and it "wants" toughness, this is what has become clear now once again. The TV shows terror rehearsals in subways etc. in order to demonstrate what the West is expecting from the future. So this is what the struggle against terrorism is about. Alleged toughness. Yet there is nothing more weak than to emphasize such a fear. The majority of the people sticks to groups and not to situations, or laws, respectively. Not only in the big, also in the small. One cannot be silent about this and one must stand up, for this concerns all of us and it harms all of us. How many other people will have to die until you seriously think about that, too?

- 9/6/2004: Debate Free from Rulers -

(September 7, 2004) I love collective psyches! They are as juicy as fresh mangos. The Sueddeutsche Zeitung for example. When I read it - and this is my current task which I intend to spend as unboringly as possible -, I sometimes have the feeling as if the paper wanted to tell me something. Maybe it is the other way around, that I want to tell something to the SZ, but this is obvious, anyway. Otherwise I would be on Barbados now.

Yesterday's issue was very good, it was about the debate free from rulers. An excellent point for discussion! It reminded me of a mail which I had received shortly before. An insider wrote to me that our media would probably rather not be so liberal and that it would be good to deal with the press in a conciliatory way. This has been a very stimulating contribution. By the way, you can also participate in the discussion, I will post

comments, if wished. If you have something of general interest write it in English or German to anis@anis-online.de. All democratic opinions are allowed, with the possibility of my asking back, of super-comments and abridgements.

The article of the day 09/06/2004 is called "Too weak for a sign of strength. President Putin demonstrates his incapability of adequately reacting on the terror of Beslan." It was created by Frank Nienhuysen, printed on the opinion page 4, on a prominent spot under the cartoon in which Angela Merkel is putting something into her bottom. Three sentences out of this article are important. Firstly: "In a country, in which all power originates in the control center in Moscow, it is vice versa so that all weaknesses must go back there." Secondly: "Russia needs an open debate, free from rulers, about the Caucasus policy, carried out also in the media which may freely inform about what happens at the Russian south flank." And thirdly the final sentence: "Unfortunately, all probabilities say that he (meant is Putin) is too weak for such a sign of strength."

The interesting aspect about this comment by Herr Nienhuysen is that it can help explaining the ruler fractal. It goes like this: one group blames another group of not having a discourse which is free from rulers, but originally, such an accusation is not allowed from a group which does not have a discourse free from rulers itself. A bit like the Americans when they think they could motivate Iraq to be democratic, with means that are not democratic. Or like some family fathers think they could bring their children to the good when they beat them. Concerning the discourse free from rulers one can say that the SZ criticism of Russia structurally is similar to my criticism of the SZ. And this is what the fractal is about. It is the same in the small and in the big. Like those little apple men from physics.

When the SZ comments: "In a country, in which all power originates in the control center in Moscow, it is vice versa so that all weaknesses must go back there", then it shows the mechanism which allows it to deny responsibilities itself. There always is a higher one who can be blamed. And when it writes that Putin is too weak for such a sign of strength while rehabilitating him in the feuilleton then it may expect to be judged as mildly itself. For on page 13 Franziska Augstein writes: "Top down democracy. The pros of Wladimir Putin". You can find the word "Tätervolk" in it, perpetrator people, which is a good word for the worst-word-of-the-year-competition. Such a concept is not helpful at all, it is too suggestive, especially in Germany where people think of the controversial conservative legislator Martin Hohmann in this context. That democracy in Russia could only happen top-down is a quote by Egon Bahr (SPD), by the way. This is a politician whose best days lay behind him. I remember a recent article in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. How was that again? America leads war, Europe safeguards peace... or something like that. As a partnership. I have the quote in the book before my last, but I am not going to look this up now for Egon Bahr.

All in all, the article by Franziska Augstein is a catastrophe. Next to the title this is mainly due to two sentences at the end. Firstly: "Concerning the Chechenia war Putin could currently not succeed with negotiations in the lawless province: 'There is nobody with whom he can make binding agreements.'" (Quote Bahr). As if one could stop at this point! There are people suffering from oppression! I remember Mister Putin having talked in the German Bundestag about trust. Well, I don't trust him. In the good article below (below, because democracy goes top-down), by Sonja Zekri, it says that Russia rather sacrifices its people than only one square meter of land. That Putin's most recent announcements give little reason for optimism, concerning the whole Caucasus. And yet above, and this is the second sentence from the Augstein article, it reads at the end: "It does not matter so much that democracy functions according to its original idea, what matters is that it is perceived as functioning by the population." This is the most decadent sentence I have read for years, at all. As if this was about temperatures: not the real temperature is decisive, but the felt one. As if democracy was something belonging to the realm of the wellness industry.

Apart from that there was not much up in the SZ of September 6, 2004. There was this boring New York Times supplement, in English. As is known, the American press is even worse than the German press, because it cherishes this nationalist element. It is like reading the Mars press. They are by now living in a world of their own and do not really need communication anymore. The article about Bjork was an exception, it was at least interesting. This is not to say, by the way, that the Chinese press or the Arab press were much better. We will surely also talk about the Arab press in what follows.

The second supplement was the Protestant magazine *Chrismon*, that was better. The editor, Bishop Johannes Friedrich from Bavaria, on page 10 demands solidarity with the churches in Iraq. I find that he is completely right. The contribution "Solidarity with gaps" is good altogether. The only thing that irritated me was the talk of the "missionary mission" of the Christians. It is true that he says that this mission should consist in the living example of Christian values, but still, missionary is missionary. I don't think that such an idea - no matter in which religion or ideology - should play a role in the 21st century. This reminds me of the timetable flyer from the train. Yesterday I had a public discussion as a Palestinian, in Landau in the Pfalz, at the university, with the Israeli Alex Elsohn from the communication center Givat Haviva. On my way back in the train I read on the backside of this official German railway timetable a Bible quote in big letters, from John's gospel: "Jesus Christ speaks: I am the path, the truth and life. Nobody will come to the Father, except through me. John 14, 6b)". Included is the address and telephone number of a Mister Ralf R. Hildebrandt in Bremen. I found that really unpleasant and suggestive. Such claims of absolutisms do in a way indicate a discourse of rulers and are not fitting the times. Whether or not Jesus had really said such a thing, by the way, is more than questionable, because we know very little about the historic Jesus from Nazareth and his sayings, as for example Rudolf Augstein makes plausible, in his book "Jesus Son of Man".

Chrismon, yes, it also includes the interview with a brain researcher, who is abstracting the free will, and a pedagogue who plays the role of a moral advocate and who gives humanistic comments. This is quite interesting, because this pedagogue is Mister Micha Brumlik from the anti-Semitism institute. I know him from different public situations in which he had worked for the exclusion of participants of the public discourse. Also, the philosopher Habermas apologized to him, when once Herr Brumlik became angry (see Google under the key-word "Ted Honderich"). In the book before my last I wrote about it. I wonder what the reasons are that Herr Brumlik's word has so much weight. There is not much substance to detect in his contributions. What might Herr Brumlik think about the discourse free of rulers?

- Self-Analysis -

(September 7, 2004, late in the night) What the heck was I doing here? Who was I? Why did I sit here analyzing the *Sueddeutsche Zeitung*? I went to the mirror and looked into it. "It is completely immaterial what you are doing here", said the face in the mirror. Oh yes, of course, I could have guessed that. "They will blame you." Oh yes, this was really boring. "What, for instance, was this Deanna Troi number with this 'I can clearly feel your perplexity'?" Yeah well, because it was true. I react differently on newspapers than other people, that's all. Certain things just attract my attention. Also, I look at the people behind it. I always ponder what people these are who do that. This is as important as the articles. At least. And the people at the SZ are not happy. They are not content and this reflects in their work. They are sending impulses which I can receive and they put strange thoughts into the heads of the population and infect them with their depression. "But do you think", asked the face, "that the people at the SZ are able to make something out of this, when you say it like that?" Yes, I think so. I think they realize that I do not want them harm. On the other hand they show themselves that they mostly react on shock. So I had to shock them. "They will certainly blame you for that." No, I don't actually believe that. Maybe in the first days... Except they don't read what I have

to say. Besides, the discussion is developing in a very positive way. The face in the mirror looked at me unwillingly. Now, give this thing a chance! I said. It is a sociological experiment. The following issue, for example, the one from Tuesday, September 7. There the SZ implicitly says that it does not even want to discuss terror, but the others, the Muslim societies, are to stop it. This is quite interesting...

- 9/7/2004: Relativity of Terror? -

The article of the day September 7, 2004, is the comment by Rudolph Chimelli on page 4: "Always in the mirror of the own suffering. Despite the horror of Beslan the Islamic World is relative about the terror - and thereby excuses it." According to this article, pictures of horror in the Algerian and Iranian media would lead to a widespread knowledge of Russian cruelties in its sadistic details, more so than in the West. There is a report about the comparison of casualty accounts between Chechenian children and the children of Beslan, made by a Chechenian leader, and this would touch "a sensitive nerve" in the Middle East. The finish is about the Arab Peninsula: "The compassion with the Chechenians on the Arab Peninsula has made the support flow richly for the victims. No pious individual orders an accountant in order to know whether the money only is for the benefit of widows, orphans, and miserable people - or whether there also are weapons bought with it." Let's start with the title. It does not really fit the article. There was no report about the Middle East at all, only about a couple of countries. Moreover we find two quotes from Egypt which are denoted as typical and which say the opposite of what the title suggests. Then I would like to know from where Herr Chimelli knows that "no pious individual" from the Arab Peninsula is interested in the purpose of their donations.

Yet the most important thing here is the concept "to be relative about terror" (in German "Relativierung des Terrors", relativation of terror) as well as the alleged consequence that terror would be excused by that. With the concept "to be relative about terror" the discussion about terror is made a taboo. According to this argument one is not allowed to discuss the roots of terror within the general terror discussion, because one allegedly excuses terror with it. As if the wish to understand things was the same as to excuse things. When I think about the dead children of Beslan, then I quickly ask myself how such things can be avoided to happen in the future, no matter where. It got to stop. As a matter of logic I enter the question of the roots and causes. Here I do see the anger in Muslim societies as a factor, too, because indeed in some social circles it does lead to latent or manifest justifications of terror and this is in fact exploited by the extremist edges and it encourages them to a certain extend. Yet it is not enough for the situation analysis to demand this anger to go away. This would be comparable with the fate of Jack Nicholson in "One flew over the cuckoo's nest". In order to still his anger they took his brains out. The film suggests that this is not an adequate method for solving problems. Concerning Chechenia, Palestine, Israel, Iraq, the USA, Europe, the Sudan and other countries, the terror will cease as soon as the severe injustice ceases, this is so even according to the mainstream media. There is no alternative known to me.

Apart from that there was a book review by Alexander Kissler on page 18: "Killing terror. Stefan Zweig's forgotten revolution drama 'Adam Lux'". The core sentence is: "Shortly before the war Stefan Zweig was enthusiastic about his humanistic program in a similarly ecstatic way and with a similar lack of consequences like 150 years before Adam Lux was about the French Revolution. And like the title hero in Zweig's most passionate drama its author chose suicide, too." With this Herr Kissler is suggesting that an engaged humanism leads to suicide. It is as if one would judge Jesus to be a failure, because the world is bad. This is why I mentioned above that one should take a look at the people who are behind it. So if we compare the great writer and humanist Stefan Zweig with the nihilist SZ journalist Alexander Kissler, it becomes clearer what my point is. And this is also my legitimate reproach at the address of the SZ: you don't believe in anything!

A fuzziness of values occasionally can also be observed in Thorsten Schmitz. In the issue at hand on page 3 there is his article: "A minister for rebellion. He gathers like-minded people around him, because Uzi Landau has an aim: in Israel everything shall remain the same." It deals with a minister in the Israeli government whose creed is: "We must win the war." Thorsten Schmitz calls him the "Robin Hood of the settlers". This will surely have pleased Mister Landau. So will the photo on which the young minister can be seen, cool with sunglasses, together with a member of the US foreign department. In the subtext Landau is called "far right-wing" ("Rechtsaußen"). Thorsten Schmitz also ridicules Landau a little and thus has his fun, too. This article reveals a lot about the relation between Germans and Israelis. Never could Schmitz coquet with a German far right-wing individual in such a way, but with an Israeli one he can live this inclination publically.

This leads us to an examination of the images for Israelis and Palestinians in the repertoire of Herr Schmitz. So here we have a Robin Hood. Robin Hood in our culture belongs to the heroes. Images of Palestinians, on the other hand, look differently. For the time of this analysis there have so far been three examples in Schmitz's articles. The first one I do not have anymore, because on September 2 I threw away all the older issues of the SZ. I think it was on the first of September when Schmitz reported under the rubric "People" about a Palestinian singer: "Sad hero". Sad, because he reached "only" the second place in an Arab competition. I asked Thorsten Schmitz in an email whether he would not want to also write something about a happy Palestinian hero. On the next day there was this picture of the muffled-up Olympia perpetrator of 72, somewhat out of context, which I mentioned above. On September 3 on page 8 he reported about the call-off of the hunger-strike of 3800 Palestinians in Israeli prisons. The strike was called off because of the lack of interest in the (frontal!) world public. (This means that the lack of interest is reported about, but the conditions in Israeli prisons are not.) Underneath the photo, which shows two victory fingers through prison bars, it reads: "Winners? Palestinian prisoners have stopped their hunger-strike, apparently without concessions of Israel." Not only it is suggested here that those prisoners are losers, but we also meet a type of Palestinian here, like the muffled-up Olympia type and the sad hero type. We will see what kind of pictures we will get in the future.

A remarkably good article was the "View from the outside" on page 2, "Justice for the victims in Darfur" by Lotte Leicht, director of the Brussels office of the human rights organisation Human Rights Watch. In it she demands that Germany should urge on the establishment of an international investigation committee. Finally a quote from the media page 19. The article by Klaus Ott bears the title: "Controlled controllers. Stock-exchange news coverage: the state wants to examine the rules of profession, the Press Council stands up against this." There it reads about the German Press Council which was founded in 1956 as an instrument and voice of self-control: "The media people, this was the idea, were to prevent, or at least to correct, excesses within the own ranks by themselves." My comment on this issue is that I don't believe the German Press Council is fulfilling this task in a sufficient way.

- 9/8/2004: We and the Others -

The first article that attracted my attention in the SZ from September 8, 2004 is the one about the Indian author Arundhati Roy. "From the fairytale princess to the she-devil" are the first words of the title. I pondered about these words before I read the long article on page 3. From the fairytale princess to the she-devil... In the supermarket I had seen something very similar, on the title of the magazine Stern, it was a photo of Herr Hartz with the title: "From savior to boo-man". A cascade of memories came over me. In 2002, in the 400 pages online book "Rock'n'Roll. Message from Ozzy Balou", I had elaborated on the thesis that in our (frontal!) publics there hardly are stars, heroes, personalities anymore: the public has increasingly lost its faith in the human being after 1945. In the American and the British societies the turning-point came in 1977 with Elvis's death and the beginning of punk. In the previous issue of the SZ we already saw how an advocate

of humanism, Stefan Zweig, was ridiculed and presented as a failure. It became clear that Jesus, was he among us today, would not have the least chance in the German frontal public. Let's see now what Stefan Klein says about Arundhati Roy.

Mainly a positive surprise. The long report with the full title: "From the fairytale princess to the she-devil: the change of roles of the Indian writer Arundhati Roy. A laughter lets the dykes breach. She curses, swears and is polemic, she stands up for the poor - her critics might not have understood that there is something which she does not want: to be objective". With it a big photo of a triumphing Roy. According to the text the thing about the fairytale princess and the she-devil is her own description. I read the article very critically and even - see above - with prejudice. There are indeed some points in it worth discussion, especially the role and perception of emotions in persons of public life, but the article is not ideological. It is... good. Of course, Ms. Roy is Indian. Had she such a political engagement and such an image as a German, this would probably be a different case. Imagine this: a German doing these things... Oh I see!! So it is an alibi article.

The SZ from September 8, 2004, was quite full of articles which attracted my attention. Especially on page 2. It mainly deals with the atomic program in Iran. Stefan Kornelius and Thorsten Schmitz atmospherically write about (against?) Iran. The report is from the point-of-view of the USA and Israel, in other words: the American and Israeli view is being carried on, including the threat of Israeli "preventive strikes". While the marginal notes by Rudolph Chimelli indicate that Iran seems to be dealing openly and constructively with the situation, the counter side (meaning "us") is suspicious and threatens and insults "unconcealed" (e.g. in the title "Bombs as a final means. Israel's plans etc." by Schmitz). About this article 11.1 of the human rights says: "Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence." Also note that the USA and Israel are the ones with atomic weapons.

On the same page below the politologist Wilfried Röhrich in the "External views" writes about "Limiting the power of Islam." While the text is about limiting the power of religions in general Islam is singled out as an object of explanation in the title and in the conclusion. From it two sentences. Firstly: "Contrary to Christian consciousness and to the pluralism of values in the Western civilisation the individual has only little significance in the Islamic self-understanding." And secondly: "In order to effectively approach Islamism (...) those countries must do all they can to oppose the politisation of Islam." Concerning the first sentence there is to say that something is being constructed here. "Pluralism of values" can mean anything. I regard it as too general in this context to claim that the individual in the West is free and in the East not. For example, I see the exclusivity of the frontal public as being an indication for the fact the individual in the West is not so completely free. The second sentence is abstract, too: "politisation of Islam", what does that mean? The restriction to religious cultural things, says Röhrich. Hm. But religions also are social and thus always political. So the analysis of Herr Röhrich is too limited. Which values does Herr Röhrich name? Autonomy of the individual, technical industrial world orientation, private property, limitation of rule, tolerance and constitutional state order. Sounds quite reasonable. The article is not bad, except for those fears of losing control which are not sufficiently reflected and which thus are shifted.

So we come to page 4. The commentary "Terror, Muslims and the churches" by mad deals with a conflict between the chairman of the Protestant Churches in Germany, Wolfgang Huber, and the chairman of the Central Council of the Muslims in Germany, Nadeem Elyas. The central sentence is addressed to the Muslims and it reads: "As long as those organisations do not consequently ban Islamist thoughts and Islamist bearers of thoughts their explanations sound bound in duty." Nobody can exactly say what actually is demanded or expected from the Muslims here. Clear is that the other side (meaning "us") does not want any more terror and that the Muslims are to do something about it and not we all together, as one might have believed. This is an attitude we already know

of the SZ. It rather likes to deepen the gaps than to concern itself with unpleasant issues. On this page 4 there also is a caricature where Iran is being brought into a connexion with atomic missiles and Joschka Fischer says "Crazy", but I did not understand this caricature. Probably for insiders.

On page 7 there is a report about "Vexations and taboos. Russias critical journalists again are led by the hand" by Thomas Urban. Hard to say what to make of such contributions. Interesting for the analysis of images about Palestine and Israel is the article " Hamas declares 'war against every Zionist'. After an Israeli air raid on Gaza City with 14 deads Palestinian terror groups now threaten with bloody assaults", by Thorsten Schmitz. The photo shows "anger and sadness: sympathizers of the terror group Hamas carry a killed Palestinian to the grave in Gaza City". There we have the type of the angry and sad Palestinian. Not exactly a role-model. The article itself is bad journalism as can be seen even in the title. The Israelis recently have carried out one of the most severe and most violent attacks on the population in Gaza. But this was not a headline. Hamas declares war, this is the headline. Every school child in Israel will notice that this is a trick so that the good remain the good and the bad remain the bad. Concerning Hamas see the German essay "Hamas: social integration and armed resistance" by Helga Baumgarten (in: inamo - Informationsprojekt Naher und Mittlerer Osten. Issue 38, Summer 2004, pp. 46-50, www.inamo.de).

Now for the feuilleton. There are two interesting contributions on page 11. In "Shooting children. The Chechenian rebels aim at the civil society" by the pedagogue Jürgen Oelkers it reads towards the end: "(...) Who shoots children, fleeing ones, from behind, committs more than a brutal act of terror, namely an assault on the society and its education." It is not very difficult to write something like that. Of course Herr Oelkers is right, but is the use of such articles? Honestly, who can benefit from demonizing the terrorists and from sentencing them over and over again in the mind? Why do the terrorists receive so much more attention than the victims and the advocates of the human rights? What makes the terrorists more important? Are they in the end indeed a mirror of our frontal public? Why do they get so much attention?

On the same page there is "School of terror, children of war. Only the international community can now save the Caucasus - if it wants: an interview with the Chechenian poet Apti Bisultanow" by Sonja Zekri. The best part of it is the note: when the people is suffering the poet must not stand offside. At first I had been happy about this interview and thought it was good. Mister Bisultanow explains the situation in the critical region as an insider. But then I saw the forth question (which rather is an answer than a question), of the SZ: "SZ: Chechenia has lost sympathies because of the murder of school children." (And the poet replies: I know). I wonder whether this principle of custody of kin is legitimate. This is not about sympathies, but about security and human rights. The SZ implicitly says firstly that human rights are only for sympathetic people, and secondly that a whole society (living under occupation, not sovereign) is called to account. Towards the end Mister Bisultanow explains the way of solution (temporary administration under international patronage, civil structures, new leadership, negotiations, contract), whereafter the SZ says: "This sounds utopian" and Bisultanow agrees and says resigning that he also rather believes that the violence will increase. This is the way the SZ is hammering into the minds of its readers: the world is getting worse and worse. It lures and seduces: come with us into resignation. There is no solution, realize it etc.

Finally a short dpa press agency note on page 14: "Terror and culture. To be prepared for the performance on the fair." It deals with the impending Frankfurt book-fair with the Arab World as the guest of honor. In it the Egyptian poet Hegasi says the Arabs must be prepared for the questions of the Germans, also about terrorism. Hoda Wasfi, scientist of literature, is against such an "act of defense" and emphasized the aspect of the cultural presentation. Whether Arabs also have a legitimate criticism towards Germans was not

made an issue at all. I could easily think of two or three substantial and plausible items in this respect.

- 9/9/2004 -

Today's issue is more calm than the ones before. More relaxed. No stereotype images of enemies, no extreme poles. One would not necessarily have guessed that in view of the (bad) headline: "Russia wants to chase terrorists worldwide." Also the Israel contribution by Herr Schmitz was of the usual kind. Yet there is little to do for me. Hm.

The best article of the day is Alexander Kissler's "Grace of diverse opinions. The Muslims are divided in their positions on cloning" in the feuilleton on page 15. A progressive, substantial contribution. Informative, also for me. Also good was Gustav Seibt on the new Hitler film and the public handling with the "unpleasant person". Whereas for me the aspect of Hitler's effect on the society is much more relevant than the question of how to deal with the person. The best news of the day was that the known Israeli nuclear scientist Mordechai Vanunu now applied for the Palestinian citizenship.

Lately I have been wondering whether the direction of the SZ can be named somehow, but I cannot think of anything matching. It is too colored and in confusion. Things which are criticized in the USA are not criticized in Israel. It is not even clear what exactly is criticized in the USA. It is a Joschka Fischer newspaper, I think one could say that. Maybe I can come up with a better description with time. I wonder whether the SZ takes this as a compliment or as an insult or indifferently. I wonder how I take it myself. Foggy... somewhat unclear. We will see.

CHAPTER 2

- 9/10/2004: Terror as a Field for Projections -

The advantage of a newspaper compared with a woman is that the newspaper cannot run away. It appears over and over again. It is faithful. Of course there also are faithful women. The disadvantage, however, is... ok, let's leave that. The SZ article of the day 9/10/2004 is on page 13 and it is called: "The impossible exchange. Why hostage-taking is the most effective of all terrorist weapons". It was written by Burkhard Müller. The central sentence is: "In view of terrorist violence the state is as helpless as an aristocrate in former times was in view of insults against his honor." This is another feuilleton article of the kind which starts with terror and philosophizes about its structure. The focus here is on the relation between terror(ists) and the state.

As we saw above several times the terror analysis of the SZ is defective, it is lacking things. All the more interesting are the images which are used in the context of terror. There is a very good and extensive German inaugural dissertation that deals with the metaphors about the state through the ages. I read it about 15 years ago, for example the metaphor of the state as a person, as a machine, as a bee-hive, as a ship and other things. The metaphor "The state is an aristocrate" with the extension "terror is like an insult" is revealing, because it shows why societies become repressive when they are afraid. The factual terror situation is being sublimated, transported into a different domain, a domain which has nothing to do with hostage-takings and victims on the spot, but which is about insults. The state feels insulted by terror. The newspaper, too, seems to feel insulted, as it is ennobled for its merits in society, so to speak. There are only few examples which show so clearly that there is a distinct class thinking in our society which is activated through phenomena like terror.

This is one side, says Herr Müller. But there would certainly also be the idea of the society contract ("Gesellschaftsvertrag"). "It says that the state is the voluntary agreement of its citizens for the greatest possible benefit." In this scenario the aspects of class and punishment is not highlighted, it is more objective in the sense of: closer to the situation. Müller mentions the aspects "valuation of goods" and "negotiations" which subsequently occur. In the aristocrate scenario, on the other hand, the "Staatsraeson" is mentioned as a reaction, this is the supremacy of the state. This would be the conflict of the state, Müller alludes, "it must be a hypocrite" in order to consider both scenarios, for both would be relevant.

Let's come back to the aristocrate scenario one more time, the one which Burkhard Müller is closer to. In detail the passage reads: "In view of terrorist violence the state is as helpless as an aristocrate in former times was in view of insults against his honor; every idiot was allowed to force him into the limits, he was dependant on the accidental impulse of hostile evil. This was the weakness of his power. On the threat of violence the state can only react with overwhelming counter-power which is to veritably bruise this threat. A state cannot give in to hostage-takers. If it did it would become a private person, as it were; it ceases being a state." When you read this quote thoroughly it becomes clear that terror is equalled with "the accidental impulse of hostile evil". And this is exactly what I am suspecting, namely that - instead of making peace - the frontal public is searching for "evil" which it sees hidden in some "non-aristocrats".

Reason for the attractiveness of the metaphor "the state is an aristocrate" is that it gives the citizen the opportunity to participate in this nobility via his identification with the state, and be it supposedly, only in his head. The argumentation is paradoxical, however, because in this scenario the state indeed acts like an emotionalized - I don't mind if aristocratic - private person, meaning not sovereign and not noble like a good state. The competing scenario, on the other hand, the one of the society contract, is not as attractive, because it is more abstract. Moreover, I don't believe that the conclusion is

correct, i.e. that state gives in to terrorism if the state does not "bruise". In my set of metaphors the good state is conceptualized as an educated big family that organizes a society of responsible citizens and lives with it. It also considers the edges of society with attention and does not know any differences of class. It does not prevent terror by focussing on the terrorists and by seeing evil in them, but by realizing social tensions in the outset and by solving them through dialogues (as well as through punishments, when the law is violated), and thus by cutting the ground of terror.

After having read this article my first reaction was disappointment. Was this really all the Sueddeutsche had? I mean, I was sacrificing my precious time and attention... On the caricature by Ironimus on the opinion page one can see Putin fighting with a shapeless octopus which is embracing him with its tentacles and which is meant to denote terror. This matches the subject at hand. Terror as a shapeless and uncalculable being. When you see it this way you lose your scruples about applying violence against "the terror".

What else? For the collection of images concerning the Middle East on page 8: "When the wolf becomes the chased lamb. For the third summer in sequence young Israelis and Palestinians have spent 'vacation from the war' in Germany together" by Nina Berendonk. On the photo there is a young Pal who paints a tattoo onto the upper arm of a smiling Israeli girl. It is true that one, in a deeper analysis, can find indications that the text is written from an Israeli viewpoint, but this is not a secret, anyway. The article is good, at any rate, it does not reflect the viewpoint of the Israeli government, like most of the articles of Thorsten Schmitz. Today, on September 10, Arafat again is threatened with expulsion. This is the way the Israeli government tests how far it can go. For within valid international law there is no possibility of such an expulsion. For the SZ this hardly poses a problem.

This was basically it, September 10. On the readers' mails page there are three contributions on the Middle East in which the wall is justified, Arafat is called a terrorist and Zionism is stood up for. Two other readers' mails deal with oppressed peoples who want their liberty and the question of guilt of terrorism which would also concern Schröder and Putin. There were other things, e.g. the question of quotas in German pop music and a review about Brandauer as Nathan the Wise. Interesting also the report about Schwarzenegger.

- 9/11-12/2004: Leviathan -

Today is the third anniversary of the massaker of September 11. In the weekend edition of the SZ there is another terror article in the feuilleton, again it is about the state. "The death of Leviathan. The lore of the 'Malmesbury monster': when the state can no longer guarantee the lives of its citizens it is gone" by Volker Breidecker. The argumentation is like this: since the beginnings of Islamist terror Thomas Hobbes' (1588-1679) conception (=scenario) of the absolute state is topical again. I did mention before that the SZ sometimes toddles off into the evil past when it all gets too much, but that it goes back so far into the past indeed is a bit of a surprise. Leviathan originally is a Biblical monster, the philosopher Hobbes means the state with it. He was of the opinion that an absolutist state is the only way to escape the "war of everybody against everybody", yet not without the normalty of wars between states. This pre-industrial philosophy now is taken by the SZ for the fight against terror. "Global terrorism of the new century" is blamed for having abandoned the principle of human self-preservation. Therefore it could not effectively be fought with the "balance of horror", the philosophy of the previous century. Today we would find "suicide armies". This criticism of terrorism then expands to a general critique of religion, as in religion "even violent death" would not be the biggest evil.

Let us now leave this moth box and return to the current time. Apparantly, war between states is regarded as a normalty in the SZ. This is a problem. It is a justification for the

state to become a monster which sees itself having an enemy who also is a monster. A lot of monster images. Like on TV. Hm.

On page 13 there is a long article by Holger Liebs about photos and collages of places of terror. Yet there hardly is a message to be discovered in it, unless that "pictures lie". The best contribution of the day is the reader's mail by Sabine Matthes on that the path towards peace in the Middle East is that Israel, similar to South Africa before, acknowledges the rule of law. About the anthropologist Uri Davis Sabine writes: "Contrary to American democracy, this is how he argues, Israel distinguishes between four kinds of citizenship which are rooted in racist discrimination. Thus the meanwhile four million Palestinian refugees (according to data of the UN support organisation for refugees from Palestine UNRWA) have a right to get the Israeli citizenship (according to international law, UN partition resolution 181 and UN resolution 194) which is denied by Israel, because otherwise it would not be a predominantly Jewish state anymore." Six further readers' mails deal with this subject which is related to an article about the judgement of the international court on the Israeli wall. I vaguely remember it, it was quite some time ago. While reading these exceptionlessly good contributions I had the feeling of peeping through a window into a free world outside.

Apart from that, the weekend edition from 9/11-12/2004 was about "the humans" permanent complaints which leads to their incapability of realizing how sick the whole system is (page 3). It is not easy to assess the value of such texts. The success of right-wing extremist parties is the subject of page 5. On page 2 the Pisa test is mentioned, this comparison of educational systems in different countries in which Germany got very bad marks. My comment on this is: we survived Versailles, so we will survive Pisa, too.

- 9/13/2004: "Eyes Shut, Eyes Open" -

Hard to say what to make of today's issue, the one from 9/13/2004. Topic of the day on page 2 is that the democratic parties are discovering how dangerous the escape of the voters towards the right-wing could become. Heribert Prantl notes that the "struggle against right-wing extremism" is not a seasonal work. In this article ("Eyes shut, eyes open") there is an interesting metaphor. Herr Prantl compares right-wing extremism with natural phenomena and writes with reference to mysterious "observers of the political scene in Germany": "They note that right-wing extremist parties would traverse the Federal Republic like thunderstorms: they draw on, roar, and leave again." As we know one cannot lead a discussion with natural phenomena like thunderstorms, they are beyond the discourse. The "struggle against right-wing extremism", which Herr Prantl is demanding, in its structure is comparable with the struggle against "terrorism": in the end the opponent is conceptualized as a dehumanized phenomenon. The right-wing party NPD in another article on the same page is called a "time bomb".

On it goes with the anger of the masses on page 3, and on the opinion page 4 mad comments on the "Jesus Day" in Berlin: "When it comes down to the influence of Christian values the organizers leave open which ones are concerned - otherwise the Jesus Day would quickly have had a vehement fundamentalism debate. (...) As little as it is true that all of those who had gathered in Berlin are fundis: behind the Jesus Day stands a clear church and society concept in sharp contrast to liberalism and pluralism." The commentator closes with the remark that the established churches "must clearly say where the borderlines are between them and the fundamentalist parts of the Charismatics." Thus a vehement fundamentalism debate is out of the question. It is hardly mentioned why there is such a sharp contrast to "liberalism and pluralism". Mentioned is the denial of the evolutionary laws, and besides the gathering would have been "enormously political". Here it becomes apparent why Jesus has no chance in the frontal media: he is too political! So political even that certain subject matters are not even part of the discussion. What are they afraid of at the SZ that they devalue their own liberalism and pluralism? Is it necessary to be afraid of people who deny the laws of

evolution? Why is not not enough to smile about this view? To deny the laws of evolution is a bit like denying the theory of relativity or the law of gravity. It is possible to do it, but it is not a very successful enterprise. The central genuine question in this context is the one of the contextuality of revelational scriptures, that is the question in how far these texts are and have to be seen in their historical contexts. This obvious and rather harmless issue was not even alluded to in the SZ.

On the same page 2 there is a view into the press. From Le Monde there is a quote: "Struggle against terrorism in the first place means to take away its legitimization and thus to care for the removal of the problems which are exploited by the terrorists." From the Neue Zuercher Zeitung there is a quote of the Islamic Studies academic Navid Kermani: "Who questions the dialectics of escalation and points to the roots of violence is declared an accomplice of terror, who talks about political negotiations, even about peaceful solutions, is declared a naive simpleton (...) One does not have to negotiate with terrorists, but one should also not wait with negotiations as long as there are terrorists." Herr Kermani here foremostly criticizes the weekly newspaper "Die Zeit", there was no reference to the SZ. I think the SZ does not realize that it exists...

Concerning the Middle East image collection there is an AP/dpa article on page 6: "Sharon warns about civil war in Israel". On the photo one can see "settlers protesting against the government in July with a human chain". In the foreground a sympathetic looking bearded settler with a kipa, laughing, with a small child on his arm, in a shining white shirt. In the center of the picture the Israeli flag. People taking each other by the hand. A picture of peace, one could assume. Who sees the photo will get a positive first impression.

Then in the feuilleton the article "The future of former times. Between Hartz and Hitler: how democracy changes" by Harald Welzer. The author complains about lacking utopias without offering utopias himself. Maybe he is from the 68 movement. He talks about our being talked into a new Hitler cult and at the same time participates in this fashion. It is this kind of self-fulfilling prophecy for which the media often does not seem to have an eye. They think they only inform, but of course they also are role-models with their behavior. Two pages ahead we see an esthetical, big colored photo of Adolf Hitler, collar, mustache, Fuehrer's cap, on the very top of the page, impersonated by the actor Bruno Ganz. Underneath an interview with routine questions. So far I had known such illustrations only from the "Spiegel". Unfortunately, the film-makers also put this stupid face onto the book of the film, as I noticed a couple of days ago on the desk of the newspaper shop in the station. This indeed is advertising Hitler, how else should one call it?

Finally on page 16 another contribution from the series: "What the state may prescribe to us. Wolfgang Kersting and Horst Dreier explain Kant's wise separation of morals and law" by Michael Stolleis. It is a book review. Of course Kant did not separate between morals and law as is suggested in the subtitle. Rather, the article is about the theses of Kant that the executive part of the law is to function without an additional reference to morals while the foundation of the law is rooted in morals.

- 9/14/2004: The German Angst -

There is hope. Evelyn Roll writes on 9/14/2004 on page 3 about the patient Germany. It is the second part of a trilogy which is to be completed on Friday. Here is the full title: "'Patient Germany (II) - the diagnosis of the psychologists: 'Everything that has happened since the war was nothing but psychological shifts.' A journey to the almond core of fear. Couragelessness, self-hatred, panic attacks - the country seems to be the victim of its forgotten, but never really mourned history." This is the best article I have read in the SZ since the French Revolution. Let's just adjust the title first so we don't get on a wrong track for all that joy. Germany has forgotten its history and is incapable of

mourning AND THUS of fundamentally improving! Let's immediately forget this thing about the victim!! Now for a progressive quote: "When an individual has committed a terrible crime and wants to live on the question is: where to put the evil? In crass cases he subsequently splits off the evil. And this is how it went with Germany. The splitting off into East and West. The evil ones were the respective others. Everything that has happened since the war (...) was nothing but psychological shifts." According to this the 68ers only fought the symptoms. "German Angst", by the way, is a word out of the previous part. A good word. And yet it is nothing specifically German. You can find it everywhere. Only that Germany because of its past has a special relation to fear.

At last one can take the Sueddeutsche Zeitung seriously. Al-hamdu lil-lah! (Thank God). I am looking forward to reading the third part which is called "In the rehabilitation". On page 4 three interesting articles: a commentary by rabe criticizing the constitution intelligence service (Verfassungsschutz) in Saxony about the NPD ("What use is it if the verfassungsschutz nicely observes the brown comrades without passing its knowledge on?") dbr writes about Putin that he would speak with a split tongue. How true! Thorsten Schmitz reports about "The silence of the left-wing. Israel's settlers dangerously trump, but the silent majority in the country wishes the withdrawal from Gaza". This article is not written from the viewpoint of the Israeli government. On page 8 there is another article by Schmitz, about Netanjahu. On page 9 again the nuclear program of Iran. Europe is warning. In view of Europe's silence about the real Israel this cannot really be taken seriously. Even less can be said about the minister of the interior, Herr Schily's statements about the Israeli wall being ok. He discredits himself. The Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ) writes about it, the SZ doesn't.

In the "View from the outside" an article by Daniel Benjamin who had been working in the National Security Council during the Clinton time. He speaks against the war on Iraq and criticizes the war against terror without being principally against it. He sees surroundings of "increasing hatred against the USA" in the Arab countries and says one would instead have had to "transform" those countries, which are called "incubators of terror", with reforms (from the outside!?). The title of this not especially material article is "The terror gets even more effective". In the feuilleton then we find something about a historians' day in Kiel. I didn't even know that we have historians here in Kiel. Cool. For sometimes one is almost inclined to think that we live in a history-less society. A society in which history has become a code, frozen. But there are also counter-examples. Regards to the SZ editors!

- 9/15/2004: God and Gods -

A good edition. The article of the day is in the feuilleton on page 14 and it is called: "All Gods are one! The discomfort in religion" It was written by Professor Jan Assmann, an Egyptologist from Heidelberg. A stimulating article, even a dialogue. Herr Assmann poses the thesis that the idea of monotheism, which changed the world - is based on an excluding concept of truth, meaning that it defines itself via demarcation by nature. No god but God! in the three monotheistic religions therefore means the exclusion of alternative belief systems: "For all three religions accord in a strong concept of the other against whom they define themselves, in different ways, by persecution, by courting, missionary action, subjection or simply by excluding them as goyim, gentiles, pagani, unbelievers, heretics, respectively." Monotheism would be about demarcation, not about the one, says Professor Assmann, and therefore it would be exclusive. As a reflecting historian and author of the book "Moses the Egyptian" he speaks about the principle of the translatability of values in an "inclusive monotheism" in which all gods are one and he calls this an "intercultural transparency" in which the other can be understood inherently in his own terms. Great, progressive article!

The religions are a fundamental origin of our social and individual behavior. An overall and updated critique of religions indeed is of central significance today. This sounds

straightforward. But it isn't. When one wants to critically assess the monotheistic religions then one will have to regard all three as a matter of justice. It is absolutely no problem to criticize Islam, this is happening on a daily basis in the German press, on whatever level. (In Muslim societies, on the other hand, it is not so easy yet to talk freely about religions, in the press, neither.) It is also possible here to pose critical questions concerning Christianity. Well... But when all three are discussed together, then it could work. Presupposition is an overall agreed upon system of values, like for instance the human rights about which a simultaneous critical reflection is necessary as they were not formulated by all involved parties.

In the new library in Alexandria I had seen a modern black statue in Egyptian style. It fascinated me, as did the barque near the pyramids which I visited in February. The old Egyptian style is marvellously beautiful. I would really like to meet Professor Assmann. He is a socially engaged Egyptologist. Of such people I normally only dream at night. My experiences with our universities and with our educational system in general have normally been rather bad, with few exceptions. This is the reason why I wrote dozens of pages on this subject before. The SZ of today is full of Pisa and the new marks for education in Germany, again a miserable account in the ranking. The fundamental problem to my mind lies in the unefficient conceptualization of learning processes as the acquisition of something alien. It is basically the same missionary thought Herr Assmann was talking about. The society knows beforehand what is to become of the pupils and students, it has expectations, the parents, the educational officials, the economy. In this way we are educated to become unfree people and not to become responsible citizens. Also, I have come to the conclusion that our natural creativity gets methodically destroyed in the educational institutions. In the end this is due to the image of the human in the society.

What else? On page 8 Herr Schmitz tells us the news of Mister Sharon from Israel. The headline is: "Sharon calls Arafat 'killer'". It actually is quite a harrassment for the readers that they have to overhear this children's theater every time again. Interesting the sentence: "At a suicide assault of a Palestinian terrorist in the West Jordan Land on Tuesday three Israeli soldiers were injured, one of them with danger for his life." What I wonder is not what this news has to do with the title, but whether the SZ sees "terrorists" in a differentiated way. This example is about a clash with the occupation army. Is this the same kind of terror? I wonder where the SZ sees the limits of the right of resistance in societies under occupation. - Frau Steinberger wrote again and on the page with the readers' mails today there also are the publishing dates of those articles that are referred to.

- 9/16/2004: Da da Didacticism -

One of the most important principles in the literary critique of the Imagistes, an Anglo-American group around Ezra Pound, about one hundred years ago, is: "No didacticism!" The teaching and the beautiful do not really fit together. Unfortunately, Ezra later went a bad way politically. Yet as a literary critic he is worth admiration. The problematic thing about this humanistic demand of "No didacticism!" is that it is didactic. The didactic always also takes away freedom. The newspaper is didactic, too. It gives the readers freedom through knowledge, analysis and commentary and it takes away freedom for example by the choice of subjects and opinions. When I concern myself with the newspaper in this way I may also partly take away its freedom. Sometimes it is paradoxical, but there is nothing one can do about paradoxes. They are not so bad, anyway. Violence is bad.

When you are doing a simultaneous newspaper online review then there is a lot which comes into and goes out of your mind. There is little time for digestion, the dreams can become heavy. And yet it is a fascinating thing, a good practise, very vivid, and what are a couple of months? I was pleased about the SZ of today, Thursday. Despite the fact that

there were slight aggressions in it. But who is free of aggressions? You cannot expect this in these times that everybody always is so cool. They are hard times and we all are doing our best to get out of them. Sometimes I wonder how I can find an edition of the SZ pleasant when there is this Israel "coverage" in it. I probably mean it in a relative way. There is no other explanation I can think of.

On page 1 there is a quote by EU foreign deputy Chris Patten: "The struggle against terrorism does not justify nor excuse human rights violations." That the Nato is sneaking into Iraq writes Christian Wernicke on the 4. Arne Perras comments the world population situation. Herr Prantl writes about Putin: "We have no better one". Hm. What does that mean: we have no better one? Who is "we"? I think Herr Prantl did indeed understand this article about Kant from the 13th in the way that law and morals are separated. He separates, anyway. Thorsten Schmitz comments on Sharon's "Farewell from the Road Map". Sharon is not criticized there (We have no better one?), but it becomes obvious that Sharon even wants to intensify the control over the Palestinians. Normally in the comments of page 4 one can derive opinions, not in this case. The photo of the respective article on page 8 shows "anger and sadness", a crowd of people with a man who is screaming of pain. The text lapidarily says: "During raids of the Israeli army in the West Jordan Land eleven Palestinians were shot on Wednesday." But this is not the headline. "Sharon calls off peace plan", that is the headline. - Amusing the article "Good guys come from hell. The downfall is near! But Guillermo del Toros' 'Hellboy' stands up against the Nazi horror villains" by Doris Kuhn on page 14.

The best article is by Torsten Körner and it is called: "Have fun with Hitler! Big Bunker: once the television offered the NS state like a pedagogue, now the brown rulers are becoming human there". On the media page 17. The author wrote the Heinz Rühmann biography (NB: famous German actor) "The good friend" and "The history of the Third Reich". This long article is about the relationship between the German media after the war and Hitler, also about didactics and the educational mission of the media. Three passages I have marked, they do not summarize the excellent article, they just caught my attention. "Isn't the presentation of Hitlers as a miserable individual also an uncomfortable hint to his intimate relationship with his people?" Interesting a media Hitler conclusion from 1955: "Be alert, don't say Jawoll anymore!" And the criticism of the media towards Hitler biographer Joachim Fest: "Wasn't there a dangerous empathy going on?" It is about the German Angst of the "Hitler in us". For Hitler's success was due to the population's ability to identify with him. How could people identify with Hitler? Hardly imaginable today. No? Be alert, don't say Jawoll anymore! This conclusion from 1955 is not exactly popular these days. What might be the reason? In this context a post 9/11 quote by Hannsheinz Bauer (SPD), the sole still living member of the Parliamentary Council which in 1948/49 brought the constitution of the Federal Republic of Germany on the way: "(...) Especially after the German crimes of the Nazi time the generally valid criteria of the human rights and of international law, which are in the UN Charta, were formulated. By these criteria the actions of current governments are to be measured." ("Who might be compared with whom?" June 2003, www.sopos.org/aufsaetze/3ee9f8c72d31a/1.phtml).

- 9/17/2004: Isolated Community -

Maybe I am wrong, but I have the impression that there is a kind of movement going on. The human rights seem to be valued up in the SZ, a nice thing if it is so. Surely Kofi Annan has contributed to this with his assertion that the war on Iraq was illegal. We have to see how the SZ will be in the next situation of crisis, concerning the recent past the level seemed to me to be much higher than on average. This does not mean that I principally accord, for example regarding this conference in Berlin:

Today they wrote about a so-called Islamist conference. Officially it is called: "First Arab Islamic Congress". It is set to take place in the beginning of October, in Berlin, and our

minister of the interior wants to prohibit it, after a suggestion of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Paris. "We are against terrorism and extremism" claims organizer Gabriel Daher (p. 8). The newspaper writes in the commentary that here a mosquito is made an elephant (German saying), because the conference would be badly organized, anyway. Which means that, was the conference better organized, the commentator would have written differently, too. What is it that the organizers are blamed for so that Herr Schily wants to prohibit the congress? On the homepage it reads: "Yes to the liberation of the countries occupied by American Zionist terror, no to the hegemonial attempts of the USA." The SZ writes that the invitation appears "like the paper of a lobby group for the resistance in Palestine and in Iraq." On page 4 the case is commented, rabe writes about "what is really dangerous", namely when hate is preached in mosques, when Muslims want to draft fighters for the Holy War and: "the withdrawal of whole migration groups into an isolated community and the rejection of values which are a basis of our democracy."

This assessment of the SZ is cautious and well-considered. What is lacking is an accompanying self-criticism. Fact is, one cannot prove that these people are ready for violence, still there is the threat of prohibition. Here the public is asked to make a situation analysis. "Liberation from American Zionist terror", this is something which you cannot say so well in Germany. Also "lobby group for the resistance in Palestine and in Iraq" apparently sounds dangerous for German ears. Something fundamental is being questioned here. What is it exactly? Why? By right? May somebody call for resistance in Palestine? How long shall we continue to sit on the conflict, how many people will still have to die? Today I am asking this the Germans. Consider in this context that the insinuation of a "Zionist lobby" can in Germany lead to the exclusion from the discourse. The SZ assessment of this Arab Islamic congress does not really look like a dialogue, rather like an affirmation of the current borders in the frontal public discourse. Clear camp thinking. This is not progressive. It is understandable insofar as in former times such affirmations of borders had been necessary for the definition of the self. "Isolated communities" still is a boomerang reproach.

On the same page 4, the opinion page, Heribert Prantl writes: "The venture of a party donation softening law is reminding one of Max and Moritz, sixth prank: the two had come through the chimney and reached the delicious products of the bakery, fell into the dough and were shifted into the oven and baked by the master." According to this, the parties eat their own law like M&M ate the cover in which they had been baked, to escape. Herr Prantl digs cartoons from this time (about 100 years ago). For example, once he had compared a German politician with the figure Paulinchen from the famous children's book "Struwwelpeter", Paulinchen with the matches. Then, I found it remarkable that the argumentation was based on the pitch conservative Struwwelpeter. I guess the Crocodeel from Kiel might please Herr Prantl, too. The CD with the booklet is only 5 euros 80.

On the page with the readers' mails it becomes obvious that the "Patient Germany" trilogy by Evelyn Roll met a great deal of feedback, and controversy, too. Actually, the third part was set for today, instead there was something about locusts, without any comment. Two contributions on the literature page attracted me: "Proved rivalry: the science of literature and literary criticism" by Ijoma Mangold. Interesting is: "Criticism has to react quickly, science may, even must, take its time. (...) While literary criticism very much likes to connect between esthetics and morals (also the ones of personal lives), it is, on the contrary, part of the dogmatism of the science of literature to reject every form of biographical analysis." This relates to a couple of subject matters which have occurred here before. Maybe we come back to this later on.

There also is a book review by Thomas Thiel about Petra Werner's book: "Sky and earth. Alexander von Humboldt and a cosmos" on this page 18. It reflects about the cumulative concept of science of the era of the encyclopedias. We find this phenomenon in Arabic scripts, too. The metaphors and conceptualizations of the Arab Islamic concept of science

had been my major academic subject back then. Which images and conceptions did people in former times have about knowledge, science, and learning procedures? It was a positivist philosophy of the world, in the West and in the East alike. People imagined the world to be like a chart or list and they thought in terms of taxonomies, as if the things in the world, about which one could "acquire" knowledge, were like the chemical elements or the divisions in biology. The same happened in the linguistic sciences. In early Islam people thought that there was an exact relation between all individual "things" of the world and the words which denote them.

By the way: in today's edition (9/17) of the *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* from Switzerland the Arab frontal publics are criticized ("Stone throws instead of thoughts. September 11 and the Arab intellectuals. On the occasion of the third anniversary of September 11 the London-based Arabic newspaper 'Al-Hayat' publishes statements of Arab intellectuals about the terror assaults on America. The sobering one-sidedness, assesses the Iraqi writer and publisher Najem Wali, is representative for the Arabic discourse.") Mister Wali blames the Arab media for continuously talking about the "liberation of Palestine" and for finding "the always same guilty ones", instead of looking for the responsibility for the decay in themselves, in the magisterial state, in Saudi Wahhabism, and other things. I know Najem a little from uni times in Hamburg. Last year he was in the telly sometimes, because he was in favor of the war on Iraq. I am glad that the Arab publics are also questioned anew, this all belongs together. It would be nice if there could be a constructive and sincere spirit as a basis so that positive changes can really come about.

- 9/18-19/2004: Be the Change you Want -

A reader in Vietnam yesterday asked me if I really believe that things in Palestine/Israel can turn to the good without a bang. Yes, indeed I believe that this is possible. It is a matter of bringing things to awareness. Most societies after 45 have been educated in a way that they do no longer really strive after happiness. After the Holocaust it almost seems perverted to want to be happy. To want to be unburdened, innocent. But despite all this it is human nature, we all subconsciously strive after innocence, also the victims among/in us, and also the perpetrators. And it is the right way to strive after it, for it is the way of fulfilment and unfolding, away from violence in a natural way. The reason for wars I see already on this level. There is a quickly activated aggressivity in the people, a control drama with severe fears of loss and safety. This also leads to wars. Another point is that in the process of peace-making you are changing yourself, too. Many people are afraid of this, because they fear a loss of identity. So they rather remain in the conflict.

With me this is somewhat different. Right now I am sensing a change in myself, because the paper has a different effect on me than two weeks ago, or two years ago, for that matter. There is no more reason for using war paint (sentences like "I love collective psyches"). Remarkable. I looked up from the screen and saw Lawrence of Arabia hanging on the wall. I had to grin. While I was still pondering about the fear of changing oneself I turned on the TV. On the channel Vox there was a BBC Special about children's psychology. When I turned it on somebody in the film was just saying that the reflection of the own behavior, and in case of necessity also the altering of the own behavior would be of central significance in education, too. The documentary about the work of the admirable British psychologist Dr. Tanya Byron inspired me. At that time I had not yet dared to read the SZ, it was a strange fear of disappointment which probably belongs to every hope in a way.

Today's edition was beautiful. With one day delay Evelyn Roll writes about "The therapy in the reha: 'Don't complain! Stand up! Do it! Action!' The sorcerer's apprentices at the bed of the ill. Maybe we can even make it to distribute the pain in a just way - why the renunciation of populism could be the beginning of the healing process." With populism the media is meant especially, and especially the *Bildzeitung*, Germany's biggest tabloid. Frau Roll first spoke with Feridun Zaimoglu, a writer who talked about the lack of

overcoming the hard aspects of migration in Germany and who comprehensively assesses the Bildzeitung ("Shit paper" / "Drecksblatt"). Also, the hair-oil of the boss of Bild, Herr Kai Diekmann, was made a subject in Herr Zaimoglu's assertions. Afterwards Frau Roll talked with Herr Diekmann who knew how to defend himself as a professional, but who also let her "run into cotton-wool". There is, as I read, an internet diary www.bildblog.de in which "since July four journalists day by day decompose the false news and the mistakes of the Bildzeitung in a well-founded and very readable way." Gotta have a look at this, sounds interesting what the colleagues do there. Frau Roll says, only 5 percent of the Germans read the SZ (or FAZ, FR, Welt, Spiegel, Focus), the other 95 read nothing or Bild. On the front page of the SZ it reads: "Today's print edition: 669.400".

Then she continues to write: "Let us assume that all German media would (...) for one month get itself together. It would not write about Weimar conditions in an alarmistic way." No more "catastrophe bulletins", and instead keep the focus on the positive for one month... Really amazing, this was very close to what the children's psychologist in the BBC Special had said, too. For identity finding/peace-making one should focus on positive impulses and set a positive behavior and thinking as an example. Although the end of the Roll article is less strong (a Germanized American calling us to positive thinking) this is the kind of researching, experiencing, progressive spirit which I have in mind when I dream of the present future.

Matthias Drobinski on the following page 4 basically continues where Evelyn Roll had stopped. He wishes for a "new German confidence". It is about the right-wing extremists in the impending elections. The voter would take revenge, is his thesis: "In an act of revenge, say the psychologists, the satisfaction does not lie in the own benefit, but in the damage for the other." There would be a need for a salutary expectation to overcome the German angst. Maybe this could only be a patchwork carpet, but now would be the time to work for this aim, visions, too, would be important. Herr Drobinski mostly writes about Christianity in the SZ. He is quite deep in this analysis and thought, yet once I was really angry on him. I don't remember what it was, at first I had wanted to write a complete article about it, but then I skipped that. It had something to do with Islam. Below on page 4 a good sentence by gras: "It is the task of politics to contrast the confession of the voter for the brown world of ideas. The democratic culture is stable enough to bear this discussion. In the end it will be strengthened by it." Concerning Iran Herr Chimelli starts his commentary with: "When the Europeans speak with one voice (...) they can really achieve something." This is old camp thinking. Not when the Europeans, but when the world speaks with one voice, we can really achieve something.

Franziska Meier writes in the feuilleton (p. 16) "Old Europe. The historians, too, have discovered the 'linguistic turn'". From it a quote which touches several aspects of the discussion at hand, for example the one of the contextuality of revelation scriptures (see 9/13). According to this article the German historians find back to the international community, "by emulating the so-called Cambridge School which does not want to view the past only as a history which is to be reconstructed, but as a 'unit in communication'. After that the linguistic turn now seems to also have reached the German sciences of history from now on not only social or material constellations determine reality, but rather are the historians aware now that historical reality is 'constituted through language' and thus that language, that concepts have to be analyzed in their respective contexts."

Very good on the media page the review "The drug of power. Politicians and journalists are not better than the people they represent - a book by Jürgen Linnemann" by Michael Jürgs. Then the weekend supplement. I admit that I had some prejudices when I first saw this title: "Every year again. On Sunday there will be an old ritual: right-wing extremist parties will alarm Germany. Kurt Kister on sovereignty. Heribert Prantl on the sovereign. For a strong society". Now this did sound a bit odd. Especially the last bit, for a strong society, sounds like a slogan of the conservative party, or one of Herr Struck.

But it is all different. Both articles are not only tolerable, but good. Herr Prantl writes: "You don't fight Neo-Nazis with exorcism, but on the street." And Herr Kister said one should let the church remain in the village (German saying meaning one should not exaggerate): "There is no need to be afraid of the DVU and the NPD. Both are too stupid for the parliament again and again." There would be a justification for fearing really radical individuals, but not the parties. This is good.

CHAPTER 3

- 9/20/2004: Dream Sequence -

And where shall the journey go then? Tobbi asked the robot next to him in the cockpit. *We have a mission to accomplish. Click*, said the sympathetically rattling voice. Tobbi looked down from out of the window. Tree tops were slipping away underneath them. The sky was clear. I want to listen to some music, said the boy. *OK*. The robot took one hand from the steering and plugged it into another place. A CD slot opened. Tobbi put in Bob Dylan's CD "Desire". Sounds of violins ended the monotony of the roaring rotating wings. The boy rocked his head rhythmically to the right and to the left. You do it also! he said. It is not difficult. Have a try. It is like mathematics, but better. *OK*. Right, left, right, left. *Click. Our first task is...* Look-a there, a waterfall! *...to find the correct questions*. But this is easy! Where to with the evil? You gotta branch off here.

They were approaching the polar circle. Floes of ice were shifting in the water, becoming more and more. There a big ship was pulled with a rope. Is this the Titanic? *No*. Look over there, the little tug-boat. Steer over to him. We must talk to him. He is waving his arms. *We need cod-liver oil. The fuel will be off soon*. They circled around the tug-boat. On a tongue of land they met. "You are completely wrong here", the bearded seaman with the pipe in his mouth laughed. You have started too hastily. You were to go to Africa, and to America." The two received some cod-liver oil to continue the journey. And where to with the... At this the seaman transformed into a coyote and he kept joking and laughing all the time. Come, Robbi, we are leaving.

They flew over a meadow which was full of corpses. Oh, what happened here? *The humans did that. Click*. They are so many. I had not thought death had undone so many. There were body parts all over the place, heads, arms, legs. This must be millions. *Click*. Over there next to the cinema there is a take-away diner, let's ask there. "They are dozens of millions", said the keeper, "the blue ones did that. They will pay for that." A blue head appeared from under the chaos and said the striped ones did it. "We will get them. We will fight until hell is freezing in." All terrorists. *Click*.

A professor stepped in. Maybe we can separate it, segregate it. We must do something with it. Quick. Robbi and Tobbi looked at each other. Go where everything has started. *Kenia?* Few words in the cinema. Robbi and Tobbi watched the whole film. We must return to Africa. *Yes, we will take the way via Egypt*. It is so dark. *Wait, I switch on the spotlight*. Is this Africa? *Yes*. They were flying tightly over the ground. The day began. They listened to saxophone music by John Coltrane.

There sat a child. "The killing is becoming harder to do", it said. Who are you? "I am the child of the world. I am Om." The child made a bow. *Click*. Where to with the evil? asked Tobbi. The child said: "The freedom of the living expresses itself in action only." Yes, and? "They were hundreds of millions. Explanation monopolies, justification strategies, consciousness blockages." Yes and where to with the evil? The child took the two by the hand and guided them to the village. "look into the faces", said the child of the world, "look into all the faces." Will we know it then? "Yes, then you will know it."

- 9/21/2004: Epilogue -

Lawrence of Arabia I took from the wall and put it into the archive. The mission was accomplished. I opened the window. "Oh really?" asked the blackbird. "Now that it is beginning to get a structure." A routine, I said, it is getting routine. I took off the mask and hung the cape into the cupboard. Job finished. From the fridge I got myself a malt beer. "Hel-lo!" said the voice in the mirror, "you cannot be serious." Yes, sure. "You said: a couple of months." I said: change. I said: company for a while. "Oh man, now that it is getting so beautiful!" Yapp. I took a long swallow from the bottle. "And what if they get into this camp thinking again?" They gotta know by themselves. I am not a nanny. "And how was the paper today?" Super. "Really?" Yapp. "Say at least what the article of the day was." Hey, do you know how tired I am? "Only the article of the day." Well ok. It is called: 'Resurrected from ruins. How depression becomes a feeling of optimism: catastrophes and therapeutic communities', it is a book review, by Olaf B. Rader. "And apart from that?" UNO. Cohen. Self-criticism. "And what about Herr Schmitz?" Herr Schmitz also wants peace. All want peace. "But there are still so many questions open." Yeah. A lot of questions.