



# *Burning Conscience*

*The case of the Hiroshima pilot,  
CLAUDE EATHERLY,  
told in his letters to  
GUNTHER ANDERS,  
with a postscript for American readers by  
ANDERS*

*Preface by  
BERTRAND RUSSELL*

*Foreword by  
ROBERT JUNGK*

MONTHLY REVIEW PRESS  
NEW YORK

© 1961 Rowohlt Verlag G.m.b.H.,  
Reinbek bei Hamburg

Library of Congress catalogue card number: 62-15160

*First published in Germany under the title:*  
OFF LIMITS FÜR DAS GEWISSEN  
*First American edition, 1962*

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

115  
A85 E213  
1962

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Preface by the Rt Hon the Earl Russell, OM	ix
Foreword by Robert Jungk	xi
Letter 1 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	1
2 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	6
3 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	8
4 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly with enclosure	9
5 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	21
6 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	22
7 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	24
8 Girls of Hiroshima to Claude Eatherly	25
9 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	26
10 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	30
11 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	32
12 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	35
13 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	37
14 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	37
15 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	38
16 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	41
17 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	42
18 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly's brother	45
19 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	46
20 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	47
21 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	48

	<i>Page</i>
Letter 22 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	50
23 Günther Anders to Doctor Frank	51
24 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	54
25 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	54
26 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	55
27 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	56
28 Claude Eatherly to Mr Roland Watts	57
29 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	58
30 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	60
31 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	61
32 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	62
33 Günther Anders to Judge W. Haley	63
34 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	66
35 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	68
36 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	69
37 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	73
38 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	75
39 The XY Society to Claude Eatherly	78
40 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	79
41 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	79
42 Claude Eatherly to the Reverend N.	80
43 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	83
44 Claude Eatherly to Senator Ralph Yarborough	84
45 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	85
46 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly's sister and brother	87
47 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	89
48 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	92
49 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	93
50 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	94
51 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	98

	<i>Page</i>
Letter 52 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	100
53 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	100
54 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	101
55 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	102
56 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	103
57 Günther Anders to the President of the United States	104
58 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	112
59 Günther Anders to Mr Ray Bell	115
60 Günther Anders to Mr Roland Watts	116
61 Mr Ray Bell to Günther Anders	117
62 Günther Anders to Mr Ray Bell	119
63 Günther Anders to Doctor Walter F. Ford	121
64 Günther Anders to Mr Robert Kennedy	122
65 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	124
Appendix	
66 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	128
67 William Orrick to Günther Anders	129
68 Günther Anders to William Orrick	129
69 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	131
70 Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders	133
71 Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly	134
Postscript for the American Reader	136

## *Preface*

by

EARL RUSSELL, OM

The case of Claude Eatherly is not only one of appalling and prolonged injustice to an individual, but is also symbolic of the suicidal madness of our time. No unbiased person, after reading Eatherly's letters, can honestly doubt his sanity, and I find it very difficult to believe that the doctors who pronounced him insane were persuaded of the accuracy of their own testimony. He has been punished solely because he repented of his comparatively innocent participation in a wanton act of mass murder. The steps that he took to awaken men's consciences to our present insanity were, perhaps, not always the wisest that could have been taken, but they were actuated by motives which deserve the admiration of all who are capable of feelings of humanity. The world was prepared to honour him for his part in the massacre, but, when he repented, it turned against him, seeing in his act of repentance its own condemnation. I most earnestly hope that as a result of publicity the Authorities may be persuaded to adopt more just views of his case and to do what lies in their power to redress the wrongs that he has suffered.

*Bertrand Russell*

the high priests, Caiaphas - the <sup>new</sup> representation  
of the pious and the respectable - the  
'conventional good people' of all ages  
including our own. These people, while  
they are not blameworthy in the same  
sense as Judas, are yet guilty in  
a more subtle, but also more profound  
sense than he. This is the reason  
why I have been having such difficulty  
in getting society to recognise the  
fact of my guilt, which I have  
long since realised; the truth is  
that society simply cannot accept  
the fact of my guilt without at  
the same time recognising its own  
far deeper guilt. But it is, of course,  
highly desirable that society should  
recognise this, which is why my  
and ~~my~~ story is of such vital  
importance. Now I accept the fact  
that I am unable to bring about  
that recognition by getting into  
scrapes with the law that I have  
been doing ~~in my determination~~  
~~to~~ in my determination  
x to shatter the hero-image of me by

Facsimile of a page of Letter 12 in Claude Eatherly's handwriting.

# Foreword

by

ROBERT JUNGK

Since 1945, millions of words have been written by eminent authorities on 'the effects of nuclear weapons'. Nevertheless, there is still a yawning gap in this comprehensive volume of literature on the subject. The experts, it is true, have subjected whole mountains of ruins and tens of thousands of survivors to most minute examination, but in their meticulous studies, they omitted one very important object—themselves; and by so doing they have disregarded an aspect of decisive importance, namely, that atom bombs strike back at those who use them and, indeed, at those who earnestly labour at making their use possible.

The 'delayed action effect' of these weapons of mass destruction is, admittedly, not of a physical, but rather of a moral and mental nature. For these atomic 'weapons', endowed with a power of devastation unparalleled in the history of war, impose upon those who use them, or who are prepared to use them, mental burdens and stresses, from which they are unable, either deliberately or subconsciously, to free themselves.

It was the 'Eatherly Case' that first opened our eyes to this 'delayed action effect' of the new 'weapons'. Here we have a man who makes no attempt to brush aside or dismiss from his mind the horrors in the unleashing of which he participated, but is conscious of a deep sense of contributory guilt, a man who cries to high heaven, while almost the whole of the rest of the world remains silent and resigned.

To future generations, his mental confusion, his indignation and his sufferings will probably appear to be 'more normal' than the attitude adopted by his fellow countrymen in the narrower, and his contemporaries in the broader, sense.

We must, all of us, surely have experienced and admitted in our own hearts the same feeling of horror, the same desire to fight

with all the forces of conscience and reason against the intrusion of this monster of inhumanity.

Yet we remain silent, calm and collected, and pride ourselves on being 'tough' and 'hard-boiled'.

But this composure of ours is no more than a spurious pose. In reality we are not of a stature to pass unscathed through the test of the burden and stresses which the new 'weapons' have imposed on us. Under the weight of them, the very foundations of our moral and political existence are collapsing. The contradiction in terms between those things which we desire to defend and the means which we envisage using to defend them is becoming ever greater and greater. And this has led to the incidence of overwhelming mental strains and to a collective moral sickness, which is reaching an acute stage in an ever increasing number of people.

The United States of America, which was the first country to introduce this monstrosity into our human affairs and which, despite the warning signs from Japan, has continued to develop and improve upon it, has also been the first country to be affected by the moral and mental delayed action effects of the bombs.

How very simple, in reality, is the 'Eatherly Case', in comparison with 'the Case of America'! It is not the sufferings of this Texan pilot which is the real tragedy of this drama, but rather the baleful entanglement of his country and his fellow citizens. In its fight to ensure 'freedom from fear', it has brought the terror of the atom into the world; in order to safeguard the freedom and happiness of the individual, it has felt itself compelled to employ the counter-threat of death and destruction to countless millions.

Nor is that by any means all. Now, in addition, we have 'the Case of the Soviet Union', 'the Case of Great Britain', 'the Case of France'—and tomorrow the 'Cases' of Sweden, Switzerland, Israel and China will be added to the list. No country that decides to safeguard its values and rights by using these new 'weapons' (which will annihilate all values and all rights), will be able to emerge from the test of moral stress inherent in such a decision without grave and lasting damage.

For without ever exploding, these atomic weapons, held in readiness for instant use, are having their effect on the potential users of them. By leaving the most vital decisions in the hands

of the few, they are making a hollow mockery of democracy. They are having a general brutalising effect upon the armed forces, who must always be prepared and determined, if need be, to stop at nothing. And they destroy the inner faith of the atomic Powers in their own humanity and standard of ethics.

## 2

If you looked at a photograph of young Claude Robert Eatherly, who volunteered for service with the American Air Force, you would see a typical picture of 'the clean-cut American boy'. There is nothing very arresting in this clear, somewhat vacant young face, but what there is seems to typify all the copybook virtues of integrity, courage, clean living and innocence.

Thousands upon thousands of similar striplings flocked to the colours to fight for 'decency and democracy' against the barbarism of national socialism. And when he moved over from the Teachers' Training Institute in Texas to the barracks of the Air Force, young Eatherly was justified in still believing that freedom and humanity could be defended by force of arms.

This fact adds weight to the importance that must be attached to his present attitude of opposition to any war, even to one which appears to be justified. For between the decision of the volunteer of yesteryear and the rejection of war by the conscientious objector of today has thrust itself the experience of atomic destruction, in the unleashing of which Eatherly took part, without realising the role that had, in fact, been allotted to him.

It is said that after the shattering experience of Hiroshima Major Eatherly spoke to no one for days on end. This, however, was not taken very seriously on the island base of Tinian, where the members of his Bomber Group that had acquired such dubious world-wide notoriety were awaiting demobilisation. 'Battle fatigue' they called it. It was something from which many a man had suffered in the past, and in 1943, after thirteen months of continuous patrol duty over the South Pacific, Eatherly himself had succumbed to a nervous breakdown.

On that occasion, a fortnight's treatment in a New York clinic

had cured him, and after Hiroshima, too, he seemed to return fairly quickly to that mental state which was regarded as 'normal behaviour' among Pacific veterans off duty—hour after hour of poker, interspersed with curses, jokes and reminiscences.

About this time, the news went round the world that one of the pilots who had taken part in the attack on Hiroshima had entered a monastery, in prayer to seek forgiveness for his sin. That was a myth. In reality, Major L., who was named in this connection, had accepted a job as Director of a chocolate factory. Nevertheless, the rumour turned out to be 'more true than reality'. It had invented an act of repentance which, in any case, had, sometime or other, to become a reality.

Among all the participants in the two atomic air raids, Eatherly was the only one who, during the immediate post-war months, resisted the temptation of allowing himself to be fêted as a hero. His fellow citizens in the tiny township of Van Alstyne showed considerable understanding, and his reticence was not regarded as a sign of madness or even of eccentricity on his part.

For at that time, the 'good American' and his fellow citizens had not yet been torn asunder. Consternation over the horrors of Hiroshima had not yet come to be regarded as a sign of weakness, or condemnation of the use of the atom bomb as grounds for suspicion. There was at that time no dearth either of self-condemnation or of confessions of guilt. Public opinion was all but unanimous in demanding the outlawing of nuclear instruments of war, and many people of the most diverse political opinions went so far as to insist that America should voluntarily renounce her atomic monopoly—a monopoly which, it was felt, could in any case be maintained only for a short period of time—and, as a grand gesture, should initiate all her allies in the United Nations into the secrets of this cataclysmic discovery.

Then, however, the isolated and comparatively small group of those who advocated the retention by America of the monopoly of these overwhelmingly powerful weapons gradually gained the upper hand, thanks in no small measure to the—to them—welcome refusal of Russia to accept the half-heartedly tendered American proposals on atomic control. The 'cold war' began, the nuclear arms race was off to a good start. Where yesterday people

had been shattered by the six figured atomic death roll in Japan, they now began to accustom themselves to the idea of casualties amounting to ten and a hundredfold that number. A new yardstick came into being—'megadeath', the symbol to denote a million atomic victims. It was now accepted that casualties of this magnitude would occur, and the fact was incorporated as a matter of course in the calculations on which the policy of the deterrent was based.

Were any individual to hatch a plot along these lines, he would inevitably be condemned as a dangerous lunatic and would be incarcerated as a public danger.

But not so a General Staff or a Government. The executive organs of society are allowed to formulate completely mad plans, and not only to formulate them, but even, to the applause of a section of public opinion, to go forward to the concrete implementation of their plans.

Were some individual, regarded hitherto as a comparatively peaceful and benevolent member of society, suddenly to see every action of his neighbour as an attempt to murder him; were he then to start entrenching himself, isolating himself and surrounding himself and all he possessed with a veil of frantic secrecy, his fellow men would have no option but to assume that the poor man was suffering from a persecution mania and stood in need of psychiatric treatment.

But not so a Great Power. In its case, all this would be regarded as politically prudent and 'realistic'.

The delayed action effect of the atom bomb on its possessors has started to make itself felt. The fact that those in authority had at their disposal forces of an almost supernatural, apocalyptic power did not make them wise and modest. It has made them arrogant and hard.

Tomorrow—if, indeed, any of us survive to see a tomorrow—the protagonists of atomic armed forces and their mathematically calculated doctrine of mass murder will be condemned before the bar of world history exactly as Hitler and his fallacious doctrines

have been condemned today. But by then, condemnation will have come too late. To re-awaken the dead will be beyond its power.

Before town and countryside are turned, by some political miscalculation in the game of mutual recrimination and threat, into an endless desert, before the whole earth, in so far as it has not already become the cemetery of mankind, is transformed into one vast, seething mass of sickness and disease, it must be made crystal clear to the whole world that the moral delayed action of the atom bomb has turned its possessors into madmen, in the most literal sense of the word, suffering from a form of mania that is all the more dangerous, because they seem to be talking rationally and give the impression of being normal, decent, responsible people.

What can we, the citizens of the world, the men and women destined to suffer the horrors of tomorrow, do to prevent the madness of these 'cold calculators' from involving us in a nuclear catastrophe?

It is this question that Major Eatherly has tried to answer, and it is perhaps the most important question that faces those who have survived the second world war.

The answers that Eatherly gave were both wrong and, above all, ineffective.

First he sought a solution in emigration. Shortly after his demobilisation in 1947, disgusted with political developments in his own country, he left the United States.

Then he returned home and—like all the others around him—he tried to forget, to make money, to devote himself to leading his own life. He became an employee of an oil company in Houston, went every day to his office, attended evening classes to study law and finally rose to the position of sales manager.

In 1943, Eatherly had married a Hollywood starlet named Concetta Margetti, whom he had met during his training period in California. For the first seven years of their married life they had only spent a few days, at the most a few weeks, at a time together. But now at last they were able to lead a more or less normal life with their own home and garden, their children, the chance of modest social advancement and all the other advantages offered by a quiet and happy little niche of their own.

That, at least, was the picture by day. But at night faces and

nightmares still tormented the ex-pilot. At first things were not too bad. A few drinks sufficed to cure depression and a few pills to banish his insomnia.

Very soon, however, these simple remedies proved to be no longer adequate. In his dreams Eatherly saw the agonised faces of those burning in the hell-fire of Hiroshima.

It was about this time that he started to cram bank notes into envelopes and send them to Hiroshima, to write letters to Japan, in which he alternately condemned and gave excuses for what he had done. But this 'medicine', too, was of no avail. So, in 1950—the year in which President Truman announced that America was to construct a far more powerful atomic weapon, the hydrogen bomb—Eatherly tried in a hotel room in New Orleans to end his own life by taking an overdose of sleeping pills.

When discovered, he was still alive. After a couple of days in hospital he was discharged and then went voluntarily for six weeks' treatment to the special military hospital for mental ailments in Waco. From there he was discharged without any apparent improvement in his condition.

He then tried to cure himself and exchanged his sedentary job for one of manual labour in the oil fields. The strenuous physical exercise enabled him to sleep more soundly for a while. Then once again began the brooding over what had happened, what would happen again, what must happen, unless someone could prevent it.

A peculiar plan started to take shape in his mind. He would, he decided, fight against this new jingoistic tendency in an America which had just elected a second world war General to be its President, he would fight it by knocking that national pigeon, the virtuous war hero, from his newly erected pedestal. He would compromise him and expose him; and the subject of this act of unmasking would be himself, 'the hero of Hiroshima', Major Claude Robert Eatherly.

Early in 1953, among a host of other petty offenders, a man was brought before the court of summary justice who had forged a cheque for some quite insignificant amount. Rapidly the



magistrate jotted down a few personal particulars, asked a question or two and passed sentence: 'Nine months. Next case' ...

Eatherly barely had a chance to open his mouth. He might perhaps have told the court that he had paid this money into a fund for the assistance of the children of Hiroshima, or he could have drawn the attention of the court to his rank and military record. He did nothing of the kind. The machinery of justice works too fast, the 'case' was far too insignificant for it to have attracted any public attention.

With a remission of sentence for good behaviour he was released. His next attempt was in Dallas—a hold-up. But the peculiar bandit concerned took nothing! The case was dismissed when his lawyer declared that his client was not responsible for his own actions and had agreed voluntarily to go to hospital for treatment. There then followed a further four months in Waco. There it was realised that Major Eatherly was suffering from a mental disability attributable to war service, and he was discharged and granted a small pension of 132 dollars per month. This, later, was doubled.

They would neither brand him as a criminal, as he had hoped, nor grant him that 'boon of punishment', through which he hoped to find relief from the burden of guilt which oppressed him. But, equally, they were not able to cure him. After working for six months as sales representative of a sewing machine company, he again attempted to commit suicide. His wife found him with the veins of his wrist severed. She would divorce him, she declared, unless he promised to submit once more to psychiatric treatment. And so, once again he found himself knocking at the door of the Waco clinic. Dr McElroy, the senior physician, described his condition at the time in the following terse, cold terms: 'An obvious case of changed personality. Patient completely devoid of any sense of reality. Fear complex, increasing mental tensions, emotional reactions blunted, hallucinations'.

The torments of his conscience were brushed aside as pathological, the sensibility, which distinguished him from so many of his fellow men who carried on happily without thought of the past, was interpreted as 'lack of emotional stability'. And all this, they decided, could be driven out of his system by intensive insulin injections.

Four or five times a week Eatherly underwent this treatment, in the hope that it would enable him at long last to forget. And at the end of six months it really did seem as though the evil memories had been exorcised from his mind. He joined his wife's family in the oil town of Beaumont, but was very swiftly forced to realise that under the strain of such great burdens, his marriage had broken up. Concetta Margetti applied first for a judicial separation and then, later, for a divorce. Her plea that her husband should be debarred from visiting the children was granted, and she formally waived any financial claim on him for their maintenance. The first of these conditions Eatherly respected, but he continued voluntarily to make a monetary contribution towards the education of his children.

And so, for five years, from 1954 to 1959, this man, whose life had been shattered by the delayed action of that atomic bomb, continued to live in a whirl of hectic monotony, alternating between the courts of justice and the mental clinic, between the commission of futile acts of rebellion by an amateur gangster, who held up cashiers without robbing them, who burst into post offices without grabbing the till, and the search for health by a sick man, whom neither psychotherapy nor tranquillisers could cure, because he, the morally more healthy, could not come to terms with the sick society into which he was continually being let loose; because, after his experience in 1945, he had failed to develop that protective pachyderm, which allowed his contemporaries to accept, more or less complacently, the horrors of Hiroshima and Auschwitz and all the fresh war crimes with which war of the future threatened them.

In spite of all this, Major Eatherly did achieve some of the things he set out to achieve. In the end, he did succeed in drawing public attention to his 'case', though public reaction to reports on 'the mad pilot of Hiroshima' was, admittedly, very different from what he had hoped. He wanted to rouse his fellow men to indignation, but in fact he did no more than excite their pity. Far from discrediting the military caste, which had been born of war and had

subsequently developed into a firmly established institution, his case merely presented it with some welcome publicity. For, when they were made public for the first time, did not the repeated efforts of the Air Force, which time and again intervened to save Eatherly from prison and place him instead in the care of a medical establishment, afford ample proof of how 'humane' the military hierarchy had become?

A great deal of curiosity and a small measure of pity—that, by and large, is all that the unending stream of reports about Eatherly aroused.

But then in the spring of 1959 a report on the Eatherly case in an American news magazine caught the eye of the Vienna philosopher, Günther Anders. A great moralist, a pre-eminent philosopher with a brilliant and original mind, Anders took the case up, for he appreciated at once the outstanding, fundamental and historical importance of an 'affair', which everybody else had regarded merely as an interesting 'Story', the by-product and aftermath of world events.

The ensuing correspondence between the 'intellectual' and 'the man of action' provides an answer to the question: 'What must be done?' It is not, and cannot be, a full and final answer, but, by subjecting this condition of atomic mania, which has been elevated in the world to the status of realistic common-sense, to a *thorough* diagnosis of novel and penetrating perspicacity, it represents an important step forward towards the curing of a sick and ailing society.

But to me, when I read it, unquestionably the most arresting aspect of this correspondence is the obviously healing effect it has had on Claude Robert Eatherly. Where drugs and neurologists failed, a clear-visioned mind, a warm and understanding friend have brought a sense of inner peace and security to a tortured man and given him fresh hope and a purpose in life.

Armed with the new conception of himself and his mission that had been given to him, Eatherly was desperately anxious to make

a fresh start in life as a free man. But in this his guide, philosopher and friend from afar could not help him. Although the authorities have always insisted that Eatherly was not being forcibly interned in the Waco clinic, but was remaining there of his own free will, they nevertheless refused him the discharge for which he eagerly begged, until at last the ex-pilot took matters into his own hands.

And this was the moment—when he emerged, no longer an emotional and somewhat muddle-headed rebel, but a thinking man, who wished to devote his life to exposing the dangers of atomic armaments—that the authorities chose to pounce on him as though he were an escaped criminal. He was arrested, brought before a court consisting solely of psychiatrists nominated by the military authorities and without one single independent expert and was condemned to incarceration in the Waco establishment, under the sharpest possible conditions of surveillance.

What this really entailed, however, is disclosed in an article written by Ray Bell, a reporter on the staff of the local Waco *News Tribune*:

The hospital for ex-servicemen in Waco consists of a large number of two-storeyed, red brick buildings. Eatherly was recently put into 'Ward 10'. This is the section which houses the violent maniacs; most of the patients therein no longer remember even their own names. Eatherly himself said: 'The only people with whom I can talk at all are the warders'.

He gets up early, but they give him nothing to do. He sees the doctors only when they make their daily routine tour of the wards. All he gets in the way of treatment is two Therazin tablets a day. In the ward with him are some thirty mental cases. In the prevailing atmosphere he is unhappy, because it prevents him from doing what he wishes to do. At the moment he is not even allowed to go to church, although divine services are held within the precincts of the establishment ...

It is of interest to know how this man, now shut up with the 'violent cases', behaved at the trial which in January, 1961, ordered his incarceration. The same American reporter, engaged by a great French newspaper to cover the trial, writes as follows:

'Eatherley's attitude was admirable. Every now and then he

laughed when his defence counsel made a good point (as, for example, when one of the doctors in his evidence stated that Eatherly had made out a typed list of questions and Eatherly had whispered to his counsel that he couldn't type!) He answered the questions put to him directly and without difficulty ... mostly with a brief, soldierly 'Yes, Sir ... No, Sir'. The only time he showed any anger was when Don Hall, counsel for the appellants, started to question him regarding the manner in which he obtained his money. (Note: Eatherly's brother, John, had been instructed by the Air Force to lodge the application for his incarceration). Hall pressed him hard on the subject, and Eatherly replied sharply: 'You get your money in your way and I in mine.'

But even in anger he did not lose his composure, but remained at least as cool, calm and collected as any normal man. He was naturally disappointed by the verdict of the court, but he certainly did not give the impression that he had given up hope. He simply said: 'Well—that's the way it goes!'

In the covering letter which accompanied his eight-page report, on the subject of those appointed to function in the court which tries the gravest cases, the reporter says: 'Eatherly was probably the most intelligent person in the whole court room.'

## 7

It should, perhaps, be added that the newspaper which employs Ray Bell, a reporter of conscientious integrity, also published a further article on the same court proceedings from the pen of another reporter, in which the comments and conclusions arrived at were at complete variance with those reached by his colleague Bell. Anyone reading it must inevitably have come to the conclusion that Eatherly was mentally deficient and that his internment was therefore fully justified.

For we are now living in an age in which goodness is regarded as naïveté, integrity as stupidity, sympathy as weakness and Christian charity as sheer foolishness. Convention alone still pays

lip service to the virtues, but in practical, everyday life they are no longer taken very seriously. No longer do the dupes, the betrayed and the disillusioned raise their voices in angry protest, for they feel that it would be useless to do so. They remain grimly determined not to be imposed upon, but further than that they will not go. A man who mentions ethics is dismissed as a pompous busybody, a hypocrite or, at the best, as an old-fashioned and laughable figure. For the sceptics and cynics, who call themselves 'realists', believe that at long last they have grasped what the game is and are deliberately taking a hand in it—even though the game is going against them and even though they themselves are the stakes in the pool.

All the greater, therefore, is the responsibility of those few, who do not fear to face ridicule, that mirror of distortion, which in a flash can transform any chivalrous and truthful knight into a Don Quixote.

The moral help which Günther Anders gave to this unknown friend in America seems to me to afford proof positive that the thoughtful and morally responsible among us must on no account resign themselves to things as they are and capitulate. Today, more urgently than ever before, their task, indeed, their bounden duty is to become the mouthpiece of those who may well be the victims of tomorrow.

By so doing, far from 'disintegrating' society, they would be helping their fellow men to realise that they themselves will inevitably be the victims of the fateful mistakes that are being made.

The 'Eatherly Case' is only a fresh manifestation of that ever recurring process in human affairs, in which some saintly fool, different from those around him, throws out a challenge to the ruling class of the moment and by so doing exposes the decadence of their code of ethics.

That, as a general rule, occurs just before new laws are carved on new tablets.

## Letter 1

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

June 3rd, 1959.

Dear Mr Eatherly,

The writer of these lines is unknown to you; you, however, are known to my friends and to me. No matter whether we are in New York, in Vienna or in Tokyo, we are anxiously watching the way you are trying to manage and master your condition. Not out of curiosity, nor because we are medically or psychologically interested in your 'case history'. We are neither medical men nor psychologists. But because full of burning concern, we have made it our daily task to push our way through the moral problems which are blocking the road of mankind to-day. The 'technification' of our being: the fact that to-day it is possible that unknowingly and indirectly, like screws in a machine, we can be used in actions, the effects of which are beyond the horizon of our eyes and imagination, and of which, could we imagine them, we could not approve—this fact has changed the very foundations of our moral existence. Thus, we can become 'guiltlessly guilty', a condition which had not existed in the technically less advanced times of our fathers.

You understand what this has to do with you. After all, you are one of the first ones who have actually been caught in this new sort of guilt, in which everyone of us can be caught to-day or to-morrow. What could happen to us to-morrow, has actually happened to you. Therefore you are playing for us the great role of a crowning example, yes even that of a predecessor.

Probably you don't like that. You want your peace, your life is your business. We assure you that we despise indiscretion just as much as you do, and we ask for your forgiveness. In this case, however, indiscretion is, unfortunately, inevitable, even required. Since chance (or however we may call the indisputable fact) wished to change you, the private individual Claude Eatherly, into a symbol of the future, your life has become our business too. Of course, it is not your fault that of all of the millions of your fellow men, just you have been sentenced to this symbolic function; but things are as they are.

And yet, please don't believe that you are the only one who has

been sentenced in this way. For all of us have to live in this epoch in which we could slide into such a guilt; and as little as you have picked out your tragic function, so little have we picked out this tragic epoch. In this sense, we are all in the same boat, we are children of one and the same family. And it is this common fate which determines our attitude towards you. When thinking of your sufferings, we are doing it as brothers; as if you were a brother to whom the misfortune has actually occurred to do that which each of us could be compelled to do to-morrow; as brothers who hope to avoid this calamity as you so terribly, futilely hope that you could have avoided it. But at that time it wasn't possible. The machinery had functioned blamelessly, and you were young and lacking in insight. You *have* done it. But since you have done it, we can learn from you, and only from you, what would become of us if we had been you, if we would be you. You see, you are terribly important for us, even indispensable. So to say, our *teacher*.

Of course, you will reject this title. 'Everything but that,' you will answer, 'for I just *can't* master my condition.'

You'll be surprised, but it is just this 'can't' which is decisive for us. And even consoling. I know that this statement must sound senseless at first. Therefore a few words of explanation.

I don't say: 'consoling for you'. Nothing lies further from my mind than to try to console you. The consoler always says: 'It's not as bad as all that,' tries to belittle the pain or guilt or to talk it away. That is exactly what your doctors are trying to do. It is not difficult to see why they are doing it. After all, these men are employees of a military hospital to whom the moral condemnation of a generally respected, even glorified action, would not exactly be beneficial, to whom the possibility of such a damning may not occur; who, under all circumstances, must defend the purity of the deed which you so rightly feel as guilt. Therefore your doctors maintain: 'Hiroshima in itself is not enough to explain your behaviour'—which, in a less indirect language, means nothing else than 'Hiroshima wasn't really as bad as all that', therefore they confine themselves to criticizing your reaction to the deed instead of the deed itself (or the world condition in which such a deed is possible). Therefore they find it necessary to call your sufferings and expectation of punishment an *illness* ('classical guilt complex'), and therefore they must treat your act as a 'self imagined

wrong'. Is it any wonder that men, who through their conformism and lack of moral backbone, in order to preserve the purity of your deed, must characterize your pangs of conscience as pathological—is it any wonder that men who work with such fraudulent suppositions have not exactly succeeded in reaching sensational results? I can imagine—if I am wrong please correct me—with what disbelief, with what suspicions, with what resistance you must face these men, since they only take your reaction seriously, not your action. Hiroshima—self imagined. Really! *You* know better. Not without reason do the screams of the wounded deafen your days, and not without reason do the shadows of the dead force their way into your dreams. You know that what has happened, *has* happened, and is not imagined. You are not taken in by those men, nor are we. We don't want to have anything to do with such sham consolation.

No, I say 'for us'. For us the fact that you cannot master what is done is consoling. Because it shows that now, afterwards, you are making the attempt to catch up with, to realize the magnitude of your acts, the effects of which you then had not realized; because this attempt, even if it fails, proves that you have been able to keep your conscience alert, although once you had functioned as a screw in a machine, even successfully so. And since you have been able to do this, you have proven that one is able to do this, that we must be able to do this. And to know that—and it is to you to whom we owe this knowledge—is consoling for us.

'Also if your attempt fails.' For it must fail. Why?

Even if one has harmed but one fellow man—I am not speaking yet at all of killings—it is, although the deed can be seen at a glance, no easy task to 'digest' it. But here it is something else. You happen to have left 200,000 dead behind you. And how should one be able to mobilize a pain which embraces 200,000? How should one repent 200,000? Not only you cannot do it, not only we cannot do it, no one can do it. However desperately we may attempt it, pain and repentance remain inadequate. The frustration of your efforts is not your fault, Eatherly. It is a consequence of what I previously had described as the decisive newness of our situation. That we can produce more than we can mentally reproduce; that we are not made for the effects which we can make by means of our man-made machines; that the effects are too big

for our imagination and the emotional forces at our disposal. Don't reproach yourself for this discrepancy. But although the repentance cannot succeed, you must daily experience the frustration of your efforts. For outside of this experience of failure, there is nothing else which could replace the repentance, which could prevent us from having once again anything to do with such a monstrous deed. That you, since your efforts cannot succeed, react panically and unco-ordinatedly, is comprehensible. One could almost say that it is proof of your moral health. For your reactions prove that your conscience is on guard.

The usual method of mastering what is too big consists of a mere suppression-manoeuver; of going on in exactly the same way as before; of sweeping the deed from the desk of life, as if the too big guilt were not guilt at all. In order to master it, one makes no attempt to master it. As, for instance, your buddy and compatriot Joe Stiborik, the former radar man on the Enola Gay, who, because he continues living as a 'regular guy', and because, in the best of spirits he explained, 'For me it was just a bigger bomb', one loves to hold up to you as a shining example. An even better illustration of this method is that President who gave you your go ahead signal, just as you gave the go ahead signal to the bomber; who actually, therefore, finds himself in the same situation as you, if not even in a worse one. But what you have done, he has failed to do. A few years ago—I don't know whether you heard about it at the time—most naively perverting all moral standards, he announced in a public interview, that he felt not the least 'pangs of conscience', implying thereby, his innocence was proven; and recently on his 75th birthday as he summed up his life, he named, as the only wrong worthy of his repentance, that he didn't marry before his thirties. I can't imagine that you envy this clean sheet. I am perfectly certain, however, that no common criminal could sell you his innocence by telling you that he doesn't feel any pangs of conscience. Isn't a man who runs away from himself a ridiculous figure? You, in any case, haven't done that, Eatherly. You are not a ridiculous figure. Even when you fail, you are doing what is humanly possible. You are trying to go on as *the one who has done it*. And that is what consoles us. Although you, just *because* you have remained identical with your deed, have been changed by this deed.

Of course, you understand that I am referring to your forgery, robbery, breaking and entering, and God knows what other irregularities there may have been. And also to your alleged demoralization. Don't believe that I am an anarchist and in favour of breaking and entering and forgery, or that I take such matters lightly. But in your case, these offences have another meaning than ordinarily. They are acts of despair. For to be as guilty as you are and yet to be publicly classified as innocent, even to be praised as a smiling hero on the 'strength' of this guilt—that must be a situation which a decent person just cannot tolerate, and for the ending of which he even takes recourse to indecent steps. Since the monstrous guilt which weighed and weighs on you was not understood, was not permitted to be understood, and could not be made understandable, you had to attempt to speak and to act in the language which is understandable there, in the idiom of petty or big larceny, in the terms of the society itself. Thus you have tried to prove your guilt by committing acts which at least are recognized as crimes. Yet even here you were frustrated. Whatever you do, one continues classifying you as a sick man, not as a guilty one, and for this reason, because the world is begrudging you this guilt, you remain an unhappy man.

Last year I visited Hiroshima, and there I spoke with those who are still there after your visit to Hiroshima. You can be sure: amongst these people there is not one who would think of persecuting a man who was nothing but a screw in the workings of a military machine (that you were when you, as a twenty-six-year-old, carried out your 'mission'); and no one hates you.

But now you have proven that although at one time you had been misused as a screw, you, contrary to the others, have remained a human being, or have become one anew.

And here is my suggestion:

Next August 6th, as every year, the population of Japan will celebrate the day on which 'it' happened. Why don't you send a message to these people, which would arrive in time for the celebration? If you would tell them: 'At that time I knew not what I did, but now I do know, and I know that this must never happen again, and that no human being ought to be allowed to demand such a thing of another human being.' And: 'Your fight is my fight, your "no more Hiroshima" is my "no more Hiroshima",'

so, or in this way—you can be sure that with such a message you would make this day of mourning a day of rejoicing, and that the survivors of Hiroshima would receive you as a friend, as one of them, and rightly so. Since also you, Eatherly, are a Hiroshima victim.

With the deep esteem which I have for each and every Hiroshima victim,

I am,  
Yours Sincerely,  
Günther Anders

## Letter 2

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
June 12th, 1959.

Dear Sir,

Many thanks for your letter which I received on Friday of last week.

After reading your letter several times, I decided that I would like to write you, perhaps carry on a correspondence with you to discuss matters which I think we have a mutual understanding. I receive many letters, but I find it impossible to answer most of them, but to your letter I felt compelled to answer and give you some insight to how I feel toward matters which involve this world to-day.

Throughout my adult life I have always been keenly interested in problems of human conduct.

Whilst in no sense, I hope, either a religious or a political fanatic, I have for some time felt convinced that the crisis in which we are all involved is one calling for a thorough re-examination of our whole scheme of values and of loyalties. In the past it has sometimes been possible for men to 'coast along' without posing to themselves too many searching questions about the way they are accustomed to think and to act—but it is reasonably clear now that our age is not one of these. On the contrary I believe that we are rapidly approaching a situation in which we shall be com-

pelled to re-examine our willingness to surrender responsibility for our thoughts and actions to some social institution such as the political party, trade union, church or State. None of these institutions are adequately equipped to offer infallible advice on moral issues and their claim to offer such advice needs therefore to be challenged. It is, I feel, in the light of this situation that my personal experience needs to be studied, if its true significance, not only for myself, but for all men everywhere, is to be grasped. If you feel that all this is relevant and more or less in accordance with your own thinking, what I would like to suggest is that we should together seek to work out its implications through a correspondence extended over a period of whatever time may be necessary.

I feel that you have an understanding about me that no one else, except my doctor and friend may have.

My antisocial acts have been disastrous to my personal life, but I feel that in my efforts, in time my motives will succeed in bringing out my true convictions and philosophy.

Günther, it is a pleasure to write to you, and through our correspondence may we form a friendship of trust and understanding. Feel free to write of any problem, situation or activity that confronts us all. I in turn will give my viewpoint.\*

Thanks again for your letter,

I remain,  
Sincerely,  
Claude R. Eatherly

### \* REMARK ABOUT EATHERLY'S LANGUAGE

The letters up to July 1960 required but minute syntactical or grammatical polishing, the adding of 'buts' or 'howevers' which nearly everybody's letters would have required in order to facilitate smooth reading. How irrelevant the changes are will be evident to those who compare the facsimile with the printed letters. The letters between July 1960 and the day of escape in October 1960, however, testify to an increasing syntactical and grammatical uncertainty. It is hard to judge whether medications were responsible for the increasingly blurred character of his language, but this explanation cannot be excluded, for Eatherly himself, when at the height of this process, mentioned 'more tranquilizers', and he himself drew attention to his, as he called it, lack of 'continuity'. As this deterioration took place shortly before the Hiroshima Day, we have to consider the possibility that the approach of this anniversary increased his suffering, and that for this reason the doctors took recourse to drugs; yet it is just as possible that the doctors treated him prior to this critical date in order to deaden him against the memory of the dead, or, as the Director of Public Relations at the Waco Hospital put it, in order to 'let him forget his past' (see Letter 60). Whatever we consider the cause of the deterioration of Eatherly's language, it is striking to see that no sign of disorder can possibly be

### Letter 3

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
June 23rd, 1959.

Dear Sir,

Glad to hear from you again. I will indeed be happy to receive a copy of *New Code in the Atomic Age*.\*

I wish I were a good writer like yourself, but through writers like yourself, someone will be impressive enough to give a message that will influence the world toward a reconciliation and peace. You may be the man, if I can be of any help to you, count on me.

You have my permission to use my letter for publication.

Claude R. Eatherly.

I have only short periods to write letters, but if you have anything to ask me, I will indeed give you a truthful answer.

I starve for answers to thoughts that envelop me concerning the prevention of further buildup of nuclear weapons and the constant preparation of war.

I have made many speeches to different organizations to gain

---

detected in the two letters which he sent off during his intermezzo of freedom and just as little in the letter written after his recapture. In these last three letters, he has regained his full linguistic powers.

As the editing consisted only of the adding of little words and of opening new paragraphs when a new point was introduced, the content of the texts was not touched. The editing corresponded to that of a musical composition which originally was lacking in dynamic markings, in an arrangement made to make the meaning of the text more transparent. This applies even to the two letters which represent the climax of Eatherly's linguistic disorder. Also there was hardly any sentence or paragraph that resisted the attempt to make it clear through the addition of a few little particles; of particles, which were obviously meant although not used. (Incidentally, the syntactical disorder was regularly accompanied by a lowering of the 'level' of Eatherly's handwriting.)

Although the changes concern only non-essentials, it is necessary to draw attention to them because, in a way, they have modified the picture of Eatherly as a letter writer.

\* Refers to a short letter which has been lost in which I had apparently told Eatherly about this short *Code* (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, July 14th, 1957) and in which I had asked him for the authorization to make use of his first letter (No. 2).

support for my convictions. Speeches are so short lived. Books are a monument, so make the best of it in yours. Give the people the message that all peace loving people strive for.

Looking forward to your next letter.

I remain,  
Sincerely,  
Claude R. Eatherly.

### Letter 4

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

July 2nd, 1959.

Dear Claude Eatherly,

First of all, please don't 'sir' me. The way we got acquainted with each other was most unusual, but from the very beginning we talked to each other with the full conviction that we could trust and that we would understand each other; and we do.

It made me very happy to know that you consented to the publication of your answer to my letter. As a matter of fact, I have already shown it to some people, particularly to nuclear scientists, who know what they are talking about when they speak of the possible destruction of mankind—and all of them were deeply impressed by the fact that the one who was unfortunate enough to become the first 'guiltlessly guilty' of the atomic age now belongs to those who try to prevent the worst.

In one of your sentences you made the remark that you have repeatedly spoken about our problem in front of audiences. So have I. In front of all sorts of people: before university people, before high school students, before Buddhist priests in Kyoto, in short: before everybody, for our problem concerns everybody, and the danger does not discriminate between young or old, military or civilian, black or white, Christians, Jews, or Mohammedans. I am curious to learn something about the audiences in front of which you have spoken.

I am enclosing the *Commandments in the Atomic Age*. My wife has translated it into English (or rather into American, for she is a native Californian).

This time the *Code* must replace a longer letter, for just yesterday I finished my book on my Japanese trip—therefore I had no



time to write; and now I am about to pack all my things because in a few days we have to move. However, I hope that I will have two weeks vacation, and I have the firm intention to make use of it for a real letter.

Sincerely, your friend,  
Günther Anders

## *Commandments in the Atomic Age*

by

GÜNTHER ANDERS

Your first thought upon awakening be: 'Atom'. For you should not begin your day with the illusion that what surrounds you is a stable world. Already to-morrow it can be 'something that only *has been*': for we, you, and I and our fellow men are 'more mortal' and 'more temporal' than all who, until yesterday, had been considered mortal. 'More mortal' because our temporality means not only that we are mortal, not only that we are 'killable'. That 'custom' has always existed. But that we, as *mankind*, are 'killable'. And 'mankind' doesn't mean only to-day's mankind, not only mankind spread over the provinces of our globe; but also mankind spread over the provinces of time. For if the mankind of to-day is killed, then that which *has been*, dies with it; and the mankind to come too. The mankind which *has been* because, where there is no one who remembers, there will be nothing left to remember; and the mankind to come, because where there is no to-day, no to-morrow can become a to-day. The door in front of us bears the inscription: 'Nothing will have been'; and from within: 'Time was an episode'. Not, however, as our ancestors had hoped, an episode between two eternities; but one between two nothingnesses; between the nothingness of that which, remembered by no one, will have been as though it had never been, and the nothingness of that which will never be. And as there will be no one to tell one nothingness from the other, they will melt into one single nothingness. This, then, is the completely new, the *apocalyptic* kind of temporality, *our* temporality, compared with which everything we had called 'temporal' has become a bagatelle. Therefore your first thought after awakening be: 'Atom'.

Your second thought after awakening should run: 'The possibility of the Apocalypse is our work. But we know not what we are doing'. We really don't know, nor do they who control the

Apocalypse: for they too are 'we', they too are fundamentally incompetent. That they too are incompetent, is certainly not their fault; rather the consequence of a fact for which neither they nor we can be held responsible: the effect of the daily growing gap between our two faculties; between our *action* and our *imagination*; of the fact, that we are unable to conceive what we can construct; to mentally reproduce what we can produce; to realize the reality which we can bring into being. For in the course of the technical age the classical relation between imagination and action has reversed itself. While our ancestors had considered it a truism that imagination exceeds and surpasses reality, to-day the capacity of our imagination (and that of our feeling and responsibility) cannot compete with that of our *praxis*. As a matter of fact, our imagination is unable to grasp the effect of that which we are producing. Not only our reason has its (Kantian) limits, not only *it* is finite, but also our imagination, and even more so our feeling. At best we can repent the murder of *one* man: more our feeling does not perform; we may be able to imagine *ten*: more our imagination cannot perform; but to destroy a hundred thousand people causes no difficulties whatsoever. And that not only for technical reasons; and not only because the acting has been transformed into a mere 'acting with' and into a mere releasing, whose effect remains unseeable. But rather for a moral reason; just because mass murder lies infinitely far outside the sphere of those actions which we can visualize and towards which we can take an emotional position; and whose execution could be hampered through imagination and feelings. Therefore your next insight should be: 'The more boundless the deeds, the smaller the hindrance.' And: 'We humans are smaller than ourselves.' This last sentence formulates the raging schizophrenia of our days, that is: the fact that our diverse faculties work independently of each other, like isolated and uncoordinated beings, who have lost all contact with each other. But it is not in order to state something final or even something finally defeatist, that you should pronounce these sentences; rather, on the contrary, in order to make yourself aware of your limitedness, to terrify yourself by it, and finally in order to break through this allegedly unbreakable frontier; in order to revoke your schizophrenia. Of course, as long as you are granted the grace to continue living, you can lay your

hands in your lap, give up hope and try to resign yourself to your schizophrenia. However, if you don't want that, then you have to make the daring attempt to make yourself as big as you actually are, to catch up with yourself. Thus, your task consists in bridging the gap that exists between your two faculties: your faculty of *making* things and your faculty of *imagining* things; to level off the incline that separates the two: in other words: you have to violently widen the narrow capacity of your imagination (and the even narrower one of your feelings) until imagination and feeling become capable to grasp and to realize the enormity of your doings; until you are capable to seize and conceive, to accept or reject it—in short: your task is: *to widen your moral fantasy*.

Your next task runs: widen your sense of time. For decisive for our to-day's situation is not only—what everyone knows—that the space of our globe has shrunk together, that all points which only yesterday lay far apart from each other, have to-day become neighbouring points. But also that the points in the system of our *time* have been drawn together: that the futures which only yesterday had been considered unreachably far away, have now become neighbouring regions of our present time: that we have made them into 'neighbouring communities'. This is as true for the Eastern world as for the Western. For the Eastern, because there, the times to come, to a never before dreamed of extent, are planned; and because times to come that are planned are not 'coming' futures any longer, rather products in the making, which (since provided for and foreseen) are already seen as a sector of the living space in which one is dwelling. In other words: since to-day's actions are performed for the realization of the future, the future is already throwing a shadow on the present; it already belongs, pragmatically speaking, to the present. And that is true secondly—this is the case which concerns us—for the people of the Western world, since they, although not planning it, are already affecting the remotest future. Thus deciding about the health or degeneration, perhaps the 'to be or not to be' of their sons and grandsons. Whether they, or rather we, do this intentionally or not is of no significance, for what morally counts is only the fact. And since this fact of the unplanned 'working into the distance' is known to us, we commit criminal negligence when,

despite our knowledge, we continue to act as if we were not aware of it.

Your next thought after awakening should run: don't be a coward. Have the courage to be afraid. Force yourself to produce that amount of fear that corresponds to the magnitude of the apocalyptic danger. For also fear, fear above all, belongs to those feelings which we are unable or unwilling to realize; and the thesis according to which we are living in fear anyhow, much too much so, even in the 'age of fear', is a mere cliché, which, even if not fraudulently propagandized, is at least ideally suited to suppress the breaking out of a fear commensurate with the threat, and thus to make us indolent. The truth is rather the contrary that *we live in the 'Age of inability to fear'*, and that we confine ourselves to allowing the development to take its course. For which fact, not considering the 'limited nature of our feelings', there is a whole series of reasons impossible to enumerate here. *One* reason, however, which through events of the immediate past has gained a special actuality and a special prestige should be mentioned: our *competence-craze*; our conviction, nourished by the division of labour, that every problem belongs to *one* specific field of competence with which we are *not permitted* to meddle. Thus, the atomic problem allegedly belongs to the competence-field of the politicians and the military. Naturally the '*not being permitted*' to meddle immediately and automatically turns into a '*not having to*', even into a '*not needing to*'. That means: the problem with which I am not permitted to concern myself, I *need not* concern myself. And fear is spared me, because it is 'dealt with' in another field of competence.

Therefore say to yourself upon awakening: 'It is *our* business.' This means two things: 1, it is *our turn* to worry about it because it can *turn* on us and 2, the monopolistic claims for competency raised by individuals are unjustified because we all, as human beings, are equally incompetent. To believe that where the possible end of the world is at stake, greater or smaller competencies could still exist, that those men who as a consequence of division of labour and the alleged division of responsibilities, accidentally happened to become politicians or military men and in this quali-

fication have more and more directly to do with the production and the exploitation of the fatal thing—that *they* are more competent than *we* are—to believe that, is simply folly. Those who try to talk us into that—whether they are those allegedly more competent people themselves or third parties—only prove their own moral incompetency. The climax of unbearability, however, is reached when those allegedly more competent persons (who are incapable of seeing problems other than as tactical ones) try to make us believe that we have not even the *right to fear*, not even the right to have a conscience. Whereby they silently imply that conscience presupposes responsibility and responsibility is *their* business, just the business of those with qualifications in that department; and that we, through our fear, even through our pangs of conscience, overbearingly usurp a department which is not ours. This immoral situation cannot be allowed. In no case can 'Clerics of the Apocalypse' be recognized; no group which arrogates to a monopoly of competency for actions that could become the end of the world. Each of us has the same right and the same duty to warningly raise his voice. You too.

Not only are we incapable of imagining, not only are we incapable of feeling, not only are we incapable of answering for the 'thing'; we cannot even conceive it. For under whatever category we might think of it, we would think of it wrongly, because once pigeon-holed into a class of objects, it would be made 'one amongst others' and be bagatellized. Even if many samples of it exist, it is unique; not belonging to any genus; thus a monster. And as we can only paraphrase what it is *not*, we have to make use of the precautionary methods of 'negative theology'. Tragically it is just this monstrous fact of its not belonging to any definite class of objects which induces us to neglect or even to simply forget it. When confronted with things we cannot classify, we like to deal with them as if they did not exist at all. If however one does speak of the object at all (incidentally not as yet in private everyday conversation from man to man) then one usually classifies it (because this is the logically least troublesome way) as a 'weapon', more generally as a 'means'. A means, however, it cannot be, since a means is defined by its running into and dissolving in its end, as the way disappears into its destination. In this case, however, that doesn't hold true. On the contrary: the effect of the

bomb is greater than any conceivable end, for this end will necessarily be destroyed by its effect. Every end will be destroyed together with the entire world in which 'ends and means' had existed. After all, that a thing which by its very existence invalidates and annihilates the scheme of 'ends and means' cannot be a means, should be evident. Therefore your next maxim should run: I won't be talked into believing that the bomb is a means. Since it is not a means as the millions of means that make up our world, you cannot permit that it be produced as though it were a refrigerator, tooth paste, or even a pistol, about the manufacture of which no one consults us.

X As little as you should believe those who call it a means, should you believe those more cunning seducers who try to persuade you that the thing serves exclusively as a deterrent: that means that it is manufactured solely in order *not* to be used. Articles, the usage of which exhaust themselves in their non-usage have never existed. At best, articles which sometimes were not used, for instance, when the mere threat proved sufficient. Besides we must, of course, never forget that the thing already (and that with no adequate justification) has been used in fact—at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Finally, you should not tolerate that the object, the effect of which surpasses all imagination, be classified by honest sounding, 'keep smiling' labels. The baptizing of a certain H bomb explosion as 'Operation Grandpa' was not only shockingly bad taste but intended fraud.

Furthermore you should resolutely contradict those who believe that they can confine themselves to a 'purely tactical' discussion of the monster. Such discussion is absolutely inadequate, because the idea that atomic weapons could be brought into play tactically presupposes the concept of a political situation which exists independently of and apart from the fact of atomic weapons. That is, however, utterly unrealistic, because the political situation—the expression 'atomic age' is legitimate—defines itself through the fact of atomic weapons. It is *not* the atomic weapons which 'also' occur within the political scene; but, on the contrary, it is the *individual events* which are taking place *within the atomic situation*: and most political actions are steps within that situation. The attempts to make use of the possible end of the world as a pawn amongst pawns in the political chess game are, whether

artful or not, signs of blindness. The time for artfulness is past. Therefore it should be your principle: sabotage all discussions in which people are trying to deal with the fact of the atomic menace from an exclusively tactical viewpoint; and therefore, make it your rule to channel the discussion into the only valid direction—the menace mankind has hung over its own head by "creating its own Apocalypse"—and do that even if you run the risk to become a 'laughing stock' and to be derided as politically immature and unrealistic. It is, in fact, the 'nothing but tacticians' who should be called unrealistic—because they see atomic weapons only as a means; and because they fail to grasp that the ends which they allege to seek are being forfeited by the very use of their means.

Do not be seduced by the statement that we are (and perhaps always will be) only in the laboratory stage, the stage of experimentation. Just a phrase. A phrase not only because we already *have* dropped A-bombs (which fact an astonishing number of people seem to have forgotten); so that the age of earnestness has started well over ten years ago, but—and this is fundamentally more important—because in this case the use of the word 'experiment' is out of place.

Your next rule should run: however successful the experiments may prove, those who are carrying them through are failing in making experiments; and failing because one is justified to speak of experiments solely in those cases in which the experimental undertaking does not leave or burst asunder the isolated walls of the laboratory; and because here this condition is not fulfilled any longer. On the contrary, it belongs to the essence of the thing, and to the desired effect of the majority of the trial explosions, to increase to the maximum the explosive force and the fall-out area of the weapon; thus, however paradoxical this may sound, to try out how far it is possible to overstep every experimental limitation.

One may object that to-day the main effort, or at least one of the main efforts, concentrates on the production and improvement of the so called—excuse the dirty term which is not mine—'clean' bombs. It goes without saying that in the very moment of an atomic war, one would use them *only* because one knows that for the last decision one has the dirty weapons at one's disposal. It is to them that the main effort is being devoted. Therefore the effects of these alleged experiments no longer belong to the class of

experimental results, but to the sphere of reality, to that of *history*—to which, for example belong the contaminated Japanese fishermen—and even to the sphere of future history since the future, for instance the health of future generations, is already affected, since ‘the future has already begun’, as Jungk’s philosophical title formulates it. Completely delusive is, therefore, the pet protestation of to-day that the decision to use the ‘thing’ has not as yet been taken. True is rather that the die, through the so-called ‘experiments’, has already been cast. Thus it belongs to your tasks to discredit the illusion that we are living in the ‘pre-atomic age’, and to call a spade a spade, an atom bomb an atom bomb.

All these postulates and prohibitions may be condensed into a single commandment: ‘*Have and use only those things, the inherent maxims of which could become your own maxims and thus the maxims of a general law*’. This postulate may appear strange; the term ‘maxims of things’ sounds provocative, but only because the fact designated by the term is strange and provocative of itself. What we mean is solely that we, living in a world that consists exclusively of instruments, are now being dealt with by instruments. Since, however, on the other hand, we are, or seem to be the users of those instruments, since we deal with mankind by means of those instruments, we treat our fellow men not according to our own principles and motives, but according to the mode of treatment incarnated in those instruments; thus, so to speak, according to *their* maxims and motives. What the postulate demands is: be as scrupulous and unsparingly severe in front of those maxims and motives as if they *were* your own (since pragmatically speaking they *are* your own). Don’t content yourself with examining the innermost voices and the most hidden motives of our own soul (a luxury lacking consequences) but do examine the secret voices, motives, and maxims of your instruments. This should be the only required ‘motivational research’ of to-day. If a high official in the atomic field would examine his conscience in the traditional way, he would hardly find anything particularly evil. If, however, he would examine the ‘inner life’ of his instruments, he would find herostratisms and even herostratism on a cosmic scale, for it is in an herostratic way that atomic weapons are treating mankind.

Only when this new moral commandment ‘look into your “instrument hearts”’ has become our accepted and daily followed principle shall we be entitled to hope that our question ‘to be or not to be’ will be answered by: ‘to be’.

Your next principle is: ‘Don’t believe that once we have succeeded in making the *first* step: in stopping the so-called ‘experiments’ everywhere, the danger will be over and that then we will be entitled to rest on our laurels. The end of the ‘experiments’ neither implies the end of further production of bombs nor the destruction of those bombs and those types of bombs which already have been tried out and which lie ready for the eventuality. There are diverse possible reasons for stopping experiments: the State can do it, for instance, because further experimenting proves superfluous: this means: because either the production of the tried-out types or even the amount of stored bombs already suffices for every case of which one could think, in short because it would be meaningless and uneconomical to make mankind ‘deader than dead’.

Don’t believe, furthermore, that once we have succeeded in our *second* step: in stopping the further production of A- and H-bombs, or even in our *third* step: in having all existing bombs destroyed,—that we would be entitled to cease worrying. Even in a thoroughly ‘clean’ world (whereby I understand the situation in which there *doesn’t exist* one single A- or H-bomb, in which we seem to ‘have’ no bombs) we still *would* ‘have’ them because we know how to make them. There doesn’t exist, in our epoch of mechanical reproduction, the non-existence of any possible product, because it is not the actual physical objects that count, but their type, or the type’s blueprint. And even after the destruction of all physical objects pertaining to the production of A- or H-bombs, mankind still could fall prey to the still existing blueprints. ‘Therefore,’ one may conclude, ‘the thing to do is to destroy the blueprints.’ This, however, is unfeasible, for ‘the blueprints are indestructible like Plato’s ideas: as a matter of fact, they are their diabolical realization.’ In short: even if we should succeed in physically eliminating the fatal objects and their blueprints, and thus saving our generation, such a salvation would be hardly more than a respite or a postponement. The physical production could be resumed every day, the terror remains and so should

your fear. From now on mankind will always and for eternity live under the dark shadow of the monster. The apocalyptic danger is not abolished by one act, once and for all, but only by daily repeated acts. This means: we have to understand—and this insight shows fully how fatal our situation actually is—that our fight against the mere physical existence of the objects and against their construction, their try-outs, their storage, turns out to be utterly insufficient. For the goal that we have to reach cannot be *not* to have the thing; but never to use the thing, although we cannot help having it; never to use it, although there will be no day on which we couldn't use it.

This, then is your task: make mankind understand that no physical step, no elimination of physical objects will ever be an absolute guarantee, but that we have to have the firm resolution never to take the step although it will always be possible. If we, you, you and I do not succeed in saturating the soul of mankind with this insight, we are lost.

Letter 5

Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
No date.

Dear Friend,

Since receiving your letter containing your *Commandments in the Atomic Age*, its content and truth has continually been in my thoughts. Your way of truth, sincerity and expression has fulfilled my faith and trust in your efforts to make this a safe and peaceful world.

If only you, I and the thousands of pacifists all over the world could get the co-operation of one group of people (the scientists) to risk their first love (science), give way to their conscience, unite with us to discontinue work on nuclear weapons until international lawyers could set up a world government void of all political organizations and overpowering military forces. Only the scientists can overthrow these groups by refusing to co-operate. Without the forces of science, political and military forces will wither and die.

I have spoken before many pacifist groups in most of the States emphasizing the importance of discontinuance of nuclear build-up, testing and stockpiling. I have appeared on television on several occasions with Christian leaders. I am not wanted in our schools and universities.

Only last month General Twining, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, tried to get me transferred to Walter Reed Hospital in Washington. His excuse was to get me better treatment. My doctor refused to let me be moved. He knew as well as I that his (General Twining's) only reason was to prevent further publicity about me and my problem. It is very bad publicity for the armed services. They would be very happy to shut me up. Thank God my doctor believes in me and permits me to work and write my convictions while in the hospital.

I would like to ask you some questions. Could we trust those nuclear scientists to delay their work and paralyze the political and military organizations? Would they be willing to risk their

first love by giving up all the grants, laboratories and government support, and to unite and demand a trusted guardian for their brainchild? If they could do this, then we would be safe.

I eagerly await your letters, and I wish to thank your wife for the translation.

I hope to leave the hospital in September. I could leave this next week, because my commitment (90 days) is up, but my doctor asked me to stay longer. I always do what he asks, I have been under him for ten years.

Hope you take the vacation. I will feel honored to receive a letter from you during those precious days.

May I have an autographed copy of your *Japan Report*?

Goodbye for now.

Your friend,  
Claude R. Eatherly

## Letter 6

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

July 22nd, 1959.

Dear Claude Eatherly,

Your letter travelled ten days before it reached me here in the heights of the Alps. No, I do not spoil my vacation days through writing to you. On the contrary, the feeling of having a friend far away who, with such sincerity, tries in his way to pursue the same aim which I am trying to pursue in my way, is consoling; and a conversation with you is no 'work', because I know that there are no obstacles which have to be cleared away.

You are asking whether the physicists will have the moral force of self denial, the force to give up their 'first love'. This question can hardly be answered. There are some who may—the number of physicists whose conscience Pauling has succeeded in awakening is most encouraging—but there will always be others, unable or unwilling to actually realize the size of the effects of their doings. It is, of course, indispensable to reach as many scientists as possible. I am, for instance, in contact with some of the 'Gottingers' (the eighteen German physicists who had the courage to inform the public about the implications of atomic armament, and who have risked to make themselves most unpopular

with Adenauer). However, it is not enough to limit oneself to influencing this professional sector. Scientists are 'people' too, more often than not morally average, surrounded, carried, encouraged or intimidated by public opinion. Therefore, it is equally urgent, if not even more urgent, to transform the *whole* atmosphere, the mentality and the attitudes of all people, of the public opinion within which and with which the nuclear scientists are living. This new attitude which we, you as well as I, are trying to produce has to become so broad and so general that finally physicists who continue working on atomic projects (at least on their military exploitation) must feel surrounded by a hostile world, by a world which considers them their enemies, their despisers, their possible destroyers.

This broadness of the front is one of the most important tasks. You will admit that if people are not doing what they physically could do (for instance kill enervating neighbours), in most cases the reason for their ethical, or at least for their non-criminal, behaviour does not lie in their passion for the happiness or inviolability of mankind, but in their fear of violating a generally accepted tabu and of being ostracized by the community. As we have to count on real creatures and not on ideal figures, it is our task to produce a situation in which even people without burning moral passion or without imagination behave as if they did it for moral reasons or out of love for mankind and all living beings.

This broad front: this is where you come in. You are (I trust you won't believe that I am speaking cynically) in the fortunate position of being able to give our 'front' a breadth which, without you, it could never attain. I have no doubt whatsoever that you are one of us, thus making our 'front' reach from the 'doer' to the victims: and you have even made the further step of openly and fearlessly expressing your position. Therefore I have the feeling that the suggestion with which I had closed my first letter (to send a message to the victims of Hiroshima) is absolutely in line with your hopes and your actions. Of course, it is impossible for me to judge your situation from this far away country. Maybe there are insuperable technical obstacles which hamper your doing it, and your remarks about those who are trying to shut your mouth and to transform you into an uncomfortably comfortable prisoner seem to confirm my suspicions. I am glad that you can rely on

such a reasonable and understanding doctor—he must be your true friend—on a man energetic and courageous enough to resist those powers and to safeguard and guarantee your freedom. Please tell him how greatly I respect him. Now, what I am trying to do for you corresponds to what he is trying. If there are obstacles which the powerful are laying in your way—believe me the powerful are not all-powerful; there are always possible detours, and to-day, unfortunately, we are living in an epoch in which detours are morally required. This means in our case: if you should be prevented from personally sending the telegram to the victims (Mayor of Hiroshima, Japan), which would be the more impressive way, there is still the second best way open: that I do it in *your* name. Of course, you know that I would never do anything behind your back. Therefore again I would need your authorization.

I think the best and shortest text for such a telegram would be: 'Your No More Hiroshima is my No More Hiroshima'.—Claude Eatherly, one of the Hiroshima pilots.'

In case you cannot send this telegram personally to Japan, yet you wish me to send it in your name, please send a cable to me with the one word 'OK'.

Your friend,  
Günther A.

#### Letter 7

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 12th, 1959.

Dear Mr Anders,

'Our' message to the people of Hiroshima has begun to pay off. I am enclosing two letters that will give some indication as to how they feel. I would like to have them back when you have finished with them.

My doctor told me to-day he thought I could be released next month. My letters will be forwarded to Box 187, Van Alstyne, Texas.

I have a very busy schedule ahead of me. Bob Hope Productions have asked me to sign a contract for a movie of my life. I will sign if they will guarantee to give my convictions and my philosophy toward problems that so involve the world problems and that so concern the both of us. I need your help to briefly outline a program or theme that they will have to convey, in order to carry out our aims and beliefs. They intend to send me with the picture on a world tour. I wish I had you to go along. I feel that we could really accomplish a great deal. I will let you know before I sign a contract.

This will be a short letter, but I would like for you to give me your advice on the movie and book deal.

I hope to be able to come to Europe soon. Maybe next year. I eagerly await your letters.

Your friend,  
Claude Eatherly

#### Letter 8

*Girls of Hiroshima to Claude Eatherly*

July 24th, 1959.

Dear Sir,

We, the undersigned, girls of Hiroshima send you our warm greetings.

We are all girls who escaped death fortunately but received injuries in our faces, limbs, and/or bodies from the atomic bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima city in the last war. We have scars or traces of the injury in our faces and limbs and we do wish that that horrible thing called 'war' shall never happen again either for us or for anybody living in this world. Now, we heard recently that you have been tormented by a sense of guilt after the Hiroshima incident and that because of it, you have been hospitalized for mental treatment.

This letter comes to you to convey our sincere sympathy with you and to assure you that we now do not harbour any sense of enmity to you personally. You were perhaps ordered to do what you did, or thought it would help people by ending the war. But you know that bombs do not end wars on this earth. We have been treated with great kindness by the Christian people (Quakers) in



America. We have learned to feel towards you a fellow-feeling, thinking that you are also a victim of war like us.

We wish that you will recover soon completely and decide to join those people who are engaged in the good work to abolish the barbarous thing called 'war' with the spirit of brotherhood.

With warm regards,

Sincerely Yours,

Hideko Sumimura	Misako Kannabe	Michiyo Zomen
Sayoko Komatsu	Hiroko Tasaka	Toyoko Yamanaka
Chieko Komura	Shigeko Miimoto	Yoshie Enokawa
Tadako Emori	Michiko Yamaoka	Masako Wada
Motoko Yamashita	Arden T. T.	Yasuko Sima
Keiko Kawasaki	Yamanaka	Hisaomi Watanabe
Miyoko Katsubara	Suzue Hiyama	Emiko Takemoto
Tazuko Shibata	Shigeko Hara	Hatsue Inoue
Mitsuko Kodama	Yukiko Okita	Ruriko Funatsu
Chizuko Suzuki	Yoshie Kihara	
Atsuko Tada	Sachiko Kawamata	

## Letter 9

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

August 18th, 1959.

Dear Claude Eatherly,

I was already worried about you as I had no reply to the letter which I had written to you from Switzerland. It seemed possible to me that you had not received my lines or that illness or people opposed to our correspondence prevented you from answering. Now I feel relieved knowing that none of my fears had a basis in fact, that you are alright, that you will soon be a free man with a great task ahead of you. Before I speak about this task, let me tell that you have really made me happy through writing about 'our' message. So you *have* sent it! Too bad that you didn't write a line about how you worded it. Anyhow the fact itself is far more important than my knowing its details.

You will remember what I had written in my first letter: that I had met no one in Japan who felt any hatred or even the slightest antipathy towards you. I couldn't think of any more striking and more beautiful confirmation of this statement than the letter from

the 'Girls of Hiroshima'. Can't we be happy that a front-line of peace has now been established in which the victims recognize the 'doers' as victims too? Now, however, all the 'victims' have to become doers, whereby I mean that they have to do all that lies in their power to forestall a situation in which human beings can become victims again.

And now to your project or rather the prospects ahead of you.

Believe me, Claude, I feel honoured by the trust you place in me, particularly by your sentence, 'I need your help to briefly outline a program or theme that they will have to convey to carry out our aims and beliefs.' As a matter of fact, I am making an experience which is probably similar to yours: that for the establishment of a friendship and for the feeling of mutual responsibility, actual physical acquaintance proves superfluous, that the knowledge of the other's integrity and good will suffices.

And now let me be more concrete. To be honest, the Bob Hope offer which you have received causes me the greatest uneasiness. I lived in Hollywood for years and I know the principles, better: the utter lack of principles, of movie producers. Once a man (no matter whether an author, an actor, or whosoever) is swallowed by a production (and highly paid for being swallowed) he is considered by the producer as his property, with which he can deal the way he pleases; and even *if* you had the sufficient experience and slyness to formulate the terms under which you would be willing and ready to become 'studio property' (no falsification of your life, of your feelings, of your moral attitude, an unequivocal statement of your convictions etc.) *they* always find a way to circumvent and break them. You, as an individual, would hardly be able to fight them, because your partner would not be another individual, but a huge commercial enterprise, against which even juridical chances are almost zero. And even *if* these chances were not zero, once a falsification *has* taken place, the damage would already have been done (through the circulation of the picture), even if you would receive reimbursement for the break of contract on their part.

There is, however, an even more important point. You are a *real* figure of the *real* historical world now; and you wish to be taken seriously by *real* people who have to make *real* decisions. Not by movie goers who wish to be entertained by fiction. There

looms the great danger that you, the real man, will be transformed into a smiling, good looking actor, thus into a harmless figure who does not belong to reality but only to the world of make believe. And there are, as you know, powers which are interested in such a transformation, and who would love to bury you under glamour. Your movie 'herofication' could have exactly the opposite effect of what you have realized to be your duty and your mission. This applies even more if you should prove to be photogenic or even an excellent actor. If you 'act' the most fatal 'act' of your life, the most fatal act of the epoch, you are depriving your life and the epoch of their deadly seriousness. From this consideration springs my first warning advice:

1. *By no means should you consent to acting yourself, to become the actor of your life.*

2. Resist all temptations of the movie business until you are absolutely sure that the producer and the director are on our side and that they are not eager to exploit your fame as the 'hero of the atomic age' for their dubious purposes. There *are* a few decent, trustworthy and clean men in the film industry, some of whom I know personally. You should, or we should, try to approach *them*.

3. The problem of the *script*. I have lived, as I already said, in Hollywood (not as a movie man, yet in contact with movie writers). For 40 years by now, scenario writing has become a very specialized routine work of the employees of the production, and even famous writers, who are invited to Hollywood in order to write screen stories, have time and again to make the experience that their sketches or even their finished scripts are being torn out of their hands and fed into the mills of the production, until the final scripts have no resemblance to their originals. This you have to keep in mind when you are told by movie men to write your own story: this manuscript would become only a pretext for the production, they would make out of it whatever they wish; on the other hand, it will serve them as an alibi, as '*the authentic autobiographical document*'. I can already see you attending the first night of *The Life of Claude Eatherly as told by Himself*, and your flabbergasted expression, because what you will see will have nothing to do with your life or your text.

4. If, despite my warnings, you should feel that the chances of

participating in such an enterprise are worth while, you should proceed as follows:

As you are probably not used to 'writing' (in the professional sense) it would be imperative to do the job in teamwork with someone who, on the one hand, *is* a professional writer, on the other hand, enjoys your full confidence. By no means let yourself be talked into associating with a ghost writer belonging to the production staff, at least not at the first stage. For the first task has to consist of preparing a text in which your life report and the statement of your fears, feelings and hopes have to be recorded without any influences coming from those people who wish to make use of your material. You will need this first script in order to always have a yardstick with which the final scenario can be measured and which, in case of falsifications, will unequivocally prove what you have said and what you have wished to convey. *This is the work on which you should now concentrate exclusively.* I cannot emphasize it strongly enough: first publish this report on your life in book form before you allow it to be fed into the production mill. First state the truth.

Your words seem to suggest that you would prefer to do the job in team work with me. I don't say no, but it would be necessary to think over thoroughly how to arrange such a collaboration. It would be out of the question for me to come to you, since I simply don't have the money to go to America. But as you have the intention anyhow to visit Europe—why don't we meet in England? This seems to me advantageous for two reasons:

1. You would be in an English speaking country, you wouldn't be lost as you would be, for instance, here in Austria; and

2. For me the travel expenses would be incomparably smaller.

There we should try in daily team work to produce a text, at least a first draft on which I could work at home, in order to give it a certain literary quality—of course under your constant supervision: you would have to re-read my version, to criticize it, to make additions, to OK or to reject it etc. This work could probably be done by mail, but it would take, of course, several months, if not even half a year. But in such a case there would be the certainty that the product would be honest, not superficial, in short, a document, the seriousness of which would correspond to the seriousness of the matter at stake.

In case you should consider this improvised suggestion, then you should consider coming to Europe earlier than you had planned. However these possibilities may develop, in any case, I am happy that I will meet my new friend, not only in writing, but in the flesh.

I already know from pictures what you look like, the two pictures which I am enclosing will show you what I look like. The little one was shot in Hong Kong while I was discussing the world situation with a tiny yet very sceptical Chinese.

I will return in a few days the Hiroshima letter of the 'Girls'.

And now please let me know details about your message to Hiroshima; about the development of the movie deal, the book project, and about your plans after your release.

With all my wishes,  
Your friend,  
Günther Anders

## Letter 10

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 22nd, 1959.

My Dear Friend,

It may seem strange to you that I have to reach so far to seek trust and guidance, but I hope you understand my position: so many people and groups wish to use me for one purpose or another. I may sound paranoid in this respect but I feel that I can not trust so many people and groups only for my name. I think that you have no designs on me in any way except the wish to help me and to advise me in a purpose for which we are born; to promote love and understanding among all people. If I depend on you for advice it's because I feel I can trust you, and for the love you have for all people. I trust that you do because of the picture you selected to send me.

I wish to tell you that I will never promote myself to become a movie star.\* My only desire is to lend influence toward peace, to

\*See Letter 34.

end nuclear buildup, to safeguard the rights of all people regardless of race, color or creed.

Günther, I do not remember all the letter I sent to Japan but I told them I was the Major that gave the 'go ahead' to destroy Hiroshima, that I was unable to forget the act, and that the guilt of the act has caused me great suffering. I asked them to forgive me. I told them that no human beings should fight. 'Why should we fight? War is wild and inhuman. War should not be done by us, the head of all creatures. It seems that those sleeping under the ashes of Hiroshima were crying for peace. I hope that people could together, hand in hand, make a better world.'

I gave them 'our' message. Something which I alone could never have phrased. All in all it must have made an impression for 'us'.

I don't think I told you that many writers have come to see me, all of which I have refused to see; they have gone ahead and gotten information, much of which isn't true and have written about me. I refused to talk to the lawyers of the Bob Hope Productions until I leave the hospital. I knew my signature would not be good on a contract anyway. I also knew that I needed advice and time to decide how I would come to any kind of agreement about my future with the movie industry. Please believe me, Günther, I do not seek fame; if I have it, I want to use it for a good cause, 'our cause'.

Al Hirschberg, the writer of many good books in this country, wants to write my story. I have not signed the contract, because I have not talked with him. He has dealt through my brother, my administrator. I promise you this: I will not be an actor. If you know anyone in the movie industry that will be trustworthy, you have my permission to act for me or as my agent. Then we will construct the book that they will accept. I have been told that Bob Hope is very reliable. If you wish, write him, I know he is interested.

I do not know how much money I will be allowed by my brother. As I have told you, he now handles all my property and my income. I will say, he is very considerate of me and my wishes. As always he is very careful of my health.

I cannot tell you if or when I can come to England unless I decide and you decide you would like to write the book. Please do not think that I demand, because of our friendship, you should

write it. I just feel that you know more about me and my convictions, than others, and that you have trust in me and my beliefs. Besides, I will certainly consider Al Hirschberg because of his association with my brother.

My doctor is on vacation until Sept. 1st. I will ask him to release me then. I will, upon release, go to my ranch and try to contact my friends. I really don't know whether I will be accepted as a friend anymore. I will face the world and the people I know, and they can accept me as they like.

Thank you for your pictures. I will frame them as soon as I get out of the hospital. I am sorry you have to see pictures of me when I was in such health.

I will say to you again: I will not become just an actor. I will not betray your trust nor will I betray my beliefs.

Best wishes always,

Your friend,

Claude R. Eatherly

## Letter 11

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

August 30th, 1959.

Dear Claude,

No, I don't think it is strange that we are in such close contact despite the distance which seems to separate us. Since armies can reach each other regardless of the thousands of miles which lie between them, friends have to show that they are just as independent from spatial distances as enemies. So let's continue shooting our long distance missiles of friendship to each other in order to show those who are inventive only in order to destroy, that we are just as able to nullify space as they.

Your letter has allayed all my fears. Now I know that you are not endangered by the movie offer, which temptation would probably have seduced most other people; and that the fame to which you are 'sentenced' will not corrupt you, but that you will use it exclusively to lend weight to the message which you wish to convey. And this attitude has my full admiration.

Now to your points:

I see that we agree about the necessity of first writing and publishing a biographical script about your life. Only after this job

is done could the making of a picture be considered. I would even add: this script should not only be the prerequisite of the picture, but a paragraph of the movie contract must state that your text and nothing but your text has to become the content of the picture; and that you are entitled to reject scenes (even the film as a whole) in case they should prove to represent a distortion or become an instrument for the promotion of aims differing from yours.

I don't know Al Hirschberg. By all means try to make his personal acquaintance, yet without committing yourself. I will try to get his latest books in order to find out whether the moral and artistic level of his writings enables and entitles him to become the author of a picture on which so much depends. Of course, it would be a great facilitation for you if you could write the text in the US.

If, however, I should feel that Hirschberg is not suited for this job, I would write you about my impression, and would suggest that you either look for someone else or that we consider the more difficult way: our teamwork in England.

Meanwhile I put out my first feelers. I have written to my German publisher (who has just brought out my Hiroshima book) that there might exist the slight possibility that the two of us write the story of your life; that for this purpose we may need a few months in England; that in such a case, our stay in England would have to be financed by those publishing houses (American, British, German, Japanese etc.) which would be interested in publishing the biography. Of course, I stressed that so far this is only a possibility, and I kept my words utterly noncommittal: I just asked him to think it over and, since the egg is not laid yet, to treat my letter discreetly. This was my first step.

My second step: I have written to the secretary of one of the (morally as well as artistically) most reliable movie directors in Hollywood, telling her about our correspondence, about the project of a biographical script, and about the offer you received. So far as I know, the movie director is shooting right now somewhere in Asia, as I don't know his address I cannot reach him directly. I know, however, from a very good friend of mine, that for a long time this movie director has considered making a picture about an atomic subject, yet that he has been hesitating,

because he felt that an average screen story blended together with the atomic issue would be unworthy and undignified—a feeling which we share. I know that this man has read my last book and holds me in a certain esteem. If I should succeed in inducing him to join us, and if he should be able to raise the money necessary for the enterprise, then we could be absolutely sure that the resulting film would be *the* film on the atomic situation. Let us be patient, let us not sign any contract before this man has been reached and reacted.

Incidentally, I am pretty sure that if you and I together would try to get financial support for it in Japan, the money would flow. You are famous there, and I am not unknown.

I have not written to Bob Hope. However, I inquired in the States about him. Of course, it will take some time till an answer will reach me.

Incidentally, there is one sentence in your letter in which you have 'promoted' me to the rank of your agent. This I cannot accept, 1, because I have neither the business or legal knowledge nor the routine, ruthlessness or connections indispensable for a real agent's activities, and 2, because, living on another continent, not even a professional agent would be able to represent his clients. So let's continue our connection without translating it into an agent-client relation.

And now your life. You know that all my wishes are now with you since, after your release, a new phase of your life will begin. I am afraid that this new beginning will not be easy. On the one hand you may be rejected by some or many people whom you remember as the incarnation of your youth and your home life; but who, meanwhile, have not developed, and, therefore, are unable to understand the experiences which you have made and the consequences which you have drawn; on the other hand there may rise swarms of mosquito-people who will try to suck your blood, to exploit your fame and to make you an ally of their more or less sincere crack-pot ideas. It will not always be easy to recognize the real gold, and to organize your life in such a way that they don't draw away too much of your energies. If I were you, whatever else may develop, I would isolate myself from the very beginning for at least one or two hours every day, in order to prepare the script of

the biography; for without this preparatory work neither Hirschberg nor I would be able to enter into the teamwork.

When you first sit down, you may, like every other writer, despair, because you don't know how to begin. This is quite normal and, believe me, it can be overcome without tears. For you must know that it is not necessary at all to begin with the beginning of your life. Rather begin with any incident or scene which occurs to you, or about which you have the feeling of being able to say something. Once a first paragraph is on paper, this very paragraph will help *you*: for it will call for the description of a preceding scene or it will smoothly lead to a following one. There is no book in no library in the whole world which has been written in the order of succession in which we find the text. On the other hand, of course, the 'job' of writing is not without certain tortures. As the writer is his own boss, never told what to do, and free to work slowly or quickly, he never enjoys the comfortable dependency of a worker, an employee or a soldier, who just obeys orders and who never has to face the task of filling and organizing the empty time which day in day out every morning lies ahead of him.

However difficult all this may seem, now you have a positive task ahead of you. And this positive task will prevent you from relapsing into those desperate acts which once have almost ruined your life. And while working you will know that you are not alone, that people all over the world are trying to work for the same purpose.

A good new beginning!

PS. Since I don't know whether you are still in or already out, I am sending this letter to both addresses.

### Letter 12\*

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,

V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.

No date

Received your letter to-day of the 8th of Aug. 59 and wish to thank you for the kind words you spoke about my not seeking the

\* In the following few letters the dates are somehow confused.

fame of a movie contract. If such a thing comes about, it must be in the way you mentioned. One has only one life, and if the experiences of my life can be used for the benefit of the human race, then that is the way it will be used; not for money nor fame, but because of the responsibility I owe everyone. In that way I will receive a great benefit and feel relief of my guilt. If I were to receive the money for any other purpose, it would only remind me of the 30 pieces of silver Judas Iscariot received for his betrayal. Although it has always seemed to me that the *real* culprit responsible for the judicial murder of Christ was the High Priest, Caiaphas—the representative of the pious and the respectable, the ‘conventional good people’ of all ages including our own. These people, while not blameworthy in the same sense as Judas, are yet guilty in a more subtle but also more profound sense than he. This is the reason why I have been having such difficulty in getting society to recognize the fact of my guilt, which I have long since realized. The truth is that society simply *cannot* accept the fact of my guilt without at the same time recognizing its own far deeper guilt. But it is, of course, highly desirable that society should recognize this, which is why *my* and *our* story is of such vital importance. Now I accept the fact that I am unlikely to bring about that recognition by getting into scrapes with the law, that I have been doing in my determination to shatter the ‘hero image’ of me, by which society has sought to perpetuate its own complacency.

I did not intend to tie you up as an agent, I merely wanted you to know that I felt you had my confidence on matters that pertain to our common cause, and to act accordingly.

My doctor told me I could leave in the next few days. He also told me to-day he would help us on the medical end of the story if we decide to do it.

I will not sign a contract until we have investigated your sources.

Hoping you are well and happy.

Claude Eatherly

### Letter 13

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

September 8th, 1959.

Dear Claude,

Many thanks for your new letter. Now I am so deeply convinced of your non-corrupibility that nothing can shake my belief in it.

This is no real letter, a real one will follow soon. Right now I am very busy. I have to postpone writing it. It is only to accompany the returning of the Japanese letter for which you have asked.

I had no answer yet to the letters (to publishers and movie people) concerning our plan. We will have to be a bit patient.

You know that all my wishes are with you. This new period of freedom in your life will become a completely new life. You have a task, and what a task!

Please try now to begin writing parts of your biography. And don't get discouraged if you don't succeed right away. One learns swimming only while swimming, and writing only while writing.

Günther

### Letter 14

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 11th, 1959.

...  
I am writing to let you know to continue writing to me here at the hospital. My request for a leave or a trial visit was turned down. My doctor tried to get me a leave, but it was turned down in Washington—so now you can see how much I will be controlled. I assure you they will never stop me from writing what I believe and think, although they may keep me under detention. My doctor told me we would try again in a month or two. He says the public is too much concerned over me and that I am still getting too much publicity to release me now. I could sign a letter for release against medical advice, but that would put my doctor

under pressure from the higher moguls, and I wouldn't do anything that would hurt him in any way.

I am still receiving many letters from Japan. They are sending other papers than the one I sent to you, so I guess every paper in Japan featured the story. I am sure it's because of such stories that they are keeping me here. My doctor said that was one of the reasons.

I try to answer as many of the people that write me as possible. I think the best way in which people can understand each other is through personal correspondence. All mankind is alike. I think there are no separations between the peoples of the world and the only way that peace may be achieved is through brotherhood and understanding. Many of the letters are from the young people of Japan, saying that they have been doing everything to stop the promotion of terrible weapons and that my writings give them some promise of help and encouragement. This makes me very happy.

If you have any suggestion what I can do while in the hospital to promote our cause, please let me know.

Now I intend to start putting down things from 'out of my memories' that will help on my book. I am keeping my letters from other people. I think they can be used at a later date.

Do not think that I am discouraged because I can't leave the hospital now. I will admit I am disappointed, but will try to do what I can to benefit from my confinement.

Hope this letter finds you and your family well and happy.

I remain, your friend

Claude Eatherly

## Letter 15

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

September 20th, 1959.

Dear Claude,

If I could only come to see you to-day. I am sick with disappointment, and shocked and disgusted by the *cause* of your continued confinement. But I wouldn't come only to tell you that. Claude, I want to shake your hand out of respect for the stoic and

understating way in which you are writing, or rather just mentioning, this new reverse. I know that you are far from striving for the pompous role of a martyr. The genuine martyr, however, never wishes to be one, he is sentenced to become one, he just can't help becoming one—against his own will. Martyrs have always been *made* and still to-day are being *made*; made by those people who, out of blindness or lack of imagination, are trying to hamper the voice of truth. Believe me, Claude, the way in which you are bearing this fate of being *made* a martyr makes me very modest in front of you. For you are living up to this unwanted role. And doing it without complaining, just by casually asking me to continue writing to your old address, although this continuity of your address stands for a great disillusionment in your life.

A few years ago I made a statistical survey on the causes of death of philosophers and religious men. It may interest you, or even console you a bit, to learn about their fate. It turned out that over 70% of these men, from antiquity to the 18th century, spent years in prison or in exile, or even died while fleeing, or met with a violent death. You see, the price which our 'comrades in the past' had to pay for not yielding and for speaking out what they considered to be the truth has hardly ever been lower than it is to-day; and when we take the risk and stand up for our beliefs, we find ourselves in the most respectable company to which Socrates and even greater ones belong.\*

And now, Claude, to your question as to how you could promote our cause in your new confinement.

If you were a medical man fighting cancer you would have two different tasks. On the one hand, you would have to follow the call to the sick bed, and the postponement of your visit would be irresponsible; on the other hand, if you would have new theoretical ideas about the causes or curing of cancer, you would have to put them down in such a way that they would have effects tomorrow and the day after to-morrow, and the calls to the sick beds could even prevent you from achieving the more important task. Now this can be applied to you. There are two completely different

\* I am saying 'we' because I, too, was persecuted, persecuted by despisers of humaneness and truth: for Hitler's people considered me a piece of dirt, partly because I am Jewish, but particularly because in the years preceding the brutal dictatorship, I had warned against it in the same way as I am now warning against the atomic danger and those who prepare or tolerate or belittle it.

types of work you can do, and, of course, the ideal situation would be to combine both. Now you are being prevented from rushing to the 'sick beds'. But not from fulfilling your other task.

I think we agree that your story *must* be written. This is your task of to-day, not for to-day, but for to-morrow. And it makes me happy to know that you already have started writing down a few things about your life. Please continue.

If difficulties should arise in this work, you should read great autobiographical documents of other men in order to learn how others succeeded in rediscovering, reconstructing and preserving their own lives. This is a difficult job, and since we are used to live into the future, not into the past, the necessary attitude cannot be acquired in one day. You should start by reading the *Confessions* of Saint Augustine.

You know, of course, if you feel like sending me this or that of your first pages, I will be happy to tell you my impressions, and maybe I can give you some concrete advice as to how to continue. But perhaps you will succeed in getting into the swing of writing without the help of any ghost writer, and that's what I am hoping for. There are paragraphs in your letters which prove that, although without the habit and the practice of writing, you are able to formulate your creed and your hopes with power and conviction. This should not be falsified, nor should it be made lukewarm by the routine and the niceties of a 'professional'. Of course this advice doesn't mean at all that I am not ready to work together with you. But first you should try it alone, because it is *your* life, *your* pain, *your* hopes, and *your* courage which are the subject of the book.

So this is what I would have told you if I had had the chance of entering your room.

Unfortunately I had no answer as yet from the movie people whom I tried to contact. You know that I would inform you immediately.

Again I happened to see the review of a Bob Hope picture which must be simply nonsensical. I think he has to be eliminated from our consideration. Hirschberg: I have not succeeded as yet in getting his books, but I learned that he has written only about show business.

My Hiroshima book is out now. I will ask my publisher to send you a copy immediately. Of course, it is written in German. I know that you won't be able to read it, but please accept it as a symbol.

And count on my friendship, don't despair, and never forget, you have more friends in the world than you know.

Your friend,  
Günther

## Letter 16

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
October 12th, 1959.

Dear Günther,

Sorry I've been so long in answering your last letter. I also want to thank you for the book by Plato.

I was locked up\* again two weeks ago after speaking a little too strongly about how the hospital was being run and my continued stay in the hospital. I cannot get letters out so easily when I am locked up, so please think nothing of it if I am delayed at times. I finally got the *Confessions* of Saint Augustine through a priest that comes out. I really enjoyed both books. I had already read a lot about Socrates. I am looking forward to the time I can leave the hospital and do the writing you ask me to do. The Schedule in the hospital pretty nearly takes all my time. I have written down several pages about my earliest memories and will continue to write as I have time here.

I still get lots of letters from Japan. Most of the people are encouraging me to come to Japan to lead the young people of Japan in the fight against nuclear weapons. I also had a letter from an Austrian priest in Kenya, Africa telling me he had read an article you had written. It may have been your book on Japan.

I am looking forward to receiving your book, maybe I will be able to find someone to read it to me.

I am sure behind on my letter writing to the many people that write me. I always try to answer those people that are interested in

\* He means his relegation to ward 10 reserved for violent cases.



the problems of to-day and encourage them to keep up corresponding with people that are trying to stop nuclear warfare. I sure wish you could get your book published in English and Japanese.

The Air Force wrote another letter to the hospital wanting to know my condition and asking if they could do anything for me. They have me a little worried that they may try to get me to come to their hospital when I leave this hospital; and that may be the reason my doctor won't release me now. He is going to put me on a trial visit when I do leave the hospital, so I will still be under his control.

I often wonder if there is anything here in the US that you need that you can't get in Europe. If there is, please let me know, and I will send it to you when I leave the hospital. Surely I'll be out before Christmas.

Hoping all is well with you, I will close this letter.

Your friend,  
Claude E.

## Letter 17

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

October 18th, 1959

Dear Claude,

Your letter has deeply saddened me. I understand only too well that once in a while a man who burns to lead an independent life grows impatient and even loses his temper. Your outbreak even proves that your vitality hasn't been quenched and that despite the boredom and the bleakness of your every day life, your hopes and ideals have not died down. Outbreaks are not signs of abnormality, to the contrary: only the abnormal do not behave abnormally in such abnormal situations.

Of course, words do not suffice. I wish I could do more for you and I am wracking my brains about how I could do it. Don't you think, too, that it would be advisable if those friends of yours whom you trust would get in contact with each other in order to discuss possibilities. I know that you have full confidence in one of your doctors and that you trust me, too. It might be a good idea to tell your doctor about me (maybe you have already done so) and to ask him to write me, so that we, as allies, can discuss the possible steps together. Of course, it is up to you, Claude, to

decide whether we should do that or not, for I dislike to do anything behind anyone's back, and in your case secrecy would be particularly injurious. After so many years during which your life was not at your free disposal, nothing is more important for you than to regain the right to make your own decisions. Therefore please think this over: whether and how much to tell your doctor about our correspondence, and whether you consider it advisable that the two of us get in contact with each other. In any case, I have the feeling that he as well as I wish to see you free again. Of course, I am aware of the fact that he, as a medical man, has to heed medical ethics when discussing his patients. However, there are enough important problems left, for instance those concerning possible work after your release.

There is one point in your letter which has to do with this problem: you write that time and again you are being urged by the Japanese to come to Japan and to 'lead the anti-atomic movement' there. Let me be frank. This is just nonsense. It will be hard enough for you to succeed in rebuilding your own life outside of an institution. You can succeed in doing that only within a world, the language of which is yours; and even then, despite the common language, you will often have the feeling of not being understood by your fellow men and of not understanding them. In Japan, I am sure, you would be welcomed warmly, even with enthusiasm; but you couldn't make one step alone and you would be forced to rely on other people for every tiny everyday step. In other words: you would be made even more dependent than you are now, even infantile. Furthermore it goes without saying that no one can lead a movement within a country or a civilization with which he is not familiar. Even if you and the ones who invite you have the best intentions in the world—and I know that this is the case—you would become nothing but a pawn and an exhibition-object.

No, Claude, first you have to stand on your own two feet, on the ground of your own country.

Your last letter contained a certain ambiguity: on the one hand you told me that you hope to be free by Christmas; on the other hand you seemed to be afraid of the possibility of being transferred to another hospital. Most likely you don't know the decision

either, and you are hoping against fear and fearing against hope at the same time. Please do write me as unequivocally as possible about the actual status as you see and judge it, so that I will have a certain basis for my deliberations as to how you could be helped.

I was proud to learn that you have already started writing down a few autobiographical details. I hope that you will find the time to continue doing this (or are you obliged to do other work? If so, I would like to know what). Here, I think, lies your most urgent task. And it is urgent not only because you should have the account of your life ready for such cases as the one which we had discussed in former letters, but also because giving an account of oneself represents an act of self healing. The book by Augustine will certainly show you what I mean.

The other day I received a letter from Japan in which I was asked to divulge details about you and your life for a Japanese author who is writing a novel about Hiroshima. I refused. If there is anybody who has to decide what and how much should be divulged about Eatherly, it is Eatherly himself. I quote:

'Mr K., a well known writer in Japan, who, unlike ordinary writers in this country, has a very wide scopic view of the international situation and politics, is going to write a novel on Hiroshima. He is interested to know all details concerning Mr Eatherly, your correspondence with whom was carried by *Asahi* and *Yomiuri*\* and attracted serious attention. It is our pleasure if you will kindly write to Mr K. all you know about Mr Eatherly and also to Mr Eatherly recommending him to write to Mr K. about the details of his experience.'

So if you care to prepare a few data about yourself for this purpose, do it and send them to me. I would forward them.

I was deeply touched by your question whether I am in need of anything. Yes, I do need something, even urgently: 48 hours a day in order to achieve all those thousand things which I consider necessary. If you could send me 1000 free hours well wrapped c.o.d. I would be very thankful. As to other things, I either have them or don't need them.

Chin up,  
Your friend,  
Günther

\* Two big Japanese newspapers.

## Letter 18

*Günther Anders to Eatherly's brother*

November 16th, 1959.

Dear Mr Eatherly,

I wonder whether my name is known to you. Claude may have mentioned the fact that for many months now a continuous correspondence has been going on between the two of us. In June I had written a long letter to him about the moral implications of his life, and this letter has filled him with so much trust in me, that ever since he has written to me about his problems, and I have always tried to advise him and to help him whenever I felt that my words could be useful for him.

Now in his last letter, he fearfully mentioned the possibility that he might be transferred to the Walter Reed Hospital instead of being released, as he had hoped. I do not feel competent to judge whether his fears had any basis in reality or not. As a layman in law, I thought that Claude (since he had been dismissed from the service) is not subject any longer to the military authorities; that, therefore, he could not be transferred by them to another hospital.

Now I am a little worried about Claude's fate, for while he had always written to me every two to three weeks, no mail from him has reached me for more than a month. I am turning to you for information, for I know from Claude that you are taking care of all things concerning him, and that he is happy to have someone whom he trusts without reserve. Please be kind enough to let me know how Claude is, whether he is still in Waco, or how you judge the chances of his release and those of his re-adapting himself to normal life.

I have the highest respect for the sincerity with which he continuously and religiously tries to master the burden which he has to carry throughout his life. It would be all the more unbearable for me to think that maybe his correspondence with me, or the fact that papers and magazines all over the world have published my first letter to him and (of course, with his authorization) his first letter to me may have rendered his situation even more difficult than it had been before. It is out of this anxiety that I am turning to you and asking for your advice. Please don't think that

I wish to find out anything behind Claude's back. In my next letter to him, I will mention that and what I have written you.

Most sincerely yours,  
Günther Anders\*

## Letter 19

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

November 21st, 1959.

Dear Claude,

This will be a very short letter. Only in order to prevent you from thinking that I have done something behind your back.

After your last letter, in which you informed me about the possibility of your being transferred to the Walter Reed Hospital, I asked Professor Linus Pauling (the famous scientist who collected the 9000 signatures against the continuation of nuclear armament) to inquire about the legal status of a person who, like you, is dismissed from service; whether, in such a case, a branch of the armed forces is still entitled to make decisions about such a person. I wrote this letter in order to become familiar with legal data which I, as a non-American, cannot know; and in order to have sufficient material on which to base advice to you, in case you should ask for it.

Now, unfortunately, my letter reached Prof. Pauling on the eve of a trip to Australia. In the rush of his departure, he handed it over to the American Civil Liberties Union; at first I welcomed this step, because I expected that they would provide me with the necessary information.

Instead they have bothered you with questions which I could have asked you just as well. They apparently handled this business without too much understanding of your individual situation.

I would be very sorry, Claude, if you would think that I have done something behind your back. The truth is that it was done behind *my* back. I trust, however, that you won't suspect me for a second. After all, we know each other now for many months and our whole correspondence would become meaningless if you would suddenly consider me untrustworthy.

In order to keep you completely informed: as I was and still am

\* The letter remained unanswered.

worried after so many weeks without a letter from you, I made up my mind to ask your brother about your well being as well as about your legal status. I don't know whether this letter will reach him for I had only a vague address which I found in a Hiroshima book as your family's home town.

Now you are completely in the know. Please sit down and write me a few lines, for I am anxious to hear about you and about whatever decisions have meanwhile been made about your life.

Your friend,  
Günther

## Letter 20

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
No date

Dear Günther,

Forgive me for not answering your letter, but I have hoped and prayed that I would be released each day and I wanted to be able to write you telling of my release and the start of a new way of life. My doctor told me three weeks ago I could go home if my brother would come after me and sign a responsibility form.

I talked to him over the phone, at first he promised to come get me. I waited two weeks then I called him again. He told me he didn't think I was ready; in other words, he refused to accept the responsibility for me. He does not share my views and has tried to prevent my work and writings for pacifist groups. He resents my popularity with certain groups and has prevented the hospital from giving me certain privileges and visitors. I did not want to tell you about this. It is very difficult to accuse my brother of this. I have found out about most of this only recently.

My doctor did tell me this last week, that he would help me get out before Christmas.

I wish to thank you and Mrs Pauling for your interest and for bringing my case to the attention of the American Civil Liberties Union. I answered Mr Watts' letter yesterday giving him the information he asked for.

I'm sorry if I keep you confused as to my status, but understand that the hospital will not give me a firm answer to anything I ask regarding my discharge, but they only threaten me with another commitment if I sign a letter against medical advice, and always bring up the possibility of the Air Force committing me to Walter Reed Hospital.

I do not wish to send anything to Mr K—— in Japan concerning my life. I'm sure he has enough about me from other writings.

This is Thanksgiving day and I must say that I am especially thankful for my many friends and I want to tell you that I consider you my finest one.

Please thank Mrs Linus Pauling for her concern of me.

I will write you again soon.

Best wishes,  
Claude R. Eatherly

## Letter 21

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

December 2nd, 1959.

Dear Claude,

At last. Believe me, I was already very impatient to get news from you; as a matter of fact I was worried, for I thought that something had happened to you. I am glad to know that at least you are in good health.

Now I think that I understand the situation better. I am convinced that your brother is not evil at all, but just an average nice guy. He is probably afraid of having anything to do with a man who, instead of blindly following the principles spread by the mass media, is following his conscience. Not to be average has always been considered by average people, even by decent ones, to be *betrayal*. The whole history of religion and philosophy is filled with reproaches raised by more or less nice or average people against those who try to keep their hands clean, or to clean them. You will remember all the things that I once wrote you about martyrs. We have to try to understand those average people, although their being average consists of their inability to understand us.

This, of course, under no circumstances can mean that we

should yield to them or to their machinations. On the contrary: we have to do everything to overcome the obstacles which they try to push between our feet—not only for our good, but for theirs, too.

If I understand you correctly, your brother is your legal guardian under whose care you are placed; and his judgement, according to which you are 'not ready yet' for standing on your own feet, prevents the hospital from releasing you. Of course, I don't know the specific American laws. But how is it possible that the word of your brother (who is neither a psychologist nor a psychiatrist, in short: utterly incompetent) can become the last instance for the hospital staff?

As I see it now, you are, to put it bluntly, the prisoner of your brother, who uses the hospital as his tool. If this should be the case, if no other person or group is interested in keeping you aloof from the world and from normal life, then, I think, your situation could be remedied. The situation would, however, be different if you should still be under the authority and jurisdiction of the Air Force. Unfortunately up to now you have never clearly answered my questions as to whether you have been definitely dismissed from service, thus, whether you are a civilian. Please answer this question immediately, because I cannot even start trying to do something for you without knowing the fundamentals of your situation: and *please*—a technical advice for your whole life—keep my letter in front of you when you answer it in order not to forget important points. Here is what I wish to know:

1. Is the guardian or the trustee entitled to influence the decisions of the hospital? (Ask your doctor.)
2. Have you been dismissed from the Air Force? If so, when?
3. Who did place you in the hospital? Were you placed there after a trial? A trial by a civilian or by a military court? Or by your brother?
4. When and why were you declared 'incapable of managing your own affairs' and put under your brother's guardianship?

It would be best if you would try to sketch a chronology of all the acts and events which have led to your present situation. Please do this soon in order to enable me to do something for you.

Yesterday I happened to find in a library a book on Albert

Schweitzer. I am sending it to you. I hope it will reach you on Christmas Eve.

Thousand thanks for your thanks. But now let us stop thanking and start acting.

Your friend,  
Günther

## Letter 22

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 10,\*  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
January 13th, 1960

Dear Günther,

I am sure now you have never received my last letter. So I will write again, to answer your questions. First let me tell you, all my letters are read by the doctor and if he sees fit, he will send them on. So this time I will smuggle the letter out. I was transferred to a maximum security ward shortly after I wrote the last letter. Fortunately I have a new doctor that sympathizes with my predicament. He told me this morning that he didn't know why I was so closely guarded, but I suspect that he does. I tried to run away, but was caught very shortly. Too many people know me and the police had been notified to pick me up and bring me back. I am treated well and with respect, but that does not satisfy me.

I will now answer your questions:

1. I have no guardian, but my next of kin (brother) is given to influence the decision to keep me in the hospital. In my last talk with him he threatened to put an indefinite commitment on me if I tried to get out.

2. I have been dismissed from the Air Force. Discharge date 1947.

3. I was placed in the hospital by a civilian court. I had walked into a store with a gun and told the cashier to put all the money in a sack. I then walked out without taking the money. I was picked up immediately because they knew that I had done the same thing before. I was examined by two doctors, they held a lunacy hearing

\* Building 10 is the ward reserved for violent cases.

and sent me here. As you know I have on occasion done antisocial acts and have always been put in the hospital. These acts started shortly after I resigned my commission in the Air Force. Since I have been writing articles against nuclear buildup the hospital and the Force have denied me visitors so I feel sure they want to stop me from further antagonizing the public against nuclear buildup.

The hospital I am in is a government hospital for veterans, so you can see that departments, such as the Air Force, have influence.

It is very difficult to write a letter telling you about my predicament without taking an attitude of a paranoid,\* but I am telling you of things that happen. I think I am in good shape now mentally and expect never to do another antisocial act again; but I do want to get out so I can express my views.

I feel sure that no court will go against the testimony of the doctors here if they say I am still sick. A lawyer is useless against a doctor's testimony in a lunacy hearing.

I might suggest a letter from you and Dr Pauling to my doctor (Dr Frank), it may have influence. I do not wish to place pressure on you to write, but only if you think you can in some way explain to him what you, as a citizen of the world, think of my behaviour and of my ability to handle my conscience and behaviour in the future.

I have to close now, my smuggler of the letter is waiting.

I received and read your book. Thanks a million.

I will try to get another letter out soon.

Your friend,  
Claude

## Letter 23

*Günther Anders to Dr Frank*, of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Waco, Texas—Psychiatric Ward.

January 22nd, 1960.

Dear Dr Frank,

I wonder whether my name is familiar to you. However, it is

\* 'Taking the attitude of a paranoid' obviously does not fit into Eatherly's original style of speaking. No doubt he means: 'without giving the impression of a paranoid'. However, the word 'paranoid' is tied to the other words 'taking the attitude . . .', for he probably knows it only as a part of a pattern, only from the admonition heard time and again in the years of hospitalization: 'Don't take the attitude of a paranoid' = 'don't simulate'. See also Letter 38, footnote 2.

possible, even probable, that Claude Eatherly has occasionally mentioned me and told you about the fact that we have been corresponding for quite a while. It may interest you to learn how this correspondence began: I had happened to read a short article about Eatherly in an American magazine, whereupon I wrote a letter to him in which I tried to clarify the completely new moral situation which has been brought about by the technological development. War, I wrote, has assumed an uncannily indirect character, since enemies do not see each other any longer, and since the magnitude of the effects of one's deeds definitely surpasses one's psychological capacities. We can *do* more, I continued, than we can visualize, produce more than we can mentally reproduce, and there exists a strange inverse relation between inhibition and the magnitude of the deed, because the mechanism of inhibition is silenced if the effects of our deeds definitely transcend the capacity of our fantasy—in short, we can become *guiltlessly guilty*. I took my arguments mainly from my book, *Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen*; yet, of course, I formulated them in a less academic idiom. I further explained to him that the asocial, or even antisocial, acts which he had committed were probably his desperate attempts to prove his guilt to himself and to his fellow men, who too easily had classified him as a guiltless, even gilded hero; that he tried to prove his guilt by committing *substitute-acts* which ordinarily are considered to require punishment. This was my letter.

Eatherly's reaction was not only surprising but deeply moving. He wrote me a letter which, through its strange combination of primitive language, on the one hand, and his insight and scrupulousness, on the other hand, proved to me that he is not only a man of indubitable value, but one who actually fell prey to the new stage of technology. He apparently was (in my opinion: to his honour) unable to digest the action, because its magnitude remained beyond all his efforts to visualize it. His letter furthermore proved that he immediately put absolute trust in me, and he asked for a continuation of the correspondence. In the course of this correspondence I had ample proof of the great purity of this man. To give you but one example: a few months ago a well-known personality in the movie business tried to approach him through his brother in order to win him over for a sleek picture.

I immediately warned him that nothing would be worse for him than to glamourize his case, that once for all he would be sentenced to become a double personality, that he would be identified with the pseudo-Claude shown in the picture, and that this becoming a double personality would aggravate his case even more. Claude was great enough to immediately renounce this glamour-temptation and even to promise me not to enter into any negotiations without being guaranteed the truthfulness of such a picture. This is an illustration of the moral standard of this man, who, otherwise (I admit unhesitatingly) may have remained a bit boyish on account of the fact that he hardly ever had the chance to live the normal life of a mature man.

I consider it quite possible—but this is nothing but a hypothesis—that the picture which I have of him is incomplete, maybe even distorted. For he may have written to me in his best moments. If this should be the case, I should be very grateful to you if you could inform me about it, because I would have to adapt my way of writing to him to those facts. To be frank, I am afraid that the continuation of his confinement could finally result in a psychological condition of abnormality which may not have existed originally, at least not to such a degree. In other words: do you think that it will be necessary to keep Eatherly in confinement indefinitely? Or do you consider the possibility of his release? I am asking *you*, because I know from Eatherly that the responsibility and the power of decision lie solely with you and your colleagues, since for 13 years now Eatherly is no longer a member of the Air Force, thus exclusively dependent on the judgement of the medically competent.

I am fully aware of the fact that a return to normal life will be extremely difficult for Claude. And the way it could be arranged, would require long and difficult soul-searching. On the other hand, I am afraid that this difficulty will grow in proportion with the prolongation of his confinement, and it would be tragic if this man, only because as a very young man he happened to participate in a mission, the scope of which he couldn't realize, should be punished with life-long exclusion from real life.

I have to apologize for the frankness with which I am talking to you, but I have the feeling that the worries about this man form a certain common denominator, and that Claude's friends should

try together to find the best ways of freeing him from his unhappy condition.

Very Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders\*

#### Letter 24

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

January 22nd, 1960.

Dear Claude,

It will interest you that this morning I have written a rather long letter to your doctor about the strong impression which your letters have made upon me, and about the sincerity and purity of your emotions and convictions. (Follows a short report about Letter 23.)

Of course, I don't know your doctor, I talked to him without much ado.

Maybe I should have asked you for permission to take this step, but I feel, not to say I know, that you would not have objected to it.†

However, I am informing you about it so that you will not be surprised in case your doctor should mention my letter.

Your friend,  
Günther

#### Letter 25

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

March 20th, 1960.

Dear Claude,

Unfortunately, all of my letters have to begin with the same sentence: I am worried because for a long time I am without news from you. Your last letter arrived shortly after New Year, I immediately answered it; besides I wrote a long letter to Dr Frank, the sincerity of which he cannot have misunderstood; however he didn't even confirm its receipt. My hands are tied and

\* This letter, too, remained unanswered.

† Since Eatherly had smuggled the letter (No. 22, in which he had authorized me to write to his doctor) out of the hospital, I treated this authorization as though it hadn't been granted.

I can hardly try to attempt to help you as long as I am not kept informed about your situation.

The main reason for this letter is to inform you that a big illustrated magazine in Germany has just brought out the first instalment of a dramatized story of your life (with many photos). I have not the slightest idea from where they got the information (which, so far, doesn't seem incorrect), but the whole tone is uncomfortably sensational, it is arranged and written so unequivocally in the style of a 'cops and robbers thriller' that it is simply lacking in dignity. I know that you cannot have given out data for this purpose, for, after all, we have corresponded about the danger of sensationalism and about your firm will not to authorize any biography of yours except one which you have written. So far the purpose of the article series is not clear at all; but I have my doubts. In case you wish to stop it as an unauthorized piece about you, here are the data. ... I will inquire what you can do in case you should wish to stop the continuation of this tear-squeezing sensation story.

Your friend,  
Günther

#### Letter 26

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 10,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
March 25th, 1960.

Dear Günther,

Thanks for your letter informing me of the story about me in the German magazine. I am sure you know that I would not authorize such a thing, and am anxious to have it stopped. If you know of a legal way to stop publication take steps to do so. Perhaps you will need legal advice, if that becomes necessary I will make financial arrangements for it. Can you get a court order to halt publication? I will trust you to use your good judgment as how to handle it. That is if you have the time. I know you are very busy, so only bother with it if it only will take a small amount of your time.

I am sorry I have neglected writing to you, but I have waited to write of good news of my release. I have hopes of being released in the near future.

Let me know what you can do about the publication, the legal aspects of unauthorized publications in Germany, and if a suit is advisable. In other words, I would like your opinion on the matter.

I will thank you again for your help and advice. I remain

Your friend,  
Claude Eatherly

Just recently an article was written in a magazine over here. Also unauthorized.

## Letter 27

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

April 6th, 1960.

Dear Claude,

Many thanks for your letter of the 25th of March. After such a long time of silence, I was, of course, most happy to have at least a sign from you, which proves to me that you are not defeated by the length of time in which you have to wait for a better time. Unfortunately, I have received your letter very late, for I was travelling for two weeks and couldn't be reached by any mail. However, in any case, I shall immediately wire the magazine in which the dramatized story of your life (even with alleged quotes and conversations which cannot be true) is still appearing. I don't know how many instalments are still ahead, maybe only one or two. Nonetheless I am sending the following telegram: 'Eatherly urgently asks and authorizes me to stop unauthorized story about him; if necessary by juridical means.' Incidentally the intentions and the tenor of the three articles which have appeared so far are not at all against you. As a matter of fact the intentions seem to be good: however the sensational presentation and the indiscreet reports about your mental health have to be prohibited. ...

Your friend,  
Günther

## Letter 28

*Claude Eatherly to Mr Roland Watts*  
of the American Civil Liberties Union

Bldg. 10,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
April 22nd, 1960.

Dear Mr Watts,

On Nov. 16, 1959 I received a letter from you, that had been prompted by Mrs Linus Pauling and Günther Anders expressing concern about my continued confinement in the Veterans' Hospital. I asked you in my return letter not to take any action at that time, because my doctor had promised to release me in the near future. I am a voluntary patient which entitles me to ask for a release on request. I asked for the release and the hospital notified my brother that I would be released on 21 April.\* My brother immediately filed a commitment against me. He came to see me and asked me to remain in the hospital voluntarily without the court hearing. He gave as his reason for my continued confinement political pressure put on him, because of my writings in magazines against continued nuclear buildup. I don't know whether Mrs Pauling and Günther Anders gave you my complete history or not: I was the pilot that led the Hiroshima A Bomb Mission in World War II, and since that time I have been conscience stricken about it. I have done antisocial acts while in a confused state seeking punishment for myself. After each act I have been placed in a mental hospital. I have been in the hospital for 13 months† and have been off medication and treatment for the last 4 months. The tremendous amount of publicity I have received, and pressure from the Air Force on the hospital make my release nearly impossible unless I go to court. The commitment my brother filed on me makes it possible for me to have a hearing and jury trial. My brother has my funds tied up in a joint account, whereby he makes it impossible for me to hire my own lawyer.

I would like to receive your legal help in my court trial. If you

\* Thus Eatherly took his first step exactly one day after the expiration of this term.

† Here he refers exclusively to his last internment in Waco.



do not feel it possible to help me, I wish you would notify me soon. I do not know the exact date of the hearing as yet, but I will ask for a jury trial and will let you know the date if you find it possible to help me.

Hoping to hear from you soon.

Sincerely Yours,  
Claude R. Eatherly

## Letter 29

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

May 2nd, 1960.

Dear Claude,

I postponed writing to you because I had hoped to be able to give you some definite information about the results of my attempt to stop the article series. I took three steps.

1. As I had already written you, I sent a telegram to the magazine asking, in your name, for the stopping of the series. No answer whatsoever.

2. I asked a law office in Hamburg (where the magazine is being published) to approach the staff and to attempt to prevent the continuation of the instalments since the series, though almost exclusively dealing with you, and containing private, even intimate details about your life, was not authorized by you. The law office answered:

a. That they couldn't do anything unless I had a notarized authorization to act on your behalf.

b. They were afraid that even then nothing could be achieved, as such articles about persons of 'public interest', even fiction-like dramatizations of their lives, are protected by the freedom of the press laws. My objection that this is not freedom of the press but denial of freedom of private life didn't seem to carry any weight.

3. I wrote a letter to the magazine repeating my first request to stop publication. Yesterday I received a rather dry reply which proves that even *if* some juridical step could be taken, this would afford so much time that the series would be completed long before anything could be decided.

However I wrote them another letter in which I formulated the fact of their non-authorized publication in order to be in the

possession of a text on which to base a complaint if an action should be taken.

I think, however, that it is not worth while investing energy or money into this matter. For the following reason:

The tendency of this series of articles (so far seven, not yet terminated) is good, almost praiseworthy. It is absolutely impossible for the reader of these instalments to remain indolent, or even to support atomic armament. As the magazine has an amazing circulation, the effect on millions of Germans can be only welcome. I think that we have to consider the poor taste and the indiscretions of the articles as the price for the excellent effect they will produce.

I think, Claude, this should be a lesson for us. It is more urgent than ever that you now actually begin to write down the story of your life in order to prevent the many avid people, who try to exploit your life as a sort of sensation, from producing an untrue picture of you. It would be deeply disappointing if at the time of the publication of your autobiography, people would be saturated with the 'Eatherly case' and would say 'old stuff, I know all about it already'. Therefore I am asking you again: please don't postpone your attempts to write your story yourself. In case you should feel too great inhibitions—which would be only natural, for not everybody who has learned writing is a writer—try to do it in the form of letters to whomsoever, which, instead of placing in a mail box, you collect in your drawer. Of course, before starting, you have to decide on the real or imaginary addressee (a man who is opposed to your principles, or one who consents to them; a person whom you know or one unknown to you; an American or a Japanese). Your attitude of writing will depend upon this choice. I am firmly convinced that it will help you a great deal if you would sit down for an hour or so every day. Once you are in full swing it will make you happy to have a job in which you and your conscience are the only bosses.

Please do tell me again about your present condition and about your expectations. I am eagerly awaiting the day on which our correspondence will be one between two equally free men.

Let's be like bells. They only ring because they are beaten.

Your friend,  
Günther

## Letter 30

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

May 22nd, 1960.

Dear Claude,

I am thinking of you very intensely to-day, for I have just received a letter from Mr Watts that you had a hearing the day before yesterday, and I am burning to know the results. I am afraid, though, that this time the chances for preparing the trial will not have been sufficient. If the result should have been negative, please don't get discouraged; you know, after all, that in three months you will have a new chance, and during this time all concerned will do their best to make a success of it. How much I would like to be there and to explain the extraordinary nature of your case to those people who have to decide about your fate; and try to appeal to their conscience, in order to prevent them from basing their decision on more or less direct intimidations.\* But this is physically and financially impossible; and probably juridically there would be no way of my influencing people. Therefore I have to think of more indirect measures which, however, I do not wish to take without your knowledge and your agreement. Thus I am asking you:

Should I write to the lawyer who will help you in your case, Mr Harold Henry, from the American Civil Liberties Union? If you wish me to do it, please let me know immediately. Besides I am considering ways to find an American psychiatrist of world-wide reputation and complete independence who, instead of, or in addition to, the local psychiatrists, could give his expert opinion about your case. Simultaneously I am writing to Mr Watts and Mrs Pauling. You see that you must not feel alone and left in the lurch; and in 90 days much can be achieved.

As ever, your friend,  
Günther

\* See letter 58.

## Letter 31

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
May 27th, 1960.

Dear Günther,

Good to hear from you, and it makes me happy that you haven't given up on me. I assure you that I won't give up. Yes, I went to court, but both Dr Frank and Dr Constantine testified that I was still sick and needed more treatment.\* It was a closed hearing, and it was evident from the start that I had a very small chance of being released. The judge seemed to be impressed by my talk and told the doctors that if I weren't released by 90 days he wanted me in court again.

I think the thing to do is for you to write the judge (Judge Haley) County Court of Law, McLellan County, Waco, Texas, a letter explaining the situation, and that my release from the hospital will be to my mental benefit and that my efforts can be of some effect toward making the world realize the danger of nuclear armament.

If you can persuade Mrs Pauling to write him also, I feel sure that the judge will have me released.

I have received many letters from foreign countries commenting on your writings, encouraging me to get well and do all in my power to help in the cause of peaceful coexistence.

I agree with you: if the story in the Hamburg magazine will have an effect that is good for our cause then the reward is great enough. Pride and dignity is nothing to sacrifice if peace and brotherhood is the reward.

I will forever be thankful for our association. You will never know how much I needed someone like you to keep me alive to continue on with my convictions. To most people my method of rebellion against war is that of an insane person. No other way could I have made people realize that nuclear war is moral degeneration as well as physical destruction.† It does not matter to

\* Seems to contradict Letter 28, paragraph 1.

† This sentence seems to imply I made myself amoral because I felt obliged to teach my fellow men that nuclear war will make them amoral. In other words: Eatherly sacrificed his morality for moral reasons.

me what people think of my moral character if it will only make them stop and think that they must not let the same thing happen to themselves and their children.

I don't want you to consider me as one that is wholly unselfish. My reward will be great. I will have that great feeling of satisfaction that maybe I had something to do with the final decision which the peoples of all countries must make if we want to exist on this earth.

Thanks for your letters,  
Your friend,  
Claude Eatherly

## Letter 32

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

June 11th, 1960

Dear Claude,

How it encourages me to know that you are not discouraged. Since we both are without false pride, we may tell ourselves without inhibitions that we are needed, and therefore must not give up. We have the same task—therefore you must not be surprised that I don't abandon your cause; by doing so I would cut into my own flesh.

Three weeks ago I asked a famous neurologist in the US (a friend of mine who, in all probability, sympathizes with your case and our cause) to find a psychiatrist who would volunteer to help you. It might be a good idea if you tried to strengthen my request by writing to him (follows address). Since he is a very old man, it would be nice to open your letter with an apology for bothering him.

Besides, upon receipt of your letter, I immediately conveyed your request to Mrs Pauling. As she is not too familiar with details, her letter will probably be rather short. But in any case it will be useful, since it will come from an American citizen. As to the foreigner: I shall give particulars and quote passages from your letters in order to document your sincerity, and 'normality'—for, as you know, I consider abnormal those who would not react abnormally after such an enormous experience.

Of course, I don't know the Judge, but I will take the chance and speak to him as if I were sure that he is a man of deepest understanding and highest responsibility. Maybe he is. After the impression you had, I consider it even probable.

I am firmly convinced, Claude, that sooner or later we will have success. And you should prepare yourself for it. This means that you should think about the way you will organize your life after your release; in order to make a success out of the success.

I am writing this letter on a day\* which more acutely than ever proves how necessary our efforts are. It is not only meanness which we have to fight, but also stupidity, in the sense of lack of fantasy. Here lies our task; to awaken and to educate other people's capacity of imagination.

Your friend,  
Günther

## Letter 33

*Günther Anders to Judge W. Haley  
of Waco, Texas*

June 15th, 1960.

Dear Judge Haley,

You may be surprised to receive a letter from a Viennese author, who, most likely, is unknown to you. Therefore I'll open by telling you that I am writing at the suggestion of Claude Eatherly who, for a year now, has been discussing those problems with me which vex him most painfully.

Claude may not have seen, but I am fully aware of the fact, that a letter written to a judge could easily be mistaken as an attempt to interfere with decisions which, seen from the legal point of view, must not be tampered with by a witness, let alone by one who is not even an eye-witness, but only a 'heart-witness'. On the other hand, Eatherly is convinced that, despite the fact that we have never seen each other, I am able to explain the intricacies of his psychological and moral situation better than others; and I feel that it would be unfair towards him not to fulfil his wish.

\* This refers to the protest demonstration in Japan against the renewal of the security pact with the US.

(Follows report about the correspondence known to the reader.)

This correspondence contains many passages which prove not only Claude's unhappiness but his rare sincerity, his quite exceptionally courageous attempt to master his experience. It is a truism that this experience (seeing a city vanish into nothingness as a result of one's own act) exceeds the emotional and moral capacity of everybody, and it is only too understandable that the few other boys who had the same experience 'mastered' it only through escapism, through not trying to master it, through trusting more the public opinion and praise of their mission than their own perception, their own shock, their own conscience.

Claude, on the contrary, had the moral independence to despise such escapism. And time and again he has tried to formulate his experience, partly in order to prevent himself from forgetting, partly in order to make the beclouded truth, and the immense danger inherent in it, known to his fellow men. Of course, his formulations are lacking in the dexterity of professional writers or of learned men; yet, after all, where should Claude, with the schooling and experiences he had, have learned the niceties of style and the conciseness of theoretical prose? As I consider it possible (and psychologically this would be only normal) that there are depths in him which become transparent in his letters, yet may remain opaque in a court hearing, I am taking the liberty of sending you some of those passages which have impressed me most.

And now I shall try to sketch the portrait of Claude as I see him. I am convinced that he is the victim of a completely new moral situation. Never before has there existed such an enormous gap between the possible effect of a man's acts and his small capacity of imagining this effect. Ever since Claude has seen the dreadful result of the Hiroshima Mission, his whole life has consisted of his futile attempt to understand what he considers his 'guilt' and to make this guilt clear to other people. All his partly 'non-sensical' and 'criminal' acts result from his frustration: he took recourse to deeds which are, at least, recognized as criminal acts in order to prove to his fellow men that he is not as innocent as they think him to be. *While ordinary people are guilty on account of their deeds, he committed the deeds in order to prove his guilt.*

I am not quite clear about the exact chronology of his trial,

confinements and psychiatric treatments. But I am sure that a life which, to a large extent, consists of a succession of war activities, confinements and frustrated attempts to prove one's guilt must gravely endanger one's chance to become entirely mature; and I am even more certain that if Claude's confinement continues, he will be made unable to ever regain normality by participating in normal life; to make decisions alone and to bear responsibility for his own deeds and convictions. It is quite possible that you do not agree with his 'philosophy' according to which the continuation of atomic armament is a sort of an 'eschatological blackmailing' under which the whole of mankind loses its dignity, if not its existence. But, fortunately, he has the chance of living in a country in which the freedom of expressing one's convictions is not only not prohibited, but safeguarded *expressis verbis*.

Of course it is impossible for me to guarantee for Claude once he will take his life into his own hands again. However, I dare say that his life will be destroyed if he is denied this chance. Time and again Claude and I have corresponded about his task to write his autobiography which, if he succeeds, will be a document of the frightful difficulties into which man can fall to-day as master-slave and slave-master of his technical world. As a matter of fact I think that Eatherly's case, although unprecedented, should not be regarded as isolated or unique, but rather as a prophetic example which indicates to us how man in the technical age will be bound to react to his being entangled in actions which, in the most ambiguous way, are his and not his; to actions which make him *guiltlessly guilty*. Therefore, in my opinion, the decision about the Eatherly case will not be the decision about an individual crank, but about '*man in the technical age*'.

I would regret it profoundly if this letter would convey the impression to you that I am trying to influence the outcome of the case in an undue way. But after the few words which Eatherly has written me about the way you treated him, I trust that my words will be received in the same way in which they are meant. I would be most grateful for a confirmation of this letter.\*

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

\* Also this letter remained unanswered.

## Letter 34

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
No date

Dear Günther,

I am sorry for my usual delay in writing, but I have been very busy and I hope it has and will have its effect.

Günther, I think you know me well enough to know that I think to mix politics with our cause would be disastrous. I am sure that you have read about the latest Japanese uprising and the withdrawal of the Japanese invitation of our president. Immediately after the preparatory visit of part of our State Dept and some senators (before the actual visit of the president) demonstrations took place to show that the president was not wanted, at least by a minority. Even so it was enough for the US not to take the chance with our president's safety. Now, I received a letter from US Senator Ralph Yarborough which enclosed a card from Rev. N., a member of the House of Representatives in Japan. The letters were very cordial and they asked me if I would write a letter to the Rev. N. about my views on the Japanese matter, and they told me that my opinions have had a great deal of influence and effect on the young people of Japan.\* (It seems that they are at the root of the demonstrations.) I wrote the Representative of Japan emphasizing what you and I feel. I tried to impress him with the fact that only love, trust and brotherhood could bring a halt to all this senseless tribal conflict. I tried to show him the demoralizing effect that nuclear armament would have, taking my own case as an example. Of course I answered Senator Yarborough's letter telling him that I had written the Member of the House of Representatives. I told him nothing of what I said, because I knew he would get a copy of it anyway.

\* How cynical that the man who is excluded from the outer world and for this purpose is being classified as mentally ill is being regarded in the opportune moment to be sufficiently competent to influence the world although, of course, in a direction contrary to his convictions.

I have lately been in contact with David McClure who wrote the story *To Hell and Back* for Audie Murphy the US's most decorated soldier and now a movie actor. It seems that Audie is very interested in portraying me in a movie. I told him it would and could only be done if my convictions were carried out.

Now as to me getting out of the hospital, I do not believe they will try to commit me again, at least that is the impression my doctor gives me.

I have not written Dr G. because I would not like to put an old man ... in such an awkward position. ... The doctors will not say this time that I am insane, but that there is a possibility that I might try to destroy myself. I wish to thank you and Mrs Pauling for your letters to the judge, they will certainly carry weight. I know the hospital would like to be rid of me, but they will not accept the responsibility that would be theirs if something happened to me.

I have only one thing that I will do when I get out, and that is to use all my influence, popularity, sensationalized publicity, regardless of lack of dignity and loss of pride to me ... (sic and to turn to) people all over the world, I mean to the masses of humanity, not to the politicians, the military and such, because they are only robots, told what to do and how to react.

By the way, Casanova (compliment) I am sending you a small clipping that might interest you.\*

I have been deluged with letters from women all over Europe, proposals and the such. Don't you have any men in Europe? It must be a reaction from the Hamburg magazine.

Günther, you will never know how much your letters give me that added drive and the knowing that, after all, this time I spent in here is not wasted. We may be able to use it very effectively later on.

I know that our efforts are being effective, because if they weren't no US Senator or Japanese Representative would ask a mental patient for help.

Best wishes, your friend,  
Claude

\* This clipping contains indiscreet news about the film star Maria Schell and the rumour that she was in love with the cameraman Günther Anders.

## Letter 35

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

Dear Claude,

July 17th, 1960.

You cannot imagine how sorry I am and how sad it makes me to be forced to destroy an idol. No, unfortunately, I had never the chance of seeing or whatsoever Maria Schell in the flesh. Only once I have seen her in a picture. Instead of congratulating me, you should have sent a letter of condolence to the other guy who is sentenced for life to bear my name, and who (at least I wouldn't be surprised) at once will lose his movie job because people may suspect him of having written philosophical books. Unfortunately I have never in my life received the checks which were meant for the other Günther Anders. They would come in handy.

But to speak seriously about the fun: it made me very happy to see that you have not lost all sense of humour, or that gradually it comes back. People like you and me, who live for serious purposes, would become unbearable, not only for other people but also for themselves, if they would forget how to laugh. Our not laughing wouldn't help anyone, our laughing doesn't harm anyone; and after a good laugh one has all the greater strength for the real tasks.

Of course I heard very much about the events in Japan. I even had detailed descriptions from friends over there. I wish to reserve my judgement till I have seen an American friend of mine who happened to be present in Tokyo at the critical time and who is expected in Europe soon.

I think it is a very good sign, which can make you proud, that you were asked by Senator Yarborough to write to Reverend N. It proves that, despite your isolation, you have succeeded in piercing the wall and influencing a multitude of people. It would interest me to know whether anything which you have written has been published in Japan or whether the publication of my first letter to you and your answer which, as you know, had appeared in the leading Japanese newspaper, has done the job. Anyhow you are not in the sad situation in which most individuals of goodwill find themselves, for the channels for your influence are open, and you have the chance of being heard whenever you wish to say something that seems important to you.

And now your remark about the possibility of a picture. Don't think that I like to ruin things, but the idea of Audie Murphy portraying you doesn't appeal to me at all. It is quite clear that the movie business hopes for a sensation because 'one hero portrays another hero'. I have never seen Audie Murphy in a picture; maybe he is an actor, but I would rather suppose that he is a man who has made exactly that step, that forbidden step about which we have repeatedly corresponded. But the main point is (fortunately you have already emphasized it in your negotiations with McClure and Audie Murphy): under no circumstances should you be falsified. I still feel that this condition can be fulfilled only if your autobiography is ready; or if you prepare it with a man who does not approach you for business reasons, but because he shares your convictions. However this problem will become acute and solvable only after your release; if I were you, I would not sign anything before that day.

I have the feeling that you are looking forward now to the possibility of your release far more optimistically than during the previous months. If you are successful, please let me know immediately, I don't wish to be late with my congratulations. Have you any plans concerning the time after this decisive day? Please tell me about them.

And now let me thank you for your consideration towards Dr G. I will write to him about your decision and that you didn't wish to disturb an old man. You would have liked him, for he is one of the most humane human beings I have ever known, but just as energetic and vital as he is humane.

Your friend always,  
Günther

## Letter 36

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
July 26, 1960.

Dear friend Günther,

I thank you for your quick response to my last letter. I fully agree with you on the offer of the writer McClure and the movie

actor Audie Murphy. I have found out that Murphy has just gotten back from Europe after making a documentary film, for a show of strength, on guided missiles. Günther, we have here in the US a society called the Sane Nuclear Society, ... headed in Hollywood by Steve Allen and Robert Allen, two of our most popular TV and movie personalities. I have not been in contact with them, but after a book is finished, these are the type of people that we can call on to make a movie.\* ... There are many more actors in Hollywood that belong to the 'Sane' Society.

Now I have two quick jobs ... confronting me, I will tell you of the response, or better send the letter from the Member of the Japanese Diet, ... so that you may make a story by writing this Representative and question him on his views as to what he thinks of my philosophy as how to stop the fear of the masses of the people of the world. Remember I must not be associated with any political matter or organization, but only with my own views as to nuclear energy, and that my philosophy is based on the three words: 'Love, Trust and Brotherhood'. These words alone will destroy the fear of all peoples of the world and is the only thing that will defeat the threat of war. I think if you can get this man and the other members of the Diet which signed the letter to make statements that we put this whole enormous problem on a *moral* basis, then there will be no reason for fear and the ceaseless show of threats by demonstrations of power in films, on the radio and in huge parades will lose its effect. You, Günther, can make a great story that will have its effect in Europe. Try to get these articles in all European countries, France, Italy, Norway, Sweden, through your friends and publishers.† We must start acting much more now, things are getting in a precarious position. I know one of our articles went to Poland. My doctor got a letter from a man

\* Here follows the utterly syntactic sentence: 'I favor the person Robert Ryan because of his popularity and a serious and convictious man as well as I can find out. I think if we keep these people in mind we may be able to get the power behind us and advantage of these sincere and great actors.' This sudden linguistic weakness, pervading the whole letter, is easily explained by the date: the Hiroshima anniversary is approaching. Since E. mentioned tranquilizers in his next letter, it is at least possible that already this text was written in a drugged state. See also Letter 37.

† Of course, Eatherly overrates the public power of a freelancing writer, and the overestimation of my influence doesn't correspond to reality. Since once in a while he had received mail in which my name appeared, and since, on the other hand, other European names never appeared in connection with his case, his picture of my person is utterly distorted.

in Poland.\* My doctor could read it because he is a Ukrainian escapee, 1927.

I will answer these Diet members in a long article based on morals, and leave the political picture or views out.† We cannot afford to be associated with any political or church group. Our purpose is to stop nuclear armament and the disbandment of it and set up a world society (government) that is capable of preserving the peace of the world—one which includes the small countries as well as the strong. To spend the money spent on world armament on the education, health, and well-being of impoverished peoples of the world.

Günther, send the letter back to me after you have made use of it and photostated it. I will try to get carbon paper for my article to the Diet for you. Günther, we must increase our efforts, I think sometimes that we have slowed down at a crucial time.

Günther, I would like to talk to you about a thing of great importance, to explain about me and my actions for the last 14 years, but I cannot afford to put, what I will tell you someday, on paper, but I suspect that you can read between the lines and know why my actions were of such nature. That is something that can wait. The important thing is that my name has far outgrown (popularity) that of people that dropped the bomb. My 'go ahead' must be our instrument that shows my guilt, and the emphasis must be put on that, and make the masses of people all over the world see the demoralizing effect that it can have as well as physical and complete destructiveness of the bomb.‡ I think it is going to take us a long and a courageous struggle for us and our friends to bring about our convictions and philosophy.

\* Presumably he means those letters which as Letters 1 and 2 open this collection.

† It must be left open whether Eatherly actually means this utter renunciation of politics (I don't consider it impossible) or whether he stresses it so emphatically for political reasons. His belief to be in full agreement with me about this point is a misunderstanding. My doubts about the desirability of a world government are just as strong. I cannot support this idea without reserve, because the tendency toward power centralization which is inherent in today's politics (not to speak of to-day's technique) would automatically transform every world government into a global, and this would mean inescapable, dictatorship. The task of to-day does not consist in the abolition of the sovereignty of States, but in the dosage of sovereignty.

‡ In the following sentences Eatherly offers a surprising interpretation of his half-criminal actions, an interpretation which, if it should be correct, would invalidate once and for all the legitimacy of his classification 'insane'. I have to omit these sentences, for Eatherly has asked me here *expressis verbis* never to make use of them.

I think to stay in the hospital a while longer until I have finished an article that I am trying to get published in *Coronet* (one of the US most respected and largest magazines) which carried a story about the crew of the Enola Gay, the bomb-carrying plane, and which was obviously written and published to destroy the effect of my writings. Each member said he felt no guilt and stood firmly behind Col. (now General) Tibbetts, the crew commander at the time the bomb was dropped, and they would do it again. It was a very contradictory story, I will send it to you. I will ask a friend of mine, a writer Al Hirschberg, to write it 'as told by me', so I will not be stopped by censorship of the Air Force which dictates to this hospital what to do with me. I have one friend (my doctor) that is helping me in his way, but he is limited to what he can do. He is our friend and has helped me these last 10 years. Knowing all all the time.

Günther, would you give me permission to use your *Commandments* in this article as a part of my philosophy? To have effect it would not be wise to acknowledge it as your work, because if I acknowledge that, then people would think everything was written by other people and they will lose faith in my efforts and sincerity. We must use each other and each other's works to win. Any money I get from it, I will share with you. Please give me your answer as quickly as possible so I can get the story published as soon as possible to destroy the effect of the other article. I have already written to Al Hirschberg who has wanted a story from me for a long time.

I am getting a great deal of mail from Germany, some foolish and lovesick but others that have certainly not remained indolent to nuclear armament. Now in closing let me express my regret that you were not the same Günther Anders that was in love with such a beautiful girl, but I am thankful to you for having a love for our great purpose.

Günther I never did receive your book on Japan. Please autograph one for me and send it to me. I hope to autograph one with you some day soon.

Don't worry about me, I am fine and will continue to be so. I know you will never forsake me.

Your friend,  
Claude Eatherly

Can you read my writing? I can't.

## Letter 37

Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly

July 31st, 1960.

Dear Claude,

I have just received your long letter of friendship, and I feel the urge to answer immediately, although I don't think that I am able to improvise valid solutions for all of your problems. However, your letter seems to show that you are troubled, presumably by the infamous article in *Coronet*; and so my main reason for writing you immediately is to ask you not to spend your emotional energies for indignation about individual mean acts, with which we have to count every day, but to save them for your main task. Those acts exist in order to show us how ceaselessly we have to follow our own lines. Formulated in an exaggerated way: we should be thankful for them, because they prevent us from becoming negligent.

And now the various points of your letter. Again I have to write as a sceptic: I have very strong doubts that those members of the Diet, who, via an American Senator, have approached you, are actually friends of our cause. I am afraid that, on the contrary, it is their intention to exploit and to misuse the fact that your authority is recognized by the young generation in Japan; that they are trying to present you as an advocate of a sly compromise—and compromises can always be couched in Christian terms.\* Unfortunately I don't know the answer you have sent them; maybe you have fallen into a trap. As to me, I have immediately asked a Japanese friend of mine, a professor, to inquire about the gentlemen who signed the letter and to find out whether they mean what they say, or whether they are Kishi people. After all, it seems to be forgotten that Kishi was an active member of the Japanese Government during the most expansive and aggressive, during the Pearl Harbour, period; that he lead and organized the exploitation of the territories occupied by Japan at that time. After all, it is not for nothing that the US imprisoned him for three years immediately after the war. No American citizen with any feeling of honour should be in contact with this man or people who have supported him. Of course, I still hope that those men

\* It would have been inadvisable to speak in a more open way (see footnote to Letter 34) because I could never expect my letters to be read only by him.



who have approached you do not belong to this clan. We have to wait for the answer from my friend in Tokyo.

You are asking me to write to these people and, if I understand you correctly, to use my text as an 'open letter', as an article to be published everywhere. I can't do that without knowing who they are. The way one speaks depends on the character of the addressee. Now—and I hope I am not late—please do not send off your letter either before we know who these men are.

Your story about the dispatch your doctor received from Poland is truly fantastic. They must have translated our letters from one of the German papers which published it. Isn't it a strange world where one has to learn in Vienna from a letter coming from Texas that one's writing has been printed in Poland?

You are asking me, Claude, for the authorization to use formulations out of my *Commandments* for your *Coronet* article. This question seems to me to be more complicated than you suppose it to be. My *Commandments* are not unknown, and the way I coin my formulas is easily recognizable. I am afraid that by using them without mentioning the source, you may run a risk; people may say: 'This is Anders, not Eatherly'. This will happen at any rate, should your article be translated (which is probable) into Japanese or German. Therefore it seems to me to be better, either to reformulate my rules so radically that the source would become unrecognizable; or to use them as quotations. It will depend on the style of your *Coronet* article which of the two possibilities seems to you the more advisable. Incidentally in February '59 I dictated a number of principles concerning the atomic situation to the students of the University of West Berlin. They have just informed me that they wish to publish them in the next issue of their magazine. Unfortunately I have no English version.\* As to the money you expect from *Coronet*, please forget about it or better, send it to the hospital in Hiroshima, atomic victims ward.

I can imagine that the mail you receive from Germany is mostly nonsensical. Although the instalments about your 'case' have been praiseworthy, the magazine as such is on a rather low level, and its ordinary readers are not exactly people of our taste.

Strangely and disappointingly you didn't mention anything

\* Meanwhile the publication of an English version was in preparation. The text appeared in the *Massachusetts Review*, August 1961.

about the way you judge your chances of getting out of the hospital. Please do not forget to tell me about it. By the way, have you heard anything about the letters which I sent to the Judge and Dr Frank?

Do you know that we already know each other for over a year now? You had foreseen in your first letter that it would become a long correspondence. Now I hope it will be a lifelong one.

Your friend,  
Günther

### Letter 38

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 3rd, 1960.

Dear Günther,\*

Just received your letter and your, as always, good advice, which I always accept as that of a friend that I can trust. Günther, as to the letter I wrote to the Rev. N. (here you are wrong). As proof I will send you a letter I received from the people of the Japanese XY Society, (the same group that we wrote last year and was so wonderfully accepted by so many Japanese as you know). The letter about Rev. N. will help you understand that the man is sincere and on our side. The letter I have written and is being typed now will be sent after I hear from you. I will send you a copy as soon as it is typed. I very carefully stayed away from any group or affiliated party or church.

\* This letter is not only illegible in long stretches, but also syntactically amorphous and here and there understandable. If this Letter 38 together with 36 would be taken out of their context and presented to psychiatrists, they would, most likely, and rightly so, diagnose a mental disturbance. However, these pieces, which lie like two erratic stones in normal surroundings, must be seen as exceptional documents. Eatherly himself was clearly aware of the lacking clarity and the blurred character of the two letters; in this Letter 38 he twice stresses the point that he is writing under the influence of drugs. In no other place has Eatherly mentioned treatment with tranquillizers. The question why he had been given this medication just at this time is easily answered (see footnote 1 to Letter 36): the first August week is the 'Hiroshima week'; the doctors most likely expected a sharp reaction to the anniversary. It is uncanny that this document of mental confusion has been caused by the very means which were applied against the alleged disturbance. The most shocking aspect of this letter, however, is not the condition of the patient but that of the doctors: for they apparently consider it the most natural and normal thing in the world to prescribe and apply pills against the apocalypse-shock.

Also I had decided before your letter arrived not to write the story for *Coronet* magazine, but to wait until I get out and write my book.

I have found out that I can not leave the States for awhile (perhaps years) after I am released. But I will get the right man to help me on my autobiography. I wish it could be you, but I want you to write a preface or epilogue or is it prologue (excuse my ignorance—but as you can tell I have been taking more tranquilizers lately and the doctor said I was hyper maniac now, just like my army medical record reported). So as you see he sees my improvement, but wants to keep me (unreadable word) off so as not to revert back to the maniac condition that brought about my breakdown along with the guilt complex.\*

I will try to tell you why I have hopes of getting out in Sept., because I had a long telephone talk with my brother and I explained a few things to him like I did in my letter to you† and I hope he will sign me out then, instead of facing a jury trial and being committed again.

I hope that it was not a trap that was set up for me either by Japan or America—I did not say anything that would have anything to do with either government in a political way. I did say violence in any way would solve nothing.

I have written articles for the XY Society and allowed a TV program to be produced about me, against nuclear armament and against war, only for peace. ... I will send you the letter written to my friend who is a pacifist and one of the members of the XY Society. ... She is my good and true friend here as you are in Austria. She has her first book published this month on prayers.

... As to using your *Commandments*, I certainly agree with you, I could never reach the depth and magnitude of philosophy that you can produce. I will in some way, as you suggest, use it by changing its words to fit my style, if I can.

\* Eatherly so automatically participates in the medical vocabulary that has surrounded him now for years, that he uses the word 'guilt complex' instead of speaking simply of guilt. As he has never tired to insist on his actual guilt, he applies a term which contradicts his own conviction. Serious psychoanalysts reserve their term 'guilt complex' only for such cases in which guilt feelings are unjustified. The misuse of this term is the subject of Letter 63.

† Here he obviously refers to the interpretation of his 'abnormal' or 'criminal' actions (Letter 36 and referred to also later on) which he has not authorized me to divulge.

Please consider writing either the preface or an epilogue for my book. I think I told you what I was going to do with the money if I make any. Most to Japan, some to Germany ... and to other countries, set up in a foundation where income tax can't touch it and build a bomb with it.

Back to my book, which I hope to start the 1st of Oct. I will be asking for your advice and help, especially about doing away with my inhibitions about my supposedly heroic acts during the war. How I can get around it (sic. in order to prevent that) every young person that reads it wants to follow a military career and try to become a hero? How can I destroy that myth? Günther, I sent you a copy of *Coronet* with the story of General Tibbetts and of the bomb carrying crew (sic. sent) by outside help. ... Just so you can see it was written to retaliate against my articles.

Whether you know it or not, the US supports Kishi because of the treaty he signed. Don't be scared that I said anything to defend him and his kind in my first small letter. As to the article, I wanted us to write that with the support of the Japanese Diet we could show that small countries want no nuclear armament (sic. because it) makes them fear the rest of the world. I have not sent off my last letter ... and will not until we substantiate the good intentions of these people. I know the XY Society is a good and respected pacifist group backed by men like Bertrand Russell and Pauling.

If I have made a mistake, I will change my previous statements in an article to the people of Japan.

I would like to read your *Principles concerning the A-bomb* if you could get it translated. ...

I have not (sic, heard) and they (sic, doctor and judge) will not tell me of any letter they received from anyone. I don't think my brother will recommit me, and I hate to take the chance in court because they (doctors) will say I am suicidal, and that will kill my efforts.

The year we have known each other seems short. Our friendship will never end. I hope I haven't left unanswered any of your questions and have told you as much as I know about my situation. I am a little doped to-day so please excuse the (sic, lack of) continuity.

Your friend,  
Claude

## Letter 39

*The XY Society to Claude Eatherly*

No date

As the Hiroshima Day of this year is drawing near, we address you this letter to convey to you our concern for you, fifteen years after the tragic incident of Hiroshima.

A year ago, we addressed a letter through our mutual friend Mrs ———. Receipt of that letter has never been acknowledged by you, but we trust that you had access to it.

Subsequent to our letter, another letter of sympathy and good will was addressed to you by thirty of the Hiroshima maidens bearing their joint signatures and testifying to the spirit of forgiveness which had prompted them to write that letter. In the same way as we did, the young maidens, who are the victims of the bombing incident, expressed their conviction that you were just as much a victim of the barbarous institution called 'war' as those innocent girls maimed for life.

We know of a letter which you wrote recently to our friend Rev. N., a member of the Diet and also a leading member of our Society. This letter was read widely and we were pleased to be able to infer from this that not only were you recovering physically, but commencing now to take a definite stand for peace and against war. We hope this is not a mere wishful thinking on our part. We are continuing to pray for your complete recovery and entry into a new life.

This letter we hope will reach you on or around the historic Hiroshima Day. It is a day dedicated to the cause of reconciliation among the nations, a day with a memory, which hereafter must serve to deliver mankind from mutual suspicion, enmity and war, but to live instead in mutual trust and with brotherly love.

With warm personal regards, sincerely yours,  
(Two Japanese signatures)

## Letter 40

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

August 10th, 1960.

Dear Claude,

I have received your long and warm-hearted lines. I am sorry not to be able to answer in full right now, for I am just about to hop a plane in order to speak at a Hiroshima memorial celebration in Berlin. After my return, you will get a real letter from me. I am happy to see from the Japanese enclosure that I was wrong, that my suspicions had no basis in reality: this Mr ——— is certainly perfectly alright.

All my good wishes,  
As ever, your friend,  
Günther

## Letter 41

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 17th, 1960.

Dear Günther,

Just a few words to let you know I received your letter. At the same time you get one part of an essay that I sent to the Japanese Diet after I found out they were OK.

The Tokyo newspaper wants to make a feature story out of the articles. I told them it was OK if the Diet approved of it. The *Tokyo Shimbun* also asked me some more questions. Of course I answered in a philosophical way so I couldn't be trapped\* ...

I haven't heard whether they are going to turn me out soon or not, if not, I will sign an A.M.A. (against medical advice) and they will have to recommit me if they want to hold me. I hope my brother will not recommit me.

Your friend,  
Claude Eatherly

\* Eatherly certainly doesn't know how right he is when discrediting philosophy as an alibi-activity.

Letter 42 (shortened)

Claude Eatherly to the Reverend N.

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 8th, 1960.

Dear Sir,

Let me first express my thanks to you and the other members of the Diet that signed your letter of 25 July 1960. My gratitude to you for your concern for me and the prayers you offered in my behalf is without bounds. I am honored that you wish to know more about my philosophy and convictions on life in these days of such fear and turmoil.

I will only speak for myself, although a great mass of the American people hold my viewpoints about ending these days of strife among all nations, large and small. I have written many articles for publishers to encourage hope, and that we must strive to save this earth.

I will first answer the question you asked as to my role in the Atom bombing of Japan at Hiroshima.

I was the commander of the lead plane, named the *Straight Flush*. It was my job to reach the target of Hiroshima, which was the primary target, to get information on the weather and determine if we would have any resistance from enemy aircraft and ground fire. I flew over the target area for approximately forty-five minutes to study the group of clouds which partially obscured the target, a bridge between the military headquarters and the city of Hiroshima. Some fifteen Japanese aircraft were flying at 15,000 feet, but made no attempt to come to my altitude of 29,000 feet. These planes soon disappeared. As to the weather that day of 6 August 1945, there were scattered strata cumulus clouds over the city of Hiroshima at an altitude of 12,000 to 15,000 feet. The clouds seemed to be moving toward the city of Hiroshima at a speed of 10 to 15 miles per hour. The time of this observation was about 7.30 a.m. The real target was clear. As I said before, the target was the bridge where it would do the most damage to the Japanese military headquarters. The weather seemed ideal to me—the city would be obscured and saved and the dropping of the bomb on the military headquarters would cause the military to realize the

strength and destructive force of the bomb, thus convincing the Japanese military that they should sign a peace treaty and end the terrible war. I sent my coded message which was the final 'go ahead' to the bomb-carrying plane to bomb the primary target.

What I wanted to happen did not happen. The clouds over Hiroshima diminished and scattered. The bombardier on the bomb carrying plane missed the target some 3,000 feet and destroyed the city of Hiroshima. I do not think it was an intentional miss, but an error of the bomb falling straight and true.\* Please remember it was a new, untried bomb. Nevertheless, the act was done and it is our job† now to do everything possible that there will never be another 'Hiroshima'.

Now that you know my role on the mission, I wish to tell you that I made a dedication that day of 6 August 1945, that I would dedicate my life to destroy the causes of war and the banishment of all nuclear weapons.‡ I said this to myself in prayer on the trip

\* This would mean that that element which we have exposed time and again as one of the most fatal implications of the atomic situation: namely the technical unreliability of machinist and machine had already played its fatal role in the very first moment of the atomic age.

† This word at this place is immensely characteristic. The word 'job' has taken the place of all other words which formerly had designated activities of the most diverse types. This replacement was welcomed because an activity which is nothing but a 'job' remains morally neutral, thus something which frees us from conscience and responsibility and asks us only for conscientious performance. I don't know of anything which could prove the inescapability of this word in so frightening a way as the fact that even Eatherly, who does not recognize moral neutrality, naively takes recourse to it, that he even calls the fight against this 'job', a 'job'. Besides this word 'job', another one is being used, a word which conjures up a religious connotation: the word 'Mission', which, oddly enough, has a function similar to that of the word 'job'. For 'missions', too, stand beyond the question: morally allowed or not—no, even worse than that: they just can't be immoral. Thus this word, too, makes the mobilization of one's own conscience and the shouldering of one's own responsibility superfluous.

‡ This sentence could lead to the misunderstanding that Eatherly had known something about the scope of the effect of the A-Bomb prior to the Hiroshima catastrophe. Two things, however, have to be held in mind:

1. This report was made exactly fifteen years after the event, and it would almost amount to a psychological miracle if Eatherly, although having been haunted by the effect every day for fifteen years, still would have been able to visualize the possibility that once he had not known the effect of his deed. 2. In a certain abstract sense Eatherly may have known something—but how unreal is such a 'knowledge'. After having learned nothing about the atomic weapon during his whole special training for this 'Mission', he and the other crew members were told something about the test explosion in New Mexico; not impossible that they were even shown movies of this test. Yet even those pictures wouldn't have meant anything as they didn't show any annihilation but only the famous 'mushroom'. The only thing stamped upon the crew before the 'Mission' was a vocable meant to produce pride and vanity: for already in advance they were called the 'Victory Boys'; and as such they flew over the Pacific in order to perform their unpacific job.

back to my home base—whatever may happen in the future, I know that I have learned three things which will remain forever convictions of my heart and mind. Life, even the hardest life, is the most beautiful, wonderful and miraculous treasure in the world. Fulfilment of duty is another marvellous thing which I, at that time and on that trip back to Tinian, accepted as my dedicated duty to make life happy, without fear, poverty, ignorance and the lack of freedom of all races, whether red, white, black or yellow. This was my second conviction. My third is that cruelty, hatred, violence and injustice never can and never will be able to create a mental, moral and material millennium. The only road to it is the all giving creative love, trust and brotherhood, not only preached but consistently practised.

Some fifteen years have passed since that dedication, and it has cost me much because of the mental and emotional disturbances, caused by the guilt of such a crime. I have spent nearly eight of those years in hospitals and a short time in jails. I always seemed to be happier in jails because I had a release of guilt by being punished. ...

The tragic time of those years did not diminish my desire to forever stamp out violence and nuclear armament, but only increased my desire to do what I could by keeping up with scientific advancements and with the decrease (or the slower development) of the moral attitude of the masses of the people of the world. ...

Let me quote this passage from the Bible:

'Blessed be the meek; for they shall inherit the earth.

'Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.

'Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the Children of God.'

... I am sorry to tell you that under my present conditions, it is impossible for me to send you a picture of my family. I will send you a picture of myself that was sent to me from a stranger in Germany who had read one of my articles.

May the best of everything be your reward for your good Christian attitude.

In Brotherhood,  
Claude R. Eatherly

## Letter 43

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 18th, 1960.

Dear Günther,

I apologize if my letters are so frequent and take up too much of your time, but now is the time when I feel I should make my move to get out of the hospital, and I think you can help by writing a letter to a sister named \_\_\_\_\_ and also addressed on the inside to my brother \_\_\_\_\_ (the address is \_\_\_\_\_). Ask them to sign me out. I have just told them in the last few days about my plan and dedication the last 15 years—but I am afraid they cannot imagine me giving up everything, name, career and money just for a cause. I hope you can tell them of the world wide movement, and that all of us must work in order to save the world. Tell them of our friendship, and that we are working for a way of life that means freedom to all. I'm sure you can impress them enough that they will not think that I am crazy.\* ...

My mail from Japan has become tremendous the last day or two, after my last letter to the Diet hit the papers.

Günther, I took the liberty to write Senator Ralph Yarborough to use his influence to get the contempt charges dropped on Dr Linus Pauling. I will send you a copy. It was poorly typed, but I had to take what I could get as I can't use a typewriter here in the hospital. He owes me the favor from the Japan incident and I all but asked for it when I asked him to do something about it.† It will have some repercussions, probably slap me in the face, but I remember he and Mrs Linus Pauling tried to help me. Write me when you can. Did the article in the German magazine end? Save it for me. Write soon and good luck, your friend, Claude.

\* Letter incomplete. Omissions were necessary (as in Letter 36) since Eatherly asked for discretion.

† See Letter 34 ff.

## Letter 44

(shortened, as many facts already known to the reader are repeated)

*Claude Eatherly to Honorable Senator Ralph Yarborough*  
US Senator from Texas

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 10th, 1960.

Dear Sir,

A few weeks ago I received a letter from you stating that you had met the Honorable Reverend N., a member of the Diet of Japan, wishing me best wishes, and that he would like to hear from me. I wrote Reverend N. a letter of gratitude for his interest in me and my illness, which has been brought about by my guilt complex,\* for the role I played in the atom bombing of Hiroshima.

I have often written articles against nuclear armament, and for the disbandment of atomic testing in all countries that now have the knowledge of the bomb.

My article to the Diet member seems to have been impressive, so he asked for more of my philosophy about world peace, and was signed by many members of the House of Representatives. ...

... Senator Yarborough, I also was told in your letter, if I needed your help in any way, to please ask for it.

Dr Linus Pauling is in contempt of court, to one of the congressional committees. ... I pray that you can feel it in your heart to help this man for a dismissal of the charge. He is a great man, a great humanitarian and there is in the use of atom and hydrogen bombs a new danger. ... We do not know what may be the effects of setting loose great floods of radioactivity. There are those (Einstein), who think that the result would be the extinction of the world.

I saw three of the first four atom bombs set off,† and I know the results of those bombs, and with the great advancement of science since then, I know, as Dr Pauling knows, that it would be the end

\* See Letter 38, footnote 2.

† Including Bikini.

of this people's earth. For this reason, war is a greater menace now than it was formerly.

The prevention of war has become necessary if civilized life is to continue, or perhaps if any kind of life is to continue.

This matter is so imperative that we must not shrink from new forms of political thoughts or from realization of new problems which could formerly be ignored, if not with impunity, at any rate without ultimate disaster.

I will not discuss further my convictions, but I do plead with you to help save this great man from further embarrassment, for (sic. he has been) doing something that he hoped would affect the thoughts of the great American people, and make them realize that we all must do everything possible to save our existence.

I want to apologize for such a long letter, but I thought it necessary to write in order to help you in your decision to help this great man, Dr Linus Pauling.

I thank you for your consideration and time.

Respectfully,

Claude R. Eatherly

## Letter 45

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

August 31st, 1960.

Dear Claude,

I have to apologize for not having written for such a long time. My wife was ill, after the worst was over I had to send her via 'airmail' to her parents, because there she can better be taken care of than here, for I too was and am ill—in short: it is a scandal how much one depends on one's body. Anyhow, now, at least, I can sit at my desk again, and the first sheet in the typewriter is for you.

Of course, I will write to your family, I am enclosing copies so that you know what they received from me. I hope that I found the right tone for them. It is, of course, not so easy to write to complete strangers. But you, too, have once been a complete stranger to me, and the understanding was perfect.

If we would only succeed in getting you out. I don't know what I would do after hearing it. Once upon a future time we will celebrate it together.

Incidentally, this morning I received a letter from Japanese

friends who implored me to tell you to be careful with the Japanese with whom you are in contact. I am afraid, Claude, that they are trying to exploit your name for purposes which are not yours. For good people, it is very difficult to learn distrust. But we have to.

There is a strange sentence in your letter which I cannot understand. You write that you okayed an article in a Tokyo paper 'if the Diet would approve it'. Why should it approve? Why is the Japanese Diet the judge over truth and untruth? Truth doesn't depend on the approval of any group. Three times three equals nine, even if all Diets of the world would say it equals ten. And how *could* the Diet approve of it? For no Diet will ever vote for or against the publishing of any newspaper article. Why don't you rely on the magnificent American principle of 'freedom of expression'? In the very moment in which you tell them that your expressing yourself depends on their consent, you are forfeiting your American freedom which guarantees the individual the right to say what he considers to be the truth. You are entitled to enjoy this right, no matter whether it is an American or a foreign paper or magazine to which you send a text.

Of course your letter to N. is a beautiful document. However, I love far better your letter to Senator Yarborough, in which you ask him to help our friend Pauling. Here you prove that you have found the way from ideal to reality. For this is our duty now: to build bridges between our hopes and the real world. It is unavoidable that we 'meddle' with this dirty world, even with 'diplomacy'. Of course one's hands get dirty, for whoever washes something that is dirty gets dirty fingers. This dirt, however, is 'honourable dirt'. If we do not 'meddle' or even try to prove that we do not meddle, we leave everything as it is. But I know that you know that, for otherwise you wouldn't have written to Senator Yarborough.

Day and night I am writing and crossing out and rewriting my new book on the atomic situation. Meanwhile you will have received my *Hiroshima Diary*. Too bad that I can't translate it for you. However I do hope that an English version will appear in the not too distant future.

I wish I had twenty fingers to cross for you.

Your friend,  
Günther

## Letter 46

Günther Anders to Eatherly's sister and brother

September 1st, 1960.

Dear Mrs — and dear Mr Eatherly,

You may be surprised to receive a letter from Vienna, and from a person totally unknown to you. I have to apologize for this intrusion.

I am writing this letter at the suggestion of Claude, who has asked me to send you a few words and to tell you about what I think of him. His request proves how much he trusts me, and it would be simply unfair not to fulfil his wish.

I wonder whether Claude has ever told you that he and I (who have never seen each other) are regularly corresponding about problems which, for both of us, are most urgent: the implications of the 'Atomic Age'. Of course, this problem has become *the* problem of millions of people: of scientists, churchmen, politicians, educators, and medical men all over the world. This subject is not just one amongst others, it is the most appalling which has ever existed, for it implies the possible self-destruction of mankind through those weapons (if one can still call them 'weapons') which have become possible through the development of nuclear physics. As you certainly know, there are congresses taking place in all corners of the globe, because the situation has to be made clear to mankind as a whole, for most of them are still indolent or blind or they do not wish to see the reality of the danger. Those people who belong to this 'anti-atomic' movement are the best of all countries, for they are those who feel responsibility for the survival of mankind; they are far from being cranks, on the contrary: never in my life did I see such a small number of cranks as in the congresses in London or Tokyo or Berlin which I have attended.

I think it is easy to understand that Claude, who happened to be one of the first to see and experience the unimaginable reality of the Atomic Age, feels that he belongs to this group of responsible people. Fifteen years after his famous flight to Hiroshima I was there, and I talked to the victims who knew about him and who told me how deeply they pitied him. For they knew and they understood that the shadows of the innumerable dead ruined his days and his nights.

You will admit that one suffers from remorse after having harmed (even unwillingly) one individual being. How unbearable must it be to know that one has participated in an action (of course, unwillingly) which brought about the death of two hundred thousand people. The 'it had to be' cannot pacify the soul of a deeply responsible being. The remorse remains alive, the wound remains open—till (and this has happened in Claude's soul) the remorse transforms itself into the firm will: 'this must never happen again'. I have no doubts that you will understand that the difficult years which lie between 1945 and 1960, the years in which Claude seemed to be even a criminal, have been the effect of the experience which none of us would have been able to digest without profound psychological disturbances. We who have been so fortunate not to feel persecuted by the shadows of thousands of dead people should try to help him who had his 'Hiroshima experience'. And I think we should understand that his pain and his (totally unpolitical) devotion to the cause of peace is a proof of his sincerity. If, on the contrary, Claude would have continued living after his experience the way he had lived before, he would have manifested a moral superficiality. His illness is proof of his moral sensitivity. One should not expect cheerfulness and indolence from a man who has gone through such misery—it is not *he* who is abnormal, the experience was abnormal; and it would be abnormal to respond to such an experience in a totally normal way.

For innumerable people in many countries Claude has become the symbol of responsibility to-day. A few months ago I was invited to lecture to a group of students at the University of West Berlin; when I mentioned the name Eatherly, I was surprised to see that everybody knew his name, and not only his name, for he was respected by everybody because he had burdened himself with guilt feelings, although he is, so to speak, 'guiltlessly guilty'. But the students had realized that maybe once they would be ordered by German generals to carry through a mission similar to the 'Hiroshima Mission'—and the image of Claude showed them that, as they put it, by destroying his fellow men, the destroyer himself is destroyed too. And they were grateful to him, because through his suffering he had given them this insight.

Of course, seen with everyday eyes, Claude's case seems to be odd and not in key with normal life. Let me stress once more: it

was his experience which was not normal, and he would be morally abnormal if he would not draw consequences from his experience. He knows that if the method of warfare continues, no life at all, whether 'normal' or 'abnormal', can continue. Of course, everybody knows that, but he knows it in a more profound way, and we shouldn't punish him for the intensity of his knowledge.

Please do believe in the sincerity of Claude's pain and of Claude's hopes. And please try to help him to return to the world of his fellow men. The longer he remains a man without contact with real people, the more difficult will it become for him to re-adapt himself. Should he become the life-long victim of an experience which was not his fault? This wouldn't be fair.

It is not easy to convey in a foreign language the sincerity which one wishes to convey. Maybe the voice of a stranger will seem to you a sort of intrusion, and you may react by saying: 'This man interferes with our business.' Please don't. We are living in an age which enables us to kill people who live on another continent. Therefore we should also try to reach one another with the voice of love.

Very Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders\*

#### Letter 47

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
August 31st, 1960.

Günther, you and I are known over the world more than you think. We must take advantage of it morally.

I know you must be busy and can't write, so since I have a little time I will write and let you know what little I know as to my situation. I sent you a copy of my Dr Pauling letter to Sen. Yarborough, and I hope you got it. I am not sure the Senator received the letter I sent, because such letters are closely censored, and mine in particular. I have no way of telling whether Yarborough is ignoring my letter because he does not want to get

\* Also this letter remained unanswered.



mixed up in it, or whether an agency has stopped the letter. I know that they have stopped several of my letters to you because I have not, on occasions, received answers to questions. I had the letter smuggled out to the post office but, after all, there are other possibilities to check the mail. Anyway I intend to write the Senator once more to ask him if he received my letter. I will do it through another source. They handicap me a lot, but I have too many friends for them to stop me entirely. I am going to demand that he pay me back the favor I did for him in the Japan crisis. I think they will only censure Dr Pauling, but I do not want to take a chance that he go to jail. If he did, I wish there could be some way I could do his time for him, since he is old and is needed so badly in our work. ... I respect his power and courage. Traps are easily laid to completely get rid of such men (unreadable) of being tied in with the reds, because he fails to give the names of the 10,000 scientists that signed the petition.\*

I am going to write my friends in Tokyo and use what we call in combat a crossfire, and use the Japanese Diet to write the President and Sen. Johnson and Sec. of State Herter to drop the charges. I am afraid he may get some time in jail and a heavy fine if I don't. The people in Japan trust me and they won't tell who instigated the matter. I am going to pull every punch. Mrs Pauling tried to help me and I don't forget easily; I know you don't, and the Paulings must be your friends, so I will go out to help Dr Pauling.

Günther, ... my success has been great in Japan, and your writings and mine† have been very effective. I can tell by the mail that my popularity and the curiosity of people on the subject of nuclear armament has had its effect, and a great deal of it can be credited to you. I hope you are as careful as I not to be typed with any one country, but (sic. to act only as a human being) working for a cause. That is the only way we can succeed. Don't get hooked up with an organization, please.

As to my getting out, my other brother and my sister are coming to see me to try to get me out, but my doctor said it would be after the election. I don't know what I have to do that has so much effect in Washington, but they sure know where I am and doing a

\* Eatherly means, of course, that Pauling refused to name those who had helped him prepare his list.

† Here Eatherly means my first letter to him and his answer; these letters had also appeared in Japan.

good job of keeping me. My doctor has ignored me for several weeks now on the subject. ...

I am receiving much mail from Japan now since my last article, the young people are very enthused over my philosophy.

I just received my mail, one of my articles was read in Brazil and a missionary wrote me that he had read it. It must have been translated (sic. by someone) from the Japanese colonies in South America. Maybe we should concentrate on a story to the South American people.

... Günther, I have had a long letter from Al Hirschberg, the writer, and I have had him investigated, and he is not the man you thought he was. The only book he has had made into a movie was *Fear Strikes Out* (true) about a baseball player (one of our baseball heroes) that had a mental disease. It was a good book and I have decided, because of his popularity over here, to use him. He is coming to see me in November and start work around the first of the year. I hope I can get you to write something in it, because it would mean a lot to me, maybe the preface. ...

I wonder if you get all my mail, I had a letter opened and censored on me to-day, the one from Brazil. I wish I could get your writing in more countries, your forcefulness is different from mine. Yours scares people out of complacency. I'm afraid mine is on the pleading and more on the Christian formula, yours may with mine have an effect on all people of every way of thinking.

I had a couple of letters from a woman doctor from Eschweiler, Germany, asking me to help her (she has helpless and sick children) by writing about people that neglect helpless, sick and homeless children. I want to help her, but can I afford to over-extend my cause? That must come after we have cleared the road for it, it seems to me. Then all the poor, illiterate, homeless, helpless can be helped by using the war money for that purpose. She has read your book. Those kind of people are hard to refuse.

Please think about the story for the missionary. I know you must make money, but we must also sacrifice some. I keep very little money as I help 19 children in foreign countries as foster father, and I don't miss it. Each one costs me \$10 a month. Write me when you can and God bless you, Günther.

Your friend,  
Claude

## Letter 48

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
September 6th, 1960.

Dear Günther,

Let me first express my regrets for your wife's illness and please express my sincere sympathy and hopes that she will be well soon. Did she come to the US (California)? If so let me have her address so as to send her a card. I did not know that you had also been sick, I hope your recovery is complete.

... Thanks for the letter to my brother and sister. ... The letter was very good, and I know it will touch my sister and more than likely have great influence on my brother James. I also signed another A.M.A. (against medical advice) letter to the hospital, as I am again a voluntary patient.\* The hospital or one of my family would have to file another commitment to hold me. I just don't believe they will. But everything is possible in the US now. They seem to want to hold me until after the election in November. What influence I have on it or how they consider it so important to keep me confined, is beyond my comprehension.

I will have to say, your letter will do the trick if anything does, and if they get it before the 12th of Sept., the week they are supposed to come.

Günther, I did not express myself very well in my letter regarding the publication of my articles. ... I wrote the article to the Members of the Diet and gave Reverend N. permission to publish it. I also told the *Tokyo Shimbum* that they could use it as the feature story if they wanted to. I sent the paper a copy of the article. If you want a copy of the other article, I will send it to you, so you can see that, whoever prints it, it can have no effect other than good. Are you talking about financial gain by the Japanese party that is not trusted or is it for some other reason, like for propaganda? If you can tell me who they are, I will try to be careful. Please let me know if it is the *Tokyo Shimbum* paper.

... I have written a Christian Minister in California to get up a

\* See Letter 68, last paragraph.

petition for Dr Pauling in California, to send it to the committee,\* and he is already doing it. I received a letter from him last week and he is doing all he can. I am really afraid for Dr Pauling. If the military can keep such men in constant strain, they make them worthless for other work. I have faith that Dr Pauling can stand the strain.

Günther, don't get sick on me, stay well and happy, we have much work to do. If you can edit a story from those two essays ... go ahead, if you think it will help in any way.

Your friend,  
Claude

## Letter 49

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 90,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
September 20th, 1960.

Dear Günther,

Received your book to-day and will treasure it along with my other valuables. I wish I could read it, but maybe soon I will be able to read the English version.†

I have some more bad news to tell you, I am numbed these days by the consistency of all bad news about my release. My sister and two brothers came and the two brothers let the doctor talk them out of signing me out,‡ and they put an application for an indefinite commitment on me. I will, of course, take it to court and will defend myself this time, as I found out that I have not been disbarred§ in the state of Texas, only in the state of Louisiana. Anyway I will fight the case by controlling the hearing with speeches, so the cross examination will be little and worthless. ... My family are against me, so you see I really have no one. If it does not work to get me out of the hearing, I will appeal to the

\* He refers to the Senate Internal Security Committee, in front of which Pauling had had to appear.

† There is no better proof of Eatherly's self-control than the fact that in the moment of his deepest disappointment, he opens his letter with a word of gratitude and not with one of complaint.

‡ This contradicts the notification. See Letter 20.

§ Eatherly had studied law, but as I don't know whether he already was admitted to the bar, the meaning is not quite clear.

district court, and they will have to have a jury, and I'm sure *they* won't be able to commit me. It may take a little time, but, Günther, I won't give up. I'll use every tactic in the law books and I know my law. I don't mean this in egotism. I mean I know the procedure, I specialized and defended many soldiers in the army. I never lost a case. I even beat a case for a negro soldier that I knew was guilty, but I was up against an inexperienced prosecution.\*

Günther, I wish we could get together soon after I am released, and do a lot of talking on what we can best do to help the world to win equality as well on how to beat this nuclear armament rap.† Günther, do you speak Japanese?

I intend to go to Japan as soon as I finish my autobiography and the movie is made by the Sane Nuclear Society. I intend to have Robert Ryan play my part, if I can get him, because he is an important member of the Hollywood group. I'm sure that we can raise the money so we can make the script as we want it. Audie Murphy‡ offered me \$250,000 for the screen rights. I turned him down and quoted your *Commandments* to him in some instances, and told him he was as phoney a hero as I was. I haven't heard from him since. He was making a documentary film for the government on nuclear weapons in Europe at that time. Rest assured, Günther, I won't sell us out. ...

Günther, tell me about your health. Do you need any money? We are friends and don't think that I am trying to buy your friendship. I just want to help if you need me. I have to close, hoping your wife is much better. Give her my kindest regards.

Your friend,  
Claude

## Letter 50

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

October 23rd, 1960.

Dear Claude,

This time I should write a whole book, for I owe you answers to

\* This proves how unusually unprejudiced Eatherly was.

† Nowhere is the discrepancy between Eatherly's 'philosophy' and the vocabulary at his disposal more striking than here.

‡ Considered to have been one of the greatest American heroes of World War II.

at least three of your letters, and only now, after the time of worry is behind me and my wife has safely returned, do I find the time and the calmness to sit down and to think over all your problems. Let me tell you first that I am full of respect for the patience with which you bear the postponements of your release and the seemingly total lack of understanding on the part of your family. I admire this patience all the more as it is not the patience of the indolent: besides your patience you possess a never tiring impatience to do the necessary things and to get over that situation in which you are prevented from doing the best you could do.

There is one point which has greatly surprised me, because I had not the slightest inkling about it: it is your having studied law and having been recognized as a lawyer. Maybe I am misunderstanding you, but when you stress that you have not been disbarred in Texas, I can't see any other meaning, but that you already had been admitted as lawyer and were disbarred only in Louisiana. I don't think that the Civil Liberties Union is aware of this fact. I feel you should tell them immediately.

X Incidentally, the man in New York, who is interested in bringing your case to a good conclusion, Roland Watts, seems to be a sincere and humane person, full of understanding for the uniqueness of your situation. I know this because, about ten days ago, my wife has seen him on your behalf, and she has the definite impression that this man is not a routine lawyer, but one passionately trying to attain the things which he considers to be right. He trusts the lawyer, whom you have seen two or three weeks ago, and he himself plans to go to Texas, though, unfortunately, only in the spring. I cannot judge from here whether and how the efforts of the American Civil Liberties Union are being combined with the efforts of the two lawyers whom you have asked to take care of the case. If my wife understood correctly Watts said (and this seems to be a very important point) it is legally impossible for a family to decide on an indefinite commitment. As you know your law, you should try to find out whether or not your family has been talked into signing something that legally does not exist, and therefore would prove invalid. If this should be the case, you would have a strong point in your favour. I cannot imagine that Watts, who, after all, is one of the lawyers of a huge organization, should be mistaken about such an important matter.

Now another point which matters even more: Watts asked me through my wife to urge you to apply for a 'temporary release' (a sort of 'probation') be it one day, one week, or one month, which would give you the chance of proving to those people on whom your destiny depends your ability to behave 'normally', and of showing that you don't give cause for distrust. Although I am not unaware of the difficulties, I think this is a marvellous idea. If I were in your place and if I were granted such a temporary release, I would behave in the following way: I would act as if eyes observed me where no optical genius would be able to discover any; I would, provided I had the necessary money, go to a nice resort spot with a good public library and would lead a rigorously regular and respectable life: a few hours writing, a few hours swimming or another sport, a few hours reading in the public library—in short: I would act with complete self control and temporarily, in the interest of our cause, not only abstain from those activities which are connected with it, but even from all discussions which could lead in this direction. Under no circumstances would I go to a place where family or friends would render discussions or the outbreak of arguments inevitable. I wouldn't touch any liquor, and, from man to man, I would avoid girls: in short: I would bore my unseen observers to tears. I know, Claude, that after the years behind you, this is a rather tall order. However, I think it would pay to try. Your whole life, your freedom to devote your life to your tasks, may depend on the good performance of this part. Before applying for such a temporary release, you have, of course, to ask and to examine yourself most scrupulously, whether you feel able to live up to its requirements. Even if those who hope that you will slip should be convinced that this behaviour is nothing but an act, they would have to admit that you are able to master yourself and are not prone to sudden excursions into what they consider abnormal or criminal.

How much I would like to be there in person (although I do not feel that I am a born policeman) just to facilitate this period. You know that this is not possible. We could, however, exchange letters as often as you wish, as a sort of substitute.

It goes without saying that you should take advantage of this 'vacation from Waco' in order to work on your planned autobiography. Maybe the never ceasing difficulties there have pre-

vented you so far from actually diving into this work. In connection with your plan, I wish to repeat a suggestion which, I think, I have expressed once before? When I compare your letters with your articles the gap is surprising. Your letters are far more lively, your formulations more succinct, your words more moving and more humorous—in short: they are *more* in every respect than your articles. Your personality becomes more transparent and more humane when you talk to somebody than when you write without any definite addressee. Therefore you should (at least first) consider describing your life in letter form, for instance as though you were writing to me, or to a Japanese victim. Your writing difficulties will disappear, for, after all, you are used to writing letters but not to writing a book.

A further point: you mention a picture to be made by SANE. Maybe I am wrong, but I fear that the SANE people have become rather cautious. For instance, it looks as though they have hardly helped Pauling. (Incidentally I doubt that he could be imprisoned immediately. There still exist various chances for appeal.) As I do not know Steve Allen, I can't give you any positive or negative advice. My wife, however, has seen one of the TV quiz programs in which he participated, she cannot visualize him in connection with a picture dealing with the problems of your life. On the other hand, he apparently has proven personal courage and has stuck out his neck when other people in Hollywood were creeping back into the last corners of their skin. As to Al. H. I don't know him. If you have the chance to see him, do it by all means; but this does not imply that you should consider starting from scratch with him. I still feel that the first rough version should be done by you alone because otherwise the style of the man who has had the routine of writing would triumph from the very first word on. After all, it should be *your* book. Once you have a text, you may, of course, ask a reliable craftsman, such as H., to go through it with you. But maybe this whole problem has lost its urgency, for you wrote about the possible collaboration with H. at a time when you still expected your release immediately after the elections. (Incidentally, the bond between your case and the outcome of the elections is simply beyond me.) Another point: you are mentioning many calls for help and assistance, and I am convinced that each of those causes is worthwhile. However, an energy divided into a

thousand tiny fragments is less efficient than an energy which gathers momentum for but one goal. A doctor who repairs the cars of all his neighbours out of pure goodheartedness may be too tired when called to perform an emergency operation.

Now after this three mile letter you will know at least that I have not forgotten you. If again the intermission between letters should become as long as it has been in the past weeks, you should always know that this never means anything against you. I am just drowned in many other duties (most of them more or less directly connected with our cause) and unable to fulfil all of them. But you are never forgotten,\* and often I think of the moment in which our paper-friendship becomes friendship in the flesh. Then we can show the world that no difference of age, country, background, experience, or religion plays a decisive role as long as two people are burning with the same fire.

Your old friend,  
Günther

P.S. I forgot to tell you that I wrote Pauling about your efforts to help him. I am convinced that he, who is as gentle as he is courageous, will be deeply touched.

## Letter 51

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

No date, arrived in Vienna November 1st, 1960.

Dear Günther,†

I am very sorry that I have not written you sooner, but I have

\* This letter of advice was written too late to still reach Eatherly. For he had fled from Waco four days prior to its dispatch. The fact that Eatherly was able to spend two months of freedom without the slightest incident proves not only that my advice was superfluous, but that his self-control is of a kind most unusual in insane people.

† This letter is most probably the only written proof for the fact that the date of Eatherly's flight was falsified in the news given to the world press. This official news stated that Eatherly had escaped from the hospital on November 22. For which reason Eatherly's absence was not published right away is unknown to me. And equally unknown the reason for the invention of another date, this all the more as the rectification of the misleading news through friends in the know had to be expected. The original of the letter contained names of persons, without whose help Eatherly wouldn't have succeeded in escaping. I leave it to the judgment of the reader to decide whether the fact that none of the doctors belonged to the helping crew speaks for or against them.

been trying to get out of the hospital legally with lawyers. That failed because the Air Force filed a commitment against me indefinitely, and then had the hospital to notify the court not to serve a summons on me so I could not take it to court.

Last Wednesday I talked with my doctor and he told me I was in the unfortunate position of being so well known and famous, that I must stop my writings against nuclear weapons and using my influence in foreign countries through US magazines. He said that he could do nothing to help me, that he and the hospital staff had to take orders from the Air Force and the State Dept. I asked him if they intended to keep me here, and he said yes.

So I made arrangements through friends to help me from the outside. I eloped from the hospital. ... So now I have to stay held up in a very nice apartment. ... I cannot leave because the Government has everyone on the look out for me. ...

Günther, I hope you don't think I am foolish for trying to escape that dam that was fronting me. ...

I have been very concerned with you and the condition of your wife.\* I hope you can let me know soon how everything is. ... Don't worry about me because I am being very well taken care of by my friends. I really didn't know I had so many until now. ...

I will work this out, Günther, so don't be worried. I have so many people who are working to protect me.

They passed over the contempt charges against Dr Pauling, but are still holding it over his head so he won't try anything else. Günther, this country is much like many other countries. It is nearly impossible to go against the military.

Senator Yarborough wrote me and assured me he would do everything he could to help me and Dr Pauling. He is a very sincere man and wants peace as much as any of us.

I'll close now hoping all is well with you and your wife.

Your friend,  
Claude

\* In this situation after the successful flight nothing would have been more 'normal' than to rejoice about the regained freedom. Not Eatherly. In three paragraphs he thinks of others: in one he gratefully mentions his helpers; in another he expresses his concern about the health of the addressee; and in a third one, he worries about Dr Pauling. This, indeed, is not normal. And it is this abnormality of Eatherly which should be accentuated.

**Letter 52***Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

November 2nd, 1960.

What a fantastic surprise, what a pity that it proved necessary, but it *was* necessary. Now for heavens sake to prevent the worst and to insure the final success of the step: 1. Don't write anyone except for the most urgent reason. 2. Have every letter mailed from another place. 3. Never write your return address. 4. Have the letters and envelopes written by your friends. 5. Don't believe that after awhile the situation will have calmed down, for it is possible that they know your whereabouts but postpone catching you because for a while they wish to find out about your connections. 6. Don't think that you can stay in the States for good, but don't rush preparations for a step which will require most minute and reliable preparations. 7. Keep me well informed. 8. Learn the rules by heart. 9. Throw this away.\*

Don't be surprised if wide publicity should be mobilized on your behalf. I, Günther, would be behind it, now you have become my full time job.

Of course, I am still where I always have been, the stamp doesn't prove a thing.

Once more: I implore you not to undertake any uncautious or whimsical step. It would be lifelong misery for you if we failed. I count on you, count on me.

Your friend as ever,  
more than ever.

**Letter 53***Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

November 2nd, 1960.

Dear Claude,†

About ten days ago I had written a rather long letter after a long pause which may have offended you. Since I haven't received

\* Originally ten rules. One had to be omitted, for its publication would harm a third party.

† Misleading letter to E.'s hospital address in order to make the staff believe that I was unaware of E.'s escape.

an answer, I just want to repeat that the worries about my wife's health and the necessity to prepare steps for an emergency prevented me from fulfilling my other duties. Meanwhile, as I already wrote, everything is fine again, again I am sitting at my desk ready to resume our correspondence.

Your friend,  
Günther

**Letter 54***Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

No address  
November 15th, 1960.

Dear Günther,

Thanks for your letter, sorry to have had to wait so long to answer it. I just haven't had an opportunity to get a letter mailed. ... I have a couple of friends whom I can trust and who are helping me. ... As you know, Günther, or probably suspect, an agency and the Air Force are very worried and are keenly interested in having me picked up and sacked away in the hospital.

I tried every way I could to convince the doctors and the people that I only had a sincere desire to do what I can, and what we both believe in, to bring about peace and equality. I suppose you know that such talk and writings are not popular in this country and they consider me a detriment to their aims and purposes. I am sorry that my country takes such a view, but I promise you that I will never stop raising my influence and name to stop the terrible ultimate goal that the military in this country are taking. Of course you know all this by the action they took against Dr Pauling.

I will wait here. Don't worry about me as I have some money and friends to help me if I need it. I promise I will be very cautious in any actions that I take.

I wish there were some way that I could get where we could meet and finish what we can toward our cause. If you have any suggestions let me know. ...

I will let you know if I make any change of address.

Whatever you consider helpful in our work, don't hesitate to use me if necessary.

I have a way to get this letter mailed away from my present place.

Thanks for your continued support of me.

Your friend,  
Claude

## Letter 55

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

November 28th, 1960.

Dear Friend,\*

What a relief to return from a trip and to find a letter from you. I was so afraid that you would be prevented from writing that I had almost given up hope to have good news from you. It is very wise on your part to stay put for quite awhile, but at some time, I think, it will become imperative to take a vacation in a southern climate, which would be more healthy for your condition. Of course, such a trip has to be prepared cautiously. Better to do it later and well equipped with a well prepared schedule than to do it in a rush. Of course I want terribly much to see you, but where? I don't see any way of financing a long trip. For many years I have wished to see Mexico, for this country is so extraordinarily interesting that I would suggest, you, too, have a look at it. Maybe during those vacations which you and I consider necessary. As to me, I would prefer ... as a meeting place ... as I would be able to raise the money for such a trip. As to the date, this is up to you to decide, it depends entirely on your condition, which I cannot judge from here. ...

Please do keep me well informed, for I am—this is not your fault—constantly worried that something will happen or already has happened to you. It would be for me the greatest joy imaginable if I would get a telegram or a letter from a vacation place where you would be out of reach for those who wish to bother you.

I was deeply touched, dear friend, that even in this situation you have been thinking of my wife's health. As a matter of fact, I am

\* The indirect language in this letter was, of course, intended. I had to avoid a text which would betray the identity of the addressee. It goes without saying that the letter was not addressed to Eatherly personally but to a third party.

dictating this letter to her. I am exploiting her as a typist although she belongs to the piano. She has beautifully recovered, and my worries can concentrate on you.

All my thoughts are with you,  
Your friend always

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

Telegram\*

YOU ARE NOT FORGOTTEN. WE ARE CELEBRATING HOLIDAYS IN SPIRIT TOGETHER WITH YOU.

GUENTHER

## Letter 56

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 10,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
December 21st, 1960.

Dear Günther,

About 20 days ago someone, possibly the government, put out a lot of publicity about me on television, radio, newspapers and magazines that I was missing. I immediately took action to leave the country as you suggested. I contacted the lawyer —— in Mexico to get me out. I met him in —— across the border and flew back to Dallas to arrange for money for the trip. On the way to see my father to arrange for a transfer of funds I was stopped by a policeman that said I had driven through a stop sign. I wasn't even driving† as L. had picked me up at the airport. I had been traced from the airport, possibly the car had been identified by my brother, as he probably knew that L. had come to Dallas to pick me up. Anyway the cop recognized me right away and took me into custody on the phoney charge. L. was released without even a ticket. The hospital had in the published reports said that

\* Cabled after reading in the papers of E.'s recapture.

† Incidentally the incorrect news according to which Eatherly had driven through a red light appeared in the world press.

I had been discharged and was not wanted.\* In reality the hospital filed a commitment on me the 20th of Oct., or the day after I escaped.

I can see now it will be even more difficult than I thought to get out, but you can rest assured I will do everything I can to gain a release so we can continue with our work. Do not feel discouraged for me, I certainly will not give up. Such incidents only make me more determined.

Feel assured that if you need any writing or can use me in any sense of the word, do so.

I have a way to get this out.

Let me know if you need anything from me.†

Your friend,

Claude

Happy holidays. Received your cable. Thanks.

## Letter 57

*Günther Anders to the President of the US*

January 13th, 1961.

Dear Mr President,

I am writing this letter, which simultaneously will be submitted to the international press, for the following reason: it is not impossible that, overburdened as you were with the tasks of the past months, you may have overlooked a certain case, more correctly, a moral scandal which you can't help inheriting upon taking over the reins of government; a moral scandal which threatens to go down in history as the Dreyfus Affair of the 20th century—no, perhaps as an even more fateful affair: for through the density of

\* The *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* wrote on December 5, 1960: 'VA officials said they have no authority to arrest Eatherly or to take him back to the hospital.'

† This question, whether I needed anything from him, closed Eatherly's correspondence with me. He was cautious enough not only to smuggle this letter out, but to hide it in a voluminous sham-letter, the text of which was utterly harmless and consisted of fragments of official American speeches. I answered him in a short reply which consisted of allusions to the name of the friend through whose help his letter had reached me. As it is impossible to divulge this name, it would be meaningless to publish this letter of allusions. Through this third person I know that my letter has reached its destination. But as it was too well camouflaged, Eatherly didn't understand it. Further attempts to maintain contact with Eatherly via this third person (Letter 58) seem to have remained unsuccessful.

communications to-day, those who cause or even just tolerate a moral scandal can lose their good name and their trustworthiness more rapidly and more thoroughly than France had lost her good name in the course of the Dreyfus Case: I am speaking of the Hiroshima Pilot Claude Eatherly who, as you naturally know, had given the 'go ahead' signal on both atomic missions.

Perhaps you will ask what gives me, a philosophical writer, living far away from Waco, Eatherly's 'home', and far from Hiroshima, his place of destiny, the right to judge this case. Answer: since for one and a half years now I have been in regular correspondence with Eatherly, I possess and am treasuring a collection of letters which conveys not only a complete but a respect-inspiring portrait of this man. Perhaps you will also inquire how I came to know him. Answer: personally not at all. Since, however, from 1945 on I have been trying to philosophically formulate the new moral postulates required by the fact of our atomic power—my publications on this subject are not entirely unknown—it goes without saying that I am interested in the 'lives, works and words' of those figures who, no matter whether guilty or innocent, stand as the founding fathers to the left and to the right of the portal leading into this new age—in short: one day a *Newsweek* article about Eatherly fell into my hands. And this article struck me as being so informative and so moving that I instantly sat down to write my first letter to him. This letter and Eatherly's answer have been published throughout the world; and this was the ground out of which a regular correspondence developed.

The acute reason for this letter to you is the AP news coming to-day from Waco, Texas, to the effect that Eatherly has been declared insane by the medical experts of the court.

To speak as plainly as possible: this verdict contradicts the facts. And I don't doubt for a moment that for you, too, Mr President, after even a casual look at the enclosed Eatherly quotations this verdict will sound strange. Of course, this man can be classified as abnormal as long as we define 'normal behaviour' as 'average behaviour', not as a behaviour corresponding to norm; and to this, of course and unfortunately, we are always tempted in this Age of Conformism. In such a case, it is true, we have to consider the uncompromising and never ceasing alertness of



conscience, which we find in Eatherly, as something abnormal. Then, however (to mention men belonging to a totally different spiritual level), we also would have to move the works of Augustine and Kierkegaard from the library shelves 'Moral Theology' or 'Moral Philosophy' to the shelf 'Psychiatric Documents'.

Now, one could object that Eatherly, through his odd behaviour (his repeated sham hold-ups etc.), has actually proven his abnormality in the medical sense. The acts as such, of course, cannot be disputed, but in the light of interpretation they assume another sense, they assume sense.

Every reasonable medical man knows: it is abnormal to act normally during or after an abnormal situation; it is abnormal if, after an appalling shock, someone goes on living as if nothing had happened. And even more so if a man, although the cause of the shock he underwent transcends all proportion and all 'holding capacity' of that which a human being can visualize, digest, remember or repent, nonetheless continues behaving 'normally'—and such is the case in question: for Eatherly has left the ashes of hundreds of thousands of people and of a city, which one second before had been vibrant with life, behind him. If he reacted 'abnormally', he reacted adequately. For cases of inadequately weak reactions the academic psychology has even introduced a special *terminus technicus* 'Seelenblindheit' (soul blindness)—and a classical illustration of such 'soul blindness' is, for instance, the well-known, though ill-reputed reply of your pre-predecessor Truman who, asked on the occasion of his 75th birthday whether any incident in his long life had caused him any pain or regret, answered: yes, he deeply regretted not to have married earlier. Hiroshima didn't come to his mind; apparently this event was too big to enter such a small mind. Or, in the words of Lessing: 'He who doesn't lose his mind over certain things, has none to lose.'

Furthermore: to isolate 'criminal actions' (as those strange hold-ups of Eatherly) instead of understanding them as reactions, is unscientific and not worthy of the medical profession. This is hardly better than as if, witnessing a man clubbed to death, we would confine ourselves to registering the unusual loudness of his screaming and, leaving out the enormity of what is being done to him, would consider his shrieks as a symptom of his abnormality. Unfortunately much speaks for the probability that the doctors

have isolated Eatherly's reactions in such a way, that they skimmed them off from the actions to which they were reactions. For the doctors have (*Newsweek* of May 25, 1959) spoken of a 'guilt complex', thereby trying to talk those familiar only with the fashion words of science into believing that the guilt feeling in question was unjustified, unreasonable, thus classifiable only as 'pathological'. No, in painful vulgarisation of a psychoanalytical school *terminus*, they even dared to speak in his case of an 'Oedipus Complex'—as though an incest desire lay at the root of his behaviour and not the never to be forgotten picture of thousands of corpses. May I betray *en marge* that such silly and undignified exploitation of the scientific vocabulary—committed in order to ornament half-truths with the dignity of science—has also for years now undermined the reputation of the United States, at least in the eyes of educated circles all over the world.

If Eatherly transgressed the law, he did it for a most plausible reason:

While he was desperately trying to digest the effect of the action, in which he had been used as one of the thousands of fool-proof parts of the apparatus; while he was tortured by the frustration of these efforts, and while, through his frustration, he was gradually gaining the insight that the thing which had happened transcended the power of responsibility of every man; while he began drawing the conclusion that every man, in order to prevent repetitions, was obliged to at least try to visualize the enormity of the event and the horrifying mechanical smoothness with which it was possible to unleash this enormous event; while slowly the decision matured in his mind to devote his life to doing his share in this work of salvation—while all this took place within Eatherly, he was celebrated as a national hero, and there was no magazine without its patriotic 'must': without the slick portrait of the dashing boy from Texas. This glamour and glory was just too much for him. And it is not difficult to deduce his so-called 'criminal acts' from this painful discrepancy between guilt and glamour. As his participation in the Hiroshima Mission was not recognized as a crime, he had to devise other methods in order to enforce the penalty to which he felt entitled. There exists something like the 'Right to Punishment'—Hegel has coined this expression—and if there is a criterion which defines the non-criminal, it is the fact

that he insists upon this right. This is just what Eatherly has done: through his sham criminal actions he has tried to enforce that punishment which was not granted him.

Of course, it is no coincidence that he was not granted this punishment and that his ever repeated attempts (which never could succeed, since no repentance can possibly master such an event) were represented to the public as utterly unjustified. For once an act of remorse is recognized as justified, it is implicitly recognized as proof of a consummated crime. In other words: Eatherly's remorse would have been an indictment, an indictment against the Hiroshima Mission and against its actual perpetrators who, in their fathomless lack of fantasy, had even believed to be able to shoulder the responsibility for the deed. Or, to repeat it in the words of my 'schizophrenic' friend: 'The truth is that society simply cannot accept the fact of my guilt without at the same time recognizing its own far deeper guilt.' Upon reading this sentence one can only exclaim: 'Happy the times in which the insane speak out this way, wretched the times in which only the insane speak out this way.'

Perhaps a reader of this letter might shake his head and ask: 'But why he? Why should he repent, he who did nothing but give the 'go ahead' signal, he who learned about the atomic projects only after his deed, he who had only followed orders and had only been used?'

Well, Mr President, I would not accept this objection from anyone. I won't speak about the, to put it mildly, ambiguity of making a man perform an act, the effect of which he is not allowed to know. I confine myself to speaking about the 'not knowing' as an excuse for a crime. I am a Jew, I lost my friends in Hitler's gas chambers. With this 'excuse': 'Why I only followed orders' the extermination employees have tried to whitewash themselves; these words resemble in too macabre a way those words of Eichmann which to-day circulate through the world press, the words: 'In actual fact I was merely a little cog in the machinery that carried out the directives and orders of the German Reich. I am neither a murderer nor a mass-murderer.' (*Life*, January 1961).

No, Eatherly is precisely not the twin of Eichmann, but his great and hope-inspiring antipode. Not the man who passes off machinery as a pretext for renouncing conscience, but, on the contrary,

the man who recognizes machinery as the fatal danger to conscience. He thereby hits the very center of the heart of the moral problem of to-day, he thereby gives us the decisive warning signal of to-day. For if we point to the apparatus into which we are incorporated as nothing but ignorant 'cogs', and if we accept the alleged excuse: 'We were not acting but merely co-acting' as being justified under all circumstances, then we abolish the freedom of moral decision and the freedom of conscience; then we even degrade the word 'free', and make the expression 'free world' into an empty and hypocritical protestation. I am afraid, we are already very close to it.

The greatness of Eatherly's behaviour consists precisely in the courage and the consequence with which he turns this argument upside down. What his behaviour says is: morally speaking there is no such a thing as mere 'co-acting'. Whatever we are doing, promoting or provoking by allegedly merely 'co-acting', is being done by us. We have to answer not only for our own individual acts, but also for the team acts in which we just participate or are made to participate. The question of our conscience is not only: 'How should we act?', but also: 'Where and how far may we or may we not, ought we or ought we not "co-act"?' No, Eatherly feels even more responsible for his participations than for his individual and private acts, since the effects of private acts, compared with the catastrophic consequences of the acts in which we only participate, have become utterly insignificant. To be blameless in private life is child's play, custom replaces conscience to a great extent. It is, on the contrary, in front of the sweet terror of the powers that make us conform and co-function where real independence and real civil courage are required. If this attitude (and this is Eatherly's position in front of the atomic stockpiling policy of your country) consists of courageous refusal, then the devil's circle of mere co-acting is perforated, and acting re-assumes the form of an individual act, of a free act in the classical sense of the world.

Time and again Eatherly has been called a hero. If he is one, it is not because after his notorious flight he left no more Hiroshima behind him, but because after his notorious treatment he dares to cry: 'No more Hiroshima!'

Ordinarily the apparatus divests everybody—not even excluding

those who seem to decide upon its use—of responsibility; so much so that finally there is no one left to answer for its doings, and far and near there is nothing to be seen but the charred land of the miserable and the radiantly good conscience of the stupid. By taking upon himself the guilt for the act of which he had only been a part, Eatherly is doing exactly the opposite: for his is the attempt to keep conscience alive in the Age of the Apparatus. And as conscience, by its very nature, is criticism; and criticism, by its very nature, non-conformistic, he is being told: 'Conscience off limits'.

And this I don't mean only metaphorically. The information which I had the occasion of getting from Waco seems to leave no shadow of a doubt: it looks as if the Air Force exerted pressure on the hospital staff of the Veterans' Administration Hospital in order to keep Eatherly interned indefinitely. Unfortunately I am not acquainted with American law. Therefore I don't know the paragraphs upon which the Air Force can base its power of decision over a civilian (for Eatherly resigned his commission in 1947); nor have I heard of the rules which entitled it to have, for instance, court hearings postponed via the Hospital Staff; nor of the rules by which a citizen officially designated as a 'voluntary patient' can be kept interned against his will, can even be rearrested after his voluntary departure from his place of internment. As I said, all of these no doubt perfectly correct measures surpass my modest knowledge of Federal Law and of the State Law of Texas; and I am afraid I would impose upon you by familiarizing you with the complete extent of my ignorance.

I assume it will be evident to you, Mr President, from the tone of these lines that nothing lies further from my mind than to cry for pardon for Eatherly. Not only the act of pardoning, but already the plea for pardoning would automatically imply that the one to whom the pardon is to be granted is in the wrong. Now, however, the fact that Eatherly keeps his conscience alive and that he possesses the courage to feel guilty and stained by a crime mobilized and perpetrated by others, can by no means be classified as a 'crime'. What is due to him is respect and gratitude. And it is not only regrettable, but, I feel, for proud Americans it could be a cause of profound shame that at home he is considered a burden and a blemish—while respect is extended to him precisely

there where hatred would be understandable: in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. For there he is honoured with respect, even with love. This I know not only from the victims themselves—for some of them spoke to me about the lives and afflictions of the crews, and in their eyes he was one of the Hiroshima victims—but also from the manifestations of their love which Eatherly has received and which he has forwarded to me: 'This letter,' wrote a group of thirty atom sick girls from Hiroshima on July 24, 1959, 'comes to you to convey our sincere sympathy with you and to assure you that we now do not harbour any sense of emnity to you personally ... you are also a victim like us.'

These words, I feel, can strike every 'born equal' mute for a few seconds, for they belong to those few documents of humaneness which entitle us to be proud of being human beings amongst humans.

No, Mr President, it is not pardon or mercy for which I am pleading, but to consider two possible steps which may prove apt to rectify the Dreyfus situation.

1. Wouldn't it be worth considering to have Eatherly's mental state examined once more by a commission of psychiatrists and to make his further life depend on the decision of this 'commission'? It seems to me that such a group could be composed in a way analogous to certain special commissions of the United Nations. I can see before my eyes a small international board consisting of recognized experts from various countries, for instance of a Swede, a doctor from India, a Pole and a Japanese. If you would grant such a request, I am sure you would greatly enhance the moral reputation of the United States. Furthermore, such a step, made at the beginning of your presidency, would be interpreted as an anticipated *Leitmotiv* of your principles and could promote the greatest trust in the further steps to be expected in the Kennedy Era.

2. I could imagine—for you are generally praised as a modern, informal, unbiased and totally unprejudiced man—that one day you could sit down together with Eatherly. Not only as *primus inter pares*, but as a brother with his brother. For the awe-inspiring burden of responsibility which now falls on your shoulders and which now, through the atomic development, has grown to become an almost omnipotent responsibility for the 'To be or not to be' of mankind—this burden, which now lies ahead of you

is not so different from that burden which Eatherly has carried on his shoulders for years, and which he was scrupulous enough not to forget for one moment through these past fifteen years. And even if the man Eatherly who would face you would be a mere nobody (which isn't the case)—the mere fact that he was sentenced to unknowingly and unwillingly committing such an act and that he has been dragging along the burden of this deed would make him into a tragic figure, into a symbol of to-day, into a man who is your equal, and not only because he was born equal.\*

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

### Letter 58†

Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly

February 10th, 1961.

Destroy this letter after reading it.

Dear Claude,

I would have written you sooner if I had been sure that my letter would reach you; I also had hoped that some news from you would reach me—now, however, after weeks of waiting, I have made up my mind to take the risk of writing into nothingness.

It may please you to hear that meanwhile I have succeeded in learning details about the court hearing, from someone (unknown to you) who was present. This letter writer went to the hearing knowing hardly anything about you and without any prejudices. Nor does he belong to our 'movement'. His words have filled me with pride for you (if we are allowed to be proud of someone else), for he writes that you were of extraordinary presence of mind (even the brightest among those present, doctors and judges included); that you didn't lose your humour and wittiness and that finally you disappointed those who felt entitled to judge your condition, by keeping full control of yourself and by not showing your disappointment in the least. Let me tell you that I smiled while reading about your smiling, but my smile was full of respect for you. Furthermore, the report contained an interesting remark

\* In the original letter to President Kennedy a collection of excerpts from Eatherly's letters was appended.

† Was sent via a third person living in the US. Since, however, this letter has never been confirmed, we can only assume that it has fallen into other hands.

about the jury members: they expressed their uneasiness, because they had felt unable to identify you with that insane person with whom, according to the doctors, they were confronted; and they explained, rather excused and justified, their final decision with the words: 'after all, are we the experts, the doctors must know, and how could we dare to contradict their competent judgement? (This, of course, amounts to a distortion of the true essence of trial by jury, for if the respect for experts is mobilized in order to intimidate the members of the jury and to make them unwilling and incapable to trust their own eyes and to formulate their own impressions, then this democratic institution is transformed into a mere comedy.) The nurses, too, spoke in your favour: when asked about their impression, they answered without exception that they had never seen you behaving abnormally. My conclusion: you did behave abnormally, Claude, *abnormally well*, and with *abnormal sovereignty*.

One remark in this letter has, however, horrified me. According to it, you are assigned not to your old room but to a section of the hospital which is reserved for the unequivocally insane, even violent patients, and that through belonging to this part of the institution, you are excluded from the most normal, but absolutely indispensable contact with normal people. It is hard not to suspect those who pigeon-holed you away in this special ward are harbouring the hope to drive you mad in order to punish you for your not being mad, and in order to make their lie true: in order to be able to brag afterwards: 'You see, we were right all along.'

But I am convinced that you will behave in your cell, or room or whatever it might be, the way Daniel did (Daniel 6),<sup>†</sup> and that those who 'laid the stone upon the mouth of the den' will be sleepless during the night as King Darius was, and that they will come in the morning to find you untouched and will free you and 'no manner of hurt' will be found upon you. The last chapter of the story, however, would have to be changed, for those who persecuted you should not be thrown into the lion's den, but they should be taught the real motives of your doings and the real causes of your destiny, and that ultimately you have been acting also for them.

You may have heard that during the weeks in which I was silent, I have tried to help you in an indirect way; that I have

written to President Kennedy about your case.\* Copies of this 'Open Letter' have been sent to papers, leading personalities and magazines throughout the world; its publication has already set in, and I am confident that through its global circulation, it will at last reach Kennedy, although the original letter, dispatched to the White House directly, most certainly has landed in the waste paper basket of a secretary's secretary. Psychiatrists in some countries are already discussing my suggestion behind the scene, and a friend of mine, one of the most reputed reporters in the world, is helping me (rather you) by writing about your case in leading foreign papers. You see again, Claude, whatever happens to you, you are not the 'forgotten man', and although your disappointment must be sharp, the probability that the authorities will maintain the courage of hiding you away indefinitely will shrink from day to day.

There is another step about which I have to inform you: after having read my first letter to you and yours to me, a great and highly esteemed publishing house had approached me, and they would like to incorporate our correspondence into their program. At first I was hesitant; I was afraid of harming you. Now, however, after your classification 'insane', I think it is simply imperative to present you through documents which authentically prove your mental soundness, your integrity, your courage, your altruism and your attempt to live up to your extraordinary situation. Our correspondence now has been copied in its entirety, in a few days I hope to find the time to read it in one sitting in order to gain an impression of the whole. It goes without saying that those passages which you asked me to treat with absolute discretion will be deleted. You authorized me several times to use your texts however I would consider their publication fruitful for our cause. Since at those times you could not have foreseen such a possibility, I am herewith repeating my request for authorization. Under no circumstances do I wish to undertake a step which afterwards could meet with your disapproval. So far I have not seen the publisher himself, the text has not been translated into German as yet, no contract has been discussed. Therefore it would be premature to speak about the business arrangements. Fifty fifty would be natural.

\* Here follows a recapitulation of the content of Letter 57, known to the reader.

Gradually the mailman becomes a hated figure, because he delivers mail only from other people.

Your friend,  
Günther\*

## Letter 59

*Günther Anders to Mr Ray Bell  
of Waco News Tribune*

January 28th, 1961.

Dear Mr Bell,

You may have a hazy idea of my identity, for, having participated in Eatherly's court hearing, you may have heard my name, although rumors coming from the US seem to indicate that the public hasn't quite understood the role which I may play for Bob Eatherly.†

Simultaneously you will receive a copy of an open letter which I have written to President Kennedy about the psychological and philosophical implications of this case, and as proof for the indubitable renormalization of Eatherly (if the integrity, self control, and altruism demonstrated by the excerpts from his letters can be called 'normal', they are far more than normal) I have added fragments of his correspondence to me. As I have sent this letter to President Kennedy, respectively copies of it, to papers and magazines in many countries, it soon will appear everywhere. As I have reason to presume that you are particularly interested in the case, and as it might be good for the judges, doctors and jury members to become familiar with the two texts, I am sending them to you, authorizing you to publish them in your paper.

Of course my authorization for publication is not limited to the *Waco News Tribune*. In case you should have contacts with other papers (for instance in Dallas) or you should write a syndicated column, you may make use of it. Fairness should oblige every

\* Since this letter remained unanswered, this authorization has not been given. However, Eatherly had repeatedly given me *carte blanche* and asked me to make use of his words at my own discretion. For instance in Letter 54: 'Whatever you consider helpful in our work, don't hesitate to use me if necessary! Or in Letter 56: 'Feel assured that if you need any writing or can use me in any sense of the word, do so.'

† Eatherly's nickname.

reporter to stress the point that the two months which Bob Eatherly has spent outside Waco have passed without the slightest incident. Unfortunately the news which was published not only in the States but in Europe too, to the effect that Eatherly was arrested when violating a traffic law seem to violate the unwritten laws of truth traffic; at least other rumors about the arrest have come to my ears. I believe it would be worth while to re-examine this version.

Hoping to hear from you in the not too distant future, I am

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

#### Letter 60 (shortened)

*Günther Anders to Mr Roland Watts  
of the American Civil Liberties Union*

February 17th, 1961.

Dear Mr Watts,

... We are trying everything to prevent Eatherly from becoming the 'forgotten man'. This danger seems to me to be acute, for *France Soir's* correspondent (asked by his paper to inquire about the case) was told by the Director of Public Relations of the Waco Veterans' Administration Hospital just to forget about the case and let the men forget their pasts.

This answer testifies in the most horrifying way how right I was when formulating (already years ago) that Eatherly is being begrudged the possession of his experiences and that the doctors hope to produce a state of mind robbed of experience and memory, as though one can restore a man's mental health by annihilating his memory of annihilation. I have grown up in the surroundings of scientific psychology. Coming from such a background, I am simply blushing with shame upon hearing about the methods and aims of the Waco psychiatrists.

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

#### Letter 61

*Mr Ray Bell of the Waco News Tribune to Günther Anders*

March 1st, 1961.

Dear Mr Anders,

I can't tell you how honored and flattered I was to receive your letter and the copy of the letter sent to President Kennedy. Unfortunately, the Kennedy letter can not be used in our paper (we are extremely limited on space and the editors are reluctant to print anything of that length) but it has been forwarded to two American periodicals which possibly may use it in the near future.

Also, even more important, is the fact that the copies of your letter are available here for the presentation by Bob Eatherly's attorney at the time the appeal is made. I think their weight certainly should have considerable impact upon a jury.

As you may or may not know, Eatherly's attorney, Mr Tom Moore, hopes to appeal the verdict in the near future. Actually, he possibly would have done this already if it were not for two rather unusual situations which have arisen since the original hearing: 1. the unusual number of criminal cases which have involved patients from the Veterans' Hospital occurring since the Jan. 12 hearing, and 2. the possibility that another adverse ruling from a jury might affect the long-range outlook, i.e., that any other jury, hearing the case at a future date, might be too easily swayed by the past verdicts.

Also, as you may have learned, I have been working in close co-operation with Mr Moore. Quite frankly, I was most surprised at the jury's verdict Jan. 12th and more than a little moved by the sheer stupidity it reflected. There were a number of claims, I feel, that can at least be questioned. And it does seem rather absurd for any man, psychiatrist or not, to state that he can tell a man's mental condition merely by shaking his hand.

This particular case has aroused my interest and my ire. I would like to see justice done, and I hope with all my heart that I can in some small way work toward that end. I think it can be done, but in order to do so Eatherly's attorney must be armed with a wealth of valid, unquestioned material.

Since the hearing, I have talked to each of the six jurors who ruled upon the case. For the most part, I think they are honest,

sincere persons who, although for the most part not well educated, had just enough belief, just enough feeling to follow the psychiatrists blindly, to accept their testimony at face value. Also, I feel it is indeed unfortunate that these jurors could not comprehend a man of Eatherly's make-up and upbringing.\* I guess it is hard for any of us to accept those things and those ideas with which we have no experience.

Again, let me emphasize that I do not feel that this was a crooked or hand-picked jury; rather, I would say, it was an uninformed jury. Had they had the facts—for instance, at one point it might have been a different story if the jury could have been presented documentary evidence that Eatherly could and has written for publication—I believe with all my heart the ruling would have been different. I know that I could not have ruled against him.

I hope that I may impose upon you to fill me in on your association with Bob. I can assure you that any information you might care to send certainly would be used in his defense and, in my humble opinion, I feel it would be of great advantage to him.

Certainly I hope to write about this, both in our newspaper and in any magazine or publication that will accept it. However, it is most difficult to do anything at present. Most of the American publications balk, either at the insanity angle or that of the pacifist. I think this is due greatly to their lack of understanding—and lack of proof. I understand you have collaborated with Bob on some articles, a book,† too, I believe; and if there is any way of sending copies of that material, I think it would be advantageous both to myself, Bob and his attorney.

Frankly, I feel this is one of the most significant stories of our generation, and, who knows, perhaps of all generations. The impact, the implications, could be tremendous.

I just pray that in some way, no matter how small, I can have at least a minor role in it.

Sincerely,

Ray Bell,

*Waco News Tribune*

\* To what Ray Bell is referring here, is unknown to me.

† Two things have probably contributed to this misunderstanding: 1. The fact that my first letter to E. and his reply have always been published together; and 2. The fact that Eatherly and I had discussed the possibility of collaborating on his biography.

## Letter 62

*Günther Anders to Mr Ray Bell*

March 8th, 1961.

Dear Ray Bell,

Nonsense, you shouldn't feel 'honoured' or 'flattered' by my letter, but just happy to know that people, no matter where, just because they are humans, are burning with the same holy indignation—at least this was my reaction when I read your letter. And it filled me with courage to see that team work is not in need of neighbourhood and that people, although thousands of miles away from each other, morally speaking, live just around the corner.

Before dealing with the various points and questions of your letter, a few facts which may interest you and Mr Moore:

1. In an article which Lord Russell just sent me he refers to Claude's letters to me and goes so far as to say that if the one who wrote them is considered mad, then 'I shall not be surprised if my last years are spent in a lunatic asylum—where I shall enjoy the company of all who are capable of feelings of humanity'.\*

2. Illustrated articles (in several instalments) about Claude and his correspondence with me have appeared in big French and Italian papers and magazines (for instance in *France Soir* and *Europaeo*).

You see: the case lies naked before the eyes of the world and—I don't think to exaggerate—the thousands in Europe and Asia who are informed about Claude's fate are now waiting impatiently for a just disentanglement of this ill-managed affair. Moreover, to a certain degree, the prestige of the US abroad may be influenced by the outcome of this story. I feel this is one of the major points which Mr Moore could consider impressing upon the members of the jury. They should be made aware of the fact that they have to fulfil two tasks: (a) to conscientiously weigh the fate of the man standing in front of them, this man made guiltlessly guilty; (b) to live up to the ideals of the US, the reputation of which they could seriously impair by yielding to voices of 'hidden persuaders' whispering into their ears in order to promote certain political or military interests.

\* *New Statesman*, London, February 17, 1961.

3. Since Dec. 22, 1960 I have not heard from Claude. Such a long pause between letters has never occurred before. This fact seems to corroborate your first report according to which Eatherly, relegated to Ward 10, is now hermetically shielded from the outer world. I am afraid that the separation now even excludes the writing or receiving of letters. I don't say that I suspect the authorities of intentionally manufacturing an insane Claude; but—and this again seems to me to be a major point for Mr Moore—it is not impossible, but even likely, that such a treatment will eventually result in producing an abnormal mental and emotional condition. This danger seems to me all the more threatening as Claude has had no normal social and other life for years and thus lacks in resources to draw on in such an exacting situation. Seen from this angle it is all the more admirable that Claude has spent the two months outside of the institution in perfect peace, without any incident, thereby showing beyond doubt that he has himself under fullest control. This is the third point which may prove useful for Mr Moore.

Your request for material: you will certainly understand that I cannot send you the whole bulk of the correspondence between Cl. and myself—and this all the less as it will be published in the not too distant future by a very great firm. This, of course, does not mean that the material is closed to you, after all the chance to help Claude directly comes first. In case you or Mr Moore should ask specific questions, I would try to find out whether in Claude's letters passages can be discovered which would represent answers. In such cases, I would even send photostatic facsimilia. It goes without saying that this book, once it is out, will increase the interest in Claude's case even more than it already is, particularly because Robert Jungk, the well-known reporter, will write the foreword and edit the volume. If anyone should be surprised by this extraordinary interest which the publishers show in the correspondence—the explanation is easy: my first letter to Claude and his reply have been published time and again in I don't know how many countries. When publishers read Claude's remarkable answer and learned that this correspondence continued, they began to become eager.

Many of the details you reported, particularly about the jury and about the extraordinary situation in the V.A. Hospital since

the Jan. 12 hearing were new to me and are most important. I am very grateful for being kept so well posted. Please continue doing so. When you mentioned 'the unusual number of criminal cases which have involved patients from the V.A. Hospital occurring since the Jan. 12 hearing', did you refer to a chronological coincidence or to a causal link between the hearing and the behaviour of the inmates (which I would not understand)?

And now to close, I wish to tell you how happy I am to see that you belong to the unhappy few who have realized that in the case of Claude our whole moral situation is on trial. As a matter of fact, it may be fortunate that we have something in hand which, like a miniature model, contains and shows the moral issues of to-day. By working for this one man, we are doing far more than working for one. And how frightful the implications of this case may be, it may be consoling to know that we are investing our energies into the case of to-day.

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

**Letter 63** (shortened)

*Günther Anders to Dr Walter F. Ford*

Director, Professional Services, V.A. Hospital, Waco, Texas

April 18th, 1961.

Dear Dr Ford,

I had the pleasure of seeing a letter which you have written to a friend of mine. In one of its sentences referring to my 'Open Letter to President Kennedy', you made the following diagnosis: 'We cannot hope to change individuals with a Dreyfus complex, especially if they are hundreds of miles away.'

Why 'complex'?

Socrates felt he had to teach truth to the youth? Far from it. Nothing but an education complex.

Hegel searched for a universal principle of history? Far from it. Nothing but a system complex.

Doctors try to heal sick people? Far from it. Nothing but a health complex.

People are hungry? Far from it. Nothing but a bread complex.

Eatherly tries to repent Hiroshima? Far from it. Nothing but a guilt complex.



Anders tries to help him? Far from it. Nothing but a Dreyfus complex.

A recommendable method indeed, this 'nothing but a complex'. For what you are achieving by applying it is:

1. You are suppressing the complexity of the issues at stake.
2. You are making other people believe that the goals for which the victims of your diagnosis are striving have no justification whatsoever.

3. You are making those striving for the goals ridiculous.

Sincerely Yours,

Günther Anders

## Letter 64

*Günther Anders to Mr Robert Kennedy*  
Attorney General, Washington D.C.

May 7th, 1961.

Sir,

A Danish journal, in which my 'Open Letter to President Kennedy' had appeared a few weeks ago, has asked me to comment on the answer which you have sent to Professor Johannes Knudsen on March 31 after having read my 'Open Letter'.

You may remember that your reply consisted almost exclusively of a quotation, that you conveyed the information about Mr Eatherly which, at your request, you had received from the Veterans' Administration.

1. This information opens with the words: 'Mr Eatherly has been a voluntary patient at our Waco Hospital from time to time over the past several years.' May I express my gratitude for this sentence, for it confirms that, as I had stated, the re-arrest and re-internment of Mr Eatherly, after his voluntary flight from the hospital, must have violated his status 'voluntary'.

2. Eatherly (the conveyed information continues) had 'advised the hospital authorities that he expected to leave the hospital; his family was notified of this intention and his brother James ... filed a complaint seeking his commitment to the hospital.' This serves perfectly as an additional corroboration for my statement that the term 'voluntary patient' amounted and amounts to a mere word.

3. The report deals furthermore with the hearing on January

12, 1961. 'The jury ... found Mr Eatherly in need of mental treatment and recommended that he should be committed to the V.A. Hospital.' This decision contradicts in a most peculiar way:

- (a) the fact mentioned in the following sentence: that 'the jury ... found him to be competent to handle his personal funds'—which represents, and in your country certainly no less than in other countries, the admission of a rather highly appreciated competency; and

- (b) a lengthy report which I received from an eyewitness of the court hearing (follows report, see Letter 58).

As to the presentation of facts given by the hospital, it is not in the most satisfactory agreement with the more detailed statements which I have received from Mr Eatherly. I have never had any reason to distrust Mr Eatherly's words, while I feel entitled to hesitate in front of the report issued by the Veterans' Administration, because this institution, as you probably know too, has occasionally lacked in the highest respect for truth—to mention but one instance: it changed the day of Mr Eatherly's escape (November 22 instead of October 19) and handed over this fictitious date to the world press.

In connection with 1, I take the liberty of drawing your attention to a statement made by the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* on December 5, 1960; 'VA officials said they have no authority to arrest Eatherly or take him back to the hospital.' Why other authorities were entitled to arrest a man who had entered the hospital voluntarily, left the hospital voluntarily, and has not committed any crime during his intermezzo of freedom—this surpasses my power of thinking which is ordinarily used only for the, of course, far easier, scholarly work. Incidentally, it seems unlikely to me that the fact that Eatherly (who was arrested allegedly on account of a traffic violation) wasn't even sitting at the wheel, should actually be known only in Europe. In other words: I feel unable to see how the meaning which is forced here upon the word 'voluntary' could be brought into agreement with the generally recognized meaning of the word. And I am still convinced that the clean settling of this case would not necessarily harm the prestige of the United States.

Sincerely Yours,

Günther Anders

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

May 16th, 1961.

Dear Claude,

I haven't too much hope that this letter will find you. For almost five months now no sign of life from you has arrived here, so I must assume that during this period you haven't heard from me either. Perhaps in the soundless world which is surrounding you now, you may have been haunted by doubts; maybe you fear that I have become fed up with hoping and that I have written you off. The step which I have taken since you have been out of reach has probably remained unknown to you. Believe me, Claude, your fears would be totally unjustified. On the contrary: the longer my attempts to reach you remain frustrated, and the longer I don't hear from you, the more your fate strikes me as an unheard of scandal. Your voicelessness rings louder in my ears than your voice had ever done, and to turn away from this thundering silence would be too much for me.

Here the step which I have taken: I have presented your case in a letter, and in order to give my account the greatest possible urgency, I have made it an 'Open Letter to President Kennedy'. This text has appeared in many countries. That I haven't received any answer from President Kennedy personally, but only a confirmation of receipt from a secretary's secretary, is not so important. More important that already to-day this letter has produced a new situation (in your country too: for, mimeographed by Harvard professors, this letter is now circulating in the United States). This means that although physically under lock and key, you are now present in the thoughts and feelings of more people, and you are surrounded by more friends than ever before, even by more than in that glamour period in which you were celebrated as a 'Victory Boy' in the press of your country. The walls which enclose you and separate you from the outer world have now become sham-walls; and there is no doctor, no Air Force, and no intimidated relative who could do anything against this fact. True, you can't see any of your friends, but no less true that the eyes of all of your friends are turned towards you. In this sense one could say that you are not shut in. If anyone *is* shut in (or, more cor-

rectly: shut out—from the sympathies of our fellow men) then it is those who, because you have conscience enough to insist upon knowing what you know, call you a sick man and keep you hidden away. Granted, these men may feel pity for you. But this pity doesn't deserve our respect, for it is nothing but a variant of fear, and ultimately it amounts to fear of the truth.

The fact that I am thinking of you so intensely, and that I am trying once again to reach your ear just in these days, is no coincidence. For we are living in a period which for all people who like you, have not become indifferent yet, is branded by the name *Eichmann*. As you know, he was the man who, in the Forties, organized the extermination of millions—of Jews, Poles, Gypsies, and who, as a 'bureaucrat of annihilation' meticulously fulfilled his duties. Perhaps you, too, have seen reports about him. In that case, you will also have read that he 'honestly' declared to have been 'nothing but a tool', 'nothing but a tiny cog in the machine of the terror', and only to have been 'loyal to the oath' which he had sworn to Hitler—in short: 'not to be guilty in the sense in which he is accused'. As little as we can visualize *Eichmann's* activity, as little can we understand how he was able to live the 15 years prior to his capture without mentioning his guilt, without trying to clarify it to himself, without even suffering too much from it. And this although the position which he held was not as subordinate as he wishes us to believe. At least the fact that he participated in those conferences in which the organizers of terror discussed the extermination, and, nipping their cognacs, weighed the most expedient and convenient measures to take, sharply contradicts the smallness of his bureaucratic function to which he attaches such great value in order to make his guilt and his punishment as small as possible. Just as little is he entitled to excuse himself by declaring only to have sat at his desk, only to have arranged his files, to have been nothing but an office clerk—thus not to have been able to imagine the actual scope of what his files had meant in reality. Even this (although it would be no excuse whatsoever) doesn't correspond to the truth, for at times he participated as an eye witness at the elimination of those people whose names and whose gold teeth were so neatly registered in his catalogue. True, he didn't enjoy the spectacle of mass extermination, and now, in utter lack of dignity, he even pleads with us to take note of the

is not so different from that burden which Eatherly has carried on his shoulders for years, and which he was scrupulous enough not to forget for one moment through these past fifteen years. And even if the man Eatherly who would face you would be a mere nobody (which isn't the case)—the mere fact that he was sentenced to unknowingly and unwillingly committing such an act and that he has been dragging along the burden of this deed would make him into a tragic figure, into a symbol of to-day, into a man who is your equal, and not only because he was born equal.\*

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

Letter 58†

Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly

February 10th, 1961.

Destroy this letter after reading it.

Dear Claude,

I would have written you sooner if I had been sure that my letter would reach you; I also had hoped that some news from you would reach me—now, however, after weeks of waiting, I have made up my mind to take the risk of writing into nothingness.

It may please you to hear that meanwhile I have succeeded in learning details about the court hearing, from someone (unknown to you) who was present. This letter writer went to the hearing knowing hardly anything about you and without any prejudices. Nor does he belong to our 'movement'. His words have filled me with pride for you (if we are allowed to be proud of someone else), for he writes that you were of extraordinary presence of mind (even the brightest among those present, doctors and judges included); that you didn't lose your humour and wittiness and that finally you disappointed those who felt entitled to judge your condition, by keeping full control of yourself and by not showing your disappointment in the least. Let me tell you that I smiled while reading about your smiling, but my smile was full of respect for you. Furthermore, the report contained an interesting remark

\* In the original letter to President Kennedy a collection of excerpts from Eatherly's letters was appended.

† Was sent via a third person living in the US. Since, however, this letter has never been confirmed, we can only assume that it has fallen into other hands.

about the jury members: they expressed their uneasiness, because they had felt unable to identify you with that insane person with whom, according to the doctors, they were confronted; and they explained, rather excused and justified, their final decision with the words: 'after all, are *we* the experts, the doctors must know, and how could we dare to contradict their competent judgement? (This, of course, amounts to a distortion of the true essence of trial by jury, for if the respect for experts is mobilized in order to intimidate the members of the jury and to make them unwilling and incapable to trust their own eyes and to formulate their own impressions, then this democratic institution is transformed into a mere comedy.) The nurses, too, spoke in your favour: when asked about their impression, they answered without exception that they had never seen you behaving abnormally. My conclusion: you did behave abnormally, Claude, *abnormally well*, and with *abnormal sovereignty*.

One remark in this letter has, however, horrified me. According to it, you are assigned not to your old room but to a section of the hospital which is reserved for the unequivocally insane, even violent patients, and that through belonging to this part of the institution, you are excluded from the most normal, but absolutely indispensable contact with normal people. It is hard not to suspect those who pigeon-holed you away in this special ward are harbouring the hope to drive you mad in order to punish you for your not being mad, and in order to make their lie true: in order to be able to brag afterwards: 'You see, we were right all along.'

But I am convinced that you will behave in your cell, or room or whatever it might be, the way Daniel did (Daniel 6),<sup>†</sup> and that those who 'laid the stone upon the mouth of the den' will be sleepless during the night as King Darius was, and that they will come in the morning to find you untouched and will free you and 'no manner of hurt' will be found upon you. The last chapter of the story, however, would have to be changed, for those who persecuted you should not be thrown into the lion's den, but they should be taught the real motives of your doings and the real causes of your destiny, and that ultimately you have been acting also for them.

You may have heard that during the weeks in which I was silent, I have tried to help you in an indirect way; that I have

written to President Kennedy about your case.\* Copies of this 'Open Letter' have been sent to papers, leading personalities and magazines throughout the world; its publication has already set in, and I am confident that through its global circulation, it will at last reach Kennedy, although the original letter, dispatched to the White House directly, most certainly has landed in the waste paper basket of a secretary's secretary. Psychiatrists in some countries are already discussing my suggestion behind the scene, and a friend of mine, one of the most reputed reporters in the world, is helping me (rather you) by writing about your case in leading foreign papers. You see again, Claude, whatever happens to you, you are not the 'forgotten man', and although your disappointment must be sharp, the probability that the authorities will maintain the courage of hiding you away indefinitely will shrink from day to day.

There is another step about which I have to inform you: after having read my first letter to you and yours to me, a great and highly esteemed publishing house had approached me, and they would like to incorporate our correspondence into their program. At first I was hesitant; I was afraid of harming you. Now, however, after your classification 'insane', I think it is simply imperative to present you through documents which authentically prove your mental soundness, your integrity, your courage, your altruism and your attempt to live up to your extraordinary situation. Our correspondence now has been copied in its entirety, in a few days I hope to find the time to read it in one sitting in order to gain an impression of the whole. It goes without saying that those passages which you asked me to treat with absolute discretion will be deleted. You authorized me several times to use your texts how ever I would consider their publication fruitful for our cause. Since at those times you could not have foreseen such a possibility, I am herewith repeating my request for authorization. Under no circumstances do I wish to undertake a step which afterwards could meet with your disapproval. So far I have not seen the publisher himself, the text has not been translated into German as yet, no contract has been discussed. Therefore it would be premature to speak about the business arrangements. Fifty fifty would be natural.

\* Here follows a recapitulation of the content of Letter 57, known to the reader.

Gradually the mailman becomes a hated figure, because he delivers mail only from other people.

Your friend,  
Günther\*

## Letter 59

*Günther Anders to Mr Ray Bell  
of Waco News Tribune*

January 28th, 1961.

Dear Mr Bell,

You may have a hazy idea of my identity, for, having participated in Eatherly's court hearing, you may have heard my name, although rumors coming from the US seem to indicate that the public hasn't quite understood the role which I may play for Bob Eatherly.†

Simultaneously you will receive a copy of an open letter which I have written to President Kennedy about the psychological and philosophical implications of this case, and as proof for the indubitable renormalization of Eatherly (if the integrity, self control, and altruism demonstrated by the excerpts from his letters can be called 'normal', they are far more than normal) I have added fragments of his correspondence to me. As I have sent this letter to President Kennedy, respectively copies of it, to papers and magazines in many countries, it soon will appear everywhere. As I have reason to presume that you are particularly interested in the case, and as it might be good for the judges, doctors and jury members to become familiar with the two texts, I am sending them to you, authorizing you to publish them in your paper.

Of course my authorization for publication is not limited to the *Waco News Tribune*. In case you should have contacts with other papers (for instance in Dallas) or you should write a syndicated column, you may make use of it. Fairness should oblige every

\* Since this letter remained unanswered, this authorization has not been given. However, Eatherly had repeatedly given me *carte blanche* and asked me to make use of his words at my own discretion. For instance in Letter 54: 'Whatever you consider helpful in our work, don't hesitate to use me if necessary! Or in Letter 56: 'Feel assured that if you need any writing or can use me in any sense of the word, do so.'

† Eatherly's nickname.

reporter to stress the point that the two months which Bob Eatherly has spent outside Waco have passed without the slightest incident. Unfortunately the news which was published not only in the States but in Europe too, to the effect that Eatherly was arrested when violating a traffic law seem to violate the unwritten laws of truth traffic; at least other rumors about the arrest have come to my ears. I believe it would be worth while to re-examine this version.

Hoping to hear from you in the not too distant future, I am

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

#### Letter 60 (shortened)

*Günther Anders to Mr Roland Watts  
of the American Civil Liberties Union*

February 17th, 1961.

Dear Mr Watts,

... We are trying everything to prevent Eatherly from becoming the 'forgotten man'. This danger seems to me to be acute, for *France Soir's* correspondent (asked by his paper to inquire about the case) was told by the Director of Public Relations of the Waco Veterans' Administration Hospital just to forget about the case and let the men forget their pasts.

This answer testifies in the most horrifying way how right I was when formulating (already years ago) that Eatherly is being begrudged the possession of his experiences and that the doctors hope to produce a state of mind robbed of experience and memory, as though one can restore a man's mental health by annihilating his memory of annihilation. I have grown up in the surroundings of scientific psychology. Coming from such a background, I am simply blushing with shame upon hearing about the methods and aims of the Waco psychiatrists.

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

#### Letter 61

*Mr Ray Bell of the Waco News Tribune to Günther Anders*

March 1st, 1961.

Dear Mr Anders,

I can't tell you how honored and flattered I was to receive your letter and the copy of the letter sent to President Kennedy. Unfortunately, the Kennedy letter can not be used in our paper (we are extremely limited on space and the editors are reluctant to print anything of that length) but it has been forwarded to two American periodicals which possibly may use it in the near future.

Also, even more important, is the fact that the copies of your letter are available here for the presentation by Bob Eatherly's attorney at the time the appeal is made. I think their weight certainly should have considerable impact upon a jury.

As you may or may not know, Eatherly's attorney, Mr Tom Moore, hopes to appeal the verdict in the near future. Actually, he possibly would have done this already if it were not for two rather unusual situations which have arisen since the original hearing: 1. the unusual number of criminal cases which have involved patients from the Veterans' Hospital occurring since the Jan. 12 hearing, and 2. the possibility that another adverse ruling from a jury might affect the long-range outlook, i.e., that any other jury, hearing the case at a future date, might be too easily swayed by the past verdicts.

Also, as you may have learned, I have been working in close co-operation with Mr Moore. Quite frankly, I was most surprised at the jury's verdict Jan. 12th and more than a little moved by the sheer stupidity it reflected. There were a number of claims, I feel, that can at least be questioned. And it does seem rather absurd for any man, psychiatrist or not, to state that he can tell a man's mental condition merely by shaking his hand.

This particular case has aroused my interest and my ire. I would like to see justice done, and I hope with all my heart that I can in some small way work toward that end. I think it can be done, but in order to do so Eatherly's attorney must be armed with a wealth of valid, unquestioned material.

Since the hearing, I have talked to each of the six jurors who ruled upon the case. For the most part, I think they are honest,

sincere persons who, although for the most part not well educated, had just enough belief, just enough feeling to follow the psychiatrists blindly, to accept their testimony at face value. Also, I feel it is indeed unfortunate that these jurors could not comprehend a man of Eatherly's make-up and upbringing.\* I guess it is hard for any of us to accept those things and those ideas with which we have no experience.

Again, let me emphasize that I do not feel that this was a crooked or hand-picked jury; rather, I would say, it was an uninformed jury. Had they had the facts—for instance, at one point it might have been a different story if the jury could have been presented documentary evidence that Eatherly could and has written for publication—I believe with all my heart the ruling would have been different. I know that I could not have ruled against him.

I hope that I may impose upon you to fill me in on your association with Bob. I can assure you that any information you might care to send certainly would be used in his defense and, in my humble opinion, I feel it would be of great advantage to him.

Certainly I hope to write about this, both in our newspaper and in any magazine or publication that will accept it. However, it is most difficult to do anything at present. Most of the American publications balk, either at the insanity angle or that of the pacifist. I think this is due greatly to their lack of understanding—and lack of proof. I understand you have collaborated with Bob on some articles, a book,† too, I believe; and if there is any way of sending copies of that material, I think it would be advantageous both to myself, Bob and his attorney.

Frankly, I feel this is one of the most significant stories of our generation, and, who knows, perhaps of all generations. The impact, the implications, could be tremendous.

I just pray that in some way, no matter how small, I can have at least a minor role in it.

Sincerely,

Ray Bell,

*Waco News Tribune*

\* To what Ray Bell is referring here, is unknown to me.

† Two things have probably contributed to this misunderstanding: 1. The fact that my first letter to E. and his reply have always been published together; and 2. The fact that Eatherly and I had discussed the possibility of collaborating on his biography.

## Letter 62

*Günther Anders to Mr Ray Bell*

March 8th, 1961.

Dear Ray Bell,

Nonsense, you shouldn't feel 'honoured' or 'flattered' by my letter, but just happy to know that people, no matter where, just because they are humans, are burning with the same holy indignation—at least this was my reaction when I read your letter. And it filled me with courage to see that team work is not in need of neighbourhood and that people, although thousands of miles away from each other, morally speaking, live just around the corner.

Before dealing with the various points and questions of your letter, a few facts which may interest you and Mr Moore:

1. In an article which Lord Russell just sent me he refers to Claude's letters to me and goes so far as to say that if the one who wrote them is considered mad, then 'I shall not be surprised if my last years are spent in a lunatic asylum—where I shall enjoy the company of all who are capable of feelings of humanity'.\*

2. Illustrated articles (in several instalments) about Claude and his correspondence with me have appeared in big French and Italian papers and magazines (for instance in *France Soir* and *Europaeo*).

You see: the case lies naked before the eyes of the world and—I don't think to exaggerate—the thousands in Europe and Asia who are informed about Claude's fate are now waiting impatiently for a just disentanglement of this ill-managed affair. Moreover, to a certain degree, the prestige of the US abroad may be influenced by the outcome of this story. I feel this is one of the major points which Mr Moore could consider impressing upon the members of the jury. They should be made aware of the fact that they have to fulfil two tasks: (a) to conscientiously weigh the fate of the man standing in front of them, this man made guiltlessly guilty; (b) to live up to the ideals of the US, the reputation of which they could seriously impair by yielding to voices of 'hidden persuaders' whispering into their ears in order to promote certain political or military interests.

\* *New Statesman*, London, February 17, 1961.

3. Since Dec. 22, 1960 I have not heard from Claude. Such a long pause between letters has never occurred before. This fact seems to corroborate your first report according to which Eatherly, relegated to Ward 10, is now hermetically shielded from the outer world. I am afraid that the separation now even excludes the writing or receiving of letters. I don't say that I suspect the authorities of intentionally manufacturing an insane Claude; but—and this again seems to me to be a major point for Mr Moore—it is not impossible, but even likely, that such a treatment will eventually result in producing an abnormal mental and emotional condition. This danger seems to me all the more threatening as Claude has had no normal social and other life for years and thus lacks in resources to draw on in such an exacting situation. Seen from this angle it is all the more admirable that Claude has spent the two months outside of the institution in perfect peace, without any incident, thereby showing beyond doubt that he has himself under fullest control. This is the third point which may prove useful for Mr Moore.

Your request for material: you will certainly understand that I cannot send you the whole bulk of the correspondence between Cl. and myself—and this all the less as it will be published in the not too distant future by a very great firm. This, of course, does not mean that the material is closed to you, after all the chance to help Claude directly comes first. In case you or Mr Moore should ask specific questions, I would try to find out whether in Claude's letters passages can be discovered which would represent answers. In such cases, I would even send photostatic facsimilia. It goes without saying that this book, once it is out, will increase the interest in Claude's case even more than it already is, particularly because Robert Jungk, the well-known reporter, will write the foreword and edit the volume. If anyone should be surprised by this extraordinary interest which the publishers show in the correspondence—the explanation is easy: my first letter to Claude and his reply have been published time and again in I don't know how many countries. When publishers read Claude's remarkable answer and learned that this correspondence continued, they began to become eager.

Many of the details you reported, particularly about the jury and about the extraordinary situation in the V.A. Hospital since

the Jan. 12 hearing were new to me and are most important. I am very grateful for being kept so well posted. Please continue doing so. When you mentioned 'the unusual number of criminal cases which have involved patients from the V.A. Hospital occurring since the Jan. 12 hearing', did you refer to a chronological coincidence or to a causal link between the hearing and the behaviour of the inmates (which I would not understand)?

And now to close, I wish to tell you how happy I am to see that you belong to the unhappy few who have realized that in the case of Claude our whole moral situation is on trial. As a matter of fact, it may be fortunate that we have something in hand which, like a miniature model, contains and shows the moral issues of to-day. By working for this one man, we are doing far more than working for one. And how frightful the implications of this case may be, it may be consoling to know that we are investing our energies into the case of to-day.

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

Letter 63 (shortened)

*Günther Anders to Dr Walter F. Ford*  
Director, Professional Services, V.A. Hospital, Waco, Texas

April 18th, 1961.

Dear Dr Ford,

I had the pleasure of seeing a letter which you have written to a friend of mine. In one of its sentences referring to my 'Open Letter to President Kennedy', you made the following diagnosis: 'We cannot hope to change individuals with a Dreyfus complex, especially if they are hundreds of miles away.'

Why 'complex'?

Socrates felt he had to teach truth to the youth? Far from it. Nothing but an education complex.

Hegel searched for a universal principle of history? Far from it. Nothing but a system complex.

Doctors try to heal sick people? Far from it. Nothing but a health complex.

People are hungry? Far from it. Nothing but a bread complex.

Eatherly tries to repent Hiroshima? Far from it. Nothing but a guilt complex.

Anders tries to help him? Far from it. Nothing but a Dreyfus complex.

A recommendable method indeed, this 'nothing but a complex'. For what you are achieving by applying it is:

1. You are suppressing the complexity of the issues at stake.
2. You are making other people believe that the goals for which the victims of your diagnosis are striving have no justification whatsoever.
3. You are making those striving for the goals ridiculous.

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

#### Letter 64

*Günther Anders to Mr Robert Kennedy*  
Attorney General, Washington D.C.

May 7th, 1961.

Sir,

A Danish journal, in which my 'Open Letter to President Kennedy' had appeared a few weeks ago, has asked me to comment on the answer which you have sent to Professor Johannes Knudsen on March 31 after having read my 'Open Letter'.

You may remember that your reply consisted almost exclusively of a quotation, that you conveyed the information about Mr Eatherly which, at your request, you had received from the Veterans' Administration.

1. This information opens with the words: 'Mr Eatherly has been a voluntary patient at our Waco Hospital from time to time over the past several years.' May I express my gratitude for this sentence, for it confirms that, as I had stated, the re-arrest and re-internment of Mr Eatherly, after his voluntary flight from the hospital, must have violated his status 'voluntary'.

2. Eatherly (the conveyed information continues) had 'advised the hospital authorities that he expected to leave the hospital; his family was notified of this intention and his brother James ... filed a complaint seeking his commitment to the hospital.' This serves perfectly as an additional corroboration for my statement that the term 'voluntary patient' amounted and amounts to a mere word.

3. The report deals furthermore with the hearing on January

12, 1961. 'The jury ... found Mr Eatherly in need of mental treatment and recommended that he should be committed to the V.A. Hospital.' This decision contradicts in a most peculiar way:

(a) the fact mentioned in the following sentence: that 'the jury ... found him to be competent to handle his personal funds'—which represents, and in your country certainly no less than in other countries, the admission of a rather highly appreciated competency; and

(b) a lengthy report which I received from an eyewitness of the court hearing (follows report, see Letter 58).

As to the presentation of facts given by the hospital, it is not in the most satisfactory agreement with the more detailed statements which I have received from Mr Eatherly. I have never had any reason to distrust Mr Eatherly's words, while I feel entitled to hesitate in front of the report issued by the Veterans' Administration, because this institution, as you probably know too, has occasionally lacked in the highest respect for truth—to mention but one instance: it changed the day of Mr Eatherly's escape (November 22 instead of October 19) and handed over this fictitious date to the world press.

In connection with 1, I take the liberty of drawing your attention to a statement made by the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* on December 5, 1960; 'VA officials said they have no authority to arrest Eatherly or take him back to the hospital.' Why other authorities were entitled to arrest a man who had entered the hospital voluntarily, left the hospital voluntarily, and has not committed any crime during his intermezzo of freedom—this surpasses my power of thinking which is ordinarily used only for the, of course, far easier, scholarly work. Incidentally, it seems unlikely to me that the fact that Eatherly (who was arrested allegedly on account of a traffic violation) wasn't even sitting at the wheel, should actually be known only in Europe. In other words: I feel unable to see how the meaning which is forced here upon the word 'voluntary' could be brought into agreement with the generally recognized meaning of the word. And I am still convinced that the clean settling of this case would not necessarily harm the prestige of the United States.

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders



*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

May 16th, 1961.

Dear Claude,

I haven't too much hope that this letter will find you. For almost five months now no sign of life from you has arrived here, so I must assume that during this period you haven't heard from me either. Perhaps in the soundless world which is surrounding you now, you may have been haunted by doubts; maybe you fear that I have become fed up with hoping and that I have written you off. The step which I have taken since you have been out of reach has probably remained unknown to you. Believe me, Claude, your fears would be totally unjustified. On the contrary: the longer my attempts to reach you remain frustrated, and the longer I don't hear from you, the more your fate strikes me as an unheard of scandal. Your voicelessness rings louder in my ears than your voice had ever done, and to turn away from this thundering silence would be too much for me.

Here the step which I have taken: I have presented your case in a letter, and in order to give my account the greatest possible urgency, I have made it an 'Open Letter to President Kennedy'. This text has appeared in many countries. That I haven't received any answer from President Kennedy personally, but only a confirmation of receipt from a secretary's secretary, is not so important. More important that already to-day this letter has produced a new situation (in your country too: for, mimeographed by Harvard professors, this letter is now circulating in the United States). This means that although physically under lock and key, you are now present in the thoughts and feelings of more people, and you are surrounded by more friends than ever before, even by more than in that glamour period in which you were celebrated as a 'Victory Boy' in the press of your country. The walls which enclose you and separate you from the outer world have now become sham-walls; and there is no doctor, no Air Force, and no intimidated relative who could do anything against this fact. True, you can't see any of your friends, but no less true that the eyes of all of your friends are turned towards you. In this sense one could say that you are not shut in. If anyone *is* shut in (or, more cor-

rectly: shut out—from the sympathies of our fellow men) then it is those who, because you have conscience enough to insist upon knowing what you know, call you a sick man and keep you hidden away. Granted, these men may feel pity for you. But this pity doesn't deserve our respect, for it is nothing but a variant of fear, and ultimately it amounts to fear of the truth.

The fact that I am thinking of you so intensely, and that I am trying once again to reach your ear just in these days, is no coincidence. For we are living in a period which for all people who like you, have not become indifferent yet, is branded by the name *Eichmann*. As you know, he was the man who, in the Forties, organized the extermination of millions—of Jews, Poles, Gypsies, and who, as a 'bureaucrat of annihilation' meticulously fulfilled his duties. Perhaps you, too, have seen reports about him. In that case, you will also have read that he 'honestly' declared to have been 'nothing but a tool', 'nothing but a tiny cog in the machine of the terror', and only to have been 'loyal to the oath' which he had sworn to Hitler—in short: 'not to be guilty in the sense in which he is accused'. As little as we can visualize Eichmann's activity, as little can we understand how he was able to live the 15 years prior to his capture without mentioning his guilt, without trying to clarify it to himself, without even suffering too much from it. And this although the position which he held was not as subordinate as he wishes us to believe. At least the fact that he participated in those conferences in which the organizers of terror discussed the extermination, and, nipping their cognacs, weighed the most expedient and convenient measures to take, sharply contradicts the smallness of his bureaucratic function to which he attaches such great value in order to make his guilt and his punishment as small as possible. Just as little is he entitled to excuse himself by declaring only to have sat at his desk, only to have arranged his files, to have been nothing but an office clerk—thus not to have been able to imagine the actual scope of what his files had meant in reality. Even this (although it would be no excuse whatsoever) doesn't correspond to the truth, for at times he participated as an eye witness at the elimination of those people whose names and whose gold teeth were so neatly registered in his catalogue. True, he didn't enjoy the spectacle of mass extermination, and now, in utter lack of dignity, he even pleads with us to take note of the

nausea which he had felt while witnessing these scenes—no pity would be legitimate, for his nausea didn't prevent him in the least from administering his office of annihilation and from reliably continuing his work for years.

The declarations of the mass-murderer: 'I was nothing but a tiny cog in the apparatus', 'I only followed orders'—are all the more dreadful as they are identical with those arguments which are being used by everyone of us: by the workers who build the Polaris rockets, by the scientists who test chemical warfare methods, by your fellow-pilot Francis Powers who almost tipped off a catastrophe through his spying flight—no, more than that: for these arguments are identical with those which are stuffed into us like tranquilizers in order to calm our conscience. Let's not deceive ourselves: if we don't accept the Eichmann arguments, we are considered—even in those countries which to-day are actually revolted by the special case Eichmann, as being disloyal or being traitors.

Or as being insane.

If during this period in which day in day out we are horror struck by these events my thoughts are with you more intensely than ever, it is because you, Claude, are the one great antipode who can console us. When you performed the task with which you, as a 'tiny cog in the machine', were charged, you knew not what you did. But after you had seen what you had done, you rose to your feet and shouted No. And ever since this first No, there hasn't been one single day on which you would have swallowed this word. You have not made yourself small, and you have not tried to unburden yourself by saying: I was nothing but a tiny cog, therefore not guilty, but, on the contrary, you declared: If we can become so dreadfully guilty through being cogs, then we must refuse to be transformed into such cogs. Eichmann and you—you are the two examples of our age. And if it were not for you, his antipode, we would have no right and no reason to hope.

Don't believe, Claude, that it is artificial to compare, or rather to confront you with Eichmann. Your 'belonging together' was already clear to me for a long time when I read this morning in the paper that Eichmann's attorney, Servatius, was shameless enough to declare: a man who has stood under orders in the way Eich-

mann did, cannot be made to bear responsibility, just as little as the man who released the bomb over Hiroshima.\* I will not speak of the appalling senselessness of this analogy (for you and your buddies have performed two actions which you were bound to consider acts of war, while Eichmann systematically, and for years, performed the extermination of human beings whose non-existence had nothing to do with the military outcome of the war), but only about the fact that you did shoulder responsibility, that you insisted on your guilt, although you were not asked to do so, although day in day out you are being asked not to do so. Therefore the attempt to discharge Eichmann of his responsibility by making him your twin is mere nonsense. If there is one man entitled to rectify Servatius or Eichmann—it is you. And I ask you to consider doing it.

However lonely every morning may be for you, every morning you should tell yourself, Claude, that you have the unique chance to be the great antipode, who gives consolation and hope to all of us. Compared with the importance of this role which has fallen upon you, and to which you have proven equal, the fact of your physical loneliness and of your remaining invisible to those whom you are consoling may become more bearable. We, at least, think of you full of gratitude. And if once we will see you—by 'we' I mean all those consoled by your existence—then you may have the feeling that the sacrifice which you had to bring during those years amounts to nothing. Let's continue working for this day.

As ever, your friend,  
Günther

\* *Newsweek*, April 17, 1961.

## APPENDIX

The correspondence was already in print when, after nearly half a year of silence, a letter arrived from Eatherly. As a matter of fact, it now looks as if a situation is developing which entitles us to more hope. It is still impossible to give account of this new phase. The Eatherly case goes on: and, who knows, maybe it will have found its happy ending when the correspondence appears.

### Letter 66

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 10,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
May 30th, 1961.

Dear Günther,

It was good to hear from you again and to know that all is well with you. Forgive me for not being able to write. I received one letter from you about three months ago.

I am doing fine here in the hospital. I can get no good news for a release from the hospital. I tried to gain my release in court back in January. I will try again soon if I don't get some encouraging news from my doctors. Be assured that I am disappointed in my continued hospitalization but I am not discouraged. I know I will eventually get a break.

Miss F. sent me the letter you wrote to her.

I read a newspaper account that concerned me, whereby your new book would be out soon. I wish it could be published in English, I would like to read it.

Yes I have been following the Eichmann trial as it is in the papers everyday over here. Whatever defense the man uses, he has no way out. ... There is no place for such a man.

... I hardly ever hear from any of my family. I cannot hope to gain any support from them.

Claude

### Letter 67

*William H. Orrick, jr to Günther Anders*

Department of Justice,  
Washington D.C.

June 26th, 1961.

Dear Mr Anders,

The Attorney General has requested that I reply to your further letter regarding Major Eatherly. Apparently you misunderstood the sequence of events regarding his retention in the hospital. His original treatment was on the basis of his voluntary admission but this was changed to an involuntary status by the order of the Texas court based on the jury's findings. It was the jury's recommendation that he be committed. Once the order on this recommendation was entered it necessarily follows that he would be returned to the hospital after leaving.

One other point I should mention in this connection is that the court and the order involved emanate from state authority and not from the Federal government. This jurisdiction is one confined to our states by the constitution and may not be interfered with by this Department. If there were anything illegal in the detention of Major Eatherly he has a full right to bring any necessary facts before the Federal courts.

I trust this has answered the points you make.

Sincerely,

William H. Orrick, jr.,  
Assistant Attorney General

### Letter 68

*Günther Anders to William H. Orrick jr.*

Mr William H. Orrick, jr.  
Assistant Attorney General,  
Washington DC.

July 2nd, 1961

Dear Mr Orrick,

I thank you very much for your kind letter of June 26, 1961 in which you tried to dispel my suspicions regarding the Eatherly case. Unfortunately I cannot say that you have completely succeeded in convincing me.

Of course, I am leaving aside here the broader and more philosophical aspects, the tragic situation of the man who unknowingly happened to become the first 'victim' of the first atomic mission—which aspects may ultimately prove of far greater historical significance than the merely legal ones. I assume, however, that we would hardly reach an agreement on this broad basis. Therefore I, too, am confining myself to the legal point of view.

You are stressing the question of sequence (of Eatherly's voluntary and involuntary status of internment) as the decisive one. This can only mean, if I understand you correctly, that his re-arrest during an involuntary phase would have been legal, during a voluntary phase illegal. If this is so, Eatherly's re-arrest has actually been illegal, for—and here is my main point—the chronology of data in my possession contradicts the sequence of events on which you based your views.

As you know better than I, Major Eatherly's phases of voluntary and involuntary internment have alternated:

For instance, one of his voluntary phases of 90 days was over in July 1959; however, despite his voluntary status, his attempts to leave the V.A. Hospital at this time were frustrated.

On April 22, 1960, Eatherly again confirmed his voluntary status in a letter addressed to the American Civil Liberties Union. In this letter he wrote: 'I am a voluntary patient which entitles me to ask for a release on request.'

It was on May 20, 1960 after a 'closed hearing' (letter to me of May 27, 1960) that Eatherly was classified as an involuntary patient, which condition must have lasted three months. This means that he resumed his status as a voluntary patient on August 18, 1960.—As a matter of fact he informed me on August 18: 'Now is the time when I feel I should make my move to get out of the hospital'—and on Sept. 6, 1960, he wrote *expressis verbis*: 'As I am again a voluntary patient ...'

If he actually was one, this implies that he had the free will to stay or not to stay in the V.A. Hospital. Either the term 'voluntary' designates a freedom of choice, or it is an empty and utterly nonsensical vocable which contradicts as well its every day as its philosophical meaning.

But let me return to your point: the 'sequence': as Eatherly's state of being a voluntary patient was restored on August 18,

1960, he must still have been in this state when he escaped on October 19, 1960. That he was a voluntary patient is confirmed:

1. By the sentence taken from the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* of December 5, 1960 to which I had drawn your attention already in my last letter. I quote: 'VA officials said they have no authority to arrest Eatherly or to take him back to the hospital.'

2. By Major Eatherly himself who, on December 21, 1960 wrote: 'The hospital had in the published reports said that I had been discharged and was not wanted. In reality the hospital filed a commitment on me the 20th of October, or the day after I escaped.'

Only after Eatherly had been recaptured and had had a court hearing (a jury trial) on January 12, 1961, was he again made an 'involuntary patient'.

Looking at this chronology I cannot help feeling that an error about the sequence of events has crept into the report which you have received. If this possibility should be plausible to you, too, it might be worth while to check on the sequence of events once again. As a matter of fact, I would be most grateful to you if you would do so.

With the expression of my deep gratitude for the efforts you are taking in order to clarify this case, I am

Sincerely Yours,  
Günther Anders

## Letter 69

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

July 3rd, 1961.

Dear Claude,

What a relief, after such a long time, to have a letter from you again. Maybe you are not aware that this was a pause of nearly half a year. You will understand that this interval was full of worries, and still to-day I am worried, because you did not explain the reason for your silence. You simply say that you had not been able to write. But what does 'not able' mean? Was your health poor? Or—this seems unlikely to me—did someone prevent you from writing?

I feel you need encouragement. Maybe I can send you a few 'shots in the arm'. Here they are:

The first shot: The interest in our correspondence, which will be published in the fall, is so great that the publishing house is now printing a first edition of 11,000 copies, three times the usual amount. Furthermore, the volume is being announced as the main product of the publishing house in 1961. This means, naturally, a certain financial gain for you, for the contract has been drawn up for the two of us, we are sharing the royalties 50-50. Already to-day, months before the publication, an amount of \$750 is waiting for you, you may draw on it whenever you need it. And even if you should not need it, I have the feeling that the fact of royalties could impress a jury as well as judges, for making money strengthens everybody's prestige. As about eight to ten publishing houses in various countries have already announced their interest in the book, there is also a good chance for a continued increase of your 'writer's income'. If you should wish to get hold of the money, you have simply to write to:

Rowohlt Verlag  
c/o Dr F. J. Raddatz  
REINBEK HAMBURG  
Hamburgerstr. 17  
German Federal Republic

Second shot: my 'Open Letter to President Kennedy' has at last found its way to an official desk. Yesterday I received a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, William H. Orrick, jr, Department of Justice, Civil Division, Washington DC—in which letter he tried by means of incorrect information to prove that your detention after your escape has been legal. He wrongly presupposes that you had been made an involuntary patient prior to your escape.

Mr Orrick concludes his letter, however, with the words: 'If there were anything illegal in the detention of Major Eatherly he has a full right to bring any necessary facts before the Federal courts.' Maybe we should take this remark seriously. I leave it to you to decide whether or not to send him a precise chronology of the legal history of your case, particularly about the sequence of your so-called 'voluntary' and your 'involuntary' status. In order

to make this report as easily understandable as possible, please arrange it in the form of a time table in three columns: left, the date; middle, the event; right, your status. For instance:

Oct. 19            escape            voluntary

In any case I am enclosing a copy of the letter which I have just sent to Mr Orrick.

And now, Claude, please let's resume our correspondence. Don't forget that already many months ago we had discussed your plans in very concrete terms. If you should be unable to follow up your project, and if you should have been unable to devote yourself to it during the last half year, please don't hesitate to tell me why. Maybe the indirect effects of your treatment or the atmosphere of the institution have made or make it just impossible for you to concentrate on your tasks. I would understand that only too well. And again: please try to give me an account of your daily life, for you have always shyly covered it with a coat of silence. If it is a drab life, don't be ashamed to say so, for the drabness wouldn't be your fault; and enduring a drab life as you do requires more heroism than many a deed which is celebrated as an heroic act.

And remember: the world in which you live does not consist of the four walls which have become your home, but of the multitude of those friends who feel close to you and who respect you. I know how easy it is to act the wise man when enjoying complete freedom, as I do; but we who without merits are not in your situation, but could have slipped into it, are ashamed of the easiness of our days.

Your friend always,  
Günther

**Letter 70**

*Claude Eatherly to Günther Anders*

Bldg. 93,  
V.A. Hospital,  
Waco, Texas.  
July 7th, 1961

Dear Günther,

Thank you for your good and encouraging letter.

I am happy to be able to tell you my situation has changed for the better. I was moved from the maximum security building and put on privilege basis, that gives me some freedom. I finally have a doctor that is trying to help me. I think that I will be able to leave the hospital in a few months. For that reason I do not think I should try again to take my case to court.

When I told you I was unable to write you, it was impossible for me to get a letter mailed to you from the building I was in. I will be able to correspond with you freely now.

I am very happy to hear you will have a book published from our letters. I really appreciate your fairness in the contract you made for me. I will not need the money until I leave the hospital so I will leave it where it is for this time.

I feel wonderful, only a little anxious about leaving the hospital, but I feel that I will be leaving soon if I will, and which I intend to, co-operate with my doctor.

Günther, I really appreciate everything you have done on my behalf, just hope I can repay you some day.

Feel sure that I will do everything in my power to gain a release and that I am not discouraged. I will not give up.

Thanks again for everything, your friend,  
Claude

## Letter 71

*Günther Anders to Claude Eatherly*

July 11th, 1961.

Dear Claude,

First of all, congratulations! Never before have I written to you with such joy and so much confidence. I would never have dared, after your last gloomy news, to hope for such a surprising turn to the better. As a matter of fact I already had prepared a public declaration on your behalf and collected the signatures of such prominent men as Lord Russell, Max Born, the Italian writers Moravia and Carlo Levi and even the Mayor of Hiroshima—but now, after this marvellous new development, its publication has, of course, become superfluous, and the signatures may now peacefully sleep in my files.

Naturally I have not the slightest idea when the great event will

occur. Please try to prepare yourself for it. And particularly for the time immediately succeeding it.

I think it is very likely that you will be besieged and stormed by armies of reporters who will not only try to squeeze silly and indiscreet details out of you, just for the sake of sensationalism, but who will try to provoke you through catch questions, the answers to which no one would have the presence of mind to improvise. I would advise to politely refuse any answers, to tell them that it is not your private life which matters and which they should try to clarify, but the atomic situation in general which has its consequences for everybody. Please tell them that you first have to adapt yourself to your new situation and to master it, and ask them to respect the reason for your reserve. Add that later on you would certainly make statements if and when you would consider it useful and necessary, but only then; that you do not like to make statements which would have, so to speak, to ride on those tracks which would be laid by their questions.

If you make up your mind to behave in this manner, you need not fear the time following your release. Incidentally when I read your casual remark about your anxiety, a picture about Dreyfus, which I had seen twenty years ago, suddenly came to my mind again. When Dreyfus, who for years had been a prisoner innocently banned to Devil's Island, heard about his release, he resumed his automatic pacing to and fro within his cell the way he had done it day in day out, although the door of his cell was wide open; and it was only after a great effort that he was able to overcome the threshold which separated him from outside. Don't be surprised if you should feel a similar hesitation. This would be only natural. And, after all, you have the chance of knowing in advance, you can do your last pacing to and fro already to-day so that, when the day comes, you can walk out unhesitatingly.

You know, Claude, that the day of your release will be a day of release for me, too, and that immediately upon receiving your cable 'I am free', I will try to meet you and to open with you the epoch in which you will be free not only from internment, but also for your task.

Your friend,  
Günther

## POSTSCRIPT FOR THE AMERICAN READER

Since the appearance of the German translation of this correspondence—the first version published—the Eatherly case has assumed a new face.

For Claude is now free.

Thus the time has come to fulfill my promise to see Eatherly. If so far this has not been possible, this was due to circumstances beyond any one's control. By the time this book appears, we may already have met. If not, then this time it *would* be someone's fault, though certainly neither Claude's nor mine.

\* \* \* \*

He has been free now for half a year. And this although you, his fellow Americans, were begrudged the freedom of learning about his freedom.

He is free now and lives amongst you.

It would of course console me if I could say that the American authorities, having at last understood the issues at stake, were the authors of this happy ending. This, unfortunately, I cannot say.

For Eatherly escaped. He chose freedom—if the word “chose” is appropriate, for in reality he had never forfeited his freedom. On the contrary, the very essence of his life was and is to remain free from the judgments and prejudices with which all of us are being ceaselessly bombarded. And it is not only true that this freedom can be maintained within and despite hospital walls; it may even happen that some of us have to face these walls on account of our loyalty to this freedom. Thus the external freedom which he now enjoys is only an appendix to the freedom which no one was able to take away from him.

This may sound odd, for all of us know how mercilessly Claude was persecuted and tortured by the ghosts of the dead and the furies of the deed of which he had happened to be a part; and a

tortured man doesn't seem to be a free man, even seems to be the opposite of free. But this is only appearance. In truth, since he mobilized the courage not to look away from and not to turn a deaf ear to the furies winging around his head—as most other people have successfully done—his suffering testifies to his freedom.

He was free even before choosing freedom. The authorities, however, were not; for they avoided giving him the only freedom which they could have given him, external freedom, and thereby missed their chance. Now they have to confine themselves to the more modest freedom of leaving him alone and not bothering him. It is comforting to know that they are doing this despite their knowledge of his whereabouts. Now, it seems to me, it is the task of Americans to see to it that at least this minimum remains unviolated.

It is not impossible that the situation will have changed again before these lines appear in print. When we try to contribute to the understanding of our epoch, we cannot compete with TV reporters who can synchronize their words with current events; we cannot help lagging behind the march of time, and we are aware of it. This, however, need not trouble us, for we are concerned not with describing the latest events but with interpreting a lasting situation, a fact which spares us from being late. It is true, of course, that even so we may be late, because the only lasting quality of our situation is the everlasting menace that nothing will last, and that all our warnings will be too late.

And this applies to the existence of Claude, who incarnates the epoch which also comprises tomorrow and the day after tomorrow (if there is going to be a tomorrow and a day after tomorrow). Since from now on (so far as time is granted us at all) we are sentenced to live in a situation whose character cannot change any more: in the “Time of the End” which can never end but by the end itself, and which will remain the “Time of the End” even if we succeed in postponing the “End of Time” from day to day. An interpretation of our atomic age which emphasizes this fact *cannot* lag behind. This character of our epoch will never disappear, for once we have acquired the ability to precipitate the “End of Time,” we have acquired it once and for all: although

able to learn many things, we are unable to unlearn what we have once learned.

Thus, although Claude's status has changed, the Eatherly case is not obsolete. On the contrary, it is so new that it hasn't even been understood as yet. For he was the first one to translate the character of our epoch into the language of individual life; the first whose own life was exclusively determined by the facts and fears of the atomic age; the first who objected to conforming to the behavior demanded in the atomic age by a conformist society; the first who refused to ignore or belittle or increase or exploit the danger as all of us are expected to do.

No, the Eatherly case is not obsolete: he is the model and the incarnation of conscience in a world whose millions are comforted by being told, and believing, that the effects of their acts are none of their business, that they are not acting but just "working," and that their work, whatever its aim, its purpose, its direct or most indirect outcome, *non olet*, never stinks. He is the one who resisted this temptation and who staunchly refused to content himself with a freedom which ultimately amounts to a freedom of blindness, a freedom *from* conscience although it is served to us as freedom *of* conscience. No the case is not obsolete, and it has not changed through the fact that Eatherly's external status has changed.

We have been increasingly forced to limit our own responsibility to the narrow confines of our private lives. Eatherly has refused to accept this limitation. This refusal and his never-tiring readiness to shoulder responsibility for the effects of acts in which he was nothing but a co-actor—this refusal and this readiness are pioneer deeds on the moral continent of today. You Americans with your tradition of pioneering and your enthusiasm for "New Frontiers"—you can and you should be proud of the fact that it is an American boy who turns out to be the pioneer of this new age. He is not only the brother of John Glenn but his big brother, for while the cosmonaut is only being used for technical pioneer deeds which had become possible without his merits, Claude became a pioneer of the new age through his own individual decision, even through his courage to contradict the effects of the technical achievements for which he had been used.

Years ago you celebrated Claude as a hero. Rightly so. But you called him a hero for the wrong reason. For he is a hero not because of his famous act, but rather because of his independent attitude towards that act. A slogan says, "My country right or wrong." Your country should say, "My citizen, because he is *right!*"

All other attitudes towards him strike me as being suspect, for they prove a shrinking of and from your spirit of democracy.

For, after all, democracy means to feel responsibility not only for one's own activities or for those conscientiously performed in one's own job, but for the issues which concern all fellow citizens and all fellow men. The very definition of democracy contradicts the specialization and the division of labor which today is being transformed into a division of responsibility. When, in the Town Meetings of early American days, tailors or bakers or woodcutters had their say and were entitled to co-decide the question whether a bridge over a river should be built or not, it was not the tailor's bridge that was meant nor that of the baker or the woodcutter, but the bridge of the people, for the people. If an individual today co-decides that the bridge to the future should not be demolished he is doing what his forefathers used to do; he is exercising his democratic rights. And to reject or deny this right is surely an Un-American activity.

Vienna, February 26, 1962

Günther Anders