Richard J. Bernstein

Reflections on Radical Evil: Arendt and Kant[1]

In the final pages of *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Hannah Arendt sums up her horrendous narrative of the eruption of twentieth-century totalitarianism. She declares:

> It is inherent in our entire philosophic tradition that we cannot conceive of a "radical evil", and this is true both for Christian theology, which conceded even to the Devil himself a celestial origin, as well as for Kant, the only philosopher who, in the word he coined for it, at least must have suspected the existence of this evil even though he immediately rationalized it in the concept of a "perverted ill will" that could be explained by comprehensible motives. Therefore, we actually have nothing to fall back on in order to understand a phenomenon that nevertheless confronts us with its overpowering reality and breaks down all standards we know. There is only one thing that seems to be discernable: we may say that radical evil has emerged in connection with a system in which all men have become equally superfluous. The manipulators of this system believe in their own superfluousness as much as in that of all others, and the totalitarian murderers are all the more dangerous because they do not care if they themselves are alive or dead, if they ever lived or never were born. The danger of the corpse factories and holes of oblivion is that today, with populations and homelessness everywhere on the increase, masses of people are continuously rendered superfluous if we continue to think of our world in utilitarian terms. Political, social, and economic events everywhere are in silent conspiracy with totalitarian instruments devised to make men superfluous.

And Arendt continues with an ominous warning that sounds almost prophetic:

> Totalitarian solutions may well survive the fall of totalitarian regimes in the form of strong temptations which will come up

[1] Lecture held at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin on November 26, 2000.

> whenever it seems impossible to alleviate political, social, and economic misery in a manner worthy of man. (OT, 459)

There are many aspects of this rich and dense passage that are worthy of discussion, but I want to focus on what Arendt means by "radical evil" and what Kant means when he uses this powerfully evocative expression. There has been a great deal of discussion – and misinterpretation – of what Arendt means by the banality of evil, but much less attention paid to her concept of radical evil. My approach to both Arendt and Kant is from the perspective of trying to come to grips with the new faces of evil that have manifested themselves in the troubled twentieth century.

Note that despite Arendt's reference to Kant, she declares that we actually have nothing to fall back on in order to understand a "phenomenon that … confronts us with its overpowering reality and breaks down all standards we know." This is a recurrent theme in Arendt's thinking – and in her own personal experience – an overwhelming sense of a rupture with the past. She believed that with the event of totalitarianism, something new came into existence, something that signifies a break with tradition. We can no longer rely on traditional philosophical and moral concepts in order to comprehend the events that burst forth in the twentieth century. Totalitarianism, as she understands it, is not to be confused with tyranny or dictatorship. In these times, one needs to think without banisters (*denken ohne Geländer*). Or, as she wrote at the beginning of *The Origins of Totalitarianism*:

> Comprehension does not mean denying the outrageous, deducing the unprecedented from precedents, or explaining phenomena by such analogies and generalities that the impact of reality and the shock of experience are no longer felt. It means, rather, examining and bearing consciously the burden that our century has placed on us – neither denying its existence nor submitting meekly to its weight. Comprehension, in short, means the unpremeditated, attentive facing up to and resisting of reality – whatever it may be. (OT, viii)

But if the concept of radical evil is intended to help us to illuminate this dark reality, what does it mean? We find a clue by returning to the first passage cited and noting that she refers three times to a system in which all human beings have become superfluous. The impor-

tance of this idea of superfluousness is emphasized in a letter that she wrote to Karl Jaspers when she sent him a copy of her book.

> Evil has proved to be more radical than expected. In objective terms, modern crimes are not provided for in the Ten Commandments. Or: the Western tradition is suffering from the preoccupation that the most evil things human beings can do arise from the vice of selfishness. Yet we know that the greatest evil or radical evil has nothing to do anymore with such humanly understandable, sinful motives. What radical evil is I don't know, but it seems to me it somehow has to do with the following phenomenon: making human beings as human beings superfluous (not using them as means to an end, which leaves their essence as humans untouched and impinges only on their human dignity: rather, making them superfluous as human beings). This happens as soon as all unpredictability – which, in human beings, is the equivalent of spontaneity – is eliminated. And all this in turn arises from – or better, goes along with – the delusion of the omnipotence (not simply the lust for power) of an individual man. If an individual man qua man were omnipotent, then there is in fact no reason why men in the plural should exist at all … The omnipotence of an individual man would make men superfluous. (C, 166)

Consequently, if we want to grasp what Arendt means by radical evil, we must try to understand what she means by "making human beings as human beings superfluous". It is clear already how she begins to depart from Kant, because she does not think that radical evil has anything to do with the vice of selfishness or what Kant calls "self-love". Indeed, she makes a much stronger claim. Radical evil has nothing to do with humanly comprehensible sinful motives. It is not a matter of treating human beings as means to an end and thereby denying their intrinsic dignity.

A close reading of *The Origins of Totalitarianism* shows the pervasiveness of the theme of the superfluous. And it takes a variety of forms. Arendt is sensitive to the fact that the major political events of the twentieth century, from the First World War on, have created millions of people who are not only homeless and stateless, but are treated as if they were completely dispensable and superfluous. She calls attention to that feature of totalitarian ideology whereby the alleged "universal laws of Nature and History" transcend all individual human aspirations, so that human individuals can be sacrificed for the cause or the movement. It is in this sense that the manipula-

tors of totalitarian regimes are most dangerous, because they not only treat their victims as superfluous, but also treat themselves as if the laws of nature and history also transcend them. But the deepest and most shocking sense of superfluousness is revealed in the concentration and death camps that are the "laboratories" of totalitarian regimes. It is in these laboratories that the most radical experiments in changing the character of human beings are tested. "The horror of the concentration and extermination camps can never be fully embraced by the imagination, for the very reason that it stands outside of life and death." (CC, 748) Any appeal to common sense, utilitarian categories, or liberal rationalizations breaks down when confronted with the phenomenon of the death camps. In her perceptive reconstruction of the "logic" of total domination, Arendt distinguishes three analytical stages.

"The first essential step on the road to total domination is to kill the juridical person in man." (OT, 447) This was started before the Nazis established the concentration camps. Arendt is referring to the legal restrictions that stripped Jews (and other marginalized groups) of all their juridical rights. The highly effective way in which these juridical restrictions were enacted has been graphically recorded in that remarkable document, the diaries of Victor Klemperer, *I Will Bear Witness*. Arendt tells us:

> The aim of an arbitrary system is to destroy the civil rights of the whole population, who ultimately become just as outlawed in their own country as the stateless and homeless. The destruction of man's rights, the killing of the juridical person in him, is a prerequisite for dominating him entirely. In the concentration camps, there is not even the pretense of any civil or human rights – no inmates have any rights.
> The second decisive step in the preparation of living corpses is the murder of the moral person in man. This is done in the main by making martyrdom, for the first time in history, impossible. (OT, 451)

The SS, who supervised the camps, were perversely brilliant in corrupting any and all forms of human solidarity. They succeeded in making the decisions of conscience questionable and equivocal.

> When a man is faced with the alternative of betraying and thus murdering his friends or of sending his wife and children, for whom he is in every sense responsible, to their death; when even suicide would mean the immediate murder of this own family –

> how is he to decide? The alternative is no longer between good and evil, but between murder and murder. Who could solve the moral dilemma of the Greek mother, who was allowed by the Nazis to choose which of her three children should be killed? (OT, 452)

But it is the third stage of this "logic" of total domination that brings us closest to what Arendt means by "making human beings as human beings superfluous" – to the core and horror of radical evil. It is the extraordinary attempt to transform human beings, to destroy any vestige of human individuality and spontaneity – and consequently, any vestige of human freedom.

> After the murder of the moral person and the annihilation of the juridical person, the destruction of individuality is almost always success-ful … For to destroy individuality is to destroy spontaneity, man's power to begin something new out of his own resources, something that cannot be explained on the basis of reactions to environment and events. (OT, 455)

In short, the ultimate stage in this "logic" of total domination is the destruction of what makes human beings *human*. This is what Arendt calls natality, the capacity to initiate (and not simply to react like a marionette) that she took to be the quintessence of human freedom. Here is where we can clearly see the relevance of her reference to omnipotence. The delusion of the Nazi leaders is that they were omnipotent. Beyond destruction and the most extreme forms of humiliation, they sought to rival an omnipotent God by "transforming human nature itself". This is the most graphic form of radical evil, which has little to do with traditional understandings of vice, sin, or evil motives. And furthermore, this is a type of evil that can be brought about in a most banal manner. Monstrous deeds do not require monstrous motives.

> The camps are meant not only to exterminate people and degrade human beings, but also to serve the ghastly experiment of eliminating, under scientifically controlled conditions, spontaneity itself as an expression of human behavior and transforming the human personality into a mere thing, into something that even animals are not: for Pavlov's dog, which as we know was trained to eat not when it was hungry but when a bell rang, was a perverted animal. (OT, 438)

Questioning evil can never come to an end. There are no "final solutions" here. I agree with Arendt that we must nevertheless think without banisters; we must seek to comprehend, even when we acknowledge that radical evil is not fully comprehensible. I admire Arendt for her restless questioning of evil. She does not provide a comprehensive theory of evil. Nor is this what she intended to do. She invites us to do what she does, to return over and over again to *questioning* evil. And she certainly leaves us with many unanswered questions about evil. But with the theme of superfluousness, and especially in her depiction of the totalitarian attempt to transform human beings by eliminating all traces of solidarity, individuality, natality, and freedom, she helps us to understand this new form of radical evil. This is why she felt that, strictly speaking, the "crimes" of totalitarian leaders were unpunishable and unforgivable. In her concluding remarks to the first edition of *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, she declares:

> Until now the totalitarian belief that everything is possible seems to have proved only that everything can be destroyed. Yet, in their effort to prove that everything is possible, totalitarian regimes have discovered without knowing it that there are crimes which man can neither punish nor forgive. When the impossible was made possible it became unpunishable, unforgivable absolute [radical] evil which could no longer be understood and explained by the evil motives of self-interest, greed, covetousness, resentment, lust for power, and cowardice; and which therefore anger could not avenge, love could not endure, friendship could not forgive. Just as the victims in the death factories or the holes of oblivion are no longer "human" in the eyes of their executioners, so this newest species of criminals is beyond the pale even of solidarity in human sinfulness. (OT [1], 433)

But we may ask, what does Arendt's analysis of radical evil have to do with Kant – the philosopher who originally coined the expression. To anticipate my answer, we will see that Kant has something completely different in mind. And although I will argue that his understanding of radical evil has serious deficiencies, there are features of his thinking that are relevant for comprehending evil in our time. It would be anachronistic to think that Kant should have anticipated twentieth-century totalitarianism. But it certainly is not anachronistic to ask whether Kant – who many consider to be the greatest moral philosopher of modernity – can help us in question-

ing evil and especially in understanding the issue of responsibility for evil deeds.

To understand what Kant means by radical evil, we must first answer the more general question: what does Kant mean by evil? Evil is primarily a characteristic of the maxims we adopt. Consequently, evil has its source in the human will (*Willkür*), and not in our natural inclinations or in our reason. There are those who think that the source of evil for Kant is to be found in our inclinations. But Kant emphatically denies this. In his *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone*, he emphatically says:

> Natural inclinations, considered in themselves, are good, that is, not a matter of reproach, and it is not only futile to want to extirpate them but to do so would be harmful and blameworthy. (R, 51)

Natural inclinations are not the source of evil, not even in their power to tempt us. The primary issue for Kant is how we *respond* to these inclinations – or more accurately, how we freely choose to respond to them. This capacity to choose freely is what Kant calls *Willkür*, and he distinguishes it from *Wille* (the legislative function of the faculty of volition). It is in his *Religion* that Kant makes fully explicit this distinction between *Wille* and *Willkür*. We freely choose to obey or disobey the moral law. If we limited our interpretation of Kant's moral philosophy to his *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, we might think that freedom consists exclusively in self-legislation. Kant never retreats from the claim that we are truly free when we choose to follow the moral law, the supreme law that we, as practical agents, legislate for ourselves. But there is another sense of freedom – freedom as free will or choice (*Willkür*), whereby we have the capacity to choose between alternatives, that is, to choose to follow or disobey the moral law. The very possibility of morality presupposes such free choice.

The primary issue in determining whether a maxim is good or evil is not whether it "contains" the incentive to follow the moral law or to follow our natural inclinations. Rather, the issue is how these different types of incentives are ordered or subordinated to each other. Kant makes it clear that it is this ordering or subordination that is the basis for distinguishing good from evil maxims – and indeed, good from evil human beings.

> Hence the distinction between a good man and one who is evil cannot lie in the difference between incentives they adopt into their maxim (not in the content of the maxim), but rather must depend upon *subordination* (the form of the maxim) i.e., *which of the two incentives he makes the condition of the other*. Consequently, man (even the best) is evil only in that he reverses the moral order of the incentives when he adopts them into his maxim. (R, 31)

If my primary incentive is to act out of respect for the moral law, and I subordinate other natural incentives to this moral incentive, then my maxim is a good maxim. And subordination does not mean that I have to deny, suppress, or repress my natural inclinations. I can desire to do what I ought to do. But my maxim is a good maxim only if my primary incentive is a moral incentive. But if I reverse this order, and give primacy to incentives of self-love or my desire for happiness, then my maxim is an evil maxim.

This characterization of an evil maxim – a maxim freely chosen whereby one "makes the incentive of self-love and its inclinations the condition of obedience to the moral law" – enables us to approach the concept of radical evil. Unlike Arendt, radical evil in Kant does *not* designate a special type of phenomenon evil – one that breaks down all previous standards. Radical evil signifies the innate propensity (*Hang*) of human beings to adopt evil maxims. Kant does not hesitate to claim, "Man is evil by nature." Indeed, Kant's language is quite strong. He describes radical evil as "entwined with and, as it were, rooted in humanity itself." It is radical in the etymological sense of being *rooted* in this human nature. There is a "radical innate evil in human nature", although Kant immediately adds that it is "yet none the less brought upon us by ourselves" (R, 28). Kant even distinguishes three degrees of evil. The first is due to the frailty of human nature. The second is due to impurity; it is manifested when an agent fails to adopt "the law alone as its *all-sufficient* incentive" (R, 25). The third is what Kant calls wickedness. Kant describes it as follows:

> The wickedness … or, if you like, the corruption of the human heart is the propensity of the will to maxims which neglect the incentives springing from the moral law in favor of others which are not moral. It may also be called the *perversity* … of the human heart, for it reverses the ethical order [of priority] among the incentives of a *free* will [*Willkür*]; and although conduct which is

> lawfully good (i.e., legal) may be found with it, yet the cast of mind is thereby corrupted at its root … and the man is hence designated evil. (R, 25)

Many of Kant's contemporaries were quite critical of this concept of radical evil – a concept that seems to play no significant role in his *Groundwork* or the *Critique of Practical Reason*. To them, Kant, who had done so much to insist upon the autonomy of morality, was backsliding by making concessions to Christian orthodoxy. Schiller called the essay in which Kant introduced the concept of radical evil "scandalous", and Goethe wrote, "Kant required a lifetime to purify his philosophical mantle of many impurities and prejudices. And now he has wantonly tainted it with a shameful stain of radical evil, in order that Christians too might be attracted to kiss 'its hem'."[2]

Yet the more closely we scrutinize what Kant says about this innate propensity to evil, the more perplexing it becomes. We may think of a propensity as a tendency or craving that is prior to an act on our part. Presumably such a propensity to evil cannot be conceived of as a natural propensity in this sense. "Evil is possible only as a determination of the free will [*Willkür*], so the propensity to evil must consist in the subjective ground of the possibility of the deviation of the maxims from the moral law." (R, 24) The propensity to evil must spring from the exercise of our freedom. A propensity to evil can exist only in beings capable of free choice; it "must spring from freedom." In short, even though Kant claims that radical evil is an innate or inborn propensity, it is a very strange innate propensity because it is "*brought* by man *upon himself*" (R, 24). In a tortuous and extremely obscure passage, Kant writes:

> … a propensity to evil can inhere in the moral capacity of the will. But nothing is morally evil … but that which is our own act. On the other hand, by the concept of a propensity we understand a subjective determining ground of the will which precedes all acts and which, therefore, is itself not an act. Hence in the concept of a simple propensity to evil there would be a contradiction were it not possible to take the word "act" in two meanings, both of which are reconcilable with the concept of freedom. (R, 26)

[2] For references and a discussion of these criticisms, see Emil Fackenheim. "Kant and Radical Evil." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 23 (1954): 340.

Kant lamely distinguishes two senses of "act". "The term 'act' can apply in general to that exercise of freedom whereby the supreme maxim … is adopted by the will [*Willkür*], but also to the exercise of freedom whereby the actions themselves … are performed in accordance with that maxim." (R, 26) The propensity to evil "is an act in the first sense". Nevertheless Kant insists that radical evil, the innate propensity to evil woven into human nature, is a manifestation of the "exercise of freedom". Even though Kant insists (and reiterates) that radical evil is an innate propensity of the human species, he also insists (and reiterates) that we are somehow responsible for this propensity – we are the authors of it.

Now it certainly looks as if Kant is caught in a double bind. Or to switch metaphors, Kant is at war with himself. The very semantics of "propensity" (*Hang*) – especially one that is allegedly innate or inborn, suggests some type of natural casual efficacy, and Kant clearly speaks as if the propensity to evil does have a causal influence upon us. Yet Kant also insists that evil itself results from an "exercise of freedom", that as agents we are responsible for it – and indeed responsible for the very propensity to evil. If we rigorously follow out the logic of Kant's reasoning, we would be led to a blatant antinomy. When Kant asserts that man is by nature evil, he is making a universal claim about human beings, and not an empirical generalization. If this propensity is genuinely universal, then it must also be *necessary*. But Kant also categorically asserts the evil results from the exercise of our freedom; it issues from our *Willkür*. But then we are led to the awkward antonymic conclusion that human beings exercise their capacity of *freedom* so that they *necessarily* adopt the moral propensity to evil – "the subjective ground of the possibility of the deviation of the maxims from the moral law" (R, 24).

Why does Kant get himself tangled up in these aporias? Why does he tell us that radical evil is an innate propensity woven into the fabric of our humanity and yet at the same time affirm that this propensity results from an exercise of our freedom? It is at this point that we approach the heart of the matter. I suggest that if we unpack what is going on here, if we probe why Kant always seems to take back or withdraw what he categorically affirms, we discover one of the most important and relevant aspects of his moral philosophy – a feature of his thinking that is relevant to the phenomenon that Arendt calls radical evil. Let me explain.

Kant never wavers on what is perhaps the most essential claim of his moral philosophy – that human beings, as finite moral agents, are completely and absolutely responsible for the moral maxims (good

or evil) that they adopt. There are no moral excuses *in the sense* that we can claim that we are not accountable or responsible for the maxims that we adopt and act upon. To be a human being is to be a finite rational agent who is free – we might even say "radically" free to choose to obey or disobey the moral law. This power of free choice (*Willkür*) is the absolute condition for the very possibility of morality. It would not make any sense to say that we ought to follow the moral law, that we ought to legislate for ourselves what is universally and objectively valid, unless we already had the free capacity to do (or not to do) this. Whatever role religion or the postulation of a Supreme Being play in our understanding of morality, morality itself is autonomous. Kant makes this absolutely explicit in the opening sentences of the preface to *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone*.

> So far as morality is based upon the conception of man as a free agent who, just because he is free, binds himself through his reason to unconditioned laws, it stands in need neither of the idea of another Being over him, for him to apprehend his duty, nor of an incentive other than the law itself, for him to do his duty. At least this need can be relieved through nothing outside himself: for whatever does not originate in himself and his own freedom in no way compensates for the deficiency of his morality. Hence for its own sake morality does not need religion at all … (R, 3).

The more closely one follows out the logic of what Kant means by radical evil, the more closely it seems to be a rather dubious concept. And the reason for this is clear. Despite Kant's attempts in the *Critique of Judgment* to find some way to mediate between nature and freedom, to bring them closely into relationship with each other, Kant never revises the analysis of causality that he gives in the *Critique of Pure Reason* in a way that would make sense of a propensity that *causally* influences the exercise of freedom. Stated positively, Kant insists that if we choose evil or good maxims, this is a manifestation of our freedom. Whatever status we assign to the propensity to evil, it is never sufficient to cause us to do evil. Furthermore, we can always resist this propensity. Kant even asserts that someone who actually becomes evil can be "reborn" and become good, that is, adopt good maxims. As he tells us, if duty commands unconditionally, then it *must* always be possible to do what duty commands, regardless of what we have done in the past. *There can be no natural causal determination in the adopting of good or evil maxims.* And on

Kantian grounds, it doesn't make sense to even speak of a causal influence or "partial" causation of our *Willkür*.

We may think that the appeal to radical evil helps to *explain* why some persons adopt evil maxims even when they recognize what they ought to do. But this interpretation is incompatible with Kant's claim that radical evil is a species concept applicable to *all* human beings. He does not say that some persons have this propensity and some persons do not have it. I fail to see that the appeal to radical evil really *explains* anything. It simply reiterates what sets the problem for morality in the first place – that human beings are tempted to subordinate moral incentives to the nonmoral incentives of self-love. Kant tells us, "The ultimate subjective ground for the adoption of good maxims or evil maxims" is "inscrutable to us". But if it is inscrutable, then the appeal to radical evil does not explain why one chooses to adopt an evil maxim rather than a good maxim.

Now although I have been sharply critical of Kant's concept of radical evil – evil that is *rooted* in human nature, I have also been arguing that there is something vitally important that we can learn from Kant about our responsibility for evil. The most dominant theme in Kant's moral philosophy is his insistence that human beings – regardless of their circumstances and excuses – are ultimately solely accountable and responsible for the maxims that they adopt and the actions that they perform. Kant, despite the caricatures of him, knows that all sorts of circumstances can influence our moral character. He is not oblivious to context. But in the final analysis, as beings with dignity, we can freely choose to follow or not to follow the moral law. This persistent and uncompromising strand in Kant's thinking goes against the prevailing tendency today to find all sorts of excuses for immoral behavior and moral lapses. Too frequently we are inclined to say that we could not help doing what we did, that it was the result of unfortunate circumstances, or early childhood traumas or abuses. Kant's understanding of freedom – not only the freedom to obey the moral law, but also the more radical freedom to choose to adopt good or evil maxims – enables us to evaluate individuals in extreme situations. The question that becomes pressing in Arendt's analysis of radical evil is: who is responsible for this evil? One of the most troubling issues of the Holocaust is assigning responsibility for the horrors that occurred, and not only the responsibility of the perpetrators – to those who gave orders and those who followed orders – but also to all those so-called "bystanders" who actively or passively supported the Nazis. We do not have to say that all those involved are responsible in the

same way. There are crucial, moral, political, and legal differences that distinguish a Hitler from a Himmler or Eichmann and from all those "good" citizens who claimed to be ignorant of what was happening.[3] Kant would never endorse a notion of "collective guilt". And Arendt, following Kant, also declares that where all are guilty, none are guilty. But both Kant and Arendt would insist that each and every human being is personally responsible for what he or she did and did not do. We are living in a time when increasingly there is a temptation to undermine, soften, or mitigate claims about responsibility. There is a dangerous convergence between some recent intellectual fashions that question the very idea of a subject to whom we can ascribe responsibility and the popular tendency to find all sorts of excuses for the most horrendous deeds that individuals commit. Arendt does bring forth a crucial feature of evil that has not been fully recognized – the attempt to transform human beings so that they become less than human and consequently superfluous as human beings. Arendt shows that the *ultimate* objective of the "logic" of total domination is the destruction of human natality and spontaneity, which Kant himself took to be the quintessence of human freedom. But it is Kant who enables us to see through all those rationalizations that seek to diminish the responsibility for the radical evil that Arendt so trenchantly describes – including the responsibility of the so-called "innocent" bystanders. Arendt brings forth a new face of evil – the radical evil in which human beings as human beings become superfluous. But it is Kant – and here Arendt would certainly agree with him – who shows us that there can be no escape from personal responsibility for this radical evil.

Abbreviations and References

C — *Hannah Arendt/Karl Jaspers Correspondence, 1926–1969*, edited by Lotte Köhler and Hans Saner. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992.

CC — "The Concentration Camps." *Partisan Review* 15/7 (July, 1948): 743–63.

[3] In this paper, I have been primarily concerned with the meaning of radical evil and the general question of responsibility. I realize of course that a fuller account of the issues requires distinguishing different types and degrees of responsibility for evil deeds.

OT (1) *The Origins of Totalitarianism.* New York: Harcourt Brace, 1951.
OT *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968.
R Immanuel Kant, *Religion Within the Limits of Reason Alone.* New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960.