

---

racial group to preserve its cultural identity or to protect its political and economic interests. Such defenders of pluralism often depict themselves as liberal or radical, but they are, in a sense, deeply conservative. They share with Euro-American traditionalists the prayer that ties of blood and family will withstand the centrifugal pressures of the modern world.

But some members of each group in the officially sanctioned American ethnic "pentagon" (whites, blacks, Indians, Latinos, and Asians) are rattling their protective fences from inside: Korean and Filipino-Americans challenge the category "Asian-American" because it connotes Chinese or Japanese ancestry; West Indian blacks distinguish themselves from African-Americans of southern U.S. origin; young people of all groups increasingly marry across ethnic and racial lines and thereby create a growing "mixed-race" population.

To those who value the free development of personality—a historic liberal commitment—over obedience to traditional prescriptions, such developments are good news. The irony of multiculturalism, Hollinger notes, is that its relentless insistence on pluralism has ended up undermining the stability of each ethnic or racial enclosure and "diversifying diversity." By so doing, multiculturalism has prepared the way for a critical cosmopolitanism that cherishes the freedom of each person to choose multiple identities. And one of those identities, Hollinger believes, should be civic, based on a decision to build up one's American self through participation in the culture and politics of the nation.

In Hollinger's view, it is time for liberals to stop belittling "patriotism," which they ceded to the Right in the wake of Vietnam. Like Marxists and other progressives, liberals have always had more difficulty than conservatives expressing their loyalty to the nation because the nation stood for something parochial. Hollinger sees the nation rather as an indispensable locus of loyalty and as the only cultural and political entity capable of advancing the historic liberal quest for equality.

Hollinger harbors no illusions that it will be easy to move beyond multiculturalism. He even concedes that, in the absence of a wide political consensus on eliminating poverty, multicultu-

ralism may be the only way to salvage a few crumbs for the poor. But his book makes a timely case for abandoning an increasingly rigid pluralism and setting out for a cosmopolitan America where cultural differences can proliferate and civic nationality deepen.

### *Philosophy & Religion*

**HANNAH ARENDT / MARTIN HEIDEGGER.** *By Elzbieta Ettinger. Yale. 160 pp. \$16*

Why should it matter, other than to the gossip-hungry, that Martin Heidegger (1889–1976) and Hannah Arendt (1906–75) once had an affair? The year was 1924. He was 35, married with two children, a professor of philosophy at the University of Marburg, and—most important—heir apparent to the throne of German philosophy then occupied by Edmund Husserl at the University of Freiburg. She was 18 when she first heard him lecture, a bright young German Jew with a first-class mind and an almost religious reverence for the misty labyrinths of Teutonic thought. Within a year they were launched upon an affair that would last, thanks to much discrete plotting, until 1928, when Heidegger succeeded to Husserl's chair (and found another mistress).

Ettinger, a professor of humanities at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, mines the newly released correspondence between Heidegger and Arendt in her attempt to illuminate the relationship between a man whom some consider the greatest philosopher of the 20th century and a woman who became one of the more influential political thinkers of her time. Heidegger is important for his radical rethinking of the Western metaphysical tradition, his probing if often obscure explorations of the "existence" question (*Being and Time*, 1927), and his critique of technology and instrumental thinking. He is controversial to an almost equal extent for his involvement with the National Socialist Party. Despite his artful postwar disavowals, a spate of recent studies shows that Heidegger was a party member not merely while rector of Freiburg (1933–34) but well into 1945. And perhaps worse than his philosophical

---

sympathy with parts of the Nazi ideology was his deplorable treatment of Jewish scholars who were once friends, colleagues, and mentors (including Husserl himself).

Arendt's postwar response to this shameful record was almost as troubling. Although she left Germany in 1933 and eventually settled in the United States, she knew that Heidegger had been anything but blameless during the Hitler years. Writing in *Partisan Review* in 1946, she noted that he had banned Husserl from the Freiburg faculty "because he was a Jew." Yet within a few years, after resuming her correspondence with Heidegger, she accepted almost all of his self-justifications and evasions. Indeed, she became one of his more ardent apologists in the United States. For this gullibility Ettinger adduces a single reason: Arendt never overcame her youthful infatuation; nor did she cease, in Ettinger's words, "to believe that she was the woman in Heidegger's life."

That may well have been Arendt's belief, but as an explanation for her action it falls woefully short of adequate. Much more to the point is her complicated intellectual debt to the substance and style of Heidegger's thought, apparent in all of Arendt's work, including her masterpiece, *Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951). This influence she found impossible to shed. Even a book as short as Ettinger's might have hinted at how Arendt's defense of Heidegger was at least partially a defense of her own intellectual position. Alas, no such hint appears. Because Ettinger so assiduously avoids the entanglement of two minds, her study ends up being little more than high gossip, a sad record of treasons large and small, as slight in significance as it is in size.

## Science & Technology

**CHARLES DARWIN: Voyaging.** (A Biography, Vol. I.) By Janet Browne. Knopf. 543 pp. \$35

The man who persuaded us that our forefathers swung from trees did not wish to scandalize. So he tucked his observations away in secret notebooks and suffered mysterious stomach ailments. In this latest of recent studies, Charles Darwin (1809–82) is once again the "tormented



evolutionist" of Adrian Desmond and James Moore's rather break-neck 1991 biography, which placed Darwin at the center of the social and political uproar of mid-19th-century England. Browne, a zoologist, historian, and editor of *Darwin's Correspondence*,

views Darwin "as his wife or friends" might have seen him—hiding from the public, puttering in his garden, studying worms. Although scholars may wish for more hard science, lay readers will find much to admire in her leisurely stroll through the great man's life.

Browne's book also adds weight to Gertrude Himmelfarb's argument in *Darwin and the Darwinian Revolution* (1959) that Darwin was a "conservative revolutionary." His theory of evolution did not grow from radical social or political persuasions, Browne shows, but from a uniquely stubborn mind. Emotionally, he could not have been more conservative. As a child, he cared only for bugs, dogs, horses, and relatives. Two weeks before his 30th birthday, with no greater ambition than to be comfortably settled, he abruptly married a younger first cousin. Affectionate natures made for a happy marriage, though Emma Darwin's Anglicanism operated as a brake on her husband's evolutionary ideas. Intellectually, Darwin proved more adventurous. His father, a doctor, sent him to Edinburgh to study medicine. But Darwin recoiled from the surgical techniques of his era and preferred to roam the countryside with other fanciers of bugs and rocks. He even tried the ministry but could not abandon his naturalist hobbies.

A Cambridge University mentor secured for Darwin the opportunity that launched his career: a five-year voyage aboard a naval surveying ship, the *Beagle*. At the tip of South America, he was exposed to a dazzling variety of geological formations and plant and animal species; contact with native "savages" impressed upon him the variations possible within our own species. Finally, the trip gave Darwin license to draw conclusions about change in the natural world; he was simply too far from home to