Modern edition | Plain English

Late notebooks · 1888-1889

Nachlass: Writings from the Late Notebooks

Friedrich Nietzsche

Read and listen to this book on SUN.

Open the book page

sunapp.ai/books/nachlass-writings-from-the-late-notebooks-by-friedrich-nietzsche

Full text, credits and source notices follow.

SUN | sunapp.ai

FRIEDRICH
NIETZSCHE

Nachlass: Writings from the Late Notebooks



sun | *Intelligent Audio*



sunapp.ai/download

Nachlass, Late Notebooks 1888-1889

Friedrich Nietzsche

Modern English edition

Translated from the German by Blue Energy People, Inc. (SUN), with AI assistance from Claude Opus 5.5.

Nietzsche Source, eKGWB NF-1888, notebooks 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 (German original)

SUN edition / 2026

Contents

Notebook 12: Early 1888 4
Preface: The Coming of Nihilism (Belief in Nothing) 60
Notebook 13: Early 1888 to Spring 1888 66
Notebook 14: Spring 1888 72
Notebook 15: Spring 1888 282
Notebook 16: Spring–Summer 1888 373
Notebook 17: May–June 1888 419
Notebook 18: July–August 1888 433
Notebook 19: September 1888 442
Notebook 20: Summer 1888 453
Notebook 21: Autumn 1888 492
Notebook 22: September–October 1888 497
Notebook 23: October 1888 517
Notebook 24: October–November 1888 536
Notebook 25: December 1888 to Early January 1889 559

Unpublished Writings: Late Notebooks, 1888–1889

Notebook 12: Early 1888

1.

List of topics for the first book.

(1)

The whole history of philosophy so far, seen as the history of how the will to truth grew and developed.

IV

(2)

It makes sense that, for a time, social feelings about what is valuable won out. They were needed to build a foundation.

IV

(3)

An attack on the 'good' person, *not* on the hypocrisy of the

good people…

II

(4)

What Kant is worth

I

(5)

On what makes up a *nation's special genius*.

I

(6)

On art and beauty

III

(7)

'Intellect and spirit' — not only as something that gives orders and leads

III

(8)

The idea of God as the highest peak; and then the way back down from it

III

(9)

Offenbach's music

IV

(10)

The priest

II

(11)

Toward an attack on the Christian morality of the New Testament.

II

(12)

Every *strengthened* kind of human being stands on the level of a lower kind

IV

(13)

War against the *Christian ideal, not* just against the Christian God

II

(14)

Francis of Assisi fighting against the church's chain of command

II

(15)

Socrates against the noble, high-minded instincts, against art

II

(16)

Vices and *culture*

II

(17)

The big lies in history

II

(18)

The Christian way of explaining *dying*

II

(19)

What stays forever the same; the question of what it is worth

III

(20)

Replacing morality with the will to reach our goal, and

so also the will to use the means that get us there

Giving up on praise…

IV

(21)

Fakes and distortions in psychology.

II

(22)

Renan gets 'science' badly wrong

I

(23)

Correcting the idea of 'selfishness'

IV

(24)

Military expressions

IV

(25)

The future of self-denial

IV

(26)

The future of the worker

IV

(27)

Nihilism (belief in nothing)

I

(28)

'Truth': the things we need in order to survive, projected outward as if they were qualities of *being itself*

III

(29)

How much unbelief, how much 'freedom of mind' a person can allow himself — this measures how much power he has

IV

(30)

Attacking and rejecting the idea of 'objective'

III

(31)

The most extreme form of nihilism: in what way it is a godlike way of thinking

IV

(32)

Dionysian (wild, life-loving): a new road to a kind of godliness; how I differed from Schopenhauer right from the start.

IV

(33)

'What for?' — the question of nihilism, and the attempts to get answers to it

I

(34)

The ranking of people is missing — that is the cause of nihilism.

The attempts to imagine *higher types* of people…

I

(35)

What the great human being has *cost*.

IV

(36)

The will to truth

III

(37)

Pinning down facts, and putting meaning into things

III

(38)

More a child of one's grandparents

(39)

The New Testament: be careful!

II

(40)

How modern times condemn the *will to power*

IV

(41)

Courage as the limit that decides where something is accepted as 'true'…

III

(42)

Music — the strong tradition. Offenbach; against German music, which is *going downhill and degenerating*.

(43)

The *worth of a person* can*not* be measured by the effects

he has. 'Noble, high-minded'

IV

(44)

Philosophy as the art of living, *not* as the art of discovering

the truth. Epicurus.

On the history of philosophy.

IV

(45)

Good expressions…

(46)

The will to truth: a huge looking inward at oneself.

III

(46)

The will to truth

IV

(47)

The basic positions on how we know things, and how they connect to the highest values

III

(48)

Cheap, door-to-door philosophy. On the ideal of the psychologist

IV

(49)

What sense it makes to *rethink and re-weigh* values.

IV

(50)

La Rochefoucauld and J. Mill: Mill is completely shallow, La Rochefoucauld is *naive*… 'Selfishness'

III

(51)

'Usefulness' depends on 'goals': the theory that the useful is the good.

III

(52)

God's fear of human beings. Knowledge as a means to power, to 'being equal to God'. *Its worth.* On the history of philosophy —

III

(53)

Mere appearance, meaninglessness, the 'real'

III

(54)

On what the 'strong' are like

IV

(55)

Those 'born after their death' — whose time comes only later — the question of being understood, and of *authority*

II

(56)

What must come first for a rethinking of all values

IV

(57)

How virtue gets its good reputation

II

(58)

Praise and gratitude — as forms of the *will to power*

III

(59)

The psychological fakes created while the herd instinct is in charge

II

(60)

The herd instinct: which states of mind and which desires it praises.

II

(61)

How morality turned against nature, and the steps it took

II

(62)

The *oppressed* morality

II

(63)

The New Testament

II

(64)

Knowing and becoming

III

(65)

Fighting determinism, the belief that everything is fixed in advance

III

(66)

Bringing back self-discipline and self-denial.

IV

(67)

The rule that something cannot both be and not be

III

(68)

Where our belief in reason comes from

III

(69)

The superstition of the 'species'

II

(70)

On art and beauty

III

(71)

For the plan

I

(71)

The 'subject', the thing in itself

III

(72)

Nihilism (belief in nothing)

I

(73)

The future of the Jews

(74)

Description for its own sake, the picturesque — its *nihilistic* side.

I

(75)

On art and beauty

III

(76)

For the plan.

(77)

The 18th century.

I

(78)

The future of art

IV

(79)

The great human being, the criminal

III

(80)

How the 19th century made progress in returning to nature.

I

(81)

My 'nihilism'

I

(82)

Morality

as a way of luring and tempting,

II

as will to power

(83)

Voltaire and Rousseau

I

(84)

The main signs of pessimism

I

(85)

A tense, critical moment: the extremes have the upper hand.

The 19th century.

I

(86)

An attack on modern man: how he lies to himself about his own mind — his *romantic* pose

I

(87)

The 18th century.

I

(88)

Thierry: the uprising of the common people, even in scholarship.

I

(89)

The future of education: raising the exceptions

IV

(90)

'Answerable to his own conscience' — Luther's cunning: his will to power

II

(91)

The instinct of civilized mankind against *great*

human beings

III

(92)

Everything good is an evil from earlier times that has been tamed and put to work

III

(93)

In defense of morality. Summing up.

IV

(94)

Modern vices

I

(95)

'Culture' as the *opposite* of 'civilization'

I

(96)

The New Testament and Petronius.

II

(97)

On how logic is only an appearance

III

(98)

The different shapes and forms of the will to power

II

(99)

Against Rousseau

I

(100)

How a virtue comes to power

II

(101)

Transformations and refinements (of cruelty, lying, and so on)

II

(102)

How tendencies that are hostile to life come to be honored.

II

(103)

The point of view from which we judge value

III

(104)

Being split in two, in the body, as a result of the will to power

III

(105)

The strong ones of the future

IV

(106)

Growing toward the heights and growing toward the bad go together

III

(107)

Today virtue gets no respect — unless someone spreads it around as if it were a vice

IV

(108)

The big fakes in psychology

II

(109)

Faking *history* on purpose, as a rule, so that it can serve as

proof for morality

II

(110)

Settling all accounts with morality: what is it in morality that wants power?

III

(111)

Moral values in the theory of knowledge

III

(112)

Moral values ruling over the values of beauty and art

II

(113)

The causes behind the rise of pessimism

I

(114)

The big fakes made while morality was in charge: an *outline*.

II

(115)

Modern times

I

(116)

Classical: toward the art and beauty *of the future*

IV

(117)

What is modern: the traders and the middlemen

I

(118)

Modern times

I

(119)

The 18th century and Schopenhauer

I

(120)

The faking done by modern artists.

I

(121)

The modern split between the 'general public' and the 'small inner circle'

I

(122)

For the *preface*. The deepest reflection.

Preface.

(123)

Whose selfishness profits from keeping the tyranny of morality in place

II

(124)

A look back that *justifies* the bad results

of the tyranny of morality.

IV

(125)

Who sponsors virtue (greed, lust for power, and so on)

II

(126)

Spinoza as Goethe's saint

(127)

To close: a look full of love, the way Goethe looked at things — a true overcoming of pessimism

IV

(128)

The three centuries

I

(129)

Goethe's attempt to get beyond the 18th century

IV

Why is Goethe missing as a voice of the 19th century?

IV

(130)

The *strong* German type

IV

(131)

Mocking those who build neat systems

(132)

Schopenhauer as the one who picks up where Pascal left off

I

(133)

The 17th and 18th centuries.

I

(134)

Rousseau and Voltaire around 1760; Rousseau's influence on the Romantic movement.

I

(135)

The problem of 'civilization'

I

(136)

The question: what is the *modern* human being worth?

Whether his strong side and his weak side belong together.

I

Second book.

(137)

My five No's: for the preface?

IV

(138)

My new road to saying Yes

IV

(139)

How people got the better of the Renaissance ideal

I

(140)

In honor of the 19th century.

IV

(141)

Being ashamed to be a Christian

IV

(142)

The lasting effect of the *Christian* belief that God guides everything

What we owe to Christianity…

I

(143)

In defense of *morality*

IV

(144)

'Reactive' idealism, which only reacts against things, and its opposite

II

(145)

Weighing the past ideals by what they cost and what they bring

IV

(146)

Making people useful through virtue:

Machine virtue

IV

(147)

Altruism (selflessness) in biology!

III

(148)

The advantage of continuity

IV

(149)

"Lower" and "higher" existence?

IV

(150)

Separating out humanity's extra, luxury surplus.

The *two* movements

IV

(151)

"Being modern"

I

(152)

Subject, substance

III

(153)

Sympathy as a kind of rudeness

Likewise the "objectivity" of the critic

I

(154)

Pessimism that comes from strength.

I

(155)

An overall view of nihilism (belief in nothing)

I

(156)

An overall view of the two-sided, unclear character of our modern world

I

(157)

Using art to fight *against* turning everything into a matter of morals

IV

(158)

Romanticism: the fake kind of strengthening

I

(159)

Justifying the *rule*

IV

(160)

Science: *two* values

IV

(161)

A whole culture, *not* society

IV

(162)

Barbarism is *not* something you can choose at will

IV

(163)

The *growth* of humanity's overall power: to what extent it brings about every kind of decline.

IV

(164)

On the *politics of virtue*:

how it comes to power

how it rules once it has gained power

II

(165)

Artists are not the people of great passion

(166)

Ways to make a virtue win

II

(167)

The lustful sadness of the Moorish dance: *modern*

fatalism (the belief that everything is fated).

I

(168)

Modern art as the art of bossing people around.

I

(169)

Ways to make a virtue win.

II

(170)

Herd instinct: valuing what is average

II

(171)

Woman, literature, art (nineteenth

century), *making things ugly*

I

(172)

For Part I. Nihilism (belief in nothing). Plan

I

(173)

The perfection of the nihilist.

I

(174)

Feelings as shield and weapon: what becomes of people who are *not* forced to defend themselves and fight?

IV

(175)

Shrinking the area that morality covers: that is progress

IV

(176)

The stages of morality's *turning against nature*

II

(177)

Bringing "nature" back into morality

II

(178)

Faith or good deeds? *Luther.* The Reformation.

"People who despise themselves".

II

(179)

The problem of the *criminal*

IV

(180)

How the senses and desire change shape

III

(181)

The nihilism (belief in nothing) of artists

I

(182)

How the people of the 19th century were made natural again.

IV

(183)

Protestantism in the 19th century.

I

(184)

On the ideal of the *philosopher*. Conclusion

IV

(185)

The history of making things moral and of taking morality out of them again

III

(186)

Plan of Book 1, "Plan"

I

(187)

The ranking of people

IV

(188)

Music against words

I

(189)

Where to look for the *stronger* natures

IV

(190)

Mockery of the kind of idealism that won't let average people be average: toward a critique of the "idealist".

I

(191)

The tragic age

IV

(192)

The "idealist" (Ibsen)

I

(193)

Not wanting to "make people better", but stronger

IV

(194)

The Christian art of slander

II

(195)

Don't make everyone the same! "Virtue" is not something average but something wild and crazy

IV

(196)

Marriage, the sex drive

III

(197)

The Jewish cleverness of the first Christians

II

(198)

The New Testament as a book of seduction

II

(199)

The three elements in Christianity. Its progress toward democracy: as Christianity *made natural*.

II

(200)

Christianity as the *continuation* of Judaism

II

(201)

Mocking the little Christians

II

(202)

Individualism as "will to power"

On the changing forms of the will to power.

III

(203)

Mocking the virtuous

A critique of the 'good' person

III

(204)

How far the moral assumption reaches

III

(205)

A critique of the 'good' person

II

(206)

Against Jesus of Nazareth as a seducer…

II

(207)

The test of strength

IV

(208)

Marriage as a kind of concubinage (living together as lovers without true marriage)

II

(209)

The principle of the *ranking of people*…

IV

(210)

The idea of God, after settling accounts with the "good"

IV

(211)

Christianity as Judaism set free

II

(212)

Jewish life as the background of the "first Christian communities"

II

(213)

Petronius

II

(214)

Can rulers do without us immoralists (enemies of morality)?

IV

(215)

The Christian: the ideal of the kind of person who is not noble or high-minded.

II

(216)

We seekers of knowledge — how immoral we are!

IV

(217)

A protest against the Christian as the model of a human being, when he is really only a caricature…

IV

(218)

How the *genius* was turned against nature (Schopenhauer) under the influence of morality.

II

(219)

What makes Schopenhauer friendly toward the Old Testament: the myth of the Fall (humanity's first sin)

II

(220)

Make a list of my yeses, my noes, my question marks.

IV

(221)

The type of my "followers"

IV

(222)

Against Schopenhauer, who wants to castrate crooks and fools. On the "ranking of people".

IV

(223)

On the strength of the 19th century.

IV

(224)

Have I *harmed* virtue?

IV

(225)

Against *regret*

IV

(226)

Virtue translated into the *noble, high-minded*

IV

(227)

My way of justifying virtue

IV

(228)

On the ranking of people

IV

(229)

The power to make a *caricature* that lies in every society's *way of valuing*: a tool of its will to power

II

(230)

Toward a critique of the idealists: as my opposite

IV

(231)

War on "noble" in the soft, feminine, sissy sense

IV

(232)

Our music; on the ideas "classical", "genius" and so on.

IV

(233)

To what extent I do *not* want to destroy the ideals

that I fight against — I only want to become their master…

IV

(234)

My position and Schopenhauer's: a dispute; the same with Kant, with Hegel, Comte, Darwin, with the historians and so on.

IV

(235)

I build on the strong sides of this century.

IV

(236)

What does the odd moral fixation mean, even in an extraordinary person like Pascal?

II

(237)

To what extent I help mediocrity win new honor.

IV

(238)

Moral hair-splitting is the kind that has lasted the longest.

III

(239)

How naive people are about the final "*things worth wishing for*", while nobody knows the "why?" of the human being.

IV

(240)

Restoring the right idea of the "good, helpful, kind attitude": it was honored *not* because it was useful, but from the point of view of the people who felt it

III

(241)

Against the altruism (selflessness) that comes from *weakness*

III

(242)

Against being wrapped up in oneself and one's "eternal salvation"

III

(243)

How love, pity and justice were misunderstood under the pressure of the morality of giving up the self.

II

(244)

Religious commands turning into cultural commands

(245)

All emotions are *useful*: so usefulness gives no measure of value here.

III

(246)

What sense society's *short-sighted* view makes

when it comes to "usefulness"

II

(247)

Where "Christian-ness" today has absolutely no right left… In politics…

II

(248)

Against overrating the "species" and underrating the "individual" in natural science

III

(249)

The "conscious world" can't count as the starting point for values: we need an "*objective* way of setting values".

IV

(250)

"God" as the highest possible state

IV

(251)

Being ashamed of misfortune

IV

(252)

We seekers of knowledge — our final way of overcoming oneself

IV

(253)

How things like indigestion get turned into something lofty.

II

(254)

My points of view on values

IV

(255)

Not narrow-minded enough for a system

(256)

Morality as the greatest lowering of value, even still in Schopenhauer's nihilism (belief in nothing).

I

(257)

Morality's total rule over all other values: in the idea of God

(258)

How all natural things lost out when supposedly higher realms were set up — all the way to the rule of "what goes against nature"

(259)

The leftovers of nature being devalued by a morality that points beyond this world.

(260)

My aim: to show that everything that happens is completely of one kind; the moral distinction is only a matter of point of view

IV

(261)

Pessimism in music

I

(262)

Marriage, adultery

IV

(263)

Christian and Buddhist castration as an "ideal": where does its seductive pull come from?

II

(264)

The "mere appearance" of thought…

III

(265)

The art of pretending grows as you go up the ranking of living beings. On "thinking"…

III

(266)

The moral fanatics, after people have freed themselves from religion: they insist that morality falls *together with* the Christian God…

(267)

"The rule of the good": irony, because it is wasteful, like "good weather"

(268)

What has been spoiled by the Christian ideal: self-denial, fasting, the monastery, festivals, faith in oneself, death…

sun | *Intelligent Audio*



sunapp.ai/download

(269)

Examples of the moralists' art of slander

(270)

On how beauty came about: a critique of its value judgments

III

(271)

The tragic artist

IV

(272)

The more hidden forms of the Christian ideal, for example in nature worship, socialism, the "metaphysics of love" and so on.

(273)

Our *kindly* way of judging human beings, compared

to the moral, Christian way.

I

Moralistic open-mindedness as a sign that culture is growing

IV

(274)

The *most moral* person seen as the *most powerful*, the most godlike: all of human knowledge was set on proving *this*. This link to *power* is what lifted morality above all other values.

II

(275)

The Christian ideal: clever in a Jewish way.

II

(276)

How little people turn themselves into gods (see 80 a).

II

(277)

Paul: bending history into shape in order to *prove* something…

II

(278)

The reality behind the Christian communities: the *small Jewish* family.

II

(279)

First impression of the New Testament. You find yourself taking Pilate's side, and then, almost, the side of the scribes and the Pharisees…

II

(280)

On the psychology of the *New Testament*.

II

(281)

"Spirit" in the New Testament.

II

(282)

How far Christianity could be supported by the *ruling* classes and taken under their protection.

II

(283)

Paul

II

(284)

Buddhism and Christianity

II

(285)

I cannot stand any compromise with Christianity —

IV

(286)

On the plan of the *first* book.

I

(287)

Pagan — Christian

(288)

One form of "turning against nature": the good for the sake of the good, the beautiful for the sake of the beautiful, the true for the sake of truth —

II

(289)

How the mind fakes things when it is forced to *fight* for its ideal.

II

(290)

My complete loneliness: for the introduction.

IV

(291)

Be "natural"!

I

(292)

"Let the little children come": oh.

(293)

What Christianity takes for granted about the human mind.

II

(294)

A critique of the ideals of the Sermon on the Mount.

II

(295)

The stupidity of the ancient world in fighting Christianity.

II

(296)

The "thing in itself" (a thing as it is apart from how we see it) makes no sense.

III

(297)

The idea of the gods: why was it turned into a moral matter?

II

(298)

The cheek of wanting a say in everything, in the New Testament.

II

(299)

How naive Kant was to claim that things exist.

III

(300)

The *intolerance* of *morality*, judged quite

generally — a sign of human *weakness*.

IV

(301)

Go ahead of others? No — go your own way, by yourself.

(302)

Making do with people as they are.

(303)

The artist: form versus content.

(304)

Sainte-Beuve

(305)

George Sand

III: 22

IV: 73

(306)

People who are fates in themselves.

(307)

"The modern woman": the Duke of Morny.

(308)

Woman and the artist.

(309)

The highest point from which to look at things.

(310)

The stronger kind of person in the Europe of the future.

(311)

The "shepherd": the great average man.

(312)

Stendhal: "the strong man lies."

(313)

On the history of Romanticism.

(314)

Pagan

(315)

Our pessimism (for the book of recipes).

(316)

Why do we put something at risk? (for the book of recipes)

(317)

Emerson, Carlyle

(318)

Doubt, and the *great* person (for the book of recipes).

(319)

Bizet: the African way of feeling ("Moorish").

(320)

How virtue is brought to power.

(321)

Christianity: how it destroyed Pascal.

(322)

Taine, Zola: tyranny.

(323)

The "idealist"

(324)

The literary woman.

(325)

The modern "worker"

(326)

Against the pessimism of Mr. von Hartmann: pleasure as the yard-stick.

(327)

The actor, performer (Talma) —

whatever *is meant to become true must not be true*…

(328)

"Good taste": Sainte-Beuve's judgment.

(329)

Pleasure and pain come second.

(330)

No goal — no *final* state: do justice to *this* fact!

(331)

"Values": measured against what?

(332)

Values: measured against what *not*?

(333)

It is not that "the will" wants to be satisfied; *that* is not what "pleasure" is.

(334)

*Dis*satisfaction is full of pleasure.

(335)

The amount of *necessary* pain as a sign of the *level* of strength.

(336)

Why *we* live through tragedies (book of recipes).

(337)

Caesar's way of keeping healthy (book of recipes).

(338)

Book of recipes: caution.

(339)

What is value measured by? *Not* by consciousness.

(340)

Rules about what people eat reveal a lot about

"cultures".

(341)

The kingly generosity of human beings.

(342)

The need for religion disguised as *music*.

(343)

Love, unselfishness, self-interest —

(344)

Prostitution, marriage

(345)

"Manure": the stuff we *can't deal with* —

(346)

"Passing away": its value —

(347)

Voltaire's *last* words: Christian and classical.

(348)

The value of all *devaluing*.

(349)

The hidden meaning behind philosophical nihilism (belief in nothing).

(350)

The value of "passing away".

(351)

Causes of nihilism (belief in nothing)! Final summary!

(352)

Nihilism (belief in nothing) as an *in-between* state.

(353)

Against regret (book of recipes).

(354)

Be amazed at "nothing" (book of recipes).

(355)

Kinds of *unbelief*: a symptom of the beginning of

nihilism (belief in nothing).

(356)

Human beings do *not* strive for happiness! They strive for *power*!

(357)

Daring misfortune to do its worst (book of recipes).

(358)

On the theory of knowledge: our *inner* world is also only appearance.

(359)

Truthfulness — what is it?

(360)

The joy of finding immorality again everywhere.

(361)

The real human being is worth more than the one we *wish* for!

(362)

Preface: The Coming of Nihilism (Belief in Nothing)

(363)

Subject, object

(364)

"Hunger" in protoplasm, the living jelly inside cells

(365)

The nonsense inside the idea of *God*: we deny "God" in

God

(366)

The *practical* nihilist, the one who lives out a belief in nothing

(367)

We — let down by the "ideal"

(368)

Mockery: "Be *simple*!"

(369)

Choosing those who are alike, "moving out" and leaving the rest behind, keeping apart (for the book of recipes)

(370)

Against "justice" (for the book of recipes)

(371)

A people: the instinct of being related, of belonging to the same family

(372)

The *three ideals*

Pagan; bloodless and weak; going against nature

2.

12.

4.

Recipes for living, meant for us.

1.

1.

Nihilism (belief in nothing), thought through all the way to its very end.

2.

1.

Culture, civilization, and the double meaning of being "modern".

3.

2.

Where the ideal comes from.

4.

2.

A critique of the Christian ideal.

5.

2.

How virtue comes to win.

6.

2.

The herd instinct.

10.

4.

The "eternal return (everything happening again forever)"

11.

4.

Big politics.

7.

3.

The "will to truth".

8.

3.

Morality as the witch who bewitched philosophers

9.

3.

The psychology of the "will to power" (pleasure, will, concept and so on.

Notebook 13: Early 1888 to Spring 1888

1.

Becoming and Being.

Looking at things in terms of value. What are values?

Why pleasure and pain are not the final measures of value.

How virtue is brought to power.

A description of what is typical

of Christianity

of Greek philosophy

Selfishness as a misunderstanding.

The European of the future.

The changing shapes of nihilism (belief in nothing):

the mind running loose with no rules, the mind wandering about with no home

the followers and heirs of Rousseau:

the herd instinct

2.

The lack of *meaning*; the value placed on one's neighbor, the small, petty meaning;

Ranking of people.

The great noon (moment of clarity) (— the two paths.) On the *special right of the very few*.

Psychology (the study of feelings and passions) as a study of the shapes the will to power takes. (*Not* "happiness" as the motive)

The values that claim to come from beyond this world, cut down to size.

The body's side of the will to power.

On the history of nihilism (belief in nothing) (— the belief that happiness is the goal of life, seen as one *form* of the feeling that *the whole thing has no meaning*).

What do moralists and systems of morality really mean?

A study of the structures through which things rule. Selfishness. Selflessness. The "herd".

The will to power in history

(Control over the forces of nature, economic life

The view from the whole universe.

How the values of art depend on other things. What is *classical*? What is "*beautiful*"? What is *romantic*? And so on.

The eternal return (everything happening again forever).

3.

I.

On the history of European nihilism (belief in nothing).

(Pessimism misunderstood.

what is it that is *missing*?

Above all: meaning is missing)

The decline of all the other highest values

The power that turns things into ideals has thrown itself onto the very opposite

I.

The will to truth.

Starting point: the decline of the value called "truth."

—

The ruling types of people up to now. The decline of the ruling type.

IV

On the teaching of the eternal return (everything happening again forever). Used as a hammer.

—

On the history of the ranking of people

1

The body's workings: how the organs and living functions work

2

The psychology of strong feelings

II.

What moralists and moral systems really mean.

IV

We people of the future. On the special rights of the very few, and on the special rights of the many

II

Where our highest ideas of value come from ("metaphysics," meaning ideas about what lies beyond the world we see)

"The herd"; "the 'good' person"; and so on. *Structures built to rule.*

II

The values of *beauty and art*: where they come from, and a critical look at them.

IV

The ranking of values.

4.

A. On the coming of nihilism (belief in nothing).

1. "Truth." On the value of truth. The belief in truth. — The decline of this highest value. Adding up everything that has been done against it.

2. The decline of every kind of belief.

3. The decline of all ruling types of people

B. On why nihilism (belief in nothing) has to come.

4. Where the highest values so far have come from.

5. What moralists and moral systems really mean.

6. A critical look at the values of beauty and art.

C. On how nihilism (belief in nothing) overcomes itself.

7. The will to power: looked at from the point of view of the mind.

8. The will to power: looked at from the point of view of the body.

9. The will to power: looked at from the point of view of history and society

D. Those who overcome and those who are overcome.

10. On the special rights of the very few.

11. The hammer: the teaching of the eternal return (everything happening again forever).

12. On the ranking of values.

Each book 150 pages.

Each chapter 50

5.

You are far away:

neither love nor hate.

As on an old fortress,

Think back and come to your senses!

Notebook 14: Spring 1888

Nice, March 25, 1888.

1.

Art. Preface

For me, talking about art doesn't go together with a sour, grumpy face. I want to talk about it the way I talk to myself on wild and lonely walks, when now and then I snatch some wicked happiness and some ideal and pull it down into my life. Here is that ideal: to spend your life among delicate things and absurd things; to be a stranger to reality; to be half artist, half bird and half dreamer about the deepest questions; to say neither yes nor no to reality, except that every now and then you acknowledge it with the tips of your toes, the way a good dancer does; to always be tickled by some sunbeam of happiness; to be playful and even cheered up by sadness, because sadness *keeps* the happy person going; to hang a little tail of silliness even on the holiest things. This, of course, is the ideal of a heavy spirit, a spirit weighing a ton, a *spirit of heaviness*…

2.

Homeopathic Notes

The effect of *tiny, almost invisible doses* is special in people with nervous illness. *I* am an example.

"The more intelligent you are, the more unhappy you are."

Schopenhauer

3.

The phases you *can't notice*: first the phase of excitement, then soon the phase of exhaustion.

Hypnotic sleep can be brought on by all kinds of excitement of the senses, through sight, hearing or smell. They just have to be strong enough and last long enough. The first effect is always that everything becomes more lively and the body moves more easily. But in the end, the brain's energy is *exhausted*. The excitement sets a force in motion that *uses itself up*…

4.

Notes on the Mind

Desire is pleasant when you believe you are strong enough to reach the things you want,

because then it is a picture of what will increase our feeling of power. That is the very first beginning of pleasure.

Otherwise desire is *unpleasant*, and soon it turns you against *yourself*. *Desire becomes a state of need and distress, just as in Schopenhauer*.

5.

Religion. Decline

The Danger of Christianity

Christianity put the teaching of selflessness and love in the front. Even so, its real effect in history has been to *increase selfishness*, the selfishness of the single person, all the way to its most extreme point. That extreme point is the belief that each single person lives forever. The single person had become so important that he could no longer be *sacrificed*: before God, all "souls" were equal. But that puts the life

of the whole human species in question in the most dangerous way. It encouraged a way of acting that is the opposite of what is good for the species. Christianity's idea of living for others is an idea that *endangers life*: it makes everyone equal to everyone else…

But that overturns the natural course of development… and all natural *values*. If the sick person is supposed to be worth as much as the healthy one (or even more, as Pascal says)…

This general *love for all humans* means, in practice, favoring everyone who suffers, everyone life treated badly, everyone who is sick.

It has actually weakened the strength to *sacrifice people*. It wanted to shrink responsibility down to sacrificing oneself. But from the point of view of breeding a better kind of human, exactly this absurd *personal* selflessness has *no value at all*. If you waited to see how many people would sacrifice themselves to keep the species going, you would be *made a fool of*…

All great movements, wars and so on, lead people to sacrifice themselves. In this way it is the *strong* who keep *reducing* their own numbers…

The *weak*, on the other hand, have a frightening instinct to *spare* themselves, to keep themselves alive, to hold *each other* up…

And this "keeping each other alive" is *supposed* to be almost the same as virtue, and in any case to be love for humankind!… *Typical:* they want to be *protected* by the state, and they think "that is its highest duty!"

Behind all the praise of "living for others" hides an instinct: if everyone looks after everyone else, the single person is kept safest… It is the *selfishness of the weak* that created the praise, the one and only praise, of living for others…

How Christianity dangerously goes against nature:

— it gets in the way of *selection* —

1)

It invents an *imaginary* value for each person, so wildly exaggerated and important that roughly everyone is worth the same.

2)

It sets up the *instinct of the weak to protect and preserve each other* as the highest measure of value. It hates nothing more than whatever treats the weak and those life treated badly the way *nature* does: by harming them, using them, destroying them…

3)

It refuses to admit that the highest type of human is the well-made and happy one… It is the slander, the poisoning, the crumbling away of every way nature judges value.

6.

Will to Power as Morality

Understand how all forms of corruption belong together, and in doing so, don't forget Christian corruption.

Pascal as the typical example.

And don't forget socialist and communist corruption either (which grows out of the Christian kind).

What socialists see as the *highest* idea of society is the *lowest* in the ranking of societies.

The corruption of the "*beyond*": as if, besides the real world, the world of change and becoming, there were also a world of things that just fixedly are.

Here there can be no *deal*. Here you have to root things out, destroy them, wage war. You have to drag the Christian, nihilistic measure of value *out* from everywhere it is still hiding, and fight it under every mask it wears… Drag it out of today's *sociology*, for example, out of today's music, out of today's pessimism (all of these are forms of the Christian ideal of value).

Either one thing *or* the other is *true*. And "true" here means: lifting up the type called human…

The priest and the pastor who looks after souls are shameful ways of existing.

All education so far has been helpless, without a firm footing, without any weight to steady it, and burdened with values that contradict each other —

7.

On *Modern Times*.

Being too cowardly to follow things through to their consequences — that is the modern vice.

Romanticism: hostility

against

the *Renaissance* (Chateaubriand, R. Wagner)

against

the ideal of value of the ancient Greeks and Romans

against

intellect and spirit that rules and dominates

against

classical taste, the simple, the strict, the grand style

against

the "happy ones"

against

the "warlike ones"

8.

Value…

The greatest amount of power that a human being is able to take into himself.

A human being: *not* humanity…

Humanity is much more a means than a goal. What matters is the type of human. Humanity is just the material for experiments, the huge surplus of the badly made, a field of ruins…

9.

Nihilism (belief in nothing)

Nothing would be more useful and more worth encouraging than a nihilism (belief in nothing) that follows through and *acts*.

The way I understand all the signs of Christianity and of pessimism, they are saying: "We are ready not to exist. For us, it makes sense not to exist."

In this case, this language of "reason" would also be the language of *nature, which selects*.

What deserves to be condemned beyond all words, on the other hand, is the two-faced and cowardly half-heartedness of a religion like *Christianity*, or more precisely, of the *Church*. Instead of encouraging death and self-destruction, it protects everything badly made and sick and makes it reproduce itself —

The problem: by what means could you bring about a strict form of the great, contagious nihilism (belief in nothing)? A form that teaches and practices voluntary death with scientific care… (and *not* the feeble going on vegetating with an eye on a false life after death —)

You cannot condemn Christianity enough. It took away the *value* of such a great, *cleansing* movement of nihilism (belief in nothing), which was perhaps already underway, through the idea of the private person who lives forever, and also through the hope of rising from the dead. In short, it always did it by holding people back from the *deed of nihilism*, which is suicide… In its place it put slow suicide: little by little, a small, poor, but long-lasting life; little by little, a completely ordinary, middle-class, mediocre life, and so on.

10.

Religion as Decline

Attack on Christianity

We need great *crises of selection and cleansing*, brought in, in any case, by *nihilistic* religions and philosophies.

You come to see that Christianity *is something failed and badly made, forever*. It started out as a tool of selection and turned into its enemy, its brake and its poisonous weed.

11.

The feelings that *say yes*

Pride

joy

health

love between the sexes

hostility and war

deep respect

beautiful gestures, manners, objects

the strong will

the discipline of high intellect and spirit

the will to power

gratitude toward the earth and life

: everything that is rich and wants to give, everything that gives gifts to life, covers it in gold, makes it last forever and makes it godlike — the whole power of the virtues that *transfigure*, that make things shine brighter than they are… everything that approves, that says yes, that does yes —

12.

Priests and other ink-wipers, squids that squirt ink —

13.

How the body works in nihilistic religions (religions of believing in nothing)

a typical course of an illness

Note well: all the *nihilistic* religions, every one of them, are *case histories of illness, put into a system*, given religious and moral names.

— in pagan worship, it is the great *cycle of the year* that the worship turns around and tries to explain

— in Christian worship, it is a cycle of *signs of paralysis* that the worship turns around…

"Faith", a form of mental illness

Regret for one's sins

Rescue

Prayer

all of it *neurasthenic*, a sign of worn-out nerves

Sin, an idea one is stuck on

Hatred of nature, hatred of reason

Being Christian as an illness

Christianity as a symptom of physical decline

14.

The push in the other direction: *art*

The Birth of Tragedy

III

These two natural forces of art are set against each other by Nietzsche as the Dionysian (wild, life-loving) and the Apollonian (calm, ordered). He claims that — — — The word "Dionysian" stands for this: an urge toward oneness; a reaching out beyond one's own person, beyond everyday life, beyond society and reality, like falling into a deep pit of forgetting; a passionate and painful overflowing into darker, fuller, more floating states of mind. It means an ecstatic yes to

the whole character of life, seeing life as something that stays the same through all its changes, equally powerful and equally blissful. It is the great feeling, as if all of nature were God, of sharing in all joy and sharing in all suffering — a feeling that approves of and makes holy even the most terrible and questionable sides of life. It comes from an eternal will to create new life, to be fertile, to last forever. It is the feeling of being one with the fact that creating and destroying both have to happen… The word "Apollonian" stands for this: the urge to be completely oneself, to be the typical "individual"; the urge toward everything that simplifies, that makes things stand out, that makes them strong, clear, unmistakable and typical. In short: freedom within the law.

The further growth of art is tied to the conflict between these two forces just as necessarily as the further growth of humanity is tied to the conflict between the sexes. A fullness of power together with self-control; the highest way of saying yes to oneself, shown in a cool, noble, high-minded, reserved beauty: that is the Apollonian side of the Greek will.

the origin of tragedy and comedy as a way of *seeing a god present right here and now*, while everyone together is in a state of ecstasy; as living through, together, the local legend — the god's visit, the miracle, the act of founding, the "drama" (—

This clash between the Dionysian and the Apollonian inside the Greek soul is one of the great riddles that drew Nietzsche in when he looked at the Greek character. At bottom, Nietzsche was trying to do just one thing: to guess why the calm, ordered Greek spirit had to grow out of a wild, Dionysian ground. Why did the Dionysian Greek need to become Apollonian? That means: why did he need to break his will toward the enormous, the many-sided, the uncertain and the horrifying, by setting against it a will toward measure, toward simpli-

city, toward fitting into rules and ideas? Deep down in him lies the boundless, the wild, the Asian. The courage of the Greek lies in his fight against this Asian side of himself. Beauty was not given to him as a gift, any more than logic was, or the naturalness of his customs. It was conquered, willed, fought for — it is his victory…

15.

This book is against pessimism: it teaches a force that fights back against all saying no and doing no, a cure for the great tiredness.

16.

The type of God modeled on the type of the creative mind, the "great human being"

17.

The Birth of Tragedy.

2.

Start of the section two pages later: II.

Here art counts as the one superior force against every will to deny life: as the anti-Christian, anti-Buddhist, anti-nihilist force above all others…

Art is the *rescue of the one who seeks knowledge* — of the person who sees, and wants to see, how terrible and questionable life is: the person who knows *tragically*.

Art is the *rescue of the one who acts* — of the person who doesn't just see how terrible and questionable life is, but lives it, *wants* to live it: the tragic human being, the hero…

Art is the rescue of the *one who suffers* — as a road to states of mind where suffering is wanted, made to shine, made godlike, where suffering becomes a form of great delight…

18.

III

There are two states in which art itself shows up in a human being like a kind of force of nature: one is vision, the other is Dionysian wild ecstasy. The body already prepares these two in dreams and in rapture. Dreaming can be understood as practice for the power of vision, as a pleasure in seeing shapes and making shapes.

The will to appearance, to illusion, to deception, to becoming and changing, goes deeper — is more "metaphysical", closer to the root of things — than the will to truth, to reality, to fixed being. Pleasure comes before pain. Pain is itself only the result of a will to pleasure (— the will to create, to shape, to ruin, to destroy), and in its highest form pain is a *kind* of pleasure…

19.

6.

This work is against modern times: it believes in modern art and in nothing else. And really, deep down, not even in modern art, but in modern music. And really, deep down, not in modern music in general, but only in Wagner… And deep down perhaps not even in Wagner, except for lack of anything better.

Page 116: "What else could we name?" it says, with a pained gesture — — —

Schopenhauer, Dürer.

It believes that a music *is going to come*… a *Dionysian* music…

20.

7.

This work acts German, even loyal to the German Empire — it even still believes in the German spirit!… Its special shade is that it is German and anti-Christian at the same time. On page 142 it says: "The most painful thing for us is the long humiliation the German spirit lived under, cut off from house and home, serving sly, wicked dwarves." These sly, wicked dwarves are the *priests*. — In another place it raises the question of whether the German spirit is still strong enough to find its way back to itself; whether it can still seriously push out foreign elements; or whether it will go on wasting away in sick effort, like a diseased, stunted plant. In this book, the transplanting of a deeply un-German myth — the Christian one — into the German heart counts as the real *German disaster*.

21.

4.

So this book is even against pessimism, in this sense: it teaches something that is stronger than pessimism, something more godlike than "truth": art.

It seems nobody would speak up more for a radical denial of life — for really doing no to life, even more than just saying no — than the author of this book. Only he knows — he has lived through it, perhaps he has lived through nothing else — that art is *worth more* than "truth".

Already in the preface, where Richard Wagner is invited in as if to a conversation between two, the statement of faith appears, the gospel of the artist: "*art* as the real task of life, art as an *activity that reaches beyond the physical world*"…

22.

5.

If this is the starting point, what must become of science? Where does it stand? In an important sense, almost as an enemy of truth: because it is optimistic, because it believes in logic. The book works out, in terms of the body, that the scientific type of person ripens in a strong race exactly in its times of decline. The attack on Socrates makes up the main part of the book: Socrates as the enemy of tragedy, as the one who breaks down art's demonic, protective instincts; Socrates' way of thinking as the great misunderstanding of life and art. The morality, the clever arguing, the easy contentment of the purely thinking person are a form of tiredness. The famous Greek cheerfulness is only a *sunset glow*, the light of an ending day… Strong races, as long as they are still rich and overflowing with strength, have the courage to see things as they are: *tragic*… For them art is more than entertainment and amusement; it is a *cure*…

The book teaches, "in defiance of all modern ideas and prejudices of democratic taste", that the Greeks — page X of the preface.

23.

II

The key thing in this way of seeing is the idea of art in relation to life. Art is understood, in the mind just as much as in the body, as the

great *driving force* that pushes life on. It is the thing that forever *pushes* us toward life, toward eternal life…

24.

3.

You can see that in this book pessimism, or to put it more plainly, nihilism (belief in nothing), counts as the "truth." But truth does not count as the highest measure of value, and even less as the highest power.

Here, the will to appearances, to illusion, to deception, to becoming and changing, counts as deeper, more basic, and more "metaphysical" than the will to truth, to reality, to being. In fact, the will to truth is itself just one form of the will to illusion. In the same way, pleasure counts as more basic than pain. Pain only comes about as a result of the will to pleasure, that is, the will to become, to grow, to shape things, and so also the will to overpower, to resist, to fight, to destroy. The book imagines a highest state of saying yes to existence. In this state even pain, every kind of pain, is forever included as a means of making life stronger and greater. This is the *tragic and Dionysian (wild, life-loving)* state.

25.

On "The Birth of Tragedy"

VIII.

What makes this book stand out is its new way of seeing the Greeks. We have already pointed to its two other strengths. The first is its new way of seeing art, as the great something that drives life on, toward life. The second is its idea of *pessimism*: a pessimism that

comes from strength, a *classical* pessimism. Here the word "classical" is not used to mark off a period in history, but to mark off a type of mind. The opposite of classical pessimism is *romantic* pessimism. That is the kind in which weakness, tiredness, and the decline of a whole race are put into ideas and judgments of value. Examples are the pessimism of Schopenhauer, and likewise that of de Vigny, Dostoevsky, Leopardi, and Pascal, and that of all the great nihilistic religions: Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Christianity. They may be called nihilistic because all of them have praised the very opposite of life, nothingness, as their goal, as the highest good, as "God."

What makes Nietzsche stand out: the natural, unforced way his insights into the mind come to him; a dizzying breadth in what he has looked at, lived through, guessed, and worked out; the will to follow his thoughts all the way to the end; and his lack of fear in the face of harshness and of dangerous conclusions.

26.

The Birth of Tragedy

But let us get to the main point, to what makes the book special and sets it apart, to what is original about it. It contains three new ideas. We have already named the first: *art* as the great something that drives life on, toward life. The second: it brings a new type of pessimism, the *classical* kind. Third: it raises a question about the human mind in a new way, the question of the *Greeks*.

27.

Philosophy as Decline

On the Psychology of the *Psychologist*

Psychologists of the kind that have only become possible since the nineteenth century are no longer like those idlers standing on street corners, who look just three or four steps ahead and are almost content to dig around inside themselves. We psychologists of the future have little wish to observe ourselves. We almost take it as a sign of decay when a tool tries "to know itself." We are tools for gaining knowledge, and we would like to have all the innocence and precision of a tool. So we must not take ourselves apart, must not "know" ourselves. The first mark of the great psychologist's instinct to protect himself is this: he never searches for himself; he has no eye, no interest, no curiosity for himself… The great selfishness of our ruling will wants us to politely close our eyes to ourselves, so that we must seem "impersonal," "disinterested," "objective"… oh, how very much we are the opposite of that! It is only because we are psychologists to an extreme, unusual degree

28.

The Psychologist

1) We are not like Pascal. We are not especially interested in "saving one's soul," in our own happiness, or in our own virtue… —

2) We have neither the time nor enough curiosity to keep circling around ourselves like that. If you look more deeply, it is even different: we distrust all those who stare at their own belly buttons, because we see self-observation as a *decayed form* of psychological genius, as a question mark hanging over the psychologist's instinct. In just the same way, a painter's eye is surely decayed if behind it there is the *will* to see just for the sake of seeing.

29.

Where Moral Values Come From

Selfishness is worth exactly as much as the person who has it is worth in body and health.

Every single person is still the whole line of development that led to him. He is not just, as morality sees him, something that begins at birth. If he stands for the upward climb of the human line, then his worth is truly extraordinary, and the care taken to protect him and help him grow may be extreme. (It is the care for the future that is promised in him which gives the well-made, healthy individual such an extraordinary right to be selfish.) If he stands for the downward line, for decay, for long-lasting sickness, then he is worth little. And the first thing that is fair is that he should take away as little room, strength, and sunshine from the well-made, healthy ones as possible. In this case society has the task of *holding down selfishness*, which sometimes shows itself in absurd, sick, and rebellious ways. This is true whether it is about single people or about whole layers of a people that have gone to ruin and become stunted. Inside such layers, a teaching and religion of "love" can be of the very highest value, even in the eyes of those who rule. This is a teaching of *holding down* self-assertion, of putting up with things, bearing them, helping, and of give-and-take in deeds and words. It is so valuable because it holds down feelings of rivalry, of resentment, of envy, which are the all-too-natural feelings of those life treated badly. Under the ideal of humility and obedience, it makes their own condition seem holy to them: being a slave, being ruled, being poor, being sick, being at the bottom. This explains why the ruling classes or races, and ruling individuals, have at all times kept alive the worship of selflessness, the gospel of the lowly, "the God on the cross."

When people value selflessness above everything else, it comes from an instinct that they are badly made. Deep down, the judgment here says: "I am not worth much." This is a purely physical judgment about one's own worth. Put more plainly, it is the feeling of being powerless.

It is the lack of the big, life-affirming feelings of power that live in the muscles, the nerves and the body's centers of movement. Depending on how cultured these social layers are, this judgment gets translated into a moral or religious judgment. (When religious and moral judgments are in charge, that is always a sign of a low level of culture.) The judgment looks for reasons to back itself up, and it takes them from the areas where these people first learned the idea of "worth" at all. Take the way the Christian sinner explains himself, the story he believes helps him understand himself. It is an attempt to find a *good reason* for his lack of power and self-confidence. He would rather find himself guilty than feel bad for no reason at all. And needing explanations of this kind in the first place is already a symptom of decay. In other cases, the person life treated badly does not look for the cause in his own "guilt", as the Christian does, but in society. The socialist, the anarchist, the nihilist all feel that their existence is something that *someone* must be to blame for. In that way they are still the closest relatives of the Christian. The Christian, too, believes he can bear feeling bad and being badly made more easily once he has found someone he can hold *responsible* for it. In both cases the instinct of *revenge* and of *resentment* is at work. Here it shows up as a way of putting up with things, as an instinct to keep oneself alive. The same goes for preferring the *selfless* theory and practice. So *hatred of selfishness*, whether it is hatred of one's own selfishness, as with the Christian, or of other people's, as with the socialist, turns out to be a value judgment ruled by revenge. On the other hand, it is also a clever way for suffering people to keep themselves going, by strengthening their feelings of give-and-take and of standing together… Finally, as already hinted, there is the way resentment lets off steam by judging, rejecting and punishing selfishness, one's own or someone else's. That too is still an instinct to keep oneself alive among those life treated badly. To sum up: the worship of selflessness is a particular form of selfishness. It shows up again and again under certain physical conditions.

30.

When the socialist demands "justice", "rights" and "equal rights" with fine outrage, he is only acting under the pressure of his poor education. His culture is not good enough for him to understand why he is suffering. On the other hand, he also gets a kind of pleasure out of it. If he were better off, he would take care not to shout like that. He would find his pleasure somewhere else. The same is true of the Christian. He condemns "the world", slanders it and curses it, and he does not leave himself out. But that is no reason to take his shouting seriously. In both cases we are still among sick people. Shouting *does them good*, and slandering things gives them relief.

31.

Worth…

The idea of a "wicked action", an action that deserves to be rejected, gives us trouble. Nothing can be wicked in itself. Nothing at all that happens can be wicked in itself, *because we would have no right to want it gone*. Everything is so tied up with everything else that wanting to cut out any one thing means cutting out everything. To call an action wicked means rejecting the whole world…

And even then: in a rejected world, the act of rejecting would also deserve to be rejected… And the end result of a way of thinking that rejects everything would be a way of living that says yes to everything… If everything that comes into being moves in one great circle, then everything is of equal worth, eternal and necessary…

In every pairing of yes and no, of preferring and refusing, of loving and hating, all that comes through is a point of view, the interest of certain kinds of life. In itself, everything that exists says yes.

32.

Worth…

A nihilistic judgment of worth says: "*I* deserve not to exist." If it goes further, it says: "*You* deserve not to exist."

33.

As for the deep feeling stirred by tragedy, Nietzsche does not take up Aristotle's old misunderstanding again —

as a transformation of lust and cruelty into something Greek: elements that, in the wild festivals of frenzy — — —

the Dionysian (wild, life-loving) as an overflowing and a merging together of many kinds of excitement, some of them terrifying

34.

Drama

Drama is not, as half-educated people believe, the "action". Instead, in line with the Dorian origin of the word "drama", it should also be understood in a Dorian, priestly way. It is the happening, the "event", the holy story, the legend of how something was founded, the "thinking back over it", the act of *bringing to life in the present* the task of the sacred priestly order.

35.

Art as a push in the other direction.

Until now, the wild, frenzied element in Greek art has been underrated. But that this frenzy meant one of the deepest movements and crises for the Greek soul itself — — —

People may remember the careless, cold way in which the scholar Lobeck kept the whole field of rituals, myths and secret ceremonies at arm's length, pages 564 and 565.

You could say that the idea of the "classical", as Winckelmann and Goethe had shaped it, not only failed to explain that Dionysian element, but actually shut it out. And — — —

there was a time when scholars of ancient languages were especially grateful to Lobeck — — —

36.

Apollonian and Dionysian

III

There are two states in which art itself shows up in a person like a force of nature, taking control of him whether he wants it or not. One is as an urge he cannot resist to see visions. The other is as an urge he cannot resist to fall into frenzy. Both states also exist in normal life, only weaker: in dreams and in rapture, as in — — —

But the same contrast also exists between dreaming and rapture. Both set loose artistic powers in us, but each one different ones. Dreaming sets loose the powers of seeing, connecting and making up stories and poems. Rapture sets loose the powers of gesture, passion, singing and dancing.

37.

On Modern Times.

What does us credit.

If anything does us credit, it is this: we have put our *seriousness* somewhere else. We take seriously the *low*, everyday things that every age before us looked down on and pushed aside. On the other hand, we hand out "beautiful feelings" cheaply…

Is there any more dangerous mistake than looking down on the body? As if that did not doom all intellect and spirit to become sick, to sink into the fumes and fainting fits of "idealism"!

Nothing that Christians and idealists have thought up makes any real sense. We go deeper, right to the roots. We have discovered that the "smallest world", the tiny everyday things, is what decides everything, everywhere. In a dangerous way we have gone into — — —

Paving on the streets, good air in the room, a home that is not poisoned, food understood for what it is really worth: we have become serious about all the *basic needs* of life. And we *look down on* all the talk of "beautiful souls" as a kind of "carelessness and silliness".

What used to be looked down on most has now moved to the front line.

I add immorality: morality is only one form of immorality, which, with regard to the advantage a certain kind of person gets from it, — — —

38.

The type called "Jesus"…

Jesus is the *opposite of a genius*: he is an *idiot*. Just feel how unable he is to understand reality. He goes round and round five or six ideas that he heard earlier and slowly understood, which means misunderstood. In those ideas he has his experience, his world, his truth. Everything else is foreign to him. He uses words that everybody uses, but he does not understand them the way everybody does. He only understands his five or six vague, floating ideas. The truly manly instincts, not only

the sexual ones but also those of fighting, pride and heroism, never woke up in him. He stayed behind and remained childlike, stuck at the age of puberty. All of this belongs to the pattern of certain nervous illnesses similar to epilepsy.

In his deepest instincts, Jesus is not heroic. He never fights. Anyone who sees something like a hero in him, as the French writer Renan does, has made this type so cheap and common that it can no longer be recognized.

On the other hand, just feel how unable he is to understand anything to do with the mind: the word "spirit" turns into a misunderstanding when he says it! Not the faintest breath of science, taste, mental discipline or logic ever touched this holy idiot, just as little as real life ever touched him. Nature? Laws of nature? Nobody ever told him that there is such a thing as nature. He only knows moral effects, and that is a sign of the lowest and most absurd kind of culture. We have to hold on to this: he is an idiot in the middle of a very clever people… It is only because his followers were not idiots, and Paul was no idiot at all, that the history of Christianity happened.

39.

Attack on Christianity.

Morality as the witch who bewitched philosophers

The Fight over the "I"

40.

How Decline Secretly Shapes the Ideals of Science

Decline has a deep effect, one nobody is aware of, even on the ideals of science. Our whole sociology, the study of society, proves this. Its fault is that it only knows, from experience, society in its decaying

form. So it can't help taking its own instincts of decay as the standard for judging society.

In these sociologists, the sinking, failing life of present-day Europe is putting its ideals for society into words. All these ideals look confusingly like the ideals of old races that have outlived their time…

Then there is the herd instinct. It has now become a ruling power, and it is something completely different from the instinct of an aristocratic society, a society led by the few best. What a total adds up to depends on the worth of the single units in it…

Our whole sociology knows no instinct except the instinct of the herd, that is, of zeros added together… where every zero has "equal rights," and where being a zero counts as a virtue…

The way the different forms of society are judged today is exactly the same as the way of thinking that values peace more highly than war. But this judgment goes against biology; it is itself a product of life in decline… Mr. Herbert Spencer, as a biologist, is a man in decline, and mostly as a moralist too. He actually thinks the victory of selflessness would be something to wish for!!! Life is a result of war, and society itself is a tool for war.

41.

Renan has this in common with women: he only becomes deadly when he loves. He has never hugged an old idol, some old ideal, without a small murderous intention on the side, always curious whether the thing he is hugging is already starting to wobble…

42.

— German =

(4) Religion in Music

How much religious need is still being satisfied in Wagner's music, without anyone admitting it or even understanding it! How much prayer, virtue, holy oil, "virginity" and "rescue" still speaks along in it!… Music is allowed to leave words and ideas aside. Oh, how this sly saint takes advantage of that! She leads us back, and seduces us back, to everything that people once believed!… Our intellectual conscience doesn't need to feel ashamed: it stays outside the door while some old instinct, with trembling lips, drinks from forbidden cups… That is clever and healthy. And since it shows a sense of shame about satisfying the religious instinct, it is even a good sign… A sneaky, underhand Christianity: that is the type of music of the "late Wagner."

43.

With alcohol and music, we take ourselves back to stages of culture, and of lack of culture, that our ancestors left behind. In that sense nothing is more educational, nothing more "scientific," than getting drunk… Some foods, too, reveal something about where we came from. For example, how much mystery lies in the link between German dumplings and the German "childlike soul"!… As soon as you have the dumplings in your stomach, the childlike soul starts to stir: you begin to have vague feelings and hunches!… Oh, how quickly you are far away from "the wisdom of the wise"!

44.

I fight against this corruption of music with every means I have, like a handsome devil — — —

45.

What the German mind has made of Christianity! And to stick just with Protestantism: how much beer there is, once again, in Protestant

Christianity! Can you even imagine a form of Christian faith that is more dull in mind, lazier, more sprawled out and stretching its limbs than that of the average German Protestant?… That is what I call a modest Christianity! I call it a homeopathic Christianity, watered down until almost nothing is left! People remind me that today there is also an immodest Protestantism, that of the court preachers and the anti-Jewish speculators. But nobody has yet claimed that any "spirit" is "hovering over these waters"… That is just a more indecent form of Christianity, and in no way a more sensible one…

46.

In Dionysian (wild, life-loving) rapture there is sexuality and lust; and these are not missing from the Apollonian (calm, ordered) kind either. There must also be a difference in tempo, in speed, between the two states… The extreme calm of certain feelings of rapture (more precisely: the slowing down of our sense of time and space) likes to show itself in visions of the calmest gestures and the calmest kinds of soul. The classical style is basically a picture of this calm, this simplifying, shortening and concentrating. The highest feeling of power is concentrated in the classical type. Being slow to react; a great awareness; no feeling of struggle:

The rapture of nature:

47.

Art as a push in the other direction.

Pessimism in Art?

Little by little, the artist comes to love, for their own sake, the means through which the state of rapture shows itself: extremely fine and splendid colour, clear lines, the shades of sound. He loves what is

distinct and sharp, where normally, in ordinary life, everything lacks distinction.

All distinct things, all fine shades, to the extent that they remind us of the extreme rises in strength that rapture produces, wake that feeling of rapture again, working backwards.

What works of art do is stir up the state in which art is created: rapture…

What is essential in art remains the way it completes existence, the way it brings forth perfection and fullness.

Art is basically saying yes to existence, blessing it, making it godlike…

What would pessimistic art mean?… Isn't that a contradiction? Yes.

Schopenhauer is wrong when he puts certain works of art to work for pessimism. Tragedy does not teach "giving up"…

Showing terrible and questionable things is itself already a sign of the artist's instinct for power and glory: he isn't afraid of them…

There is no pessimistic art… Art says yes. Job, in the Bible, says yes.

But what about Zola? What about de Goncourt?

The things they show are ugly. But the fact that they show them comes from enjoying this ugliness…

It's no use! You are fooling yourselves if you claim otherwise.

What a relief and a rescue Dostoevsky is!

48.

Signs over a Modern Madhouse

"What we must necessarily think is what morality necessarily demands."

Herbert Spencer.

"The final test of whether a statement is true is that we cannot even imagine its opposite."

Herbert Spencer.

49.

Modern Times.

Music Made Ugly.

The rule of the abstract: "this means something." It doesn't care about the "swamp" of the senses, which the senses aren't even supposed to say yes to…

Music absolutely has to mean something that is not music:

and in the process, what becomes of

the rhythm

the melody

the colour

the structure

fake depth passed off as thoughts going quiet; rage, regret, spasms, ecstasy — all easy things, toys that you can still keep mixing until they seem perfect

50.

5.

The tricks the performer uses to get on top

6.

The danger of the theatre as the place where all the arts are corrupted.

7.

How all of Wagner's new ideas are unnecessary, even in opera

8.

Carmen, and the depressing effect of Wagner: the body's protest against Wagner

9.

The great double meaning of Wagner's leaning towards tragedy: my realism in matters of art…

10.

Restoring the idea of "tragic"

11.

What this phenomenon of mind and art means for the history of the "modern soul."

12.

Basically not German, and that is what makes him stand out…

13.

A critique of "Romanticism."

51.

Wagner as a Problem.

A Word to Clear Things Up.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

52.

— — — whose cleverness made peace with the German way of being just at the right moment, who wrote the Emperor's March, and who had ambitions for top jobs as chief conductor

who stooped to every kind of dirt with which the German spirit, this so corrupt German spirit, has stained itself

who, with his Parsifal, encouraged every cowardice of the modern soul.

This character, who has become very two-faced and questionable, and on whose grave a Wagner club, the one in Munich, nevertheless laid a wreath with the words:

"Rescue for the rescuer!"…

You can see that the problem is big, and the misunderstanding is enormous.

If Wagner could become a rescuer, a savior,

who will rescue us from this rescue?

who will rescue us from this rescuer?…

53.

There are instruments that talk your guts into things, and others that work on your spinal cord… Someone let me in on a secret: Wagner's music has its strongest effect right after a health cure at the spa in Carlsbad…

54.

But Wagner is not a model only here… And people have understood him all over the world… Since Wagner, people make a *new* music. They make it in Russia, in Paris, in South America, they even make it in Germany… I myself could teach you how this new music is made. Would you like a little lesson?…

55.

Among Musicians.

We are late musicians, born at the end of a long tradition. We have inherited a huge past. Our memory is always quoting things. Among ourselves, we can make hints and references in an almost scholarly way: we understand each other right away. Our listeners also love it when we make these references: it flatters them, and it makes them feel educated.

56.

The first rule of how theater works: whatever is supposed to seem true must not actually be true.

The actor, the performer, does not have the feeling he is showing; he would be lost if he did have it.

I hope people know the famous remarks of the actor Talma on this.

57.

Conviction

On the Psychology of *Paul*

The fact is the death of Jesus. What remains is to *interpret* it…

It never even occurred to such people that an interpretation can be true or false. One day a lofty, grand possibility pops into their heads: "this death *could* mean such and such"

and right away it *does* mean that! A guess proves itself by the lofty *rush of excitement* it gives the person who came up with it…

"The proof by power": that means a thought is proven by its *effect*, ("by its fruits," as the Bible naively puts it)

whatever fills you with enthusiasm must be *true*,

whatever you shed your blood for must be *true*,

Everywhere here, the sudden feeling of power that a thought stirs up in the person who had it is counted as the *value* of that thought. And since people have no other way to honor a thought than to call it true, the first label it gets, as an honor, is that it is *true*… How else could it have such an effect? People imagine that it comes from some power: if that power were not real, it could not have an effect… The thought is seen as *inspired*, as sent from above: the effect it has feels like the overwhelming force of a demon's influence.

A thought that such a person in decline cannot resist, that completely takes him over, is thereby "proven" *to be true*!!!

All these holy epileptics and people who saw visions did not have one thousandth of the honest self-criticism that a language scholar today uses when reading a text, or that someone uses when checking whether a historical event really happened…

Compared to us, they are moral idiots…

58.

Carlyle…

Where *science* comes from: pay attention to this. It does *not* arise among priests and philosophers, who are its natural enemies. It arises among the sons of craftsmen and business people of all kinds, among lawyers and so on: people in whom the *skill of a trade, and what that skill requires*, carried over to such questions and to answering them.

59.

Conviction and Lying

"Improving" People

How Virtue Is Brought to Power

Pity

"Selflessness"

Giving Things Up

Killing Off the Senses

60.

A faith that claims to make you "blessed" and happy, after it has made you sick. A faith that relies on books, a faith that claims a revelation from God for itself, a faith that sees doubting it as a "sin", a faith that proves itself through martyrs dying for it…

Another mark of the theologian is that he is *unable to do philology*, unable to read carefully. I mean the word philology here in a very broad

sense: being able to read facts without twisting them through interpretation, without…

61.

Will to Power as Art

"*Music*" *and the Grand Style*

The greatness of an artist is not measured by the "beautiful feelings" he stirs up: let the little women believe that. It is measured by how close he comes to the grand style, by how far he is capable of the grand style. This style has something in common with great passion: it refuses to try to please; it forgets to persuade; it gives orders; it *wills*… To become master over the chaos that you are; to force your chaos to take shape; to become necessity in form: to become logical, simple, clear, to become mathematics; to become *law*: that is the great ambition here. With it, you push people away. Nothing stirs up love for such forceful people anymore. A wasteland settles around them, a silence, a fear as if in front of some great crime against the gods…

All the arts know people with ambitions for the grand style like these: so why are they missing in music? Has no musician ever built the way that architect built who created the Palazzo Pitti in Florence?… There is a problem here. Does music perhaps belong to a culture in which the reign of forceful people of every kind was already over? Could it be, in the end, that the very idea of the grand style goes against the soul of music, against the "woman" in our music?…

Here I am touching on a key question: where does all our music belong? The ages of classical taste know nothing like it. It blossomed when the world of the Renaissance had reached its evening, when "freedom" had disappeared from people's customs and even from their wishes. Is it part of its character to be a counter-Renaissance, a

reaction against the Renaissance? To put it another way, is it an art of decline, the way the Baroque style is an art of decline? Is it the sister of the Baroque style, since it certainly lived at the same time? Isn't music, modern music, already decline?…

Music is the counter-Renaissance in art: it is also decline as an expression of society.

I have already once before put my finger on this question: is our music not a piece of counter-Renaissance in art? Is it not the closest relative of the Baroque style? Did it not grow up in opposition to all classical taste, so that any ambition to be classical would rule itself out in it?…

The answer to this question about value, one of the first importance, could not be in doubt if people had properly weighed the fact that music reaches its highest ripeness and fullness as Romanticism, once again as a movement reacting against classical style…

Mozart: a tender soul, full of love, but completely eighteenth century, even when he is serious… Beethoven, the first great Romantic, in the sense of the *French* idea of Romanticism, just as Wagner is the last great Romantic… both of them enemies, by instinct, of classical taste, of the strict style, not to mention the "grand" style here… both of them…

62.

Modern Times

German *Romantic* music, its *lack of intellect and spirit*, its hatred *of the "Enlightenment" and of "reason"*

The withering of melody is the same thing as the withering of the "idea", of argument, of the freedom of the most spiritual movement of

the mind. How much fighting against *Voltaire* there is in German music!…

how much clumsiness, how much stuffed-up heaviness, which then develops into new ideas and even into principles,

people always have the principles that match their talents

against higher tragedy and mocking wit, against comic opera

I have seen beer drinkers and army doctors who "understood" Wagner…

Wagner's ambition to force even idiots to understand Wagner

63.

The hero as Wagner imagined him: how modern! how bold! how cleverly complicated he imagined him! How well Wagner knew how to use his heroes to give the modern soul its three basic needs: it wants the brutal, the sick, and the innocent…

These magnificent monsters, with bodies from ancient times and nerves from the day after tomorrow. These blond saints, whose sensuality barely seems to exist yet, which stirs so much gentle curiosity in women and *allows* them to be so very welcoming… Beaumarchais gave Cherubino as a gift to beautiful women, and Wagner gave them Parsifal:

And as for the hysterical, heroic creatures that Wagner imagined as women, that he *turned into goddesses*, the type of Senta, Elsa, Isolde, Brünnhilde and Kundry: they are interesting enough on the stage — but who would actually *want* one of them?…

There is a reason why this type of woman has not completely disgusted people, even in Germany (though that reason is far from making it right): a poet far, far greater than Wagner, the noble Heinrich von

Kleist, had already spoken up for this type there, with all the backing of his genius.

64.

Question: when you sink deep into a thought, do you really lose your own self because of some truth?

… Herzen claims so. He thinks it is something quite ordinary for a person to forget their 'me' and let it go —

Question: isn't this, too, only something that *seems* to be so? Isn't the thing that finds a question interesting really our whole, many-sided *self*?…

65.

Decline

What gets passed down from parents to children is not the illness itself, but a *tendency toward illness*: a lack of strength to fight off the danger of harmful things getting in, and so on. It is a broken power of resistance. Put in *moral* terms, it is giving up and being humble in front of the enemy.

I have asked myself whether all these highest values of philosophy, morality and religion up to now could be compared with the values of weakened people, of the *mentally ill* and of people with worn-out nerves. In a milder form, they show *the same sicknesses*…

The value of all sick states is this: they show, as if under a magnifying glass, certain states that are normal, but that are hard to see when they are normal…

Health and *illness* are not basically different things, as the old doctors believed, and as some practicing doctors still believe today. You must

not turn them into separate forces or beings that fight over the living body and use it as their battlefield. That is old stuff and empty chatter that is no longer good for anything. In fact, there are only differences of degree between these two ways of existing. When normal processes are exaggerated, out of proportion, or out of harmony, that is what makes up the sick state. So says Claude Bernard.

Just as *evil* can be seen as exaggeration, lack of harmony and lack of proportion, *the good* can just as well be a *protective diet* against the danger of exaggeration, lack of harmony and lack of proportion.

Inherited weakness as the *ruling* feeling: this is the cause of the highest values.

Note well: people *want* weakness. Why?… Mostly because they are *bound* to be weak…

Weakening as a *task*: weakening the desires, the feelings of pleasure and pain, the will to power, the will to feel proud, to own things and to want more and more. Weakening in the form of humility. Weakening in the form of faith. *Weakening* in the form of disgust and shame toward everything natural, as saying no to life, as illness and constant weakness…

Weakening in the form of giving up revenge, resistance, hostility and anger.

The *mistake* in the treatment: people don't want to fight weakness with a *strengthening* plan. Instead they fight it with a kind of excuse and *moralizing*: that is, with an *interpretation*, a way of explaining it…

Mixing up two completely different states. For example, the *calm of strength*, which is basically holding back from reacting, the type of the gods, whom nothing moves…

and the calm of exhaustion, stiffness, going as far as complete numbness.

All the philosophical and self-denying practices aim at the second kind of calm, but really mean the first… Because they describe the state they reach with words, as if they had reached a godlike state.

66.

Morality as Decline

Why Weakness Is Not *Fought*, but Only 'Excused'

Weakened people lose their instinct for what *heals* them, so that they crave as a cure the very thing that speeds up their ruin. For example, most vegetarians would need strengthening food to give energy back to their slack muscles. But they take their liking for mild and gentle things as a *hint* from nature — and so they weaken themselves even more, beyond what fate would have dealt them…

67.

Women react more slowly than men, the Chinese more slowly than Europeans…

68.

Religion as Decline

The Most Dangerous Misunderstanding.

There is one idea that seems to allow no confusion and no double meaning: the idea of exhaustion. Exhaustion can be acquired during a life; it can be inherited. In either case, it changes how things look, it changes *what things are worth*…

Think of the person who is overflowing. Out of the fullness that he is and feels, he can't help *giving* some of it to things, so he sees them as fuller, more powerful, richer in future. At any rate, he *can* give. The exhausted person is the opposite: he shrinks and spoils everything he sees. He makes value *poorer*. He is harmful…

It seems that no mistake is possible here. And yet history holds the horrible fact that the exhausted have always been *mistaken* for the fullest — and the fullest for the most harmful.

The one who is poor in life, the weak one, makes life even poorer. The one who is rich in life, the strong one, makes life richer…

The first is a parasite living off life. The second is someone who adds to it as a gift…

How can people possibly mix them up?…

When the exhausted person shows up with the look of the highest activity and energy; when his breakdown causes an outburst of too much mental or nervous discharge, then people *mistook* him for the rich one… He made people afraid…

The worship of the *madman* is still the worship of the one who is rich in life, the powerful one.

The fanatic, the possessed, the religious epileptic, all the strange and extreme people have been felt to be the highest types of power

: as *godlike*

This kind of strength, the kind that causes *fear*, was above all thought to be godlike. This is where authority started from. Here people interpreted, listened for and searched for *wisdom*…

Out of this, almost everywhere, grew a *will* to 'become godlike', that is, to the typical breakdown of mind, body and nerves: an attempt to find the way to this higher kind of being.

Making yourself sick, making yourself mad, provoking the signs of breakdown — that meant becoming stronger, more than human, more frightening, wiser:

— people believed that this way they would become so rich in power that they could *give it away*. Wherever people have worshipped, they were looking for someone who can give.

That people took the madman for something more than human

That people believed frightening powers were at work in the nervously ill and in epileptics

What misled people here was the experience of *rapture*…

Rapture *increases* the feeling of power to the highest degree

and so, if you judge it naively, it increases *power itself* —

At the highest level of power, then, there had to stand the one most *carried away by rapture*, the one in ecstasy.

There are two starting points for *rapture*: an overflowing fullness of life, and a state in which the brain is fed in a sick way.

Nothing has cost people more dearly than mixing things up about the body and how it works. —

69.

The Misunderstandings About the Body.

1.

sickness misunderstood as a higher form of life

2.

rapture

3.

the inability to feel anything.

70.

Pleasure shows up wherever there is a feeling of power

Happiness lies in an awareness of power and victory that has taken charge

Progress means this: making the type stronger, and gaining the ability to want great things. Everything else is a misunderstanding, a danger, — — —

71.

The will to power as a "law of nature"

The will to power as life

The will to power as art.

The will to power as morality.

The will to power as politics

The will to power as science.

The will to power as religion

72.

The Will to Power.

The Study of Its Forms.

The will to power

as "nature"

as life

as society

as will to truth

as religion

as art

as morality

as humankind

The push in the other direction

Will to nothing

those who have been beaten. The waste, the ones who have gone bad and lost their healthy nature

73.

What Decline Leads To.

Vice, and being full of vice

Sickness, and being sickly

Crime, and criminal behavior

Never marrying or having sex, and being unable to have children

Hysteria, weakness of will, alcoholism

Pessimism

Anarchism

74.

Degeneration, the process of going bad:

First principle: the things people have so far seen as the causes of degeneration are really its results.

vice: as a result;

sickness

crime

being unable to have children

the slanderers, who speak badly of life

those who undermine

those who cast doubt

destroyers

Doubt about everything

Self-denial, giving up pleasures

Nihilism (belief in nothing)

Focusing on a world beyond this one

loose, unrestrained living (in the mind too) — never marrying or having sex.

weakness of will: pessimism; anarchism; — — —

But also, the things people think of as cures for degeneration are only painkillers against some of its effects. They do not fix the cause. The so-called "cured" are just one more type of the degenerate.

75.

The Idea of "Decline"

Waste, decay, and the rejects are nothing that should be condemned in themselves. They are a necessary result of life, of life growing. The appearance of decline is just as necessary as any rise and forward movement of life. It is not in our power to get rid of it. On the contrary, reason demands that decline be given its due…

It is a disgrace for all the socialist system-builders that they believe there could be conditions, some arrangement of society, in which vice, sickness, crime, prostitution, and poverty would no longer grow… But that means condemning life itself… A society is not free to stay young. Even at the height of its strength, it has to produce filth and waste. The more energetically and boldly it moves forward, the more it will be full of failures and misshapen people, and the closer it will be to decline… You cannot abolish old age with institutions. Nor sickness. Nor vice.

76.

People used to say about every morality: "You will know it by its fruits." I say about every morality: it is a fruit, and from it I can tell what kind of soil it grew from.

77.

We Hyperboreans (people from beyond the north wind).

A Preface.

The Will to Power.

Part One.

The Psychology of Decline.

The Theory of Decline.

Part Two.

A Critique of the Spirit of Our Times.

Part Three.

The Great Noon (Moment of Clarity).

Part Four.

The Strong.

The Weak.

Where Do We Belong?

The Great Choice.

78.

The Will to Power.

An Attempt at a Rethinking of All Values.

Part One.

What Comes from Strength.

Part Two.

What Comes from Weakness.

Part Three.

And Where Do We Come From? —

Part Four.

The Great Choice.

79.

The Will to Power

Philosophy

Amounts of Power. A Critique of the Mechanical View of the World

Let us get rid of the two popular ideas of "necessity" and "law" here. The first puts a false force into the world, and the second a false freedom. "Things" do not behave regularly, they do not follow a rule. In fact, there are no things — that is our own invention. And they do not behave under the force of necessity either. Nothing obeys here. Because the fact that something is the way it is, this strong or this weak, is not the result of obeying, or of a rule, or of being forced…

How much resistance there is, and how much greater power there is — that is what every event is about. If we, for our own everyday use in calculating, know how to express this in formulas we call "laws", so much the better for us! But by pretending that the world obeys, we have not put any "morality" into it —

There is no law. Every power, at every moment, goes all the way to its final outcome. It is exactly because there is no middle ground that things can be calculated.

An amount of power is defined by the effect it has and by the effect it resists. It is never neutral, never indifferent, even though we could imagine that in principle. At its core it is a will to overpower others and to defend itself against being overpowered. It is not about keeping itself alive. Every atom has an effect on the whole of existence. If you imagine away this outward glow of the will to power, you have

imagined the atom itself away. That is why I call it an amount of "will to power". This name expresses the quality that cannot be removed from the mechanical order without removing that order itself.

The idea of "motion" is a translation of this world of effects into a visible world — a world for the eye. In this idea it is always quietly assumed that something is being moved. Whether we picture a tiny lump of an atom, or even its abstract version, the "dynamic" atom, we are still thinking of a thing that has an effect. In other words, we have not stepped out of the habit that our senses and our language lead us into. Subject and object, a doer behind the doing, the doing kept separate from what it does: let us not forget that this is just a system of signs and does not point to anything real. Mechanics, as a science of motion, is already a translation into the human language of the senses.

We need units in order to calculate. But that is no reason to assume such units actually exist. We borrowed the idea of a unit from our idea of the "I" — the oldest item of our faith. If we did not think of ourselves as units, we would never have come up with the idea of a "thing". Now, rather late, we are well convinced that our idea of the "I" does not guarantee any real unit at all. So, to keep up the mechanical picture of the world in theory, we always have to add a note on how far we are building it out of two inventions. One is the idea of motion, taken from the language of our senses. The other is the idea of the atom as a unit, which comes from our inner, psychological "experience". This picture depends on a prejudice of the senses and a prejudice of the mind.

The mechanical world is imagined the way the eye and the sense of touch alone picture a world: as "moving"

in such a way that it can be calculated — so that units are made up,

so that causing units are made up, "things" (atoms), whose effect stays the same (— this carries the false idea of a subject over to the idea of the atom)

The idea of number.

The idea of a thing (the idea of a subject)

The idea of activity (separating being a cause from having an effect)

Motion (the eye and touch)

the belief that every effect is motion

the belief that wherever there is motion, something is being moved

So what belongs only to appearances is this: the mixing in of the idea of number, the idea of a subject, the idea of motion. Our eye and our psychology are still in there.

If we remove these additions, no things are left. What is left are dynamic amounts of energy, in tension with all the other dynamic amounts. Their whole nature lies in their relationship to all the other amounts, in their "effect" on them. The will to power is not a being, not a becoming, but a passion, a felt force. It is the most basic fact of all, and only from it does any becoming or any effect arise…

mechanics describes the results that follow, and on top of that it does so with signs, using the means of expression of the senses and the mind. It does not touch the force that actually causes things…

80.

Suppose the deepest core of all being is will to power. Suppose pleasure is every growth of power, and pain is every feeling of not being able to resist and take control. Then shouldn't we treat pleasure and pain as the most basic facts of all? Can there even be a will without

these two swings back and forth, between yes and no? But *who* feels the pleasure?… But *who* wants the power?… That's an absurd question, if the very core of things is the will to power, and so is itself the feeling of pleasure and pain. Even so: it needs opposites, it needs resistance, and so, in a relative sense, it needs *larger units that reach over and take in other things*… Located in a place - - -

when A acts on B, only then is A located, separate from B

81.

Attacking the idea of "cause"

If we work it out in terms of the mind, the idea of "cause" is really our feeling of power when we so-called "want" something. And our idea of "effect" is the superstition that this feeling of power is itself the power that makes things move…

a state that goes along with an event, and is already a result of that event, gets projected backward and treated as the "good enough reason" for the event

the tension inside our feeling of power: pleasure as the feeling of power, the feeling of resistance overcome — are these just illusions?

Let's translate the idea of "cause" back into the only area we really know, the place we took it from in the first place. Then we cannot imagine any *change* where there isn't a will to power behind it. We have no way to explain a change unless one power is reaching over and taking hold of another power.

Mechanics, the science of moving bodies, only shows us results, and on top of that only in pictures (talking about "motion" is a way of speaking in images)

Gravity itself has no mechanical cause, because it is the very reason there are mechanical results in the first place

The will to pile up strength, as the special mark of what life is: of feeding, of having offspring, of passing things on to them,

of society, the state, customs, authority

shouldn't we also be allowed to assume that this will is the moving cause in chemistry?

and in the order of the whole universe?

not just that energy stays constant, but that it is spent in the most efficient way possible. So the only reality is that *every center of force wants to become stronger*. Not keeping itself safe, but grabbing more, wanting to take control, to become more, to become stronger.

Is a rule about cause and effect supposed to *prove* to us that science is possible?

"the same causes give the same effects":

"a permanent law of things"

"an order that never changes"

just because something can be calculated, does that mean it has to happen?

when something happens this way and not another way, there is no "principle" in that, no "law", no "order"

amounts of force, whose whole nature is to push their power onto all other amounts of force

When people believe in cause and effect, they always forget the main thing: the *happening* itself.

people have invented a doer behind it, and then they have imagined the deed a second time as something separate

82.

Can we assume a *drive toward power* without any feeling of pleasure and pain, that is, without a feeling of power going up and going down?

is the mechanical picture of the world just a sign language for an *inner* world of facts, made of amounts of will that fight and overcome each other?

everything mechanics takes for granted, like matter, atoms, pushing and bumping, weight, are not "facts in themselves". They are interpretations made with the help of fictions that come from the *mind*.

life, the form of being we know best, is above all a will to pile up strength

: every process of life gets its leverage, its driving force, from this

: nothing wants just to keep itself as it is; everything is meant to be added up and piled up

Life as one single case: from there, a guess about the character of existence as a whole.

: it strives for the *greatest possible feeling of power*

: at its core, it is a drive toward more power

: striving is nothing else but striving for power

: this will remains the lowest and innermost thing. Mechanics is just a system of signs describing the results.

83.

The problem of the *philosopher* and of the

scientific person.

The rising type: strength shown in calm. In being fairly indifferent, in being slow and hard to stir into reacting. The great passions, *all* of them, and all wonderfully coming to help one another…

How age affects it

habits that drag you down (staying shut up indoors, the way Kant did)

Working too hard

not feeding the brain enough

Reading

More important: isn't there already a *sign of decline* in the very move toward such *general, abstract thinking*? *Objectivity*, standing back and looking neutrally, as a *will falling apart* (to *be able* to stay so *distant*… this requires a deep indifference toward the strong drives:

a kind of isolation

standing apart as an exception

resistance

against the normal drives

The type: breaking away from one's *home*, into wider and wider circles; a growing love of the foreign and exotic; the old commands falling silent — — even this constant question "where to?" ("happiness") is a sign of *pulling loose* from the ways life is organized, of breaking out.

The problem: is the *scientific* person perhaps even more a sign of decline than the philosopher? As a *whole*, he has not broken loose. Only a *part* of him is completely devoted to knowledge, trained for one corner and one way of seeing — — and for that he needs *all* the virtues of a strong race and of good health: great strictness, manliness, cleverness — — here you could speak of a division of labor and a training that are very useful to the whole, and that are only possible when culture has reached a very high level. He is more a sign that a culture is richly varied than a sign that it is tired. The scholar in decline is a *bad* scholar. Whereas the philosopher in decline has, up to now, at least been seen as the typical philosopher.

84.

Compared with the *artist*, the appearance of the *scientific* person really is a sign that life has been held back to some degree, and brought down to a lower level.

But also a sign of *strengthening*, of *strictness*, of *willpower*.

: to what extent the artist's falseness, his not caring about what is *true* and what is *useful*, may be signs of youth, of "*childishness*"…

: their usual ways, their lack of reason, their not knowing themselves, their not caring about eternal values, their seriousness about "games"… their lack of dignity; the clown and the god living next door to each other; the saint and the scoundrel…

: *imitating* as an instinct that gives the orders

The artists who say *yes*, and the artists of decline.

Rising artists and declining artists: don't they belong to every stage? Yes.

85.

Pyrrho, a Greek Buddhist

Plato, who perhaps went to school with the Jews

86.

On the idea of "decline" —

1.

Doubting everything is a result of decline, and so is a mind that lets itself run loose with no limits.

2.

The breakdown of morals and manners is a result of decline: the will is weak, and people need strong thrills to feel anything…

3.

The cures, both the mental ones and the moral ones, do not change the course of decline. They do not stop it. In terms of the body, they count for *nothing*. We have to see how *completely empty* these so-called "reactions" are, which claim far too much for themselves. They are ways of numbing people against certain deadly side effects. They do not get the sickness out. Often they are brave attempts to cancel out the person in decline, to make sure he does as little *harm* as possible.

4.

Nihilism (belief in nothing) is not a cause. It is only the logic of decline, where decline leads in the end.

5.

The "good" person and the "bad" person are just two types of decline. In all the basic things, they stick together.

6.

The

social

question, the whole problem of how society should be fixed, is a result of decline.

7.

Illnesses, above all illnesses of the nerves and the head, are signs that the *defending* strength of a strong nature is missing. The same thing is shown by how easily people get irritated, so that *pleasure* and *pain* become the main problems in the foreground.

87.

The ancient philosopher, from Socrates on, carries the *marks of

decline*: preaching morality and chasing happiness.

The high point is Pyrrho, the great doubter. Here the level of Buddhism is reached.

Epicurus's way of thinking, the quiet search for pleasure and peace, is found inside *Christianity*.

Roads to happiness: these are a sign that all the main forces of life are worn out.

88.

There are times and people who *store up* strength.

And there are those who *spend it freely*: the geniuses, the winners, the conquerors, the discoverers, the adventurers.

After the spenders, the person in decline always has to follow.

89.

Push in the other direction: religion

The two types:

Dionysus and *the crucified one*.

To keep in mind: the typical *religious* person, is that a form of decline?

The great founders of new faiths are, every one of them, sickly and epileptic.

But aren't we leaving out one type of religious person here, the *pagan* one? Isn't pagan worship a way of giving thanks to life and saying yes to it? Shouldn't its highest example be someone who defends life and makes it holy, like a god?

The type of a spirit that has turned out completely well, that overflows with delight…

The type that takes into itself all the contradictions and doubtful sides of existence, and *rescues* them, makes them whole?

This is where I put the Greek god *Dionysus*:

the religious yes to life, to the whole of life, not denied and not cut in half.

Typical of this: the act of sex brings up a sense of depth, of mystery, of awe.

Dionysus against "the crucified one": there you have the opposite. The difference is *not* about suffering and martyrdom. It is just that the suffering means something different. Life itself, its endless power to bring forth new life and to come back again, requires pain, destruction, the will to destroy…

In the other case, suffering, with "the crucified one as the innocent one," counts as an argument against this life, as the formula for condemning it.

You can guess it: the problem is what suffering means. Does it have a Christian meaning or a tragic meaning… In the first case, suffering is supposed to be the road to a blessed, happy existence somewhere else. In the second case, *existence itself counts as blessed enough* to justify even a huge amount of pain.

The tragic person says yes even to the bitterest suffering. He is strong enough, full enough, and able enough to make things holy, to do that.

The Christian says no even to the happiest life on earth. He is weak enough, poor enough, and cut off from his inheritance enough to suffer from life in every form…

"The god on the cross" is a curse on life, a pointing finger telling us to rescue ourselves from it.

Dionysus, cut into pieces, is a *promise* to life: it will be born again forever and come home out of destruction.

90.

What is *false about the body* in Raphael's paintings.

A woman whose body works normally, with normal fluids, has no need to be rescued. That all these healthy, well-formed, attractive figures should always be fussing over that pale, bloodless saint from Nazareth goes against nature itself. He belonged to a different species: the kind Dostoevsky knows, touching, spoiled, twisted, malformed creatures, full of foolishness and wild dreaminess, full of *love*…

91.

Religion as decline

Buddha against "*the crucified one*"

Inside the movement of nihilism (belief in nothing), we still have to keep the *Christian* one and the *Buddhist* one sharply apart.

The *Buddhist* one expresses a *beautiful evening*, a perfect sweetness and gentleness. It is thankfulness for everything that lies behind, including all of it. Bitterness is missing, disappointment is missing, resentment is missing.

In the end, the high love of the mind, the refined conflict inside the body, is behind it, and it rests from that too. But from that it still keeps its spiritual glory and the glow of a sunset. (It comes from the highest castes, the top ranks of society.)

The *Christian* movement is a movement of degeneration, made from waste and rejected leftovers of every kind. It does *not* express the decline of one race. From the very start it is a lump formed out of sick growths that crowd together and look for each other… That is why it is *not* tied to one nation, *not* tied to race. It speaks to the disinherited everywhere, to people who got nothing from life.

Deep down it holds resentment against all the well-made, healthy ones and against those who rule. It needs a *symbol* that stands for the curse on the well-made, healthy ones and on the rulers…

It also stands against every movement of the *mind*, against all philosophy. It takes the side of the fools and puts a curse on intelligence. It feels resentment against the gifted, the learned, the people who think for themselves. It senses that in them is the *well-made*, the *ruling* kind.

92.

The Problem of Socrates.

The two opposites:

the *tragic* attitude

the *Socratic* attitude

measured against the law of life

In what way the Socratic attitude is a sign of decline.

But also in what way a strong health and strength still show in his whole manner, in his skill at arguing, in his competence, in the tight discipline of the scientific person. (This is the health of a *common man*: his nastiness, his rebellious spirit, his sharp mind, and the *rabble deep down inside him*, all held in check by *cleverness*: "ugly.")

Making things ugly:

mocking oneself

the dryness of endless arguing

cleverness as a *tyrant* against "the tyrant" (meaning instinct)

Everything about Socrates is exaggerated, odd, a cartoon. He is a clown, with Voltaire's instincts in his body.

—

He discovers a new kind of *contest* —

—

He is the first fencing master, a master of word-duels, in the upper-class circles of Athens.

—

He stands for nothing but the *highest cleverness*. He calls it "virtue." (He guessed that it was his *way to be saved*. He was not free to choose whether to be *clever*. It was required of him, he had no choice.)

—

Keeping control of yourself, so that you go into a fight with reasons and *not* with feelings. The *trick* of Spinoza. Untangling the mistakes our feelings make… Finding out how to catch anyone you can get worked up. Finding out that feeling does not follow logic… Practicing making fun of yourself, to damage the *feeling of resentment* at its root.

I am trying to understand from which narrow and personal, peculiar states the Socratic problem comes: his claim that reason equals virtue equals happiness. With this absurd teaching that these things are all the same, he *put a spell* on people. Ancient philosophy never got free of it again…

The problem of Socrates. Cleverness, clearness, hardness and logic used as a weapon against the *wildness of the drives*. Those drives must have been dangerous and threatening to destroy him, otherwise there is no point in building cleverness up into such a tyranny. To *make cleverness into a tyrant*: but *for that*, the drives have to be tyrants. That is the problem. And it was very much in tune with the times back then. Reason came to equal virtue, which came to equal happiness.

A total lack of interest in things outside himself. Hatred of science. A strange personal quirk: feeling that he himself is the *problem*.

Socrates heard voices that were not there: a sick element.

Busying yourself with morality is most unpleasant to a mind that is rich and independent. So how is it that Socrates is *obsessed with morality and nothing else*?

All "practical" philosophy jumps straight to the front in times of trouble. When morality and religion become people's main interests, those are signs of an emergency.

The answer: the Greek philosophers stand on the same basic fact of inner experience as Socrates. They are all five steps away from excess,

from chaos, from wild living. They are all people of decline. They see him as their doctor.

The answer: The wildness and chaos of Socrates's instincts are a *symptom of decline*. So is his overgrowth of logic and clear reason. Both are abnormal, and both belong together.

Logic as will to power: a will to rule over oneself, a will to "happiness"

Criticism. Decline gives itself away in this obsession with "happiness". By happiness they meant "saving one's soul", and that means feeling that *one's own condition* is a *danger*.

Their fanatical interest in "happiness" shows that something was sick underneath. For them it was a matter of life and death. *Be rational or* be destroyed: that was the *choice* they all faced.

The constant moralizing of the Greek philosophers shows that they felt they were *in danger*…

93.

Will to power as knowledge

Criticism of the idea of the 'real' world and the world we see

Of these two, the first is nothing but a fiction, built entirely out of made-up things.

The "seeming", the way things appear, is itself part of reality. It is one of the forms reality takes. That means:

in a world where nothing simply "is" and stays the same, appearance is needed first, to create a world we can calculate, a world of cases that look *the same*. It creates a pace slow enough for us to observe things, compare them, and so on.

"Seeming" is a world that has been tidied up and simplified, a world our *practical* instincts have worked on. For *us*, it is exactly right. After all, we *live*; we are able to live in it. That is the *proof* that it is true for us…

But the world apart from the conditions we need in order to live in it, the world that we have not boiled down to our own existence, our logic and our mental prejudices,

does *not* exist as a world "in itself".

At its core it is a world of relations. Depending on circumstances, it shows a *different face* from every single point. What it is, is different at every point. It presses on every point, and every point pushes back against it. And these sums of pressure and resistance never match up with one another; in every case they are completely *different*.

The *amount of power* decides what *kind of thing* the other amount of power is: in what form, with what force, under what pressure it acts or resists.

Our own particular case is interesting enough. We have made up a picture of the world so that we can live in a world. We take in just enough of it that we can still *bear* it…

94.

Philosophy as decline

Toward a criticism of the philosopher

Philosophers and moralists fool themselves when they believe they can escape decline by fighting *against* it.

Escaping it is not something their will can do. And however little they admit it, later on people discover that they were among the strongest promoters of decline.

Take the philosophers of Greece, for example. Plato, the man of "the Good"; but he *cut* people's instincts *loose* from the city-state, from competition, from military strength, from art and beauty, from the sacred mystery rites, from faith in tradition and in their grandfathers…

He was the one who led the nobles astray; and he himself had been led astray by Socrates, a commoner…

He denied everything that a true, through-and-through noble Greek took for granted. He brought arguing by logic into everyday life. He plotted with tyrants. He pursued politics for some future ideal state. And he set the most complete example of *instincts cut loose from the old ways*.

He is deep and passionate in everything that is *against* the Greek spirit…

One after another, these great philosophers stand for the *typical* forms of decline:

the odd moral and religious quirk

anarchism

nihilism (belief in nothing)

"adiaphora": the Greek idea that nothing really matters either way

cynicism

hardening oneself

hedonism, the chase after pleasure,

the urge to turn back the clock

The question of "happiness", of "virtue", of "saving one's soul", is a sign that these declining natures are *at war with themselves in their bodies*. Their instincts lack a *center of gravity*, a *direction to go*.

Why does nobody *dare* to deny that the will is free? Because they are all busy worrying about saving *their own* soul. What do they care about the truth?

95.

Two states that follow one after the other: one the cause, the other the effect.

That is wrong.

The first state has nothing to bring about.

The second has been brought about by nothing.

What really happens is a struggle between two elements of unequal power. The forces end up arranged in a new way, depending on how much power each one has. The second state is something completely different from the first; it is *not* the first one's "effect". What matters is that the forces in the struggle come out of it with different amounts of power.

96.

[+ + +] They despise the body. They left it out of their calculations. Worse, they treated it like an enemy. Their madness was to believe that a person could carry a "beautiful soul" around inside a deformed corpse… To make others believe this too, they had to redefine what a "beautiful soul" meant. They had to turn natural values upside down, until at last a pale, sickly, foolishly dreamy creature was seen as perfection, as "angelic", as a glorified being, as a higher human.

97.

"Will to power"

In democratic ages, "the will to power" is hated so much that the whole psychology of these times seems aimed at making it look small and at slandering it…

The type of the great ambitious man, the man hungry for honor: that is supposed to be Napoleon! And Caesar! And Alexander!… As if these were not precisely the men who looked down on honor the most!…

And Helvétius explains to us that people strive for power in order to enjoy the pleasures that the powerful have at their disposal… He understands this striving for power as a will to enjoyment, as hedonism, the chase after pleasure…

Stuart Mill: — — —

98.

Will to power as a basic principle

Criticism of the idea of "cause"

I need the will to power as my *starting point*, as the source of all movement. So the movement must not be determined from outside. It must not be *caused*…

I need starting points and centers of movement, from which the will reaches out and spreads around itself…

We have absolutely no experience of a *cause*.

If we trace it back psychologically, the whole idea comes from our personal conviction that *we* are a cause, for example that we make the arm move… *But that is a mistake.*

We separate ourselves, the doers, from the doing, and we use this pattern everywhere. For every event, we look for someone or something that did it…

What have we done? We have taken a feeling of strength, of tension, of resistance, a feeling in the muscles that is already the beginning of the action, and *misunderstood* it as the cause.

Or we have taken the will to do this or that and understood it as the cause, simply because the action follows it. A cause, meaning — — —

"Cause" does not exist at all. There were a few cases where a cause seemed to be given to us, and from there we projected it outward in order to *understand events*. But in those very cases it has been shown that we were fooling ourselves.

Our "understanding of an event" consisted in inventing a subject, a doer, who was held responsible for the fact that something happened and for how it happened.

We took our feeling of willing, our "feeling of freedom", our feeling of responsibility, and our intention behind an action, and we packed them all together into the idea of "cause".

The cause that makes something happen and the cause as a goal or purpose are, at root, one and the same idea.

We thought an effect had been explained once we pointed to an earlier state in which that effect was already contained.

In fact, we invent all causes by copying the pattern of the effect, since the effect is what we already know… The other way round, we are unable to predict, for any thing whatsoever, what it will "bring about".

The thing, the subject, the will, the intention: all of these are built into the idea of "cause".

We look for things in order to explain why something has changed. Even the *atom* is one of these "things" that we have added in our minds, an "original subject"…

At last we understand that things, and therefore atoms too, bring nothing about, *because they are not there at all*… We understand that the idea of causality is completely useless. Just because states follow one another in a fixed order, it does *not* follow that one causes the next. That would mean their *power to produce effects* somehow jumped from 1 to 2, to 3, to 4, to 5.

Explaining things by cause and effect is an illusion…

"Movement" is a word; movement is not a cause.

A "thing" is the sum of its effects, tied together by an idea, by a picture…

There are neither causes nor effects.

In our language we cannot get away from them. But that does not matter. If I imagine a *muscle* separated from its "effects", I have done away with the muscle altogether…

In short: *an event is neither caused nor causing.*

A cause is a *power to produce effects* that we have invented and added on to what happens…

What Kant thinks exists does not exist: there is *no* sense for cause and effect built into us.

We are surprised, we feel uneasy, we want something familiar that we can hold on to…

As soon as someone shows us something old inside the new thing, we calm down.

The so-called instinct for cause and effect is really just *fear of the unfamiliar*, and an attempt to find something *familiar* in it.

It is a search not for causes, but for what we already know…

A person feels calm right away when, faced with something new, he — — — He does *not* make any effort to understand how exactly the little match causes fire.

In fact, science has emptied the idea of cause and effect of its content. It has kept it only as a kind of comparison formula, where it no longer really matters which side is the cause and which side is the effect. What science claims is that, in two complex situations (two arrangements of forces), the amounts of force stay the same.

The fact that we can *calculate in advance what will happen* does not come from a rule being followed,

or from something having to obey a necessity,

or from us projecting a law of cause and effect onto everything that happens:

it comes from *the same cases happening again and again*.

99.

Philosophy as decline

The *wise* tiredness. Pyrrho. The Buddhist. A comparison with

Epicurus.

Pyrrho. Living among the lowly, as one of the lowly. No pride. Living in the ordinary way; honoring and believing what everyone believes. Being careful about science and intellect, and also about everything that *puffs you up*… Simply: patient beyond words, carefree, gentle.

Apatheia, freedom from strong feelings; and even more, praÿtes, gentleness.

He was a Buddhist for Greece, someone who grew up in the middle of the noisy fighting between the schools of philosophy. He came late; he was tired. He was the tired man's protest against the eagerness of the debaters. He was the tired man's disbelief that anything at all is important. He had seen *Alexander the Great*, and he had seen the *holy men of India* who punished their own bodies. On late-coming, over-refined people like this, everything low, everything poor, even everything foolish, has a tempting pull. It works like a drug: it makes you want to lie down and stretch out. Think of Pascal. On the other hand, in the middle of the crowd, mistaken for just anybody, these people feel a little warmth. And they need *warmth*, these tired ones…

Getting past all disagreement; no competition; no wish to stand out from others: this means saying no to the *Greek* instincts. — Pyrrho lived together with his sister, who was a midwife. —

Disguising wisdom so that it no longer makes you stand out; dressing it in a cloak of poverty and rags; doing the lowest jobs: going to the market and selling piglets…

Sweetness; brightness; not caring; no virtues that need big gestures. Making yourself equal with others even in virtue: the final overcoming oneself, the final not caring.

Pyrrho and Epicurus are two forms of Greek decline. They are related in their hatred of debate-style reasoning and of all virtues that are put on like an actor, performer would — back then, those two things together were what people called philosophy. On purpose, they made the things they loved seem low. They chose ordinary, even looked-down-upon names for them. They described a state in which a person is neither sick nor healthy, neither alive nor dead… Epicurus was

more innocent, more like a peaceful country scene, more grateful. Pyrrho was more traveled, more worn out by life, more given to nihilism (belief in nothing)…

His life was a protest against the great *teaching that things are the same* (happiness = virtue = knowledge).

You do not find the right way to live through science: being wise does not make you "wise"…

The right way to live does not aim at happiness; it looks away from happiness…

100.

The true *philosophers of the Greeks* are the ones before Socrates. With Socrates, something changes.

They are all noble, high-minded figures. They keep apart from the common people and their customs. They have traveled. They are serious, even to the point of gloom. They look at things slowly and carefully. They know their way around government business and diplomacy. They came up with all the great ways of seeing the world before the later wise men did. They lived those ideas themselves, and they turned themselves into a system.

Nothing gives a higher idea of the Greek mind than this sudden richness in types of people, this unplanned completeness with which they laid out all the great possible forms of the philosophical ideal.

Among those who came after, I see only one original figure: a latecomer, but necessarily the last one… the nihilist *Pyrrho*. He has an instinct *against* everything that had come out on top in the meantime: the followers of Socrates, Plato.

Pyrrho reaches back, past Protagoras, to Democritus…

the artist's optimism of Heraclitus, — — —

101.

Decline *in general*

If *pleasure* and *pain* are tied to the feeling of power, then life would have to be a growth of power, so that the difference, the "more", comes into our awareness… If one level of power were simply kept the same, then pleasure could only be measured against drops in that level, against states of pain, — *not* against states of pleasure… The wish for more is part of what pleasure is: that power grows, and that we become aware of the difference…

From a certain point on, in decline, we become aware of the *opposite difference*: the loss. The memory of strong moments from the past pushes down the feelings of pleasure we have now. — Now the comparison *weakens* the pleasure…

102.

On keeping the "weak" healthy. — Everything done out of weakness turns out badly. The lesson: do nothing. The trouble is that the very strength needed to hold off action, to *not* react, is the thing that gets sickest under the influence of weakness. You never react faster, or more blindly, than at the moment when you should not react at all…

The strength of a person's nature shows in waiting and putting off the reaction. A certain calm indifference belongs to strength just as much as weakness has its own lack of freedom: it cannot help the push in the other direction, the suddenness, the unstoppable "action"…

The will is weak. And the recipe for avoiding stupid things would be to have a strong will and do *nothing*…

A contradiction…

It is a kind of self-destruction; the instinct to keep oneself alive has been damaged… *The weak person harms himself*… that is the typical form of decline…

In fact, we find a huge amount of thought given to methods for bringing about *a state where nothing moves you*. In this, the instinct is on the right track, because doing nothing is more useful than doing something…

All the practices of religious orders, of philosophers living alone, of fakirs, come from the right way of measuring value: that a certain kind of person still *helps himself the most* when he stops himself from acting as much as he can —

Ways to make it easier: complete obedience,

machine-like activity,

keeping away from people and things that would push you to decide and act right away.

103.

1.

I am amazed to see that science today has given up and accepts that it is stuck with the world we see. As for a 'real' world, whatever it may be like, we certainly have no sense or tool for knowing it.

At this point we might already ask: with what tool for knowing do we even set up this opposite between the two?…

Say we understand that a world our senses can reach also depends on those senses. Say we understand that a world is shaped by the one who sees it. That does *not* mean that an objective world, one that exists apart from any viewer, is even *possible*. Who stops us from thinking that this viewer-dependence is itself real, and part of what things are at their core?

The idea of a thing "in itself" is actually a self-contradicting notion. A "quality in itself" is nonsense. We only ever have the ideas of "being" and "thing" as ideas about relationships between things…

The bad part is this: along with the old opposite of "seeming" and "real", a matching judgment of value has been passed down. The seeming world counts as worth less, and the real one as absolutely "valuable".

We do not treat the world we see as a "valuable" world. Mere appearance is supposed to count as evidence against the highest value. Only a "real" world can be valuable in itself…

First: people claim that it exists.

Second: people have a very fixed idea of how valuable it is.

The prejudice of all prejudices! First, it would be perfectly possible that the true nature of things is so harmful to what life needs, so opposed to it, that appearances are exactly what we need in order to live at

all… This is in fact the case in so many situations: for example, in marriage.

Our world of experience, even in the limits of what we can know, would be shaped by our instincts to keep ourselves alive. We would take as true, as good, as valuable, whatever helps our species survive…

a.

We have no categories, no basic rules of thought, that would allow us to split the world into a 'real' world and the world we see. There might be only a world of appearances, but not only *our* world of appearances…

b.

Even if we assume the *real* world exists, it could still be the one that is *worth less* to us. The very amount of illusion in our lives might rank higher, because of how much it helps keep us alive. Unless, of course, mere *appearance* is in itself a reason to reject something?

c.

Some claim there is a link between *levels of value* and *levels of reality*, so that the highest values would also be the most real. This is a metaphysical demand, a claim about what lies beyond experience. It starts from the assumption that we *know* the ranking of values, namely that this ranking is a *moral* one… Only under this assumption is *truth* needed to define everything of the highest value. Only then would "appearance" be an objection against something having value at all.

2.

It is of the greatest importance that we get rid of the *'real' world*. It is the great doubter of the *world that we are*, and it makes that world

worth less. Up to now it has been our most dangerous *assassination attempt* on life.

War against all the assumptions on which people invented a 'real' world. One of these assumptions is that *moral values are the highest* values.

Moral valuing, as the highest kind, would be disproved if it could be shown to be the result of an *immoral* way of valuing

: as a special case of real immorality

: it would then shrink itself down to a mere *appearance*

and as an *appearance*, it would have no right of its own any more to condemn appearances.

3.

"The will to truth" would then have to be studied psychologically, looking at what drives it. It is not a moral force but a form of the will to power. This could be proved by showing that it uses every *immoral* means, metaphysics first of all —

: the *proper method of research* is only reached once all *moral prejudices* have been overcome… it would stand for a victory over morality…

Note. Today we face the task of testing the claim that moral values are the highest values.

104.

Moral values as *fake values*, compared with *bodily* ones

105.

Our knowledge has become scientific to the extent that it can use number and measurement…

We should try to see whether a scientific ranking of values could not simply be built on a *scale of strength, measured in numbers*…

— all other "*values*" are prejudices, naive ideas, misunderstandings…

— they can all be *boiled down* to that number-and-measure scale of strength

— going *up* on this scale means any *growth in value*:

going *down* on this scale means a *loss of value*

Here both appearances and prejudice are against us.

A morality is a way of living that has been tried and tested over a long time of experience, and *proven*. In the end it comes into awareness as a law, as something *in command*…

And with that, the whole group of related values and states of mind moves into it: it becomes respected, untouchable, holy, true.

Part of how it develops is that its origin gets *forgotten*… That is a sign that it has become the master…

*

Exactly the same thing could have happened with the *categories of reason*, the basic rules of our thinking. Through a lot of fumbling and groping around, they could have proved themselves because they were fairly useful… There came a point where people gathered them together and became aware of them as a whole — and where people *made them commands*… that is, where they acted as *giving orders*…

From then on they counted as 'a priori', as known before any experience, as beyond experience, as impossible to reject…

And yet perhaps they express nothing more than what happens to be useful for a certain race and species. Their usefulness alone is their "truth" —

On where *reason* comes from —

A.

Up to now the highest values have been the moral ones.

B.

A critique of these values.

C.

— — —

106.

Rules for the young theologian:

1. He must stay away from women and from anything fermented, like alcohol. He must wear neither boots nor a sunshade. He must stay away from anything that excites the senses: singing, dancing and music.

2. If the student has an unwanted wet dream while he sleeps, he must dip himself three times into the holy marsh at sunrise, saying: "May what left me against my will come back to me!"

3. If his teacher interrupts him, he must not answer him while lying down, or sitting, or eating, or running, or from far away, or with a sideways glance:

4. Instead, he must come up to him, stand upright, look at him with respect, and give his answer.

If he is riding in a carriage and notices his teacher, he must get out at once to pay him his respects.

The student must not help his teacher's wife while she bathes. He must not put perfume on her, or massage her, or arrange her hairdo, or rub oils on her.

He must also not throw himself down before his teacher's young wife and respectfully touch her feet, that is, if he is already old enough to know about good and evil.

It is in a woman's nature to want to please men and tempt them. But wise men never let themselves go so far as to give in to this attraction, at least in cases where doing so would be wrong.

A man should not stay alone in lonely places with his mother, his sister, his daughter or other female relatives. The senses, stirred up by being alone, are so powerful that they sometimes win out even over the wisest.

This is what happened to the wise Vasta. To escape the wickedness of the people of Gotha, he withdrew into a cave with his two daughters, and there he made both of them mothers.

107.

Theory and Practice

A critique of the value of morality

The dangerous split between "theory" and "practice", for example in Kant, but also among the ancient Greeks and Romans

— they act as if pure intellect and spirit, on its own, set before them the problems of knowledge and metaphysics

— they act as if, however theory answers those questions, practice, meaning how we live and act, should be judged by its own separate measure of value.

Against the first point, I set my *psychology of philosophers*. Even their most far-removed calculations and their so-called "intellect and spirit" are always just the last, palest print left behind by a physical fact of the body. There is absolutely nothing freely chosen in it. Everything is instinct. Everything is steered down fixed tracks from the very start…

Against the second point, I ask this: do we know any other way to act well than to always think well? Thinking well *is* a kind of acting, and acting well depends on thinking. Do we have any way to judge the worth of a way of life other than the way we judge the worth of a theory, by gathering examples and comparing them?… Naive people believe that here we are better off, that here we simply know what "good" is. And the philosophers repeat it after them. We conclude that what we have here is a *belief*, and nothing more…

"We have to act; *so* we need a rule to guide us," said even the skeptics of the ancient world.

As if the *urgency* of having to decide were a reason to accept something as *true*!…

"We do *not* have to act," said their more consistent brothers, the Buddhists. And they came up with a rule to guide people in freeing themselves from acting at all…

Fitting in, living the way the "ordinary man" lives, treating as good and right whatever he treats as right: that is *giving in* to the *herd instinct*.

You have to push your courage and your strictness far enough that you feel that kind of giving in as a *shame*.

Do not live by two different measures!… Do not split theory from practice! —

108.

Will to power as morality

The rule of moral values over all others.

The results of this rule: the ruin of psychology, and so on.

The doom that clings to it everywhere.

What does this rule mean? What does it point to?

— It points to a certain *greater urgency* about saying a definite yes or no in this area.

— Every kind of *command* has been used to make moral values seem fixed and solid. They have been ordered upon people for the longest time. So now they *seem* instinctive, like commands coming from inside us…

— The fact that moral values are felt to be *beyond discussion* shows the *conditions a society needs in order to survive*.

— Practice, which means the *usefulness* of agreeing with one another about the highest values, has gained a kind of official blessing here.

— We see *every means used* to *cripple* thinking and criticism in this area. Look at the attitude even Kant still takes, not to mention those who reject "investigating" here as something immoral.

How morality was brought to power

109.

Science and philosophy

All these values come from experience and depend on conditions. But the person who believes in them, who worships them, simply *refuses* to admit that this is what they are…

The philosophers, every one of them, believe in these values. And one form of their worship was their effort to turn these values into *truths known before any experience*.

Worship by its nature twists and fakes the truth…

Worship is the great test of *intellectual honesty*. But in the whole history of philosophy there *is* no intellectual honesty.

Instead there is "love of the good"…

First: the complete *lack of any method* for checking how much these values are really worth.

Second: the unwillingness to check these values at all, or even to treat them as depending on conditions.

When it came to moral values, all the instincts that are *against science* came together, so as to *shut science out* here…

How can we explain the unbelievable scandal that morality has been in the history of science?…

110.

The formula of the *superstition of "progress"*, from a famous scientist who studied how the brain works:

"An animal never makes progress as a species; only man makes progress as a species."

No: — — —

111.

Philosophy as *decline*

The great good sense in all training for morality was always this: people tried to reach the *sureness of an instinct*. That way, neither the good intention nor the good means would ever have to enter the conscious mind as such. A person was meant to learn how to act the way a soldier drills. And in fact, this not-being-aware belongs to every kind of perfection. Even the mathematician works his combinations without being aware of it…

So what does it mean, then, that Socrates *reacted against* this? He recommended argument and logic as the road to virtue, and he made fun of morality when it could not justify itself with logic… But that very thing was part of its *goodness*… without it, morality *is worth nothing*!… Being able to stir up *shame* was a necessary mark of what is perfect!…

It means exactly the *breaking down* of *Greek instincts*, once people put *being able to prove it* first, as the condition for a person's real worth in virtue. All these great "virtuous" men and word-spinners are themselves examples of that breaking down…

In practice, it means that moral judgments are ripped out of the conditions they grew from, the only conditions in which they make any sense. They are torn from their Greek soil, their Greek political ground. And while it looks as if they are being *raised higher*, they are actually *turned against nature*. The great ideas "good" and "just" are cut loose from the conditions they belong to. Once "set free" as "ideas," they become things to argue about. People look for a truth behind them. They treat them as real things in themselves, or as signs of real

things. They *make up* a world where these ideas are at home, a world they supposedly come from…

In short: the nonsense had already reached its peak in Plato… And now people also needed to invent the *abstract, perfect* human being to go with it.

Good, just, wise, a master of argument: in short, the scarecrow figure of the ancient philosopher.

A plant pulled out of any soil. A humanness without any definite instincts to guide it. A virtue that "proves" itself with reasons.

The completely *absurd* "individual" in itself! The highest-ranking example of what goes against nature…

In short, turning moral values against nature led to the creation of a degenerating *type of human*: "the good one," "the happy one," "the wise one."

Socrates is a moment of the *deepest twistedness* in human history.

112.

It would make us doubt a person to hear that he needs *reasons* in order to stay decent. One thing is sure: we would avoid his company. The little word "because" can give you away in certain cases. Sometimes a single "because" is even enough to *disprove* yourself. Now suppose we also hear that this would-be virtuous person needs *bad* reasons in order to stay respectable. That still gives us no reason to respect him more. But he goes further. He comes up to us and tells us to our face: "You are disturbing my morality with your unbelief, my dear unbelieving sir. As long as you do not believe in my *bad reasons*, by which I mean God, a punishing afterlife, and free will, you are *getting in the way* of my virtue… The moral of the story: we must get rid of the unbelievers, because they get in the way of *making the masses moral*."

113.

Morality as decline

Today, any statement like "this is how a person *should* be" makes us smile a little ironically. We firmly believe that, in spite of everything, you only *become* what you already *are*. By "in spite of everything" I mean upbringing, schooling, surroundings, luck and bad luck. Because of this, we have learned to *flip* cause and effect in matters of morality in a strange way. Perhaps nothing sets us apart more deeply from the old believers in morality. For example, we no longer say, "vice is the *cause* of a person's body falling apart." Nor do we say, "virtue makes a person thrive, and it brings a long life and happiness." Our view is rather that vice and virtue are not causes at all, but only *results*. You become a decent person because you already are a decent person. That means you were born rich, so to speak, with good instincts and healthy living conditions as your inheritance… If you come into the world poor, from parents who wasted everything and saved nothing, then you are "beyond help", which means ready for prison or the madhouse… Today we can no longer think of moral decay as something separate from bodily decay. Moral decay is just a set of symptoms of the bodily kind. You are bad by necessity, just as you are sick by necessity… "Bad" here means certain *inabilities* that, in the body, go along with the type of person who is decaying. For example: a weak will; an unsure, even split, sense of who one is, as if there were several "persons" inside; being powerless to hold back one's reaction to some trigger and to "control oneself"; and being unable to resist any kind of suggestion from someone else's will. Vice is not a cause; vice is a *result*… "Vice" is a rather random label we use to group together certain results of the body breaking down. A general statement like the one Christianity taught, "humans are bad," would be justified if it were justified to treat the decaying type of person as the normal type of human. But that is probably an exaggeration. Still, the

statement is certainly right wherever Christianity in particular thrives and is on top. For that proves the soil there is sick, a breeding ground for decay.

114.

Growth or exhaustion

A critique of Christian values.

A critique of ancient philosophy.

On the history of European nihilism (belief in nothing).

Christianity as nihilistic, a belief in nothing

the groundwork that prepared the way for it: ancient philosophy

115.

Science and philosophy

How far psychologists have been spoiled by their odd, narrow obsession with morality:

None of the old philosophers had the courage to put forward the theory that the will is not free (that is, a theory that denies morality).

No one had the courage to define what is typical of pleasure, of every kind of pleasure ("happiness"), as the feeling of power. For enjoying power was seen as immoral.

No one had the courage to understand virtue as a *result of immorality* (of a will to power) working in the service of the species (or of the race, or of the city-state). For the will to power was seen as immoral. If they had understood this, they would have recognized the truth — — — that virtue is only one form of immorality.

In the whole development of morality, there is no truth anywhere. All the ideas it works with are made up. All the psychology it relies on is fake. All the forms of logic that people drag into this kingdom of lies are tricks of argument. What actually marks out the moral philosophers is that they completely lack any cleanliness, any self-discipline of the mind. They take "beautiful feelings" for arguments. Their "swelling chest" seems to them like the bellows of God himself, as if their heavy emotions were God breathing through them… Moral philosophy is the shameful, indecent chapter in the history of the mind.

The first big example: in the name of morality, under the protection of morality, outrageous mischief was carried out, which was in fact decline in every respect.

116.

Philosophy as decline

You cannot stress this strongly enough: the great Greek philosophers stand for the *decline of every kind of Greek excellence*, and they made that decline *catching*, like a disease… This "virtue", made completely abstract, was the greatest temptation for people to make themselves abstract too, that is, to *cut themselves loose* from real life…

This moment is very remarkable: the Sophists come close to the first *critique of morality*, the first real *insight* into morality…

— they set the many different moral judgments side by side, showing that each depends on its local setting

— they hint that any morality can be defended by clever argument, and that it makes no difference which. In other words, they guess that every attempt to give morality a foundation must be a *trick of argument* —

— a claim that was later proven on the grandest scale by the ancient philosophers, from Plato onward (all the way to Kant)

— they lay down the first truth: that "a morality in itself", a "good in itself", does not exist, and that it is a swindle to talk about "truth" in this area

Where was *intellectual honesty* back then?

The Greek culture of the Sophists grew out of all the Greek instincts. It belongs to the culture of the age of Pericles just as surely as Plato does *not* belong to it. It had forerunners in Heraclitus, in Democritus, and in the scientific types of early philosophy. It found its expression, for example, in the high culture of the historian Thucydides.

— and in the end it was proven right: every step forward in our understanding of knowledge and of morality has *restored* the Sophists to their rightful place…

Our way of thinking today is to a large degree like that of Heraclitus, Democritus and Protagoras… In fact, it would be enough to call it *Protagorean*, because Protagoras combined both Heraclitus and Democritus within himself.

Plato: a *great Cagliostro*, a great con man like that famous fraud. Just think how Epicurus judged him, and how Timon, the friend of Pyrrho, judged him — —

Is Plato's honesty perhaps beyond doubt?… But at the very least we know that he wanted something taught as absolute truth that he himself did not believe was true even in a limited way: namely, that "souls" exist on their own and live forever, each by itself.

117.

The push in the other direction: *art*

The feeling of rapture, which really matches an *increase of strength*:

strongest in the mating season of the sexes:

new organs, new skills, colors, shapes…

"becoming more beautiful" is a result of *increased* strength

Becoming more beautiful as the necessary result of an increase in strength

Becoming more beautiful as the sign of a *victorious* will, of better teamwork inside a person, of all strong desires being brought into harmony, of a center of gravity that hangs perfectly straight down and never wobbles

Making things simpler, in logic and in geometry, is a result of increased strength. And the other way round, *noticing* such simplicity increases our feeling of strength again…

The peak of this development: the grand style

Ugliness means the *decline of a type*: inner desires that contradict each other and fail to work together

it means a loss of *organizing* strength, of "will", speaking in terms of the body…

the state of pleasure we call *rapture* is exactly a high feeling of *power*…

the sense of space and time changes: enormous distances can be taken in at a glance, and in a way they only now become *visible* at all

the *widening* of one's view over bigger crowds and greater distances

the *sharpening of the senses* for noticing many of the tiniest and most fleeting things

intuition, a kind of fortune-telling: the power to understand from the faintest hint, from any suggestion, a "smart" *sensuality* where the senses themselves seem to think…

strength as a feeling of command in the muscles, as suppleness and joy in moving, as dance, as lightness and speed

strength as the joy of proving one's strength: as a daring show-off feat, as adventure, as fearlessness, as a carefree, unbothered nature…

All these high points of life stir each other up. The images and ideas of one are enough, as a suggestion, to set off the others… In this way, states have finally grown into one another that perhaps had good reason to stay strangers. For example:

religious rapture and sexual excitement (two deep feelings that by now are almost surprisingly linked. What do all pious women like, old and young? Answer: a saint with nice legs, still young, still an innocent fool…)

cruelty in tragedy and pity (— also normally linked…

Spring, dance, music: all of it is competition between the sexes — and even that Faust-like "infinity in the heart", that endless longing in the chest…

Artists, if they are any good, are built strong, in their bodies too. They overflow with energy. They are powerful animals, and they are sensual. You cannot imagine a painter like Raphael without a sex drive that runs a bit too hot… Making music is also a kind of making babies. Staying chaste is simply an artist saving up his energy. And in any case, even with artists, the power to create ends when the power to father children ends…

Artists should never see anything as it really is. They should see it fuller, simpler, stronger. For that, they need a kind of endless youth

and springtime inside them, a kind of rapture that lives in their body all the time.

Beyle and Flaubert, two men who were not shy about such questions, really did advise artists to stay chaste for the sake of their craft. I could also name Renan, who gives the same advice. But Renan is a priest…

118.

epidemics

,

hallucinations,

,

dances and signs made with gestures

,

song (what is left over from dance

,

— — —

normal functions:

getting *practice*

:

the dream (a state like rapture leads into it)

:

pictures we see in the mind's eye

:

pictures we hear

:

pictures we feel by touch

119.

Push in the other direction

Art

All art works by suggestion. It speaks to the muscles and senses that were active in the first, simple, artistic people. It only ever speaks to artists. It speaks to this kind of delicate, easily stirred body. The idea of a "layperson", someone who knows nothing about art, is a mistake. A deaf person is not just one kind of person with good hearing.

All art works like a *tonic*. It increases strength. It lights up pleasure, which means the feeling of strength. It stirs up all the finer memories of rapture. There is a special kind of memory that reaches down into such states. A distant world of fleeting sensations comes back there…

The ugly means what is against art. It is what art *shuts out*, what art says No to. Every time decline, the draining of life, weakness, falling apart, or rotting is hinted at, even from far away, the person who lives for beauty reacts with a *No*.

The ugly has a *depressing* effect. It is the expression of depression. It *takes away* strength, it makes us poorer, it weighs us down…

The ugly *suggests* more ugliness. You can test this on your own states of health: feeling unwell, in its different ways, also makes you better at imagining ugly things. What you pick out changes, in things, interests and questions. There is a state very close to ugliness in thinking too: heaviness, dullness… In terms of movement, ugliness

has no proper balance. The ugly limps, the ugly stumbles. It is the opposite of a dancer's godlike lightness…

The state of mind of someone feeling beauty has far too many *ways to communicate*, and at the same time it is extremely *sensitive* to signals and signs. It is the high point of how well living beings can share and pass things on to each other. It is where languages come from.

Languages were born here: languages of sound, as well as languages of gestures and looks. The fuller form always comes first. The abilities of us civilized people are what is left after things were taken away from fuller abilities. But even today we still hear with our muscles. We even still read with our muscles.

Every mature art is built on a great many conventions, shared rules, to the extent that it is a language. Convention is what makes great art possible. It does *not* get in its way…

Every rise in life increases a person's power to communicate, and also their power to understand. *Living your way into other people's souls* was not, at first, anything moral. It was a bodily sensitivity to suggestion. "Sympathy", or what people call "altruism", is just a more developed form of that link between mind and muscle that people count as part of intellect and spirit (Charles Féré calls it "psycho-motor induction"). We never pass on thoughts to each other. We pass on movements, facial and body signs, which we then *read back* into thoughts…

*

Here I list a series of mental states as signs of full and blossoming life, even though people today are used to calling them *sick*. Meanwhile, we have learned to stop treating healthy and sick as opposites. It is a matter of degrees. My claim in this case is that what is called "healthy" today is a lower level than what *would* be healthy in good conditions… that we are, comparatively, sick… The artist belongs to

an even stronger breed. What would already harm us, what would be sick in us, is natural in him ---

Having *too much* energy and life-juice can bring the same symptoms as having too little life: a partial loss of control, the senses seeing and hearing things that aren't there, a refined sensitivity to suggestion… The cause of the stimulus is different, but the effect stays the same…

Above all, the *after*-effect is not the same. Sickly people collapse into total exhaustion after their nervous outbursts. That has nothing in common with the artist's states. The artist does not have to *pay* for his good times…

He is rich enough for it. He can spend freely without becoming poor…

Just as people today might judge "genius" to be a kind of nervous disorder, they might judge the artist's power of suggestion the same way. And our *artistes* really are far too similar to hysterical little women!!! But that is an argument against "today", not against "artists"…

But people object that it is exactly when the body's machine is *worn down* that it gains an extravagant power to pick up every kind of suggestion. As proof, they point to our hysterical little women, "our researchers of the afterlife".

*

Inspiration: a description.

*

The states that are not artistic: being *objective*, just mirroring things, having your will switched off…

Schopenhauer's shocking misunderstanding: he treats art as a bridge that leads to saying No to life…

*

The states that are not artistic: those that make things poorer, that pull away, that let go, and under whose gaze life suffers… the Christian…

*

The problem of *tragic* art.

*

The *Romantics*: a question with two sides, like everything modern.

*

The *actor, performer*

120.

Love

Do you want the most amazing proof of how far the power of rapture can go in changing how things look? "Love" is that proof. I mean what people call love, in every language and every silence in the world. Here, rapture deals with reality in such a way that, in the lover's mind, the real cause is wiped out, and something else seems to stand in its place. It is like a trembling and flashing of all the magic mirrors of Circe, the witch from the old stories… Here it makes no difference whether you are a human or an animal. It makes even less difference whether you have brains, kindness, or honesty… If you are refined, you get fooled in a refined way. If you are crude, you get fooled in a crude way. But love, even love for God, even the saintly love of "rescued souls," is at its root one and the same thing. It is a fever that has good reasons to make itself look beautiful. It is a rapture that does well to lie about itself… And anyway, when you are in love, you lie well, to yourself and about yourself. You seem changed, stronger,

richer, more perfect. And you actually are more perfect… Here we find art working as a natural function of the body. We find it built into the most angel-like instinct of life. We find it as the greatest thing that drives life on. So art is wonderfully useful, even in the fact that it lies… But we would be wrong to stop at its power to lie. It does more than just imagine things. It actually shifts values. And it does not only shift our feeling about values… The lover really is worth more. He really is stronger. In animals, this state brings out new substances, new pigments, colors and shapes. Above all, it brings out new movements, new rhythms, new mating calls and ways of luring. With humans it is no different. A person in love has a whole inner economy that is richer than ever, more powerful and more complete than in someone who is not in love. The lover becomes a big spender: he is rich enough for it. He now takes risks. He becomes an adventurer. He becomes a fool in his generosity and innocence. He believes in God again. He believes in virtue because he believes in love. And on the other hand, this happy idiot grows wings and new abilities, and even the door to art opens for him. Take away from songs and poems, in music and in words, the influence of that fever in the gut: what would be left of poetry and music?… Maybe "art for art's sake": the showy croaking of frogs left out in the cold, despairing in their swamp… Everything else was created by love…

121.

Will to power, seen through psychology

A single idea behind psychology

We are used to thinking that a huge wealth of different forms can still come from one single source.

My claim is that the will to power is the most basic form of feeling, and that all other feelings are only shapes it takes:

That it clears things up a great deal if we replace the individual "happiness" that every living thing is supposed to strive for with power. Then we say: "It strives for power, for more power." Pleasure is only a sign of the feeling of power that has been reached. It is an awareness of a difference —

— A living thing does not strive for pleasure. Instead, pleasure shows up when it reaches what it is striving for. Pleasure comes along with it. Pleasure does not drive it…

That every driving force is will to power, and that there is no other physical, dynamic or mental force besides it…

— In our science, the idea of cause and effect has been reduced to a kind of equation. Its goal is to prove that the same amount of force is on both sides. And so the driving force is missing. We only look at results. We treat them as equal in how much force they contain. We let ourselves off from asking what actually causes a change…

It is simply something we know from experience that change never stops. In itself, we have not the slightest reason to understand why one change must be followed by another. On the contrary: a state, once reached, would seem bound to keep itself going, unless there were something in it that does not want to keep itself going…

Spinoza's rule that every thing tries to preserve itself should really put a stop to change. But the rule is wrong. The opposite is true. In all living things you can see it most clearly: they do everything not to preserve themselves, but to become more…

Is the "will to power" a kind of "will," or is it the same as the idea of "will"? Does it mean the same as wanting something? Or giving orders?

Is it the "will" that Schopenhauer thinks is the "thing in itself," the hidden core of everything?

My claim is this: the "will" of psychology so far is a generalization that is not justified. This kind of will does not exist at all. Instead of seeing one specific will taking many forms, people erased what makes a will a will. They did this by taking out its content, its "where to?"

This is true most of all of Schopenhauer: what he calls "will" is just an empty word. And it is even less a matter of a "will to live." Because life is only one single case of the will to power. It is completely arbitrary to claim that everything strives to turn into this particular form of the will to power.

122.

On how we know things: based only on experience

There is no "mind," no reason, no thinking, no consciousness, no soul, no will, no truth. These are all made-up ideas that are of no use. It is not about "subject and object." It is about a certain kind of animal that can only thrive if its perceptions are fairly accurate, and above all regular, so that it can build up experience and use it like savings…

Knowledge works as a tool of power. So it is obvious that it grows with every increase in power…

The meaning of "knowledge": here, just as with "good" or "beautiful," the idea must be taken strictly and narrowly as centered on humans and on biology. For a certain kind of creature to survive, and to grow in power, it must grasp in its picture of reality enough that is predictable and stays the same, so that it can build a pattern of behavior on it. The motive behind the growth of our organs of knowing is how useful they are for survival. It is not some abstract, theoretical need not to be fooled… These organs develop in such a way that what they observe is enough to keep us alive. Put another way: how much a kind of creature wants to know depends on how much its will to power is

growing. A creature grabs hold of as much reality as it needs in order to master it and put it to work.

The mechanical idea of motion is already a translation of what really happens into the sign language of the eyes and of touch.

The idea of the "atom," which separates a "place where the driving force sits" from the force itself, is a sign language that comes from our world of logic and of the mind.

We are not free to change the way we express things. But it is possible to understand how far it is just a system of signs.

To demand a way of speaking that matches reality exactly is nonsense. It is in the nature of a language, of any means of expression, to express only a relationship… The idea of "truth" makes no sense… The whole realm of "true" and "false" only refers to relationships between beings, not to the "thing in itself"… Nonsense: there is no "being in itself." It is the relationships that first make beings what they are, just as there cannot be any "knowledge in itself"…

123.

Push in the other direction

Against Darwin

When I look over the great fates of humankind, what surprises me most is that I always see the opposite of what Darwin and his followers see today, or *want* to see. They see selection that favors the stronger ones, the ones who came off better, and they see the species making progress. But the exact opposite is plain enough to grab with your hands. The lucky strokes get crossed out. The types that turned out higher are of no use. And the middle types, even the *below-average* types, unavoidably end up in charge. Unless someone shows us a reason why humans should be the exception among living creatures, I

lean toward the view that Darwin's school got it wrong everywhere. I see the will to power as the deepest cause and the true nature of all change. And that will to power gives us the tool to explain why selection in favor of the exceptions and the lucky strokes does not happen. The strongest and luckiest are weak when they face organized herd instincts, when they have the fearfulness of the weak, of the majority, against them. My overall view of the world of values shows this: in the highest values that hang over humanity today, it is *not* the lucky strokes, the types worth selecting, that have the upper hand. Instead, it is the types of decline. Perhaps there is nothing more interesting in the world than this *unwelcome* spectacle…

Strange as it sounds, you always have to arm the strong against the weak, the lucky against the unlucky, and the healthy against those who are rotting away and those burdened by bad inheritance. If you want to turn reality into a *moral* rule, that rule says: the average are worth more than the exceptions; the products of decline are worth more than the average; the will to nothing wins out over the will to live. And the overall goal is

well, to put it in Christian,

Buddhist, or Schopenhauer's terms:

better *not* to exist than to exist

I *rebel* against turning reality into a moral rule. That is why I shudder at Christianity with a deadly hatred: because it created lofty words and gestures to wrap a horrible reality in a cloak of rightness, of virtue, of godliness…

I see all philosophers, I see science, kneeling before a reality that is the *reverse* of the fight to survive that Darwin's school teaches. Everywhere, the ones who come out on top, the ones who survive, are the ones who drag life and the value of life down and put it in danger. The

mistake of Darwin's school became a puzzle for me: how can people be so blind that they see wrongly right *here*?… The claim that *species* represent progress is the most unreasonable claim in the world. For now, they represent a fixed level, —

and so far not a single case proves that higher organisms developed out of lower ones —

I see that the lower ones have the upper hand through their numbers, their cleverness, their cunning. I do not see how a chance change gives an advantage, at least not over such a long time. That itself would need a new explanation: why a chance change became so strong —

— I find the "cruelty of nature" that people talk about so much in a different place. Nature is cruel to her lucky children. She spares, protects and loves the humble ones — just like — — —

*

In short: the growth in *power* of a species is perhaps less guaranteed when its lucky children, its strong ones, are in the majority than when the middle and lower types are in the majority… The lower types have great fertility and staying power. With the strong ones, the danger grows: quick ruin and a fast drop in numbers.

*

124.

Push in the other direction

Where Religion Comes From

Even today, an uneducated person believes that when he is angry, anger is the cause; that his mind is the cause of his thinking; that his soul is the cause of his feeling. In short, even now people casually

assume a whole crowd of mental things that are supposed to be causes. In the same way, at an even more naive stage, humans explained these very same events with the help of mental beings imagined as persons. States that seemed strange, sweeping and overwhelming to him, he explained to himself as being possessed and bewitched under the power of some person. That is how the Christian, today the most naive and backward kind of human, traces hope, calm and the feeling of "rescue" back to God breathing these into his mind. For him, as a type who is basically suffering and anxious, it is only natural that feelings of happiness, uplift and calm seem like something *foreign*, something that needs explaining. Among clever, strong and lively peoples, it was most of all the person having an epileptic fit who made people convinced that a *foreign power* was at work. But every similar loss of control also served to invent powers beyond the human: for example, the inspired person, the poet, the great criminal, and passions like love and revenge. People harden a state into a person, and then claim that when this state shows up in us, it is the effect of that person. In other words: when the mind creates a god, a state is turned into a person and treated as the cause, so that the state itself can be the effect.

The logic of the mind goes like this. The *feeling of power*, when it suddenly and overwhelmingly floods a person, which happens in all great passions, makes him doubt himself. He does not dare to think of himself as the cause of this amazing feeling. And so he puts a *stronger* person, a god, in place to explain it.

In short: religion comes from extreme feelings of power that take people by surprise as something *foreign*. Think of a sick person who feels one of his limbs as too heavy and strange, and decides that another person must be lying on top of him. In the same way, the naive religious person splits himself apart into *several persons*. Religion

is a case of "a changed personality". A kind of *fear* and *terror* of oneself…

But equally an extraordinary feeling of *happiness and height*…

among sick people, the *feeling of being healthy* is enough to make them believe in God, in God being near

125.

Basic Psychology of the Religious Person

all changes are effects,

all effects are effects of someone's will. The idea of "nature" or a "law of nature" is missing.

every effect has a doer behind it

basic psychology: you yourself are only the cause when you know that you wanted it.

Result: states of power give a person the feeling that he is *not* the cause, that he is *not responsible* for them

: they come without being wanted, so we are not the ones who made them

: the unfree will (that is, being aware of a change in us that we did not want) needs a *foreign* will to explain it

Consequence: humans have never dared to give *themselves* credit for their strong and amazing moments. They thought of them as "passive", as something "suffered", as being overpowered

: religion is born from a *doubt* that a person is one whole self; it is a change in the personality

: because people thought of everything great and strong as *superhuman*, as *foreign*, humans made themselves smaller. They split their two sides, one very pitiful and weak and one very strong and amazing, into two separate realms. The first they called "human", the second "God".

They kept doing this. In the period of *moral oddity*, they did not explain their high and lofty moral states as "wanted", as the "work" of the person. The Christian too splits himself into two: a petty and weak invention he calls human, and another he calls God (Rescuer, Savior) —

Religion has lowered the idea of "human". Taken to its extreme, it means that everything good, great and true is superhuman and only given to us as a gift of grace…

126.

Push in the other direction: religion

Morality as an Attempt to Rebuild Human Pride

The idea of "free will" is against religion. It wants to give people the right to see themselves as the cause of their own great moods and great deeds. It is a form of a growing sense of *pride*.

A person feels his power, his "happiness," as people call it. And so, he thinks, there must have been a "will" before this state came about. Otherwise the state would not really belong to him.

Virtue is the attempt to place an act of wanting, of having wanted, in front of every high and strong feeling of happiness, as the thing that must come first.

If the will to do certain things is regularly present in our minds, then a feeling of power may be explained as the result of that will.

This is just the way *psychology* happens to *look at things*. It always rests on the false assumption that nothing belongs to us unless we are aware of having wanted it.

The whole teaching about responsibility hangs on this naive psychology: the idea that only the will is a cause, and that you have to know you wanted something before you may believe that *you* were its cause.

A person may respect himself only as long as he is virtuous.

Then comes the push in the other direction: that of the moral philosophers. But they are still caught in the same prejudice, that you are only responsible for something you wanted.

The worth of a person is set as his *moral worth*. So his morality has to be a first cause, something that starts things without being caused itself.

So there has to be a principle inside a person, a "free will," acting as this first cause.

The hidden thought here is always this: if a person, as a will, is not a first cause, then he is not responsible. So he does not belong in front of the court of morality at all. Virtue and vice would then be automatic, like the workings of a machine…

In short: for a person to be able to respect himself, he must also be capable of becoming evil.

127.

A Form of Religion Meant to Build a People's Pride

There was another way to pull people out of the low opinion of themselves they fell into when their high and strong moods left them, since those moods had seemed to come from outside, as if they were foreign. This other way was the theory of family ties, of kinship.

These high and strong moods could at least be explained as the influence of our ancestors. We belonged together, we stood by one another, and we grow in our own eyes when we act according to a rule we know as ours.

An attempt by noble, high-minded families to bring religion into line with their own sense of self-worth.

Transfiguration: The Temporary Transformation

Poets and prophets do the same thing. They feel proud to be honored and *chosen* for this kind of contact with the divine. They make a point of not counting at all as individuals, of being nothing but mouthpieces, the way Homer presents himself.

Yet another form of religion. The god chooses someone, or the god becomes a human, or the god lives together with humans and leaves behind great gifts. This becomes the local legend, acted out again and again forever as a "drama."

Step by step, a person takes ownership of his high and proud moods, and takes ownership of his actions and his works.

In earlier times, people believed they were honoring themselves when they knew that they were not responsible for the greatest things they did, but that God was.

Back then, the *will not being free* was what gave an action higher value. A god had been made into its author…

128.

Will to Power and Morality

Play-Acting as a Result of the Morality of "Free Will"

It is a step in the *development of the feeling of power* itself to believe that you have also caused your own high moods, your own perfection. And from that, people at once concluded that you must also have *wanted* them…

Criticism: all perfect action is in fact unconscious and no longer willed. Being conscious of what you do shows an imperfect, and often sick, personal state. To think of *personal perfection as depending on the will*, as *being conscious*, as reason that argues things out, is a caricature, a kind of contradiction with itself… In fact, the more conscious you are, the more *impossible* perfection becomes… It is a form of *play-acting*…

129.

Philosophy as Decline

Why Everything Ended Up as Play-Acting

There was a primitive psychology. It counted only the *conscious* moments of a person as causes. It took "being conscious" to be a quality of the soul. And it looked for a will, that is, an intention, behind everything a person does.

This psychology only needed to answer two questions. First: *what does a person want?*

Answer: *happiness*. (One was not allowed to say "power": that would have been *immoral*.) So in everything a person does, there is an intention to reach happiness by doing it.

Second: if a person does not actually reach happiness, what is the reason? It comes from making mistakes about the means of getting there.

What is the means to happiness that never fails? Answer: *virtue*.

Why virtue? Because it is the highest form of reasonableness, and reasonableness makes it impossible to make the mistake of choosing the wrong means.

As *reason*, virtue is the road to happiness…

Arguing things out logically is virtue's constant craft, because it shuts out everything that clouds the mind, all strong feelings and passions.

In fact, a person does *not* want "happiness"…

Pleasure is a feeling of power. If you shut out the passions, you shut out exactly the states that give the strongest feeling of power, and therefore the most pleasure.

The highest reasonableness is a cold, clear state. It is far from giving that feeling of happiness that rapture of every kind brings with it…

The ancient philosophers fought against everything that intoxicates, everything that disturbs the total coldness and neutrality of the conscious mind…

They were consistent, given their false starting point: the belief that being conscious is the *high*, the *highest* state, the condition for perfection,

while the opposite is *true*…

As long as something is willed, as long as something is consciously known, there is no perfection in doing anything of any kind. The ancient philosophers were the *greatest bunglers in practice*, because their own theory condemned them to *bungling*… In practice, everything ended up as play-acting. And whoever saw through this, Pyrrho for example, came to the same judgment as everyone else: that the "little people," ordinary folk, are far ahead of the philosophers in kindness and honesty.

All the deeper minds of the ancient world were disgusted by the *philosophers of virtue*:

people saw them as quarrelsome arguers and actors, performers.

Judgment on *Plato*:

from *Epicurus*

from *Pyrrho*

Result: in the practice of daily life, in patience, kindness, and helping one another, the little people are ahead of them. This is roughly the judgment that Dostoevsky or Tolstoy claims for his Russian peasants: they are more philosophical in practice, and they have a braver way of coping with what cannot be avoided…

130.

The Push in the Other Direction: Religion

Morality as Decline

The reaction of the *little people*:

love gives the highest feeling of power.

We need to understand how it is not people in general who are speaking here, but one particular type of person. This type needs to be dug up and examined more closely.

"We are godlike when we love, we become 'children of God'; God loves us and wants nothing at all from us except love."

That means: all morality, all obeying and doing, does not produce the feeling of power and freedom that love produces.

Out of love, you do nothing bad; you do much more than you would do out of obedience and virtue.

Here is the happiness of the herd: the feeling of community, in large groups and small ones, the living feeling of being one, felt as the *sum total of feeling alive*.

Helping, caring, and being useful keep stirring up the feeling of power. The visible success, and the joy that others show, underline this feeling of power.

Pride is not missing either: pride in being a congregation, a home where God lives, the "chosen ones."

In fact, people once again went through a *change of personality*. This time they called their feeling of love God.

We have to imagine such a feeling waking up: a kind of delight, a strange new language, a "gospel," good news.

It was this newness that did not let a person count the love as his own. He believed that God was walking before him and had come alive inside him.

"God comes to people." The "neighbor", the person next to you, is transformed into a god, because he is the one who sets off the feeling of love. *Jesus is the neighbor,* in the same way that the neighbor was re-imagined as a god, as the cause that *stirs up a feeling of power*.

131.

Science and Philosophy

Being scientific: either as *training,* like teaching an animal tricks, or as

instinct.

In the Greek philosophers I see a *decline of the instincts*. Otherwise they could never have made such a huge mistake as to rank the *conscious* state as the *more valuable* one.

The *strength* of *consciousness* goes in the *opposite* direction to how easily and quickly the brain passes things along. The more aware we are of something, the slower and harder the brain is working.

Among them, the *opposite opinion* about instinct was in charge, and that is always the sign of *weakened* instincts.

In fact, we have to look for the *perfect life* where it is least conscious of itself, that is, where it least shows itself its own logic, its reasons, its means and goals, its *usefulness*.

Going back to the plain fact of common sense, of the decent ordinary man, of "little people" of every kind.

Honesty and good sense stored up over generations, like goods kept in a warehouse. It never becomes aware of its own principles, and it even feels a slight shiver of fear at the idea of principles.

Demanding a *virtue that argues and explains itself* is not reasonable… A philosopher who makes such a demand gives himself away and loses his credibility.

132.

When, through practice over a long chain of generations, enough fine judgment, courage, caution and self-control have been gathered up, then the instinctive strength of this virtue, now part of the body itself, shines out even into the highest matters of the mind. And then that rare thing becomes visible: *intellectual honesty*. It is very rare. The philosophers do not have it.

You can weigh a thinker's scientific spirit, or, to put it in moral terms, his *intellectual honesty*, on a scale as exact as a goldsmith's. By that I mean his fine judgment, courage, caution and self-control that have become instinct and carry over even into the highest matters of the mind. Here is the test: get him to talk about morality…

And then the most famous philosophers show that their *scientific spirit* is still only a *conscious* thing, a beginning, a "good intention", a hard effort. They show that at the very moment their instinct starts to speak, the moment they start moralizing, the discipline and fine judgment of their conscience are finished.

Being scientific: is it just training and a surface coating, or is it the end result of a long discipline and *practice in morality*?

In the first case, it steps aside and lets something else take its place as soon as instinct speaks, for example the religious instinct or the instinct for the idea of duty.

In the other case, it stands in the place of these instincts and no longer lets them in. It feels them as something *dirty* and as *temptations*…

133.

Against Darwin

The *taming of human beings*: what lasting value can it have? Or does any taming at all have lasting value? There are reasons to deny the latter.

Darwin's school does make a great effort to convince us of the opposite. It wants the *effect of taming* to be able to go deep, even to the very foundations. For now, we hold on to the old view. So far nothing has been proven except a very shallow effect from taming, or else degeneration, things getting worse. And everything that slips out of human hands and human breeding goes back almost at once to its natural state. The type stays the same. As the French saying goes, you cannot "un-nature nature".

People count on the fight to survive to bring the death of weak creatures and the survival of the toughest and most gifted. So they imagine that living things are *always growing more perfect*. We, on the

other hand, have made sure of the opposite. In the fight for life, chance helps the weak just as much as the strong. Cunning often makes up for strength, and does so with advantage. And how many young a species has stands in a strange relation to *how likely it is to be destroyed*…

People give *natural selection* credit for changes that are both slow and endless. They want to believe that every advantage is passed down and shows up more and more strongly in each following generation, even though heredity is so unpredictable… They look at how well certain creatures fit very special living conditions, and they declare that these traits were gained through the *influence of their surroundings*. But examples of *unconscious selection* are found nowhere, not at all. The most different individuals pair up, and the extreme ones blend back into the crowd. Everything works together to keep the type as it is. Creatures that have outward features protecting them from certain dangers do not lose those features when they end up in places where they live without that danger… When they live in places where their coloring no longer hides them, they do not in any way come to look more like their surroundings.

People have exaggerated the *selection of the most beautiful* far beyond the urge for beauty in even our own race! In fact, the most beautiful mate with creatures that nature has given very little, the biggest with the smallest. Almost always we see males and females take advantage of any chance meeting and show themselves not picky at all.

Change through climate and food. But in truth this makes absolutely no difference.

There are no *in-between forms*…

Different species are traced back to a single one. Experience says that crossing them is doomed to be sterile, and that one type takes over again.

People claim that living things keep developing further. There is no basis for this at all. Every type has its *limit*, and beyond it there is no development. Up to that point, everything is completely regular.

Primitive creatures are supposed to be the ancestors of today's creatures. But one look at the animals and plants of the Tertiary period, the age after the dinosaurs, only lets us think of it as a land still unexplored. There we find types that exist nowhere else, related to one another, and even related to those that do exist elsewhere.

My Conclusions

My overall view. First point: the human species is *not* making progress. Higher types are reached, yes, but they do not last. The level of the species as a whole is *not* raised.

Second point: the human species is no step forward compared to any other animal. The whole world of animals and plants does not develop from lower to higher… Instead, everything happens at once, on top of each other, mixed up with each other, and against each other.

The richest and most complicated forms, and the phrase "higher type" means nothing more than that, are the ones that are destroyed most easily. Only the lowest hold on to something that looks like lasting forever. The first are rarely reached and only barely stay on top. The second have a crushing ability to reproduce on their side. In humanity too, as luck turns for and against them, the higher types, the lucky strikes of development, are the ones destroyed most easily.

They are open to every kind of decline. They are extreme, and so they are themselves almost already in decline… The short life of beauty, of genius, of a Caesar, is a thing of its own kind: such things are not

inherited. The *type* is inherited, and a type is nothing extreme, no "lucky strike"…

This is not because of any special curse or "ill will" on nature's part. It comes simply from the idea of a "higher type". The higher type is far more complex. It is a bigger collection of parts that have to work together. And so it is also far more likely to fall apart.

The "genius" is the finest machine there is, and so the most fragile.

Third point: the taming of human beings, what we call "culture", does not go deep… Where it does go deep, it is at once degeneration, and the model of this is the Christian. The "wild" person, or, in moral terms, the *evil* person, is a person's return to nature. And in a certain sense it is his recovery, his *cure* from "culture"…

134.

Philosophy as decline

Why are philosophers *slanderers*?

The sneaky and blind hostility of philosophers toward the *senses*.

It is *not* the senses that deceive us!

Take our nose. As far as I know, no philosopher has ever spoken of it with respect. Yet for now it is the most delicate measuring instrument there is. It can still detect vibrations where even the spectroscope, a scientific tool for studying light, is powerless.

How much of the *mob and of the smug respectable citizen* there is in all this hatred!

Ordinary people always treat a misuse of something as an *argument* against the thing itself, as long as they feel bad effects from that misuse. All rebel movements against principles, whether in politics or

in the economy, always argue this way. Their hidden aim is to make it look as if the misuse were a necessary part of the principle, built right into it.

It is a *pitiful* story. Humans look for some principle that lets them look down on humans. They invent another world so that they can slander and dirty this world. In fact, every time, they grab hold of nothing at all, and they build that nothing up into "God", into "truth", and in any case into a judge who condemns *this* life, the one we actually have…

Do you want proof of how deeply and thoroughly people's truly *barbaric* needs still look for satisfaction, even after people have been tamed and "civilized"? Then look at the "recurring themes" running through the whole development of philosophy. You find a kind of revenge on reality. You find a sneaky destruction of the values by which people live. You find an *unsatisfied* soul that feels being tamed as torture, and that takes a sick pleasure in picking apart every tie that binds it to the world.

The history of philosophy is a *secret rage* against the things life needs in order to exist, against life's sense of what is valuable, and against taking life's side. Philosophers have never hesitated to say yes to a world, as long as that world contradicted this one and gave them a handle for speaking badly of this world. Until now, philosophy has been the great *school of slander*. And it has impressed people so much that even today our science, which presents itself as life's defender, has *accepted* the basic position of this slander. Science treats this world as mere appearance, and treats the chain of causes in it as just something that shows on the surface. So *what* is it, really, that hates here?…

I'm afraid it is always morality, *the witch who bewitched philosophers*, that has played this trick on them and forced them, in every age, to be slanderers… They believed in moral "truths". They found the highest

values there. So what else could they do but say no to existence, more and more, the better they understood it?… Because this existence is *immoral*… And this life rests on immoral foundations. And all morality *says no* to life —

— Let us get rid of the "real" world. And to be able to do that, we have to get rid of the highest values we have had so far: morality.

It is enough to prove that morality itself is *immoral*, in the very sense in which immoral things have been condemned up to now. Once the tyranny of the old values is broken this way, once we have gotten rid of the "real world", a *new order of values* will have to follow all by itself.

Important, important: the true opposition is between the world we see and the *made-up*, lying world. Until now, that made-up world has been called the "real world", "truth", "God". *These* are what we have to get rid of.

135.

The logic of my idea:

1.

Morality as the highest value. It rules over *every* stage of philosophy, even over the skeptics, the people who doubt everything. *The result:* this world is worthless; it is not the "real world."

2.

What decides the highest value here? What is morality, really? It is the instinct of decline. It is the worn-out people and the people who were left nothing, who *take revenge* in this way. *Proof from history:* philosophers have always been people in decline… working in the service of religions of *nihilism (belief in nothing)*.

3.

The instinct of decline, showing up as the *will to power*. The proof: the means used across the whole history of morality have been completely *immoral*.

II. In this whole movement, we have recognized only one *special case* of the *will to power*.

136.

The Will to Power.

An Attempt

at a Rethinking of All Values.

I.

A Critique of the Values We Have Had So Far.

II.

The New Principle of Value.

The Shapes and Forms of the "Will to Power"

III.

The Question of What Our Modern World Is Worth

: measured by this principle

IV.

The Great War.

137.

Book One.

Which values have been on top until now.

1. Morality as the highest value, in every stage of philosophy (even among the skeptics, who doubt everything).

The result: this world is worthless, so there must be a "real world" somewhere else.

2. *What* actually decides the highest value here? What is morality, really? It is the instinct of decline. It is the worn-out people and the people who were left nothing, who *take revenge* in this way and make themselves the *masters*…

Proof from history: philosophers have always been people in decline, always working in the service of religions of nihilism (belief in nothing).

3. The instinct of decline, showing up as the will to power. A display of its system of means: the means it uses are completely immoral.

The overall view: the highest values we have had until now are a special case of the will to power. Morality itself is a special case of *immorality*.

Book Two.

Why the opposing values always lost.

1. How was this actually *possible*? The question is: why did life lose everywhere? Why did bodily health and good make-up lose everywhere? Why was there no philosophy that says *yes*, no religion that says *yes*?… The signs in history of such movements:

the pagan religion.

Dionysus against "the crucified one"

the Renaissance.

Art —

2. The strong and the weak: the healthy and the sick; the exception and the rule. There is no doubt about *who* is the stronger one…

A view of history as a whole. Does this make human beings an *exception* in the history of life? — An objection against *Darwinism*. The tools the weak use to stay on top have turned into instincts, have turned into "humanity," have turned into "institutions"…

3. Proof that this rule by the weak exists in our political instincts, in our social judgments about what is good and bad, in our arts, and in our *science*.

We have seen two "wills to power" fighting each other. *In this special case, we have a principle* that lets us say the side that lost until now was right, and the side that won until now was wrong. We have recognized the "real world" as a "*made-up world*" built on lies, and mor-

ality as a *form of immorality*. We do *not* say: "the stronger one is in the wrong"…

Book Three

what causes all values, and what causes values to differ

1.

the values of nihilism (belief in nothing) are on top

2.

the push in the other direction always loses — and soon it goes bad and falls apart…

3.

Up to now, the push in the other direction has only been known in half-hearted and spoiled forms. Its true type must be *cleaned up* and *restored*. A precise statement of the system:

Psychology

History

Art

Politics

138.

3. Cleaning up the values that have lost out so far

We have understood *what* has decided the highest value up to now

and *why* it became master over the opposing way of valuing things

: it was *stronger*…

Now let us clean the *opposing way of valuing things* of the infection and half-heartedness, of the *spoiled state* in which all of us know it.

A theory of how it was turned against nature, and of *bringing nature back*: free of moralizing

Theory of knowledge, the will to truth

Theory of psychology

Where religion comes from

Where art comes from

Theory of how systems of rule are built

Theory of life

Life and nature

History of the

pushes in the other direction:

the Renaissance

the Revolution

science breaking free

139.

The rotten and mixed-up state of our values matches the bodily state of people today: a theory of *modern times*

140.

The *instincts of decline* have become master over the *instincts of rising*…

the *will to nothing* has become master over the *will to live*…

— but is that *true*? Isn't there perhaps a bigger guarantee for life, for the human species, in this victory of the weak and the average?

— Is it perhaps just a tool within the whole movement toward life, a way of slowing down the pace? A kind of self-defense against something even worse?

— Suppose the strong had become masters in everything, including in how things are valued. Let's think it through: how would they think about sickness, suffering and sacrifice? The result would be that *the weak would despise themselves*. They would try to disappear and wipe themselves out… And would this perhaps be *something to wish for*?…

— And would we really want a world without the lasting effects of the weak — without their delicacy, their consideration for others, their intellect and spirit, their *flexibility*?…

141.

Science

Science fought against by the philosophers

This is remarkable. Right from the start of Greek philosophy we find a fight against science, using theories of knowledge, or rather doubt about whether anything can be known. And what for? Always in favor of *morality*…

The hatred against the natural scientists and doctors

Socrates, Aristippus, the Megarian school, the Cynics, Epicurus, Pyrrho — an all-out attack on knowledge in favor of *morality*…

Hatred also against logical argument…

A puzzle remains: they move closer to the Sophists, those clever word-twisters, just to get rid of science

On the other hand, the natural scientists are all so far under their control that they take the pattern of 'truth', of 'true being', into their own foundations: for example the atom, or the four elements (placing unchanging things side by side in order to explain how there can be many things and how things change —)

People were taught to look down on being interested in things for their own sake, objectively: a return to practical interest, to the idea that all knowledge must be useful to the person…

The fight against science is aimed at

1) its driving passion (objectivity),

2) its tools (that is, against its usefulness)

3) its results (calling them childish)

It is the same fight that is fought again later by the *Church*, in the name of faith and devotion:

: the Church inherits the whole ancient armory for this fight.

Theory of knowledge plays the same role here as it does with Kant, and as it does among the thinkers of India…

People don't want to have to bother with science: they want to keep their hands free for their own 'path'

What are they really defending themselves against? Against being bound, against laws and rules, against being forced to go hand in hand with others —

: I believe people call that *freedom*…

This is where decline shows itself: the instinct for standing together has become so weak and spoiled that standing together is felt as *tyranny*:

: they want

no authority

no standing together

no falling into line, rank and file, and no endlessly slow movement

they hate the step-by-step, the pace of science; they hate the scientist's willingness not to reach a goal, his long patience, his personal indifference —.

142.

Theory and *practice*

A disastrous distinction — as if there were a separate *drive to know*, which charges blindly toward truth without caring whether that is useful or harmful; and then, cut off from it, the whole world of *practical* interests…

Against this, I try to show which instincts were at work behind all these *pure* theorists — how all of them, as if fated, under the spell of their instincts, went straight for something that was 'truth' *for them*, for them and *only* for them. The battle between philosophical systems, along with the battle over doubts about knowledge, is a battle between very specific instincts (forms of vitality, of decline, of social classes, of races, and so on).

The so-called *drive to know* can be traced back to a *drive to take possession* and *to overpower*: by following this drive, the senses, memory, the instincts and so on developed…

— reducing what we see as quickly as possible to something simpler, saving effort, piling up the treasure of knowledge we have gained (that is, of a world that has been taken over and made easy to handle)

Morality is such an odd science because it is practical to the highest degree: so the pure search for knowledge, scientific honesty, is given up right away as soon as morality demands its answers.

Morality says: I *need* certain answers — reasons, arguments. Doubts may come afterward, or they may not —

'How should we act?'

Now, if you think about it, we are dealing with a type of being that has fully developed and is in control, that has been 'acting' for countless thousands of years, and for whom everything has become instinct, fitness for purpose, automatic habit, fate. Seen that way, the *urgency* of this moral question even seems quite funny.

'How should we act?' — Morality was always a misunderstanding. In fact, a kind of creature that had a fate to act in a certain way built into its body wanted to justify itself, by *trying to order* that its own rule should be the rule for everyone…

'How should we act?' is not a cause but an *effect*. Morality comes afterward; the ideal comes at the end.

On the other hand, when moral doubts appear — in other words, when people *become aware of the values* they act by — it gives away a certain *sickliness*. Strong eras and peoples don't think about their right to act, about principles, about instinct and reason —

becoming aware is a sign that real morality, meaning the instinctive certainty of how to act, is going to the devil…

Moralists, like every time a *new world of awareness* is created, are signs of damage, of becoming poorer, of falling into disorder —

people whose *instincts run deep* shy away from turning duties into logic: among them you find followers of Pyrrho who oppose logical argument and even the idea that anything can be known at all… A virtue is *disproved* the moment it needs an 'in order to'…

Claim: moralists appear in times when morality is coming to an end

Claim: the moralist breaks down the moral instincts, however much he believes he is restoring them

Claim: what actually guides the moralist is not moral instincts but the *instincts of decline*, translated into the formulas of morality: he feels the growing uncertainty of the instincts as *corruption*: in fact — — —

Claim: the *instincts of decline*, which through the moralists want to become master over the instinctive morality of strong races and eras, are

1)

the instincts of the weak and of those life treated badly

2)

the instincts of the exceptions, the loners, the ones cut loose, the failed births among both the high and the low

3)

the instincts of those who suffer all the time, who need a noble-sounding explanation of their condition and therefore must avoid, as much as possible, looking at it as doctors of the body would

Morality as *decline*

143.

A philosopher is clever when he is 'impractical': it makes people believe he is genuine, simple and innocent in the way he deals with ideas. In his case, impractical means 'objective'. Schopenhauer was clever when he once had his photograph taken with his vest buttoned up wrong. By that he was saying: 'I don't belong in this world. What does a philosopher care about the custom of matching seams and buttons!… I am too objective for that!…'

It is not enough to prove that you are *impractical*: most philosophers believe that this is enough to lift the objectivity and purity of their reason above all doubt.

1. The supposedly pure drive to know that all philosophers have is under the command of their moral 'truths' — it only seems to be independent…

2. The "moral truths", the ones that say "this is how people *should* act", are just the way a tired, weakening instinct shows up in our awareness. Underneath, they only mean: "this and that *is* how people act among us." The "ideal" is supposed to bring an instinct back and make it stronger. It flatters a person into feeling that he is obeying, when really he is just a machine running on its own.

144.

Wherever things seem to be grouped together with a certain unity, people have always assumed that a *mind* must be the cause of this arrangement. But there is no reason at all to think so. Why should the idea of a complicated fact be one of the conditions that make that fact happen? Or why should a complicated fact need to be preceded by a mental picture of it? —

We will be careful not to explain the way things seem to serve a purpose by pointing to the mind. There is no reason at all to say that the mind has the special power to organize things and put them into systems.

The nervous system covers a much larger area. The world of conscious awareness is just something added on top. In the whole process of adapting and organizing, consciousness plays no part.

Nothing is more mistaken than to treat mental events and physical events as two faces, two ways of showing, of one and the same underlying "substance". That explains nothing. The idea of "substance" is completely useless if you are trying to explain something.

Consciousness plays a supporting role. It is almost unimportant, extra, maybe even destined to disappear and make room for a body that runs completely on its own, like a machine —

When we only watch what happens inside our own minds, we are like deaf people who guess words they cannot hear by watching how lips move. From what our inner sense shows us, we draw conclusions about visible and other events. We would actually perceive those events if our tools for observing were good enough. These events are what people call the nerve current.

145.

That there is a world for which we lack all the finer sense organs, so that we feel something a *thousand times more complicated* as if it were a single unit, so that we invent cause and effect where the real reasons for every movement and change stay hidden from us. (After all, one thought or feeling following another is only the moment those things become visible in our awareness. It is completely unbelievable that this order has anything to do with a chain of causes. Consciousness never gives us a single example of cause and effect.) — — —

146.

Science Against Philosophy

The huge mistakes:

1)

the absurd *overrating of consciousness*. People made it into a single unit, into a being, into "the mind", "the soul", something that feels, thinks and wants —

2)

the mind seen as a *cause*, especially wherever things look purposeful, organized or well coordinated

3)

consciousness seen as the highest form anything can reach, as the top kind of being, as "God"

4)

a will read into everything, wherever there is an effect

5)

the "real world" seen as a world of the mind, a world we can reach through the facts of consciousness

6)

knowledge seen as purely a power of consciousness, wherever

there is any knowledge at all

What people concluded from this:

all progress means moving toward becoming more conscious; all going backward means becoming less conscious.

You get closer to reality, to "true being", through logical argument. You move *away* from it through instincts, the senses, and mechanical processes…

To turn the human being into pure mind would mean making him into God: mind, will and goodness all as one.

Everything *good* has to come from intellect and spirit, has to

be a fact of consciousness.

Progress toward the *better* can only be progress in becoming more *conscious*.

Becoming less conscious was seen as falling prey to *desires* and the *senses*, as *turning into an animal*…

The fight against Socrates, Plato and all the schools that came from Socrates starts from a deep instinct: you do not make people *better* by presenting virtue to them as something that can be proved and that demands reasons…

In the end it comes down to a petty fact. The competitive instinct forced all these born debaters to praise their own *personal skill* as the *highest quality*, and to present every other good thing as depending on it. The *anti-scientific* spirit of this whole "philosophy" is this: *it wants to be right*.

147.

The *Struggle of Science*

The Sophists

The Sophists are nothing more than realists. They take the values and habits that everyone commonly lives by and raise them to the rank of values. They have the courage that all strong minds have: the courage to *know* that they are immoral…

Does anyone really believe that these little free Greek city-states, which would happily have eaten each other alive out of rage and jealousy, were guided by kind and honest principles? Does anyone blame Thucydides for the speech he puts in the mouths of the Athenian messengers, when they are bargaining with the people of Melos over whether Melos will be destroyed or will surrender?

In the middle of this terrible tension, only perfect hypocrites like Tartuffe could talk about virtue — or *people standing off to the side*: hermits, refugees and those who had run away from reality… all people who said no to things so that they themselves could go on living —

The Sophists were Greeks. When Socrates and Plato took the side of virtue and justice, they were *Jews*, or I don't know what. Grote's way of defending the Sophists is wrong. He wants to raise them up as honorable men and models of morality. But their honor lay in this: they did not cheat people with big words and virtues…

148.

Parmenides said, "you cannot think what does not exist." We stand at the opposite end and say, "whatever can be thought must surely be a made-up thing." Thinking has no grip on what is real, but only on — — —

149.

The followers of Pyrrho also took an interest in the *Jews*, especially Hecataeus of Abdera, who lived at the Egyptian court and wrote about the philosophy of the Egyptians.

150.

"For practical life, you need a belief."

151.

"Making people better"

Morality as Decline

There is widespread fooling and being fooled in the area of so-called moral improvement. We do not believe that a person becomes someone else if he is not already that someone. That is, unless he is, as happens often enough, many people at once, or at least the beginnings of many people. In that case, what you can achieve is that a different role steps into the front, and "the old self" is pushed into the

background… The appearance has changed, not the actual nature… Even this is not always achieved: breaking the habit of doing a certain thing, or taking away the strongest reason for doing it. Someone who is a criminal by fate and by talent does not unlearn anything. Instead, he keeps learning more. A long time of going without even works like a tonic, a boost, for his talent… The fact that someone stops doing certain things is just a raw fact of fate, which can be explained in all sorts of ways. Of course, society cares about only one thing: that someone no longer does certain things. For this purpose it takes him out of the situations where he *can* do those things. That is at least wiser than trying the impossible, which is to break the fate of his being the way he is.

Now the Church. In this matter it did nothing but take over from ancient philosophy and inherit from it. It starts from a different measure of value and wants to save a "soul", the salvation of a soul. First it believes that punishment has the power to make up for wrongdoing, and then that forgiveness has the power to wipe it out. Both are illusions of religious prejudice. Punishment does not make up for anything, forgiveness does not wipe anything out, and what has been done cannot be undone. Just because someone forgets something, that is far from meaning the thing no longer *exists*… A deed has its consequences, inside a person and outside him, no matter whether it counts as punished, "made up for", "forgiven" or "wiped out", and no matter whether the Church has meanwhile promoted the person who did it to being a saint. The Church believes in things that do not exist, in "souls". It believes in effects that do not exist, in effects caused by God. It believes in states that do not exist, in sin, in rescue, in saving one's soul. Everywhere it stops at the surface, at signs, gestures, words and symbols, and gives them whatever meaning it likes. It has a fully worked-out method of psychological faking.

152.

Will to Power as *Knowledge*

Not "knowing" things, but sorting them into patterns: forcing on the chaos just as much order and shape as our practical needs require.

When reason, logic and our basic categories of thought took shape, need was what decided things. It was the need not to "know", but to file things under headings and sort them into patterns, so that we could understand one another and do our calculations…

Adjusting things, making them up to look similar, to look the same: this is the same process that every impression from our senses goes through, and it is how reason developed!

No "idea" that existed beforehand was at work here. What was at work was usefulness: only when we see things roughly and make them look alike do they become something we can calculate and handle…

The sense of purpose in reason is a result, not a cause. With every other kind of reason, and there are always new attempts at other kinds, life goes wrong. It becomes too confusing to see clearly, too uneven.

Our categories of thought are "truths" only in the sense that we need them to live, just as the space of Euclid's geometry is that kind of limited "truth". (Strictly speaking, since nobody will claim that humans simply had to exist, reason, like Euclid's space, is just a quirk of certain kinds of animals, one quirk among many others…)

The fact that we feel forced to agree here, that we cannot argue against it, is a biological force. The useful instinct to draw conclusions the way we draw them is built into our bodies. We almost are this in-

stinct… But how naive it is to take this as proof that we therefore own a "truth in itself"…

Not being able to contradict something proves that we lack an ability, not that we have found a "truth".

*

We should not look for mere appearances in the wrong place. Nothing is more a matter of appearance, or more obviously so, nothing is so much an illusion, as this inner world that we watch with our famous "inner sense".

We have believed that the will is a cause. We believed it so strongly that, based on our own personal experience, we put a cause into everything that happens at all. In other words, we treated intention as the cause of events.

We believe that one thought and the next, as they follow each other inside us, are linked in some chain of cause and effect. The logician especially, who in fact talks only about cases that never happen in real life, has got used to the prejudice that thoughts cause thoughts. And he calls that "thinking"…

We believe, and even our scientists of the body still believe it, that pleasure and pain cause reactions, that the point of pleasure and pain is to set off reactions. For thousands of years, people have actually presented pleasure, and avoiding what is unpleasant, as the motives behind every action. If we think about it a little, we might admit that everything would happen in just the same way, following exactly the same chain of causes and effects, if these states of "pleasure and pain" were missing. People are simply mistaken when they claim that these feelings cause anything. They are side effects that come along, with a quite different purpose than setting off reactions. They are already results inside a reaction that has already begun…

In short: everything that becomes conscious is a final stage, an end point, and causes nothing. Everything that follows one after another in our consciousness is completely separate, like loose atoms. And we have tried to understand the world the other way round, as if nothing were active and real except thinking, feeling and willing…

153.

Science

Chapter One

Where the 'real world' came from

Philosophy went wrong for this reason. Logic and the categories of reason are tools for shaping the world to suit useful purposes, which means, at bottom, a useful falsification. But instead of seeing them that way, people believed they held in them the test of truth, or of reality. In fact, the "test of truth" was only how biologically useful such a system of basic falsification was. And since a species of animal knows nothing more important than keeping itself alive, we may indeed speak of "truth" here. The only naive thing was to take this human quirk as the measure of all things, as the rule for deciding what is "real" and what is "unreal". In short, people made something limited into something absolute. And look what happened: suddenly the world split in two, into a real world and a world that only "seems". And the very world in which man had invented his reason so he could live and settle in it, that same world was now made to look worthless to him. Instead of using these forms as handles, to make the world easy to handle and to calculate, the crazy cleverness of philosophers decided that these categories gave us the idea of that other world, and that the world we actually live in does not match it… The tools were mistaken for a measure of value, and even used to condemn their own purpose…

The purpose was to fool ourselves in a useful way. The tools for this were invented formulas and signs, with whose help the confusing variety of things was boiled down to a pattern that was handy and suited our goals.

But alas! Now a moral category was brought into the game: no being wants to be fooled, no being is allowed to fool others, and so there is only a will to truth. What is "truth"?

The law that something cannot contradict itself provided the pattern. The real world, which people were looking for the way to, cannot contradict itself, cannot change, cannot become anything, has no beginning and no end.

This is the greatest mistake that has ever been made, the true disaster of error on earth. People believed they had a test of reality in the forms of reason, when in fact they had those forms in order to gain control over reality, in order to misunderstand reality in a clever way…

And look what happened: now the world became false, and exactly because of the qualities that make up its reality: change, becoming, variety, opposites, contradiction, war.

And now the whole disaster had arrived:

1) How do we get free of the false world, the world that only seems real? (But it was the real one, the only one.)

2) How do we ourselves become as much as possible the opposite of the character of the world we see? (This is the idea of the perfect being as the opposite of every real being, or more plainly, as something that contradicts life…)

3) The whole direction of values was aimed at slandering life.

4) People mixed up dogmatic belief in ideals with knowledge in general, so that the opposing side now always hated and feared science as well.

- - - So the road to science was blocked twice over: first by the belief in the real world, and then by the enemies of this belief.

Natural science and the science of the body were 1) condemned for the things they studied, and 2) robbed of their innocence…

In the actual world, where absolutely everything is linked and depends on everything else, to condemn anything and wish it away in thought means to wish away and condemn everything.

Saying "this should not be" or "this should never have been" is a farce, a joke… If you think the consequences through, you would ruin the source of life if you tried to get rid of whatever is harmful or destructive in any sense. The science of the body shows this even better!

154.

Morality as decline

We see how morality

a)

poisons the whole way we see the world,

b)

cuts off the road to knowledge, to science,

c)

breaks down and undermines all real instincts (by teaching people to feel that their roots are immoral).

We see a terrible tool of decline at work in front of us, a tool that keeps itself going with the holiest names and gestures.

155.

Decline

Religion as decline

Against regret, and for treating it in a purely psychological way. (I recommend treating a guilty conscience with the Mitchell cure, the rest cure doctors use for nervous patients.)

Not being able to get over an experience is already a sign of decline. This tearing open of old wounds, this wallowing in self-contempt and remorse, is just one more illness. Out of it can never come "saving one's soul", only ever a new form of the same illness…

These states of "rescue" that Christians go through are just changes within one and the same sick condition. They are ways of explaining an epileptic fit using a certain formula, and that formula does *not* come from science but from religious madness.

When you are sick, you are *good* in a sick sort of way… Today we count most of the mental tools that Christianity has worked with as forms of hysteria and of something close to epilepsy.

This whole practice of healing the soul has to be put back on a *bodily* basis. A "guilty conscience" as such, the sting of regret, actually gets in the way of getting well. You should try to make up for everything with new actions, and get away as fast as possible from the sickness of *torturing yourself*…

We should give the purely mental methods of the Church and of religious sects a bad name, as things that are dangerous to health…

You do not heal a sick person with prayers or by driving out evil spirits. The feelings of "peace" that come over people under such treatment are far from something you could trust, if you look at them as a doctor of the body would…

You are *healthy* when you can laugh at how seriously and eagerly you were gripped by some detail of your life, as if it had *hypnotized* you. You are healthy when the bite of a guilty conscience feels to you like a dog biting a stone: pointless and harmless. You are healthy when you feel ashamed of your regret —

The way things have been done up to now, the purely mental and religious way, only aimed at *changing the symptoms*. It considered a person cured if he humbled himself in front of the cross and swore to be a good person… But a criminal who holds on to his fate with a certain dark seriousness, and who does not afterwards speak badly of what he did, has *more health of the soul*… The criminals Dostoevsky lived with in prison were, every single one of them, unbroken people. Aren't they worth a hundred times more than a "broken" Christian?

156.

The Will to Power

An attempt

at a rethinking of all values.

Chapter One:

the 'real' world and the world we see

Chapter Two:

How could such a mistake happen? What does it mean when people actually want to misunderstand life?

A critique of philosophers as types of decline.

Chapter Three.

Morality as a sign of decline.

A critique of selflessness, of pity, of Christianity, and of turning away from the senses

Chapter Four.

Are there no beginnings of an *opposite* attitude?

1. What is pagan in religion

2. "Art"

3. The state

The war against them: everything that keeps *plotting* against them…

Chapter Five.

A critique of the present: where does it belong?

its badge of nihilism (belief in nothing)

its types who *say yes*: we have to grasp the *huge fact* that science has a *clear conscience*…

Chapter Six.

The will to power as life

Chapter Seven.

We Hyperboreans (people from beyond the north wind).

Nothing but absolute positions, for example *happiness*!! For example, history as enormous enjoyment, with triumph at the end. *To have nothing but clear yeses and noes*… Rescue from *uncertainty*!

157.

Morality as decline

Decline

"*Senses*" *and* "*passions*"

Fear of the senses, of desires, of passions, when it goes so far as to *advise against* them, is already a sign of *weakness*. Extreme measures always point to abnormal conditions. What is missing here, or has *crumbled away*, is the strength to *hold back* an urge. If your instinct tells you that you will have to give in, that you *must* react, then you do well to stay away from the chances to do so, the so-called "temptations".

Something that "stirs the senses" is only a *temptation* for beings whose system is too easily moved and pushed around. In the opposite case, when the system is very slow and hard, strong stimulation is needed just to get things working…

For us, excess only counts against someone who has no right to it. And almost all passions have got a bad name because of the people who are not strong enough to turn them *to their own advantage* —

We have to understand clearly that whatever can be said against *passion* can also be said against *sickness*. And yet we could not do without sickness, and even less without the passions…

We *need* the abnormal. Through these great sicknesses we give life an enormous shock…

*

In detail, we need to tell apart:

1) the *ruling passion*, which even brings with it the very highest form of health there is. Here the inner systems work together best and all serve one single purpose. But that is almost the definition of health!

2) passions fighting each other, two, three, many "souls in one chest". This is very unhealthy. It is inner ruin. It tears a person apart, and it shows and increases an inner split and a kind of chaos with no ruler —: unless one passion finally becomes the master. *Then health returns* —

3) passions sitting side by side, *without* fighting each other or working together. This often comes and goes in phases, and once it has found some order, it is healthy too… The most interesting people belong here, the chameleons. They are not in conflict with themselves. They are happy and secure, but they do not develop. Their different states lie next to each other, even if they are kept apart sevenfold. They change, but they do not *grow into* something…

158.

Morality as *decline*

The 'good' person as a *tyrant*

Humanity has always repeated the same mistake: it has taken a tool for living and made it into a *yardstick* for measuring life

: instead of finding the measure in the highest lifting up of life itself, in the question of growth and exhaustion, it has used the *tools* for one very particular kind of life to shut out all other forms of life. In short, it has used them to judge life and to select among it

: that is, in the end people love the tools for their own sake and *forget* that they are tools. So now these tools appear in people's minds as goals, as the standards by which purposes are measured…

: that is, *one particular kind of human being* treats the conditions it needs to exist as conditions that should be forced on everyone by law, calling them "truth", "good", "perfect". It *acts like a tyrant*…

: it is a *form of belief*, an instinct, when one kind of human does not see that its own kind is shaped by particular conditions, and that it is only one kind compared to others:

: at least, it seems to be over for a kind of human being (a people, a race) once it becomes tolerant, grants equal rights, and no longer thinks of wanting to be master —

159.

Religion as decline

A critique of faith

Conviction and lie.

1. "There is an opposite between a lie and a conviction": there is no bigger opposite…

2. But it has rightly been said that convictions are more dangerous enemies of truth than lies are (in "Human, All Too Human").

3. Should the conviction stated in point one perhaps also be counted among the enemies of truth? And among its most dangerous ones?

Every conviction has its history, its early forms, its trials and its mistakes. It becomes a conviction after a long time of *not* being one, and an even *longer* time of *barely* being one…

Could a lie not also be among these early, unborn stages of a conviction?…

It often needs a change of person. What was still only a leaning in the father becomes a conviction only in the son.

What makes a liar sell us a mistake as a truth? His "practical reason" — or, to put it in plainer words, his own advantage.

What makes someone decide between different possibilities? His practical reason, his advantage…

What makes someone choose one way or another between different theories? Advantage.

What difference is left between someone who is convinced and someone who has been lied to? None, if he has been lied to well.

What is it that makes all philosophers take their convictions for truths? Their advantage, their "practical reason".

Fiction, usefulness, guessing, likelihood, certainty, conviction: this is the history of an inner passion, and at its beginning stands the lie, its god…

"I want to believe that something is true." Is that the instinct for truth? Or is it really a different instinct, one that does not care much about truth at all, but knows very well what advantages believing can bring?…

Suppose a person gains something by lying to himself. Then how is the strong feeling of having fooled yourself any different from the strong feeling of being convinced?…

In faith, the way Christianity understands it, which one has been put in charge: cleverness or truth? Is it the "proof by strength", meaning the proof by the advantages that a belief brings with it, or is it the
— — —

And what is it that makes martyrs? Is it the instinct for truth? Or is it the opposite: a gap in how a person is built inside, the lack of any such instinct? We see martyrs as a lower kind of being. Proving a conviction makes no sense at all. What has to be proved is that you have a right to be so convinced… A conviction is an objection, a question

mark, a challenge. You have to prove that you are not just convinced, that you are not just a *fool*…

Dying on the cross proves no truth. It only proves a conviction, only a personal quirk. (There is a very popular mistake here: "having the courage of your convictions." No! What matters is having the courage to attack your own convictions!!!

160.

Religion as decline: *conviction*

Against dying as a sacrifice

Today we would be willing to die for certain things, but without making a big solemn fuss about that sacrifice. We are far from worshipping such things like idols just because they demand human lives… Take the famous "fatherland", for example, an idea that is being paid for at a strangely high price in Europe today. Or take the even more famous "science", which, I expect, may one day cost even more than the idea of the "fatherland".

A death for a — — —

Do you need to be right in order to win the argument and come out on top? Quite the opposite! And besides, wanting to be right is immodest. You should not want too much honor… But all those great wise men were modest: they only came out on top…

You think a cause becomes *honorable* because you pay for it with your life?… A mistake that becomes honorable is simply a mistake with one more trick for luring people in! Do you think we will want to encourage you to die as a sacrifice for your "truth"?… That was exactly the huge, history-making stupidity of all persecutors: they forced their opponents to become heroes… They turned every kind of stupidity into a sacred object for humanity to worship… *Woman* still kneels

today before a teaching whose teacher died on the cross… Is the cross a proof?

Today a certain amount of faith is enough for us to count as an *objection* against the thing believed in. Even more, it raises a question mark about whether the believer is mentally healthy. "Rock-solid convictions" almost always belong in the madhouse.

161.

I really cannot see how someone can make up for it if he failed to go to a *good school* at the right time. Such a person does not know himself. He goes through life without ever having learned how to walk. His weak, flabby muscle still gives him away with every step. Sometimes life is kind enough to give him this hard schooling later on. It might be years of illness, which demand the greatest willpower and the ability to rely only on yourself. Or it might be a sudden crisis that also hits his wife and children, and forces him to work, so that his slack fibers get their energy back and his will to live wins back its *toughness*… But in every case the best thing remains hard discipline *at the right time*. That means at an age when it still makes you proud to see that a lot is expected of you. Because this is what makes a hard school a good school, different from every other kind: a lot is demanded; it is demanded strictly; what is good, even what is excellent, is demanded as normal; praise is rare; there is no going easy on anyone; and criticism is spoken out loud, sharp and to the point, no matter how talented someone is or what family they come from. You need a school like this in every way. That goes for the most physical things as well as the most mental ones. It would be disastrous to try to separate the two here! The same discipline makes both the soldier and the scholar good at what they do. And if you look more closely, there is no capable scholar who does not have the instincts of a capable soldier in his body… To stand in line with the others, but to be ready at

any moment to step forward and lead. To prefer danger to comfort. Not to weigh what is allowed and what is forbidden on a shopkeeper's scales. To be more of an enemy to what is petty, sly and parasitic than to what is evil…

So what do you *learn* in a hard school? To *obey* and to *command*, — — —

162.

Philosopher

Pyrrho was the gentlest and most patient man who ever lived among the Greeks. He was a Buddhist, even though he was Greek, a Buddha himself. Yet one single time he was driven completely out of control. By whom? By his sister, who lived with him. She was a midwife. Ever since then, philosophers have been most afraid of the sister (the sister! Sister! It sounds so terrible!) *and* of the midwife!… (This is where staying unmarried comes from.)

163.

(For the chapter: Religion as decline)

Religious morality

Strong feelings, great desire, the passions for power, for love, for revenge, for owning things: the moralists want to wipe them out, rip them out, "clean" the soul of them.

Their logic goes like this: these desires often cause great harm, so they must be evil and shameful. A person has to get free of them. Until then he cannot be a *good* person…

This is the same logic as: "If one of your body parts leads you into sin, tear it out." Take the special case that this dangerous "innocent

country boy", the founder of Christianity, recommended his disciples to practice: the case of sexual arousal. Sadly, the result is not just that a body part is missing. The result is that the person's character is *castrated*, robbed of its manhood… And the same is true of the moralists' madness, which demands that the passions be cut out completely instead of tamed. Their conclusion is always: only the castrated person is the good person.

The great sources of strength in the soul are like wild rivers, often bursting out in a dangerous and overwhelming way. Instead of putting their power to work and *using it wisely*, this most short-sighted and most harmful way of thinking, the moral way of thinking, wants to make them *dry up*.

164.

The Christian quack doctors of morality

Pity and contempt follow each other quickly, back and forth, and sometimes I am outraged, as if I were watching a vile crime. Here, error has been turned into a duty, into a virtue. The mistaken move has become the standard method. The instinct to destroy has been organized into a system and called "rescue". Here every operation becomes an injury, even a cutting out of organs whose energy is exactly what is needed for health to ever come back. And at best nothing is healed; one set of symptoms of the illness is just swapped for another… And this dangerous nonsense, this system of disgracing and mutilating life, is seen as holy, as untouchable. To live in its service, to be a tool of this so-called art of healing, to be a *priest*, lifts a person up, makes him respected, even makes him holy and untouchable himself. Only God, they say, can be the creator of this highest art of healing. Rescue can only be understood as something revealed by God, as a

kind of grace, as a gift that the creature has done nothing at all to deserve.

First statement: a healthy soul is seen as sick, and treated with suspicion…

Second statement: the things a strong and flourishing life needs, strong desires and passions, are treated as arguments against a strong and flourishing life.

Third statement: everything that could put a person in danger, everything that could take control of him and destroy him, is evil and shameful, and must be torn out of his soul, roots and all.

Fourth statement: the human being who has been made harmless, both to himself and to others; who is weak, thrown down in humility and modesty, aware of his own weakness; the "sinner" — that is the most desirable type. It is the type that you can even *produce*, with a bit of surgery on the soul…

165.

Courage.

1.

I tell apart courage in front of people, courage in front of things, and courage on paper. The last kind was, for example, the courage of David Strauss. I also tell apart courage in front of witnesses and courage without witnesses. The courage of a Christian, or of anyone who believes in God at all, can never be courage without witnesses, because God is always watching. That alone already makes it a lower kind. Finally, I tell apart courage that comes from a person's nature and courage that comes from being afraid of fear. Moral courage is one example of this second kind. On top of these, there is also the courage of despair.

Wagner as a Seducer

2.

Wagner had this courage, the courage of despair. When it came to music, his situation was really hopeless. He lacked both things that make someone a *good* musician: natural gift and training. He had neither a born talent for music nor the discipline and schooling in it. But he had courage. He turned this lack into a principle. He invented a whole kind of music for himself. "Dramatic music," as he invented it, is simply the music that *he was able to make*. The very idea of it marks the limits of Wagner himself.

And people have misunderstood him. Or have they really misunderstood him? Five out of six modern artists are in the same situation as he was. Wagner is their rescuer. And by the way, five out of six is putting it mildly. Every time nature has been harsh and given an artist no gift, and every time his training has stayed a matter of luck, a half-hearted attempt, an amateur's hobby, that artist now turns to Wagner

by instinct. What am I saying? He turns to him with enthusiasm. As the poet puts it: "half she pulled him, half he sank down."

2.

Wagner's success is a great *seducer*. Let's imagine that this seducer learns to talk. Imagine he joins young musicians, disguised as a wise friend and adviser to their conscience. These are young musicians who carry, deep inside themselves, a small fatal flaw. And already we can hear him talking: friendly, trusting, like a decent honest fellow, with an angelic tolerance for all those "small fatal flaws"...

166.

An idea for a painting. A cart driver. A winter landscape. The driver, with a look of the most shameless contempt, pees on his own horse. The poor, worn-out creature turns its head to look at him, grateful, very grateful, for the warmth...

167.

Wagner as a Problem

Wagner the Actor, Performer

What Has Become Popular

Wagner as a Role Model

Wagner as Temptation

Music as playacting. Every thought...

168.

The 'Real' World and the World We See

Draft of the First Chapter

A.

The *temptations* that come from this idea are of three kinds:

First, an *unknown* world. We are adventurers, curious, and what we already know seems to make us tired. The danger of this idea is that it quietly suggests to us that "this" world is already *known*...

Second, a *different* world, where things are different. Something inside us starts doing the math. Our quiet acceptance of things, our silence, loses its value when we think this way. Maybe everything will turn out well, maybe we didn't hope for nothing... a world where things are different, where we ourselves, who knows, are different...

Third, a *true* or *real* world. This is the strangest trick and attack ever played on us. So much has stuck to the word "true," like a crust, that without meaning to we hand all of it over to the "true world" as a gift. We assume the *true* world must also be an *honest* one, a world that doesn't cheat us or make fools of us. Believing in it almost feels like something we *have* to do, out of good manners, the way you trust people who seem trustworthy.

The idea of an "unknown world" quietly suggests that *this* world is "known," and so boring.

The idea of a "different world" quietly suggests that the world *could be different*. It cancels out necessity and plain fact. Then it seems pointless to *accept* things or to *adapt* to them.

The idea of a "true world" quietly suggests that this world is untruthful, deceitful, dishonest, fake, and unimportant, and *so* also a world that is not on our side. Then it seems unwise to adapt to it; *better* to resist it.

So we *pull away* from this world in three ways:

with our *curiosity*, as if the more interesting part were somewhere else;

with our *acceptance*, as if there were no need to accept things, as if this world were not the most basic necessity of all;

with our sympathy and respect, as if this world didn't deserve them, as if it were impure and not honest with us...

In short, we have rebelled in three ways. *We have turned an unknown '*x*' into a tool for criticizing* the "known world."

B.

The first step toward clear thinking: to understand how far we have been *tempted* and led astray.

Because in itself it could be exactly *the other way around*.

a) The *unknown* world could be the kind of place that makes us want this world more, because it might be a stupid and lower form of existence.

b) The *different* world, far from making room for our wishes that find no fulfilment here, could be just one of the many things that make *this* world possible. Getting to know it could be a way of making us content with this one.

3) The *true* world: but who actually tells us that the world we see must be worth less than the 'real' world? Doesn't our instinct go against this judgment? Isn't it true that humans are forever creating a made-up world because they want a better world than reality?...

Above all: how do we get the idea that *our* world is *not* the true one?... After all, the other world could just as well be the one that is only "seeming." In fact the Greeks, for example, imagined a *realm of shadows*, a *fake existence*, alongside true existence. And finally: what gives

us the right to set up something like *levels of reality*? That is something more than an unknown world. That already means *wanting to know something about the unknown*.

Note: The "other," unknown world, fine! But to say "*true* world" means "to *know* something about it." And that contradicts the idea of an unknown 'x' world...

In short, the world 'x' could be more boring, less human, and less worthy in every sense than this world.

It would be different if someone claimed there were countless worlds, meaning every possible world besides this one. But nobody has ever *claimed that*...

The "real" world

means

the *truthful* one, the one that doesn't lie to us, the one that is honest

is

means

the *right* one, the only one that matters

means

the *genuine* one, as opposed to something copied or faked

C.

The problem: why has the *idea of another world* always worked against this world, or served to criticize it? What does that point to?

Here is the point. A people that is proud of itself, that is on the rise in life, always thinks of being *different* as being lower and worth less. It

sees the foreign, unknown world as its enemy, as its opposite. It feels no curiosity about the foreign, only complete rejection...

A people would never admit that another people was the "true people"...

The very fact that such a distinction is possible, that we take this world as the "seeming" one and *that* one as the "true" one, is a symptom of something.

Where the Idea of an "Other World" Comes From

The philosopher, who invents a world of reason where *reason* and *logic* fit perfectly: this is where the "real" world comes from.

The religious person, who invents a "divine world": this is where the world of turning against nature, the world of what goes against nature, comes from.

The moral person, who imagines a "free world": this is where the "good, perfect, just, holy" world comes from.

What the three sources have *in common*... the *psychological* mistake... the confusions about the body and its states.

"The other world," as it actually shows up in history, and with what features: marked with the scars

of philosophical,

religious,

and moral

prejudice.

The other world, as these facts make clear, is *another word for not-being*, for not-living, for not *wanting* to live...

Overall insight: it was the instinct of being *tired of life*, not the instinct of life, that created the other world.

Conclusion: philosophy, religion, and morality

are *symptoms of decline*.

Chapter 2

Proof from history that religion, morality and philosophy are forms of human decline.

Chapter 3

1. The reasons people gave for calling "this" world "only how things seem" actually prove that it is real. Another kind of reality, a different one, can never be proven at all.

2. The features people have given to the "true being" of things are really the features of not being, of nothing at all. People built the "real world" by taking the actual world and turning it upside down, making it the opposite. So in fact it is this "real world" that is only how things seem. It is a trick of the eye and a trick of morality, an illusion created by how we look and what we want to believe is good.

3. To sum up: making up stories about a world other than this one makes no sense at all, unless there is a strong instinct in us to slander life, to make it seem small, and to cast suspicion on it. If that is the case, then we are taking revenge on life by dreaming up the fantasy of a "better life"…

4. Splitting the world into a "real" one and one that only "seems" real is an idea put into our heads by decline. Someone might object that the artist values how things seem more highly than how things really are. But that is no argument against what I am saying. Because for the artist, how things seem just means this same reality again, only chosen carefully, made stronger, and corrected… Or are there pessim-

istic artists, artists who see only the dark side? Is the tragic artist, the one who shows suffering and doom, a pessimist?…

169.

1.

The 'real' world and the world we see.

2.

The philosopher as a type of decline.

3.

The religious person as a type of decline.

4.

The 'good' person as a type of decline.

5.

The push in the other direction: *art*.

The problem of the tragic.

6.

The pagan side of religion.

7.

Science against philosophy.

8.

Politics.

9.

A critique of the present.

10.

Nihilism (belief in nothing) and its opposite: those who will return.

11.

The will to power

1)

Suppose that other world is *worth more*. Why should that make it *more real* than this one? … Is being *real* a sign of being perfect? — But that is just the old *ontological proof of God*, the argument that God must exist because a perfect being has to be real…

2)

But suppose it is *true*. Then it could still be *worth

less* than our world…

170.

The pushes in the other direction: *art*.

What makes someone an artist are unusual, extreme states of mind and body. All of them are closely related to signs of illness and grown together with them. So it seems impossible to be an artist and not be sick.

These are the bodily states that, in the artist, have been bred up until they almost form a 'person' of their own. In some degree, though, they belong to every human being:

1. *Rapture*: a heightened feeling of power. It is an inner urge to turn things into a mirror of one's own overflowing richness and perfection —

2. The *extreme sharpness* of certain senses. Because of it, they understand a completely different language of signs — and they create one too… — the same sharpness that seems to go along with some nervous illnesses. Then there is an extreme restlessness, which turns into an extreme need to share and communicate. Everything that knows how to give signs wants to speak… There is a need to get rid of oneself, so to speak, through signs and gestures, and an ability to talk about oneself through a hundred kinds of language… It is an *explosive* state. First you have to picture this state as a pressure and an urge to get rid of an overflow of inner tension through every kind of muscle work and movement. Then you have to picture it as the movement *lining up*, without any choice, with what is going on inside (pictures, thoughts, desires). It is a kind of automatic working of the whole muscle system, driven by strong stimuli working from within. There is an inability to *stop* the reaction; the body's brakes have been unhooked, as it were. Every inner movement (feeling, thought, emotion) comes with *changes in the blood vessels*, and so with changes in skin color, body temperature and what the body gives off. Think of the *suggestive* power of music, its 'mental suggestion', its way of planting moods in the mind;

3. The need to imitate. This is an extreme sensitivity in which a given example spreads like an infection. A state is guessed from mere signs and is then *acted out*… A picture that rises up inside already works as a movement of the limbs… a certain unhooking of the *will*… (Schopenhauer!!!!)

It is a kind of deafness and blindness toward the outside world. The range of stimuli that are *let in* has sharp borders —

*

This is what separates the artist from the ordinary person, the one who is open to receiving art. The ordinary person is most sensitive

when taking art in; the artist is most sensitive when giving it. So a clash between these two gifts is not only natural but desirable. Each of these states looks at things from the opposite direction. To ask the artist to train himself to see things the way the listener (or the critic) does is to ask him to make himself and his special strength *poorer*… It is like the difference between the sexes. You should not ask the artist, who *gives*, to become a woman — to '*receive*'…

In this sense our theory of beauty has so far been a woman's theory of beauty, because only the people who receive art have put into words their experiences of 'what is beautiful?'. In all of philosophy up to today, the artist is missing… As what I said before suggests, this is a necessary mistake. An artist who started to understand himself would make a wrong grab, would lose his grip on what he does. He is not meant to look back; he is not meant to look at all; he is meant to give. — It is to an artist's credit if he is incapable of criticism… otherwise he is half one thing and half another; he is 'modern'…

171.

Religion as decline

Sleep as the result of every kind of exhaustion, and exhaustion as the result of every kind of too much stimulation…

The need for sleep, and even the very idea of 'sleep' being made into a god and worshipped, in all pessimistic religions and philosophies —

In this case the exhaustion is the exhaustion of a whole race of people. Sleep, seen as a bodily thing, is only an image for a much deeper and longer *need to rest*… In practice it is death that is so tempting here, wearing the mask of its brother, sleep…

172.

Religious obsession usually shows up as 'circular madness', swinging between two opposite states: one of depression and one of tense excitement.

Féré, page 123.

173.

The *will to power as life*

The psychology of the will to power.

Pleasure and pain

Pain is something different from pleasure. What I mean is: pain is *not* the opposite of pleasure. People have rightly described pleasure as a feeling of *more* power, a sense of 'plus'. That makes it a feeling of difference, which depends on comparing one state with another. But saying this still does not tell us what displeasure really is. Ordinary people believe in false opposites, and *because of that*, so does our language. These false opposites have always been dangerous chains around the ankles of truth, slowing it down. There are even cases where a kind of pleasure depends on a certain *rhythm* of small unpleasant sensations, one after another. This makes the feeling of power, the feeling of pleasure, grow very fast. That happens, for example, with tickling, and also with sexual tickling during sex. So here we see displeasure at work as one of the ingredients of pleasure. It seems to work like this: a small obstacle is overcome, then right away another small obstacle comes and is overcome too. This game of resistance and victory stirs up most strongly that overall feeling of extra, overflowing power, and that feeling is what pleasure really is. The reverse does not exist: you cannot make pain stronger by slipping in small moments of pleasure. That shows that pleasure and pain are

simply not opposites. Pain is a process of the mind in which a clear judgment is spoken out loud: the judgment 'harmful'. That judgment adds up a long history of experience. In itself, there is no such thing as pain. It is *not* the wound that hurts. What speaks to us is experience, the knowledge of how badly a wound can affect the whole body, and it speaks in the form of that deep shock we call displeasure. When something harms us that earlier humans never knew about, for example newly mixed poisonous chemicals, pain gives us no warning at all, and we are lost. What really marks pain is always the long shock, the trembling aftermath of a frightening jolt in the brain's nerve centers. We do *not* really suffer from the cause of the pain, say some injury. We suffer from the long disturbance of balance that follows that jolt. Pain is a sickness of the brain's nerve centers. Pleasure is not a sickness at all. It looks as if pain causes us to react and move against it, and even philosophers have assumed so. But if you watch closely in sudden cases, the reacting movement clearly comes before the feeling of pain. I would be in trouble if, every time I stumbled, I had to wait until the event rang the bell of my awareness and a signal telling me what to do was sent back down, like a telegram. Instead, I notice as clearly as I can that first my foot moves to stop me from falling. Then, after a time gap you could measure, a kind of painful wave suddenly comes up in the front of my head. So we do *not* react to pain. The pain is projected afterward onto the wounded spot. But even so, this local pain does not express what kind of local wound it is. It is just a sign of place, a marker, whose strength and tone match the wound as the nerve centers received it. It is true that after that jolt the body's muscle strength measurably drops. But that is still no reason to think that the *real nature* of pain is a loss of the feeling of power. To say it once more: we do *not* react to pain. Displeasure is not a 'cause' of actions. Pain itself is a reaction. The reacting movement is a different reaction, and it comes *earlier*. Both start from different places.

174.

The will to power as *life*

People do *not* go looking for pleasure, and they do *not* run away from displeasure. You can see which famous old belief I am contradicting here. Pleasure and displeasure are only results, only things that come along on the side. What a person wants, and what every tiniest part of a living body wants, is more power. While striving for that, both pleasure and displeasure follow. Out of that will, a person looks for resistance and needs something that pushes back. Displeasure, as something that blocks the will to power, is therefore a normal fact. It is a normal ingredient of everything that happens in a living body. People do not avoid it. On the contrary, they need it all the time. Every victory, every feeling of pleasure, everything that happens assumes some resistance that has been overcome.

Let us take the simplest case, the most basic kind of feeding. A tiny blob of living matter stretches out its false feet, its little arms, to look for something that resists it. It does this not out of hunger, but out of will to power. Then it tries to overcome that thing, to take it over, to swallow it into itself. What we call 'feeding' is only a side effect, a practical use of that original will to become *stronger*.

You cannot take *hunger* as the first thing that sets everything in motion. The same goes for staying alive. If you see hunger as the result of not getting enough food, that means seeing hunger as the result of a will to power that can *no longer get the upper hand*.

splitting in two as the result of a unity that is too weak to hold together

It is not at all about replacing something that was lost. Only much later, as tasks become divided up, after the will to power has learned to satisfy itself in completely different ways, does the body's need to

take things over get *reduced* to hunger, to the need to replace what was lost.

So displeasure does not necessarily make our *feeling of power weaker*. In fact, in ordinary cases, it works exactly as a spur to that feeling of power. The obstacle is what *stirs up* this will to power.

People have mixed up displeasure in general with one particular kind of displeasure: the displeasure of exhaustion. Exhaustion really does mean a deep weakening and lowering of the will to power, a loss of strength you can measure. In other words, there is displeasure that acts as a spur to make power stronger, and there is displeasure that comes after power has been wasted. In the first case it is a stimulus. In the second, it is the result of too much stimulation. The second kind of displeasure comes with being unable to resist. The first kind comes with the challenge of something that resists. When you are exhausted, the only pleasure you can still feel is falling asleep. In the other case, the pleasure is victory.

The great mistake of psychologists was that they did not keep these two *kinds of pleasure* apart: the pleasure of *falling asleep* and the pleasure of *victory*.

Those who are exhausted want rest, stretching out their limbs, peace, quiet.

That is the *happiness* offered by religions and philosophies of nihilism (belief in nothing).

Those who are rich in strength and full of life want victory, beaten enemies, and a feeling of power that overflows into wider areas than before.

All the healthy functions of a living body have this need. And the whole body, up to the age of puberty, is a bundle of systems all struggling for a growing feeling of power.

175.

Plato: ...

But *Manu* says: when the soul reaches out toward the unknown, that act is a *memory* of Swarga, the heaven it came from, of which it has kept a trace. It is like when we wake up and, unsure, still see the pictures that came to us in our dreams.

176.

Drinking alcohol.

A Brahmin, a member of the highest priestly class, who gets drunk and forgets the holy substance his person is made of, sinks down to the rank of the unclean Sudra, the lowest class.

A dwidja, a 'twice-born' man of the upper classes, who gives himself over to fermented drinks will be burned up inside by their fire. Let him clean himself by *drinking boiling cow urine*.

177.

Let him save a cow: this good deed makes up for the murder of a Brahmin.

178.

Priest

The Brahmin is an authority in this world and in the next. The Brahmin is someone the gods themselves honor.

Whoever kills a cow must stay covered in that cow's skin for three months. Then he must spend three months working for a cowherd. After that, he must give the Brahmins ten cows and a bull as a gift, or, better still, everything he owns. Then his wrong has been paid for.

Whoever kills a *circumcised* person makes himself clean again with a simple offering. (By contrast, killing any animal at all calls for six months of penance in the forest, letting your beard and hair grow.)

179.

On Christian *practice*.

All through the long chain of thousands of years, people did not know how their own bodies worked. And they still don't know today. For example, knowing that you have a nervous system (but no "soul") is still something only the best-educated people know. But people do not suspect that they lack knowledge here. You have to be very humane, very generous with yourself, to say "I don't know that," to *allow* yourself not to know things. Suppose someone is suffering, or suppose he is in a good mood: he has no doubt that he will find the reason for it, if only he looks. So he looks for it. In truth, he cannot find the reason, because he does not even suspect where he would have to look. What happens? He takes a *result* of his condition and treats it as its *cause*.

For example, a piece of work that he started in a good mood turns out well. (Really, he only started it because the good mood already gave him the courage to.) And look: now the work is said to be the *reason* for the good mood.

In fact, the success itself came from the same thing that caused the good mood: the lucky way the body's forces and systems were working well together.

He feels bad, and *as a result* he cannot get over some worry, some doubt of conscience, some self-criticism. But in truth, the person believes that his bad condition is the result of his doubt of conscience, his "sin," his "self-criticism."

But then the state of recovery comes back, often after deep exhaustion and collapse. He says: "How is it possible that I feel so free, so released? It's a miracle. Only God could have done this for me." And his conclusion is: "He has forgiven me my sin."

From this comes a practical method. To stir up feelings of sin, to prepare the ground for crushing guilt, you have to bring the body into a sick and nervous state. The methods for doing this are well known. As you would expect, nobody suspects the real chain of cause and effect. People give a religious meaning to *punishing the flesh*. It looks like a goal in itself, when it really only turns out to be a *tool* to make that sick indigestion of regret possible. (This means the fixed obsession with sin, like the trick of hypnotizing a hen by drawing a chalk line in front of it, except that here the line is called "sin.")

Mistreating the body prepares the soil for the whole series of "feelings of guilt." That is, it creates a general suffering that *will then be explained*.

On the other side, the method of "rescue" follows in the same way. People stir up every kind of wild excess of feeling through prayers, movements, gestures and vows. Exhaustion follows, often suddenly, often in the form of something like an epileptic fit. And after this state of deep drowsiness comes what looks like healing. In religious language, this is called "rescue."

180.

Islam, as a religion for *men*, has a deep contempt for the sentimentality and dishonesty of Christianity, which it feels to be a religion for women.

181.

The *religious person* as a type of decline

How religious states are related to madness and to nervous exhaustion

The moment in history when a religious crisis takes hold of a whole people

The imagination of the religious person as the imagination of someone whose nerves are *worn out* and *overexcited*

The "*moral nervousness*" of the Christian.

Our task now is to describe Christianity, a difficult thing, and one that is unclear and double-sided, not only to us.

The whole Christian training in penance and rescue can be understood as a deliberately produced *folie circulaire*, a circular madness that swings back and forth between low and high moods. As you would expect, it can only be produced in people who are already set up for it, that is, people who are sickly by nature.

182.

Why the weak win.

In short: the sick and the weak have more *sympathy*. They are more "human."

The sick and the weak have more *mind*. They are more changeable, more many-sided, more entertaining, and more spiteful. The sick alone invented *spite*.

(A sickly early ripening is common in people with rickets, scrofula and tuberculosis.)

Wit and cleverness belong to late races, such as Jews, French and Chinese. The anti-Semites cannot forgive the Jews for having "mind", and money. Anti-Semitism is just a name for those life treated badly.

The fool and the saint: the two most interesting kinds of people.

Closely related to them are the "genius" and the great "adventurers and criminals."

The sick and the weak have had *fascination* on their side. They are *more interesting* than the healthy.

And all people, the healthiest first of all, are *sick* at certain times in their lives. The great stirrings of the heart, the passion for power, love, revenge, all come with deep disturbances.

And as for decline: every person who does not die too early shows it in almost every sense. So he also knows from experience the instincts that belong to it.

For *almost half of every* human life, a person is in decline.

Finally, *woman*! *One half of humanity* is weak, typically sick, changeable, unsteady. Woman needs strength so she can cling to it. And she needs a religion of weakness, one that praises being *weak*, loving and humble as something divine.

Or, better, she makes the strong weak. She *rules* when she manages to overpower the strong.

Woman has always plotted together with the types of decline, the priests, against the "powerful," the "strong," against *men*.

Woman sets the *children* aside for the worship of devotion, pity and love. The *mother* stands for selflessness in a way that *convinces* people.

Finally, growing civilization, which at the same time necessarily brings with it a growth in the sick elements: the *nervous and mentally ill* and the *criminal*.

An *in-between species* arises: the *artist*. He is kept apart from actually committing crimes by his weak will and his fear of society. Likewise,

he is not yet ready for the madhouse. But he reaches curiously into both worlds with his feelers, like an insect's antennae. This particular plant grown by culture is the modern artist: the painter, the musician, and above all the novelist, who uses the very misleading word "naturalism" to describe his way of being.

The mad, the criminals and the "naturalists" are on the rise. This is a sign of a culture that is growing and rushing suddenly *forward*. That means the rejects, the garbage, the waste products are gaining importance. The downward slide *keeps pace* with the progress.

Finally, *the social jumble*, which comes from the Revolution, from setting up equal rights, from the superstition of "equal people." In this jumble, the carriers of the instincts of decline mix into all the blood of every social class. These are instincts of resentment, discontent, the urge to destroy, anarchism and nihilism (belief in nothing). Also included are the slave instincts, and the instincts of cowardice, slyness and lowlife scoundrels, coming from the classes that were *kept down for a long time*. Two or three generations later, the race can no longer be recognized. Everything has been *turned into a mob*. Out of this comes an overall instinct against *selection*, against *privilege* of every kind. It is so powerful, so sure of itself, so hard and cruel in practice, that in fact even the *privileged* soon give in to it.

Whatever still wants to hold on to power flatters the mob. It has to have the mob on its side.

The "geniuses" lead the way. They become *heralds*, announcers of the feelings that get the masses excited. The note of pity, and even of deep respect for everything that has lived a life of suffering, lowliness, contempt and persecution, rings out above all the other notes. (Examples of this type: Victor Hugo and Richard Wagner.)

The rise of the mob means, once again, the rise of the *old values*.

Our civilization moves at an extreme speed and with extreme means. In a movement like that, the weight among people shifts. I mean the people who matter most, the ones who, so to speak, have the job of balancing out the whole great danger of such a sick movement. These will be the ones who slow things down above all: the people who take things in slowly, who find it hard to let go, who stay fairly steady in the middle of all this huge changing and mixing. Under such conditions, the weight has to fall to the *mediocre*, the average middling people. Against the rule of the mob and of the eccentrics (who are mostly on the same side), *mediocrity* grows firm, as the guarantee and the carrier of the future. This gives the *exceptional people* a new enemy — or else a new temptation. Suppose they refuse to adapt to the mob and refuse to sing songs that please the instincts of the 'disinherited', the people who feel robbed of their share. Then they will need to be 'middling' and 'solid'. They know that the middle way is also golden, as the old Latin saying about the 'golden mean' goes. In fact, the middle alone has money and gold in its hands (— everything that *glitters*…)… And once again the old virtue, and the whole *worn-out* world of ideals in general, finds talented people to speak up for it… The result: mediocrity gains intellect, wit and genius — it becomes entertaining, it tempts people…

Result. I will say one more word about the third force. Crafts, trade, farming, science, and a large part of art — all of this can only stand on a broad base, on a middle layer of ordinary people that is strong, healthy and firmly settled. *Science* works in the service of this middle, and is served by it — and so does even art. Science could not wish for anything better. By its nature it belongs to a middle kind of person. It is out of place among exceptions. There is nothing aristocratic in its instincts, and even less anything anarchist. — The power of the middle is then kept up by trade, above all by trade in money. The instinct of the big financiers goes against everything extreme. That is

why the Jews are, for the time being, the *most preserving*, most conservative power in our Europe, which is so threatened and so uncertain. They have no use for revolutions, or socialism, or militarism. If they want power, and need power, even over the revolutionary party, that only follows from what I just said, and does not contradict it. Now and then they need to make other extreme movements afraid — by showing *how much* is in their hands. But their instinct itself never changes: it is conservative — and 'middling'… Wherever there is power, they know how to be powerful. But they always use their power in one direction. As everyone knows, the polite, honorable word for *middling* is the word '*liberal*'…

something that is not witty, and not even true…

Thinking it over. — It makes no sense to assume that this whole *victory of these values* goes against biology, against life. One must try to explain it as serving some interest of *life* itself

keeping the type 'human' *going*, even by this method of letting the weak and those life treated badly rule *over* everyone else —

: otherwise, would human beings no longer exist?

Problem - - -

Is *raising* the type higher fatal for *keeping the species alive*?

why?

what *history* teaches us:

the strong races *wipe each other out*: war, hunger for power, adventure. Their way of living is costly and short — they wear each other down *among themselves* —

the strong passions: *waste* — strength is no longer saved up and built on, the way money is invested…

mental disturbance, caused by too much strain — then come periods of *deep exhaustion* and slackness. Every great age has to be *paid for*…

afterwards the strong are weaker, have less will, and are more absurd than the average weak people

They are *wasteful* races. —

'*Lasting*' in itself would have no value. One might well prefer a shorter existence for the species, but one *richer* in value.

It would still have to be proven that even in this way a richer yield of value would be gained than with the shorter existence.

that is, humanity, seen as a sum of strength, gains a much larger amount of mastery over things if things go the way they actually go…

We are facing a problem of economy, of how strength is spent and saved - - -

183.

I am laying out my argument in all its main steps, point by point. With a little logic in one's body, with an energy something like mine, and with the courage to face what one actually knows… one could already have taken this argument from my earlier writings. People did the opposite and complained that those writings were not consistent. This mixed-up rabble of today dares to put the word 'consistency' in its mouth!

184.

'seeming' = a specific activity of acting and reacting

the world we see means a world looked at according to values, ordered and selected according to values. In this case, that means

according to what is useful for keeping alive, and increasing the power of, one particular kind of animal.

So it is the *point of view*, the perspective, that gives things their character of 'seeming'!

As if any world would still be left if you took away the perspective! That would mean taking away *relativity*, the —

every center of force has its own *perspective* on the whole *rest* of the world, that is, its very particular way of *valuing*, its way of acting, its way of resisting

So 'the world we see' comes down to one specific kind of action on the world, starting out from one center

But there is no other kind of action at all: and the 'world' is only a word for the whole play of these actions

Reality consists exactly in this particular action and reaction of each single thing against the whole…

Not a shadow of a *right* remains to speak of *mere appearance* here…

The *specific way of reacting* is the only way of reacting there is: we do not know how many kinds there are, or what kinds.

But there is no 'other', no 'true', no essential being — that would describe a world without action and reaction…

The contrast between the world we see and the 'real' world comes down to the contrast between 'world' and 'nothing' —

185.

Morality

The idea that the value of an action should depend on what went before it *in our conscious mind* — how wrong that is! — And people have measured morality by this, even crime…

People thought one had to know an action's consequences: and the naive psychologists of the past said — — —

The value of an action must be measured by its consequences — so say the utilitarians, the people who judge everything by usefulness. To measure it by where it came from, they say, would require something impossible, namely to *know* where it came from.

But do we know the consequences? Maybe five steps ahead. Who can say what an action sets off, stirs up, or provokes against itself? As something that drives things on? Maybe as the spark that lights an explosive?… The utilitarians are naive… And in the end we would first have to *know what* is useful: here too they only see five steps ahead… They have no idea of the great economy of things, which cannot do without evil —.

We do not know where an action comes from, and we do not know its consequences: so does an action have any value at all?…

What is left is the action itself: what goes along with it in our conscious mind, the yes and the no that follow when we carry it out. Does the value of an action lie in these personal feelings that come with it —? Feelings of value certainly come with it: a feeling of power, of being forced, of being powerless, for example, or freedom, or ease. To ask it another way: could we reduce the value of an action to bodily values, to whether it is an expression of full life or of blocked life? The biological value of an action?

is it allowed to measure its value by what goes along with it, by pleasure and displeasure, by the play of the emotions, by the feeling of release, of explosion, of freedom…

it may be that its *biological* value shows itself in these…

that would mean measuring the value of music by the pleasure or displeasure it gives us… or the pleasure it gives its *composer*…

So if we cannot judge the worth of an action by where it came from, or by what it leads to, or by the things that go along with it, then its worth is x. It is unknown…

So: an action has no worth.

To sum it all up, in the words of the church hymn: "Creep, fly and crawl along God's paths."

186.

Philosophy

Physicists believe in a "real world" in their own way. For them, it is a fixed system of atoms, the same for every living thing, moving in ways that must happen exactly as they do. So for them, "the world we see" shrinks down to just the side of this general, necessary existence that each creature can reach in its own way. Each creature can reach it, and it also gets adjusted along the way, made "subjective", that is, shaped by the one who sees it. But here the physicists go wrong. The atom they assume was worked out using the logic of that very same point-of-view thinking of our minds. So the atom itself is also a subjective made-up thing. The picture of the world they draw is not different at its core from the subjective picture of the world. It is only built with senses that are stretched further in thought, but it is still built entirely with our own senses... And in the end, they left something out of the picture without knowing it. What they left out is exactly this necessary point-of-view nature of things. Because of it, every center of force, and not only human beings, builds the whole rest of the world from its own position. That means it measures the world by

its own strength, feels it out, and gives it shape... They forgot to count this force, the one that sets up points of view, as part of "true being"... To say it in the language of the schools: being a subject. They think this "developed" later, that it was added on afterward.

But even the chemist needs it. After all, it is what makes a thing specifically what it is, and that decides that it acts and reacts in this or that particular way, depending on the situation.

Having a point of view is just a more complicated form of being specifically one thing.

My idea is this: every specific body tries to become master over all of space and to spread its force outward. That is its will to power. It also tries to push back everything that stands in the way of its spreading. But it keeps running into the same efforts by other bodies. In the end it makes deals with the ones that are similar enough to it, and "joins up" with them. Then they plot together to gain power. And the process goes on...

187.

Philosophy

There is nothing unchanging in chemistry. That is only an appearance, just a prejudice taught in schools. We dragged in the idea of the unchanging, gentlemen physicists, and it still comes from metaphysics, the old thinking about what lies beyond nature. It is very naive, read straight off the surface, to claim that diamond, graphite and coal are the same thing. Why do people claim it? Only because no loss of material shows up on the scales! Fine, so they still have that in common. But the work done by the molecules during the change, which we cannot see or weigh, is exactly what turns one material into something else, with specifically different qualities.

188.

The new way of seeing the world

1) The world exists. It is not something that comes into being, and not something that passes away. Or rather: it does come into being, and it does pass away, but it never began coming into being and it never stopped passing away. It keeps itself going in both at once... It lives off itself: its own waste is its food...

2) The idea of a world that was created should not worry us for a single moment. The idea of "creating" can't be defined today at all, and no one can really think it through. It is only a word now, a leftover from the age of superstition. And a word alone explains nothing. The latest attempt to imagine a world that has a beginning has been made several times recently with the help of a logical trick. Mostly, as you can guess, it was done with a hidden religious purpose.

The eternal return (everything happening again forever)

Philosophy

3) Recently, some people have tried several times to find a contradiction in the idea that the world's time stretches endlessly into the past. They even found one, but only at the cost of mixing up the head with the tail. Nothing can stop me from counting backward from this moment and saying, "I will never reach an end." In the same way, I can count forward from this same moment, out into the endless. I would only end up grabbing the head, this present moment, as if it were the tail, if I wanted to make a mistake, and I will be careful not to. The mistake would be to treat this correct idea of going backward forever as the same as an idea that can't be carried out at all: an endless forward march that ends right now. That is, if I treated the direction, forward or backward, as making no logical difference. I'll leave that mistake to you, Mr. Dühring!...

4) I came across this thought in earlier thinkers. Each time, it was shaped by other hidden motives, mostly religious ones, in favor of a creating spirit. Suppose the world could ever freeze, dry up, die off and become nothing. Or suppose it could reach a state of balance. Or suppose it had any goal at all that included lasting forever, never changing, being settled once and for all. In short, to put it in metaphysical terms: suppose becoming could flow into being, or into nothing. Then that state would have to have been reached already. But it has not been reached. From this it follows... This is the only certainty we hold in our hands. We can use it to correct a great many ideas about the world that would otherwise be possible. For example, if the mechanical view of the world can't escape the conclusion that Thomson drew from it, that everything ends in a final state, then the mechanical view is proven wrong.

Philosophy

5) Suppose we may think of the world as a fixed amount of force and a fixed number of centers of force. Any other idea stays vague and is therefore useless. Then it follows that the world has to go through a number of combinations that can be counted, in the great game of dice that is its existence. In endless time, every possible combination would be reached at some point. More than that, it would be reached an endless number of times. Between each "combination" and its next "return", all the other possible combinations would have to have played out. And each of these combinations sets off the whole chain of combinations in the same order. So this would prove a cycle of completely identical sequences: the world as a circle that has already repeated itself endlessly many times, and that keeps playing its game forever.

This way of seeing things is not simply a mechanical one. If it were, it would not lead to an endless return of identical events, but to a final

state. Because the world has not reached such a final state, we have to treat the mechanical view as an incomplete and only temporary guess.

189.

The philosopher as a further development of the priest type

— he carries the priest's inheritance in his body.

— even as a rival, he is forced to fight for the same thing with the same tools as the priest of his time.

— he aims for the highest authority.

What gives someone authority if they don't hold physical power in their hands, no armies, no weapons at all...?

And above all, how do you gain authority over those who do have physical force and authority?

They compete with the deep respect people feel for the prince, for the victorious conqueror, for the wise statesman.

Only by making people believe that they hold a higher, stronger power in their hands: God.

Nothing is strong enough on its own: people need the priest to stand in between and to do his services.

They place themselves in between as something no one can do without. To survive, they need two things:

1) that people believe their God is completely superior, that people believe in their God;

2) that there is no other direct way to reach God.

The second demand alone creates the idea of "heresy", believing the wrong way. The first creates the idea of the "unbeliever", meaning someone who believes in a different God.

So what is old-fashioned and backward about the philosopher?

That he teaches his own qualities as the necessary and only qualities for reaching the "highest good", for example clever arguing, as Plato did.

That he has all kinds of people climb step by step up toward his own type, as if it were the highest.

That they look down on what everyone else values, and that they tear open a gap between the top priestly values and the worldly ones.

That he knows what is true, what God is, what the goal is, what the path is... Here the typical philosopher is completely a dogmatist, someone who lays down fixed beliefs. If he needs doubt, it is only so that he can then speak with fixed certainty about his own main point.

190.

The problem of the oppressed

I can't rule out that, in very ancient times, the Semitic peoples lived in terrible slavery under the Hindus, as outcasts. If so, certain traits would already have taken deep root back then, traits that belong to the type of person who is *enslaved* and *looked down on* (just as later happened in Egypt).

Later they *make themselves noble*, to the same degree that they become warlike… And they win lands of their own and *gods of their own*. The way the Semitic peoples *shaped their gods* happens, historically, at the same time as their entry into history…

The "spirit", the stubborn patience, the trades that people looked down on

The official idea of the outcasts is exactly that of the *waste and dung* of the noble, high-minded classes…

191.

Plato thinks completely in the spirit of Manu: he was let in on the secret teachings in Egypt. The morality of castes, the god of the good, the "one eternal soul"

— Plato the follower of the Brahmins

— Pyrrho the Buddhist

copied: the type of the philosopher.

the castes

splitting the teaching into a *secret* part for insiders and a *public* part for outsiders

the "great soul"

the passing of souls into new bodies as Darwinism turned upside down (this idea is not Greek)

192.

The idea of "selfishness"

It is part of what being alive means that a living thing must grow. It must widen its power, and so it must take outside forces into itself. People talk, in the fog of moral painkillers, about an individual's right to defend itself. In the same way, one could also talk about its right to attack. Because *both* of these, and the second even more than the first, are necessities for every living thing. Selfishness that attacks and

selfishness that defends are not a matter of choice, let alone of "free will". They are the *fate* built into life itself.

Here it makes no difference whether you are looking at an individual, or at a living body, or at a "society" that is climbing upward. The right to punish (or society defending itself) only got the name "right" by misusing the word. A right is gained through agreements. But fighting back and defending yourself do not rest on any agreement. At the very least, a people could, with just as much good sense, call its need to conquer and its hunger for power a right, whether it acts with weapons or through trade, contact and settling colonies. A right to grow, you might say. A society that, finally and by its *instinct*, rejects war and conquest is in decline. It is ripe for democracy and for being ruled by shopkeepers… In most cases, of course, promises of peace are just drugs to numb people.

193.

In the old criminal law, a *religious* idea was powerful: the idea that punishment had the power to make up for a wrong. Punishment cleanses; in the modern world it stains. Punishment is a paying-off: you really are free of the thing you *chose* to suffer so much for. If people believe in this power of punishment, then afterwards there is a feeling of *relief* and of *breathing freely again*, which really comes close to a new health, a recovery. You have not only made peace with society again; you have also become worthy of respect in your own eyes again, "clean"… Today punishment cuts you off even more than the crime does. The *doom* that follows a crime has grown so big that it can no longer be healed. You come out of punishment as an *enemy* of society… From now on there is one more enemy…

The law of "an eye for an eye" *can* come from a spirit of paying back (that is, from a kind of holding back of the urge for revenge). But in

Manu, for example, it comes from the need to have something of equal value in order to *make up* for the wrong, in order to be religiously "free" again.

194.

The philosopher against his *rivals,* for example against science

: there he becomes a doubter

: there he keeps for himself a *kind of knowledge* that he denies to the scientist

: there he walks hand in hand with the priest, so as not to be suspected of atheism or materialism

: he treats an attack on himself as an attack on morality, virtue, religion and order. He knows how to give his opponents a bad name as "seducers" and "underminers"

— there he walks hand in hand with power

The philosopher fighting with other philosophers:

: he tries to push them into looking like anarchists, unbelievers, enemies of authority

In short: as far as he *fights,* he fights exactly like a priest, like a whole body of priests.

195.

What a yes-saying Aryan religion, born from the *ruling* classes, looks like:

the Laws of Manu (ancient Indian rulebook).

What a *yes-saying* Semitic religion, born from the *ruling* classes, looks like:

the law book of Muhammad. The Old Testament, in its older parts

What a *no-saying* Semitic religion, born from the *oppressed* classes, looks like:

by Indian-Aryan ideas: the New Testament, a *religion of outcasts*

What a *no-saying* Aryan religion looks like, grown up among the *ruling* classes

: Buddhism.

It makes complete sense that we have no religion of *oppressed* Aryan races. That would be a contradiction: a master race is either on top or it dies out.

196.

Selfishness

Basic rule: only single individuals feel *responsible*. Groups were invented to do things that the individual doesn't have the courage to do.

For exactly this reason, all communities and societies are a hundred times more *honest* and *teach us more* about what human beings are really like than the individual does, who is too weak to have the courage of his desires…

All of "altruism", that is, living for others, turns out to be *the cleverness of private persons*: societies are not "altruistic" toward each other…

The command to love your neighbor has never yet been widened into a command to love neighboring peoples. Instead, what Manu says still holds there…

"Tolerance"

Studying society is so priceless because a human being as part of a society is much more *innocent and open* than a human being as a single "unit".

"Society" has never seen *virtue* as anything other than a means to strength, to power, to order.

How simply and with what dignity Manu puts it: — — —

197.

"Reward and punishment"… These live together and they fall apart together. Today people don't want to be rewarded, and they don't want to *accept* anyone who punishes…

A state of war has been set up: you *want* something, you have opponents along the way, and perhaps the most sensible way to get it is *to get along*, to make an *agreement*.

A modern society in which every single person has made his "agreement": the criminal is someone who breaks the agreement… That would be a clear idea. But then you could not put up with anarchists and people who oppose a form of society *on principle* while living inside it…

198.

"With God nothing is impossible," thinks the Christian. But the Indian says: with devotion and knowledge of the Veda, nothing is impossible; the gods are subject to such people and obey them. Where is the god who could hold out against the devoted seriousness and prayer of a holy man who has withdrawn into the forest?

Just as a stone thrown into a lake vanishes in an instant, so sins sink and vanish in the knowledge of the Veda.

199.

Where morality comes from

The priest wants to make sure that he counts as the *highest type* of human being

that he rules, even over those who hold *power* in their hands

that he cannot be harmed, cannot be attacked…

that he is the *strongest power* in the community, absolutely impossible to replace or to underestimate

Means.

He alone is the one who *knows*.

He alone is the one who has *virtue*.

He alone has the *highest control over himself*

He alone is, in a certain sense, God, and returns into the godhead

He alone is the go-between between God and *everyone else*

The godhead punishes every harm, every thought aimed against a priest

Means

Truth exists.

There is only one way to reach it: become a priest

Everything that *is good*, in the order of things, in nature, in tradition, goes back to the wisdom of the priests.

The holy book is their work. All of nature is only a carrying out of the rules written in it

There is no other source of the *good* than the priest

Every other kind of excellence differs in *rank* from the priest's, for example the excellence of the *warrior*

What follows from this:

if the priest is supposed to be the *highest* type of person, then the *ranking* of his *virtues* must also decide how people are ranked in value.

Study, turning away from the senses, not acting, being *unmoved,* being *without feelings,* being *solemn*. — The *opposite* (the *lowest* kind of human: — — —

Making people afraid

the gestures, the sacred, priestly manners

the extreme *contempt* for the body and the senses

— *what goes against nature* taken as a sign of being *above nature*

The *priest* taught *one* kind of morality: so that he himself would be seen as the *highest type*

He invents an *opposite* type: the outcasts. Making *these* people despised by every possible means serves as the dark *background* that makes the caste order stand out

his extreme fear of *sensuality,* of bodily desire, also comes from his *insight* that this is where the *caste order* (that is, *order* of any kind) is most badly threatened… Any 'freer tendency' when it comes to sex throws the marriage laws *into chaos* —

200.

Some things about this idea are *admirable*: for example, the complete separation of society's waste, its rejects, with the aim of *destroying them*. They understood what a living body needs — *to cut out the diseased limbs*…

1) In an admirable way, it is far from the limp, weakened decay of instinct that people today call 'humaneness'…

Then there is the demotion from one caste down to another…

Then the rules for marriage: where the 'love marriage' stands (the kind called the 'heavenly musicians' kind: — — —

2) the fight against *alcoholism*… page 332.

3) their complete respect for old age and for woman, page 127

4) their starting point is to *make people worthy of respect* in their own eyes: to do this, they need to transform even the *most natural* things, by bringing duty, as a holy ritual, to meet and shape feeling

201.

The castes understood as a *division of labor*, and on the other hand as the only way to make *perfect* work *instinctive*…

the main thing is the tradition of work, the *mechanical skill*, which, exactly because it is handed down through generations, becomes perfect…

202.

When the union of a young man and a young woman comes from their choosing each other, then this union — born as it is from love, and having love as its goal — is called:

the 'heavenly musicians' kind

The last four kinds of marriage produce only children who are wasteful, quarrelsome and liars, who do not know the holy scripture or the duties it sets out

Decent and praiseworthy marriages produce decent and praiseworthy children; but bad marriages see only contemptible offspring.

Praise of the virgin: page 225

203.

Criticism of Manu:

Nature is reduced to morality, to a state of punishment for humans: there are no natural effects — the cause is Brahman, the divine power.

What drives people is reduced to *fear of punishment* and *hope of reward*: that is, to fear of and hope from the law, *which holds both in its hands*…

You must live in complete obedience to the law: the sensible thing is done *because* it is ordered; the most natural instinct is satisfied because the law has commanded it.

That is a school for *making people stupid*. In such a breeding ground for theologians — where even the young soldier and the farmer have to go through a nine-year course in theology to become 'steady', the nine-year 'military service' of the top three castes — the outcasts must have had intelligence and even everything interesting on their side. They were the only ones with access to the true source of knowledge: *experience*… Add to that the *inbreeding* of the castes…

What is missing is nature, technology, history, art, science, — — —

204.

People today talk a lot about the *Semitic* spirit of the *New Testament*. But what they call that is simply priestly — and in the Aryan law book of the purest race, in Manu, this kind of 'Semitism', that is, *priestly spirit*, is worse than anywhere else.

*

The development of the Jewish priest-run state is *not* original: they got to know the pattern in Babylon, and the pattern is Aryan. When that same pattern later ruled in Europe again, at a time when Germanic blood had the upper hand, this fit the spirit of the *ruling* race: it was a great throwback to the distant past. The Germanic Middle Ages aimed at bringing back the *Aryan caste order*.

*

Islam in turn learned something from the Christians: using the 'afterlife' as a tool of punishment.

The pattern of a *community that never changes*, with priests at the top — the oldest great cultural achievement of Asia in the field of organization — naturally *must* have invited people in every way to think about it and copy it.

Even Plato did: but above all the Egyptians.

205.

One thing is the hardest to forgive: respecting yourself. Such a being is simply hateful, because he brings to light what tolerance really amounts to — tolerance, the only virtue of the rest, of everybody…

I wish people would start by *respecting* themselves: everything else follows from that. Of course, by doing *exactly that*, you stop existing for others, because that is precisely what they forgive last. What? A person who respects himself?

That is something different from the blind urge to *love* yourself. Nothing is more common — in love between the sexes, and also in the split pair we call 'I' — than *contempt* for what one loves: a kind of fatalism, a giving-in, in love —

206.

Against catching nervous illness from others

Choosing places, things, books,

Alcoholism

and music…

choose the best climate and weather; and likewise the best food

Reducing the number of impressions:

Set aside times when no book and no thing speaks to us — let alone a person…

Times of recovery, the Genoa routine; even the healthiest person needs such times today: — times of fasting —

Against vegetarianism: — — —

207.

We are *outcasts*: and our artists and performers lead the way…

208.

Why does everything

turn into acting, into performance —

why does it become that?

what modern people lack:

a sure *instinct* (which comes from a *long, unchanging

way of working* kept up by one kind of person)

the inability to make anything *perfect* is simply the result of this: — as a single person, you can never make up for missing that schooling

209.

The times when people are *steered* with *reward* and *punishment* have a low, still primitive kind of person in mind: it is like with *children*…

In the middle of our late culture, being doomed and degenerate is something that completely *cancels* the meaning of reward and punishment…

— this real *deciding* of actions by the prospect of reward and punishment requires young, strong, vigorous races…

in old races the impulses are so *irresistible* that a mere idea is completely powerless…

not being able to resist when something tempts or stirs you, but *having* to follow it: this extreme over-sensitivity of people in decline makes such systems of punishment and *improvement* completely pointless…

The idea of 'improvement' assumes a normal and strong person, whose single wrong action must somehow be *balanced out* again, so as *not to lose* him and not to have him as an *enemy*…

210.

Moralities of decline have this odd feature: they recommend a practice, a way of living, that *speeds up* the decline…

— both in the body and in the mind: the instinct to *repair* and reshape oneself no longer works…

— they believe in *healing* and in *rescue*, even the kind that borders on nothingness, on the deepest exhaustion

— they gather together what is *like themselves* from all things, conditions and times: for example the Goncourt brothers…

211.

In sick people, the *energy of health* shows itself in a *sharp, sudden resistance* to the things that *make them sick*…

a reaction of the instinct, for example against music in my own case —

212.

The purpose of woman is to continue the family through children, and the purpose of man is to father them: this double duty, which man and woman carry out together, is made holy by scripture.

Who should be seen as the most guilty? The man who murders a Brahmin, the man who drinks strong liquor, and the man who seduces the wife of his spiritual adviser.

After the required act of making amends, the ruler is to sentence these people to death or to other bodily punishments. On the forehead of the man who seduced his adviser's wife, he is to brand a picture of the female private parts. On the liquor drinker, he is to brand the sign of the tool used to distill alcohol. On the murderer of a Brahmin, he is to brand the picture of a body without a head.

213.

A rulebook like this sums up the experience, the wisdom and the moral trial and error of many long centuries. It closes things off. It brings an age to an end. It no longer *creates* anything new.

The ways you give authority to a truth that was won with great effort and at great cost are completely different from the ways you would *prove* it. A rulebook never proves that a rule is useful or harmful. It only shows the bad results for the single person who does not keep a law because it is the law, in other words, who disobeys.

All the *bad* results that would come naturally from breaking a law are never looked at as natural results. Instead, the bad result is presented as a *supernatural* punishment for not following a rule.

The problem is this. At a certain moment in a people's history, its smartest class declares that the learning about how one may live, or may not live, is finished. Their goal is to bring home the harvest, as rich and complete as possible, from the long periods of experimenting and of *bad* experiences…

What must be prevented above all now is new experimenting, any wish to keep on testing and choosing. Against this, a double wall is put up: first, *revelation*, and second, *tradition*. Both are *holy lies*. The smart class that invents them understands them just as well as Plato understood them.

Revelation: this is the claim that the reasoning behind those laws did not come from humans. It claims the laws were not looked for and found slowly, with mistakes along the way, but were handed down all at once by *God*…

Tradition: this is the claim that things have already been this way since ancient times. In short, it is a deliberate faking of a people's whole history. (One example is how the Jews reinterpreted their history after the exile, their *wish* to misunderstand their own past.)

a)

it is *godless* to criticize the law

b)

it is *disrespectful*, a crime against one's ancestors, and it makes them angry at you.

214.

A wife who pushes her husband away because he has a passion for gambling or for strong drink, instead of caring for him as if he were sick, is to be locked up for three months in the inner rooms of the house, without any jewelry or decoration. (A note for George Eliot!)

215.

Turning the *natural* results of an action into something else

There are no natural results anymore. Instead, disobedience gets punished, and virtue gets rewarded.

Happiness, a long life, having children — all of these are results of virtue, handed out through the eternal order of things —

Being unclean, for example, is forbidden. But not because being unclean harms your health. It's the other way around: it harms your health *because it is forbidden*…

So, *as a basic rule*: the natural result of an action is presented as a reward or a punishment, depending on whether something was commanded or forbidden…

For this to work, most of the punishments must *not* be natural ones. They must be supernatural, belonging to the next world, coming only in the future…

So, as a basic rule: every disadvantage, every misfortune is proof of *guilt*. Even every low form of life (animals, for example) counts as such proof.

The world is perfect, as long as the law is obeyed. *All imperfection* comes from disobeying the law.

*

The highest caste, being the perfect one, also has to show happiness. That is why nothing suits it less than *pessimism*, always expecting the worst, and *outrage*…

no anger, no striking back when bad things happen —

strict self-denial only as a means to a higher happiness, to rescue from many things

The highest class has to keep up a *happiness*. The price is that it must show total obedience, every kind of hardness, self-control and strictness toward itself. It wants to be felt as the most worthy of respect of all kinds of people, — and also as the most admirable. So it cannot make use of every kind of happiness —

216.

Criticism of the Law

The higher *reason* behind such a process is this: to push *awareness*, step by step, out of the way of life that has been recognized as right. That way, instinct comes to work *completely automatically*

— and that is the condition for *every kind of mastery*.

It is holy, it is the custom, it is the badge of decent and high-minded people to act in this or that way: — that is what is left over.

Where the rule came from, how useful it is, the reason behind it — all of this gets *pushed out* of awareness.

The most important tool for this *pushing out* is that two other ideas are forced into the foreground with enormous strength. Both of them *shut out* any real thinking about where the law came from, and any criticism of it…

1) reward

2) punishment

"Every person who has received punishment for a wrongdoing by order of the king goes to heaven free of every stain, just as pure as someone who has only ever done good."

Obeying completely here becomes a matter of the highest self-preservation, of "the one thing that truly matters"… Not obeying here gets relabeled as the greatest *foolishness* —

Selfishness is brought into play, so that obeying and not obeying stand against each other like *happiness* and *doing yourself the deepest harm*.

For this purpose, the whole of life is seen from the point of view of an afterlife. That way, life is understood as *full of consequences* in the most terrifying sense…

— a sort of immortality is the great *magnifying glass* that blows up the ideas of punishment… and reward to an unheard-of size.

These wise men don't believe in it themselves: — otherwise they wouldn't have invented it…

217.

A caste that has given up all the work of defending and attacking, even in its way of thinking, — and that takes the idea of "good" very strictly…

218.

There is the 'good' person as a product of decline. This is someone who "gives in", who sees the downside of all hostility, all anger and all wanting revenge, — and who is too weak for these things, too *weak in the nerves*…

And there is the 'good' person who comes from strength, from a fullness of power, as a ruling type. This is someone who has *chosen* a way of life that frees him from needing aggressive and defensive feelings…; someone who has put a separate *caste* in charge of those feelings… Such a person then also makes himself a "God" in his own image —

— for him the world is justified too: evil has a teaching purpose, that is, a *punishing* purpose…

219.

"Weakness of the will": that is a figure of speech that can mislead us. Because there is no such thing as a will, and so there is neither a strong will nor a weak will. When our many drives are scattered and pulling apart, with no system among them, the result is what we call a "weak will". When they work together under the rule of a single one, the result is what we call a "strong will". In the first case, there is swinging back and forth and no center of gravity. In the second case, there is precision and a clear direction.

220.

The Religion That Says Yes

The highest respect for the act of making children, and for the family:

You have to pay off the debts of your ancestors…

the *instinct for tradition*, and the deepest contempt for everything that broke tradition…

The instinct against *degeneration*, against things going downhill in body and kind…

This needs to be studied: *what* all was lumped together as degenerate.

Those living in vice

The mentally ill.

Those with severe leprosy

Prostitutes.

Artists.

221.

The *order of castes* is based on the observation that there are three or four kinds of people. Each is meant for a different activity and is best developed for it, just as, through dividing up the work, each activity belongs to one of them…

a way of being as a *privilege*, and a way of acting as one too

The *order of castes* is only the official approval of a natural distance between several *physical types* (characters, temperaments and so on).

— it only puts a stamp on what experience shows. It doesn't come before experience, and it certainly doesn't cancel it…

a)

the more *intellectual* people (— scholars, advisers, judges, philosophers —) — the teaching class

b)

the *muscular* people, the warriors — the defending class

c)

those who trade, farm and raise animals — the feeding class

d)

and finally a *lower* (conquered) kind of native people, accepted as a race of servants.

In every case here, the starting point is a real *natural separation*: the idea of caste only puts an official stamp on that natural separation.

The *holiness of the family*, the bond that ties one generation to the next, is the foundation of the whole building: — so this, above all, has to be *translated* completely into terms of the afterlife.

You need a son, because only a son brings *rescue*… You marry "to pay the debt of your ancestors".

222.

The *modern pessimists* as people of decline:

Schopenhauer

Leopardi, Baudelaire

Mainländer, Goncourt

Dostoevsky

People have made the tasteless attempt to file Wagner and Schopenhauer under the mentally ill. What would have fit the truth completely was to point out, sharply and clearly, the physical decline in their type…

223.

The Jews try to assert themselves after they have lost two castes, the warriors and the farmers.

In this sense they are the "castrated" ones.

— they have the priest — and then, right after, the outcasts…

As you would expect, it comes to a break among them, an uprising of the outcasts: the origin of *Christianity*.

Because they knew the *warrior* only as their master, they brought into their religion a hostility against the *noble, high-minded* — against the noble and the proud, against power, against the *ruling* classes —: they are pessimists out of *outrage*…

In this way they created an important new position: the priest at the head of the outcasts —

against the *noble, high-minded classes*…

Christianity carried this movement to its final conclusion. Even in the Jewish priesthood, it still sensed the caste, the privileged, the noble —

so it *crossed out the priest* —

The Christian is the outcast who rejects the priest… The outcast who rescues himself…

That is why the *French Revolution* is the daughter of *Christianity* and carries it on… It has the same instinct against the Church, against the noble, against the last privileges — —

224.

You mustn't mix these up: the Sudras were a race of servants, probably a lower kind of people who were already living on the land where these Aryans settled…

But the idea of the outcasts stands for the degenerate people from all castes: the permanent *waste matter*, which in turn keeps breeding among itself.

The deepest instinct for a race's health speaks out against them. Being hard here means the same thing as being "healthy": it is *disgust* at de-

generation that finds expression here in a whole lot of moral and religious formulas…

Nothing teaches us more than looking at what this throwaway material is made of. The wise old thinkers, with their fine and deep minds, knew something that people have not known, right up to today!!)

: namely, that

vice,

sickness,

mental disorder,

and the over-sensitive, jumpy nerves that come with certain mental gifts

are all signs of decline in the body.

They count *artists* among the people in decline…

225.

Suppose the reasons for needing those *metaphysical guesses* about what lies behind the world fall away. Suppose people no longer want to *rule*, to *educate*, or to keep their own type of person on top as the *highest* and *first*:

suppose you think about things the way the outcasts do. Then perhaps you put back together the whole chain of experiences and conclusions that those ancient thinkers used as their starting point when they made their guesses. What I mean is: you find the "truth". But you find it exactly by *dissolving* all authority, all respect for every tradition, and every moral prejudice. In doing this work, we *use up* whatever is left of the morality we inherited…

What we now call science is an exact measuring stick for the *decline* of moral and religious belief. We fall apart once we reach the end of our "wisdom". We have spent all our positive strength on *gaining knowledge*… Knowledge by itself has no power at all. And as for "selfishness": in a time of decline, we cannot even be sure that we want what is *good for us*. Our urges are far too strong for usefulness to stay the thing that guides us. In this situation, "altruism", that is, living along with others and sharing every kind of feeling and state they are in, is just one more serious illness. It is the conscience of the outcasts, a weakness that comes with pleasure attached…

226.

What creates a morality, what creates a book of laws, is the deep instinct that only *automatic habit*, doing things without thinking, makes perfection possible in living and in creating…

But now we have reached the opposite point. In fact, we *wanted* to reach it: the most extreme self-awareness, where human beings and history see right through themselves…

And so, in practice, we are as far away as possible from perfection in being, doing and wanting. Our hunger, even our will to know, is itself a sign of enormous decline… We are reaching for the opposite of what *strong races* and *strong natures* want.

Understanding something completely is an *end*…

The fact that science is even possible in the way it is practiced today proves that all the basic instincts of life, the instincts to *defend* and *protect* itself, no longer work.

We no longer save things up. We are wasting the wealth our ancestors built up, even in the way we go about *knowing* things.

227.

People have misused a word that was picked at random and is accidental in every way: the word "pessimism". This misuse spreads like a contagious disease. And in doing so, people have overlooked the problem we live in, the problem that we *are*.

The question is not who is right. The question is where we belong: whether we belong among the condemned, the forms of life that are in decline… If we do, then our *judgments* are nihilistic, based on a belief in nothing.

People have set two ways of thinking against each other, as if they were arguing about the truth. But both are only symptoms of certain conditions. And the very fact that they *fight* proves that there is a basic problem of life here, *not* a problem for philosophers. Where do we belong? Are we — — —

Notebook 15: Spring 1888

1.

A critique of modern values.

Liberal institutions

the selflessness that morality preaches.

sociology (the study of society).

prostitution

marriage

the criminal

2.

"Rising" life and sinking life: each of them turns its deepest needs into lists of values.

How does it happen that the highest values people believe in are all — — —

3.

There are cases where having a child would be a crime. This applies to people who are chronically ill, and to people with severe nervous exhaustion of the third degree. In such cases, simply telling them to give up the sex drive altogether would be nothing more than wishful thinking. (With people life has treated this badly, this drive is often even disgustingly easy to stir up.) In all these cases, the demand must be made *that they be prevented from having children*. Society knows few demands this urgent and this basic. Here it is not enough to use con-

tempt, or to publicly declare someone dishonorable, as a way of keeping a low, shameful weakness of character in check. One would be allowed, no matter a person's class, rank or education, to act against such crimes with the harshest money fines, and in some cases with the loss of "freedom", by locking people away. To put a child into a world in which you yourself have no right to exist is worse than taking a life. The man with syphilis who fathers a child starts a whole chain of failed lives. He creates an argument against life itself. He is a pessimist not in words but in *action*: through him, the value of life really is lowered, without any limit we can see. —

4.

Prostitution will never be done away with. There are even reasons to wish that it is not done away with. So it follows that we should *give it dignity*: — I hope people understand this "so it follows"? But what makes something become despised? The fact that it has been despised for a long time. Stop despising prostitutes, and then they will no longer have any reason to despise themselves. In the end, things are already better on this point everywhere else than they are here: across the whole world, prostitution is something innocent and simple. There are cultures in Asia where it is even highly honored. The shame does not lie in the thing itself at all. It was only put there by Christianity's going against nature — by that religion which dirtied even the sex drive!… The low, degraded prostitute is a special Christian invention. Europe is the soil where she grows best, and the big cities of Europe are the places where the most extreme version of her thrives… — Here is a problem: what conditions give the capital of the new German Empire an edge in the art of dragging the prostitute down into the gutter?… It is a fair question. But one is ashamed to answer it in plain German…

5.

A critique of philosophy.

How far philosophy is a sign of decline: Socrates. Pyrrho.

The philosophers' strange personal *dislike* of the senses:

their "real world"

What the fear of the senses and of passion really *is*…

Philosophers as *moralists*: they dig away at the natural roots of morality

A critique

of

moral *improvement*.

of regret

of

the philosophy of pity

The philosopher and firm belief.

How the "real world" finally became a fairy tale.

A critique of art.

A critique of religion.

Religion.

Where it comes from.

The dangerous misunderstanding

Toward a history of the idea of God.

Paganism. Christianity.

The Christian ideal

What is dangerous in Christianity.

6.

1.

The eruption of Wagner's art is still the last great event we have had in art. Since then, everything has been like a volcano going off! Above all, it has been very loud. People no longer have ears, the way they once did, in order to understand! They have them almost in order to understand nothing anymore! Wagner himself, more than anyone, remains misunderstood. He is still an unknown land on the map. For now, people just worship him. But do they also want to understand him? The typical Wagner fan is a square, stiff creature in every way, and he believes in Wagner. Clearly he believes in a square, stiff Wagner too. But Wagner was anything but square: Wagner was 'Wagnerian.' I have asked myself whether there has ever been anyone modern enough, sick enough, many-sided enough and twisted enough to count as ready for the problem of Wagner. At most in France: Charles Baudelaire, for example. Perhaps also the Goncourt brothers. The authors of 'Faustine' would surely guess a few things about Wagner. But they did not have music in their bodies. Has anyone understood that musicians, all of them, are not psychologists? Not wanting to know about this is part of their trade. Let's say it is part of the genius of their trade. They would no longer trust themselves if they understood themselves. It is not for nothing that they say farewell to ideas and words: they want to get into the unconscious. From this follows something sad. Either a person is a musician, and then he does not understand musicians (himself included), though he does understand music. Or else he is a psychologist, and then he probably does not understand music well enough, and so he does not understand musicians either. That is the contradiction with no way out. And that is why, so far, there has only been idle chatter about Beethoven, and just as much about Wagner, as musicians.

2.

Luckily, Wagner was only partly a musician. Wagner as a whole was something other than a musician, and was even closer to its opposite. In him, the Germans were given the most extraordinary genius for acting and theatre that has ever existed. You understand nothing about Wagner if you do not understand him from this side. Was Wagner German precisely in these instincts? The opposite is plain to see. The Germans get their great men as exceptions, and as the opposite even of their own usual rule. Beethoven, Goethe, Bismarck, Wagner are our last four great men. Taken together, you can work out from them, with the strictest logic, what is at bottom not German, un-German, anti-German.

3.

Wagner was so little a musician that he sacrificed all the laws of music. To put it more exactly, he sacrificed style in music altogether. He did it to turn music into a kind of speech-making, a tool for expression, for making things stronger, for planting suggestions in the listener, for painting pictures of the mind. Wagner's music, if you do not judge it by how it looks and how massive it feels on stage, but as music in itself, is simply bad music. It is non-music. I have never met anyone who did not know this. Naive people think they are praising him when they announce that Wagner created the 'dramatic style' of music. Said plainly, this 'dramatic style' is having no style, going against style, being unable to make style, all turned into a principle. Dramatic music, understood this way, is just another name for 'the worst of all possible kinds of music.' You do Wagner an injustice if you try to make a musician out of him.

4.

Wagner's music on its own is unbearable. You need the drama to rescue you from this music. And then, all at once, you understand the magic that can still be worked with an art that has been, so to speak, cut into pieces and broken down into its raw elements! Wagner has an almost eerie awareness of everything raw and basic in the way music affects people. Without exaggerating, you could call him the greatest master of hypnotizing, even in our age of chickens and magicians. He moves, he searches, he strokes, he makes gestures, and he is understood. The little ladies have already gone cold. Wagner never calculates as a musician, from any musician's conscience. He wants an effect. He calculates from the point of view of the theatre. Nothing is more opposite to him than the secret, godlike quality of Beethoven's music, which speaks to itself alone: loneliness making its own sound, a shyness that remains even as it becomes sound. Wagner has no scruples, just as Schiller had no scruples, just as all theatre people have none. When he needs to, he needs the listener to believe he is hearing exactly that kind of other music, and so he makes it. It seems to us that he makes it. Even we monsters are fooled. Afterwards we understand well enough that we were fooled. But what does 'afterwards' matter to a theatre artist! He has the moment on his side. Wagner wins people over completely. 'There is no real counterpoint anywhere in Wagner,' says the 'afterwards.' But why would it matter! We are in the theatre, and it is enough to believe that it is there.

5.

Wagner's art has a deep effect, and above all a heavy one. Why is that? First of all, as I hinted, it is not because of the music. You could not even stand this music if you had not already been overpowered by something else and, so to speak, made unfree. That something else is Wagner's pathos, his huge, solemn emotion, and he only invented his

music to go along with it. It is the enormous power to convince that this emotion has, the way it holds its breath, the way it refuses to let go of an extreme feeling. It is the frightening length of this emotion. That is how Wagner conquers us, and how he always will, so that in the end he even talks us into accepting his music. Can you be a genius with this kind of pathos? Or even be able to be one? People have sometimes understood an artist's genius as his highest freedom within the rules, his godlike lightness, his carefree ease even with the hardest things. Might we say: 'Wagner is heavy, a hundred pounds heavy, so he is no genius'? But perhaps we are wrong to make light feet the mark of a god. Another question, with a clearer answer plain to see, is this: is Wagner German precisely in having this pathos? Is he a German? Never ever! He is rather the exception of all exceptions!

6.

Wagner's way of feeling is not German, but his kind of mind, his intellect and spirit, is all the more German. I know very well why young Germans felt so wonderfully at ease with him, like nowhere else. In the middle of Wagner's depth, variety, fullness, wilfulness and uncertainty in matters of the mind, they are at home with themselves! They listen with delight as the great symbols and riddles grow loud from an enormous distance, with a soft thunder. They do not get annoyed when things sometimes turn grey, ghastly and cold. After all, every single one of them is related to bad weather, to German weather! They do not miss what the rest of us miss: wit, fire, grace; great logic; a high-spirited, playful intellect and spirit; the happiness of the calm and happy ones; the shining sky with its constellations and its shivers of light.

7.

Wagner's way of feeling does not belong in Germany. You find it again among his closest relatives, the French Romantics. Passion, the way Wagner understands it, is in any case the opposite of what Schiller called 'the free-thinking of passion,' the German Romantic way of feeling. Schiller is just as German as Wagner is French. Wagner's heroes, his Rienzi, Tannhäuser, Lohengrin, Tristan, Parsifal, have blood in their veins, no doubt about it, and certainly not German blood! And when these heroes love, will they love German girls? I doubt it. But I doubt even more that they would love Wagner's heroines in particular. Those heroines are a poor lot, specimens ready for all sorts of nervous, hypnotic, erotic experiments by Paris psychologists! Has anyone noticed yet that none of them ever gave birth to a child? They can't do it!

8.

Even today, people least want to admit how much Wagner owes to France, and how much he himself belongs in Paris. An artist's ambition to work in the grand style — even that is still French in Wagner… And grand opera! And the race against Meyerbeer! And even using Meyerbeer's own tricks! What is German about any of that?… In the end, let us think about the thing that decides it: what marks Wagner as an artist? The play-acting, the staging, the art of putting things on display, the will to make an effect just for the sake of the effect, the genius for performing, presenting, imitating, portraying, signifying, seeming: is that, in any field at all, a *German* kind of talent?… On this point — we know it too well! — we Germans have always been weak. And we don't want to turn this weakness into something to be proud of!… *But it is the genius of France!*…

7.

Romanticism

Naturalism

8.

Progress.

VI

Let us not fool ourselves! Time moves forward — and we would like to believe that everything in it moves forward too… that development always means moving forward… That is how it looks on the surface, and even the most careful thinkers are tricked by it. But the nineteenth century is no progress compared to the sixteenth. And the German mind of 1888 is a step backward compared to the German mind of 1788… "Humanity" does not move ahead; it does not even exist… The big picture looks like a huge workshop for experiments, where a few things succeed, scattered across all the ages, and an unspeakable amount fails, and where there is no order, no logic, no connection and nothing binding at all… How could we fail to see that the rise of Christianity is a movement of decline?… That the German Reformation was a fresh outbreak of Christian barbarism, like an old disease flaring up again?… That the French Revolution destroyed the instinct for large-scale organization, the very possibility of a society?… Man is no progress compared to the animal. The pampered, over-civilized person is a freak compared to the Arab and the Corsican. The Chinese are a well-made type — that is, better able to last than the Europeans…

9.

Jesus: Dostoevsky

I know of only one psychologist who has lived in the kind of world where Christianity is possible, where a Christ could appear at any moment… That is Dostoevsky. He *guessed* who Christ really was. And by instinct he was protected, above all, from picturing this type with the crudeness of Renan… And in Paris people think Renan suffers from being too subtle!… But could anyone get it more wrong than by making a genius out of Christ, who was an idiot? Than by lying a hero into being out of Christ, who stands for the very opposite of heroic feeling?

10.

What Is Tragic

Again and again I have pointed my finger at Aristotle's great misunderstanding, when he thought he saw the tragic feelings in two *depressing* emotions: terror and pity. If he were right, tragedy would be an art that endangers life. People would have to be warned against it as something harmful to everyone and disreputable. Art, which is otherwise the great thing that drives life on, a rapture in life, a will to live, would here become *bad for your health* — working for a downward movement, as a kind of servant of pessimism. (Because the idea that stirring up these emotions "purges" you of them, as Aristotle seems to believe, is simply not true.) Something that regularly stirs up terror or pity throws you into disorder, weakens you, discourages you. And suppose Schopenhauer were right that what we should take from tragedy is resignation — that is, gently giving up on happiness, on hope, on the will to live. Then we would be imagining an art in which art says no to itself. Tragedy would then mean a process of falling apart, with the instincts of life destroying themselves inside the

instinct for art. Christianity, nihilism (belief in nothing), tragic art, bodily decline: all of these would be holding hands, they would all take over at the same hour, they would push each other forward — *downward*!… Tragedy would be a symptom of decay.

You can disprove this theory in the most cold-blooded way: by measuring the effect of a tragic emotion with a dynamometer, a device that measures strength. And the result you get is something that, in the end, only the total dishonesty of a system-builder could fail to see in psychological terms: that tragedy is a *tonic*, something that strengthens you. When Schopenhauer *refused* to understand this, when he set up a general state of depression as the tragic state, when he hinted to the Greeks (who, to his annoyance, did not "resign" themselves…) that they had not reached the highest view of the world — then that is bias, the logic of his system, the faking of a system-builder. It is one of those nasty bits of faking that, step by step, spoiled Schopenhauer's whole psychology (he who misunderstood, in a forced and arbitrary way, genius, art itself, morality, pagan religion, beauty, knowledge, and roughly everything

Aristotle

Aristotle wanted tragedy to be seen as a laxative, a cleaning-out, for pity and terror — as a useful release of two sick emotions that had built up far too much…

The other emotions have a strengthening effect. But only two depressing emotions — which are therefore especially harmful and unhealthy — pity and terror, were supposed, according to Aristotle, to be flushed out of a person by tragedy, as if by a laxative. By stirring up these dangerous states to excess, tragedy sets a person free from them — and makes him better. Tragedy as a *cure* for pity.

11.

Today you are the only musician who makes music the way my heart wants it. So isn't it only fair that everything I have against today's music should go to you?

Having a taste for Wagner's music makes you look bad. I say this as someone who does not leave himself out — I *have* made myself look bad.

12.

Toward a Critique of Wagner

Wagner's music is *anti-Goethe*, the opposite of everything Goethe stood for.

In fact, Goethe is missing from German music, just as he is missing from German politics. On the other hand, how much Schiller there is in Beethoven — or to be more exact, how much of Schiller's *Thekla*, his gushing, idealistic heroine!

Lots of goody-goody respectability, lots of preachy, oily solemnity:

Wagner has no ideas, just like Victor Hugo. But he knows how to terrorize us so much with a sign put in place of an idea — — —

I am looking for the causes of the *extreme exhaustion* that Wagner's art brings with it

the constantly shifting point of view:

the body's resistance:

Breathing

Walking

the constant exaggeration:

the bullying hidden purpose:

the stirring-up of sick nerves and

of the nerve centers by terrorizing methods:

his sense of *time*

13.

A Preface

I have had the luck — and let's say the honor too — after whole thousands of years of going astray and confusion, to find again the road that leads to a Yes and a No.

I teach saying No to everything that makes you weak — that wears you out.

I teach saying Yes to everything that makes you stronger, that stores up strength, that pride — — —

Up to now, nobody has taught either the one or the other. People have taught virtue, giving up the self, pity; they have even taught saying no to life… These are all the values of the worn-out.

Thinking for a long time about how exhaustion works in the body forced me to ask how far the judgments of worn-out people had pushed their way into the world of values.

My result was as surprising as it could be, even for me, who had already felt at home in many strange worlds. I found that all the highest judgments about value — all those that have become master over humanity, or at least over tamed humanity — can be traced back to the judgments of worn-out people.

First I need to teach that crime, celibacy and sickness are results of exhaustion…

Underneath the holiest names I pulled out the destructive tendencies. People have called "God" whatever weakens, whatever teaches weakness, whatever infects with weakness… I found that the 'good' person is a way that decline says Yes to itself.

There is a virtue that even Schopenhauer still taught was the highest one, the only one, and the foundation of all the other virtues. That very virtue, pity, I came to see as more dangerous than any vice. Until now, what was called virtue above all else meant this: to block, on principle, the selection that goes on within a species, the way it cleans itself of its waste…

The race has been spoiled. Not by its vices, but by its ignorance. It is spoiled because it did not understand tiredness and exhaustion for what they were. Mixing up what is really happening in the body is the cause of all evil. That happened because the race's instinct was led astray by the exhausted ones, so that it hid its best qualities and lost its center of gravity, its firm footing… Falling down, saying no to life: people were supposed to feel even that as rising up, as being made glorious, as being turned into a god.

Virtue is our great misunderstanding.

The problem: how did the exhausted ones end up making the laws about what has value?

Or, asked another way: how did those who are the lowest come to power?… Get to know history! How does the instinct of the animal called man end up standing on its head?…

I want to make the idea of "progress" more exact. And I am afraid that to do this I will have to slap modern ideas in the face. (My comfort is that they have no faces, only *masks*…

Sick limbs should be cut off: that is the first moral rule of society.

A correction of the instincts: freeing them from ignorance.

I look down on people who ask society only to protect itself against those who harm it. That is not nearly enough. Society is a body, and none of its limbs may be sick if the whole body is not to be put in danger. A sick limb that is rotting must be cut off. I will name, one by one, the *types of people in society who should be cut off*…

We should honor *fate*: the fate that says to the weak, "Go under, perish…"

People have called it *God* when they fought against fate, when they spoiled humanity and made it rot… You should not take the name of God in vain…

We have cancelled almost all the ideas about the mind that the whole history of psychology so far depended on, and that means the history of philosophy too!

we deny that there is such a thing as will (not to mention "free will")

we deny consciousness, both as a single unified thing and as a power or ability

we deny that thinking happens (because we have no *thing* that does the thinking, and likewise no thing that is being thought

we deny that one thought really causes another, the way logic believes

My writing is aimed against all the natural types of decline. I have thought through the signs of nihilism (belief in nothing) more fully than anyone.

that is, the born destroyer — — —

14.

Forgive me! This is all the same old game from 1830. Wagner believed in love, like all the Romantics of that crazy, undisciplined decade. What is left of it? This senseless worship of love, and, on the side, the worship of wild living and even of crime. How false that seems to us today! Above all, how worn out, how unnecessary! We have become stricter, harder, more impatient with this cheap, common psychology, which even thought of itself as "idealistic" because of it. We are cynical even about this dishonesty and romantic dreaming of the "beautiful feeling" —

15.

You have to be backward (or to have *gone* backward) to still believe in Wagner's problems today! Not to mention Wagner's women!

They are all sickly folk, with all their show-off muscles… Have you noticed that none of them ever gives birth to a child?… They *can't*… And when there is an exception, what does Wagner turn to in order to make that exception believable?… You know — — on this one point alone, Wagner *corrected* the old legend…

Or can you stand Wagner's heroes? All these impossible creatures, the way he put them on stage and set them to music? With muscles from ancient times and nerves from the day after tomorrow? Heroic and, at the same time, *nervous*! Any expert on the body would say: that is false!

Of course, that is how he won over the old women and the young women alike. They love such heroes. Maybe they also love the impossible…

In any case, they love the blond saints, the Parsifal type, everything that has a sensuality already hidden inside it from the start… What

tender curiosity a case like that awakens! How much closeness it *allows*!… In short, Beaumarchais gave women his young page Cherubino as a present, and Wagner gave them his Parsifal… the cleverer of the two —

16.

Wagner as a model.

Wagner as a danger.

Wagner and the *Jews*

Wagner's "woman": the only kind he knows is the hysterical female. Why is it that exactly here the *illusion* becomes more and more impossible?

Wagner and the form of drama

Wagner's relationship to France — "European"

Wagner's relationship to Christianity and culture: the Romantic and the nihilist. A typical transformation, ending, as it normally does, with a return to Christianity.

17.

Christianity…

a *No* that is completely certain…

You know that I don't forgive Wagner for his Parsifal for another reason. It is a question of honesty, and, if you like, of the ranking of people. You belong here, or you belong there, depending.

If anyone today is two-faced in how they stand toward Christianity, I won't even give them the little finger of either hand. Here there is only one kind of honesty: an absolute No, a No of the will and of

action… Who can show me anything more thoroughly disproven than Christianity, anything more finally judged and condemned by all higher sense of value? We have seen through its temptation as a temptation. We have seen in it the great danger, the road to nothingness that knew how to pass itself off as the road to God. We have recognized these "eternal values" as values that slander life. What else makes up our pride, what else sets us apart from the last two thousand years?…

18.

Philosopher

Seriousness.

And all great seriousness: isn't it already a sickness in itself? And a *first* step toward making things ugly?

The sense for ugliness wakes up at the same moment as seriousness does. You are already *bending things out of shape* when you take them seriously…

Take a woman seriously, and see how quickly even the most beautiful woman becomes ugly!…

It is hard to stay serious here. In the middle of these problems, you don't turn into a gloomy funeral-faced mourner… Virtue in particular has such poses and gestures about it that you would need a bad stomach to keep your dignity in spite of them.

Laughing: that is more or less, if not the cleverest, then at least the wisest answer to questions like these…

19.

Christianity

Until now, Christianity has always been attacked in the wrong way, and not just too timidly. As long as people don't feel Christian morality to be a *capital crime against life*, its defenders have an easy game. The question of whether Christianity is simply "true" is a minor side issue as long as nobody touches the question of what Christian morality is worth. That goes for whether its God exists, for whether its story of how it began really happened, and certainly for Christian ideas about the stars and nature. Is Christian morality *any good*, or is it a disgrace and a shame, however holy its arts of seduction may be? The problem of truth has hiding places of every kind. In the end, the most faithful believers can even use the logic of the strongest unbelievers to give themselves the right to declare certain things impossible to disprove, that is, *beyond* the reach of any means of disproving them. (Today this trick is called "Kant's critical philosophy" —

20.

On the Plan.

1.

The 'real' world and the world we see.

2.

Philosophers as examples of decline

3.

Religion as a sign of decline

4.

Morality as a sign of decline.

5.

The pushes in the other direction: why they lost.

6.

Where does our modern world belong: to exhaustion, or to a new rise? Its many sides and its restlessness come from the highest form of becoming aware.

7.

The will to power: the will to live becoming aware of itself…

8.

The medicine of the future.

8:600

56

———

40

70 pages

On point 1: 'the real world and the world we see'

1)

Putting the two side by side like this makes the 'world we see' look lower and worse.

2)

Thinking it over again: it would not have to mean that the world we see gets made to look lower.

21.

Chastity.

VII

With the Indian priests, we should not only think about the grudge against the body and its pleasures that every priest has. (On this point all priests agree: they treat bodily desire as their personal enemy.) The main thing is something else. Only by being extremely strict in this area could they hold up the base of the whole order they built: the idea of caste, the distance between the castes, and the purity of the castes…

They demand marriage, and they are very strict about it. Like the Chinese, they stand at the opposite end from European slackness. They think it is a religious duty to have a son, and they make a person's happiness in the afterlife depend on having one. We cannot value this attitude highly enough. It is a hundred times more dignified

and serious than the attitude of Christianity, for example. In Christianity, marriage counts only as sex and nothing more: as a favor granted to human weakness, and as a last resort to keep people from sleeping around.

22.

This is the worst of all possible bad music. It stumbles from one beat to the next in restless, shapeless adventures. It wants to pass for passion, but in truth it is the lowest level of crude, ruined taste. I have no mercy for it: this has to be stopped.

23.

Renaissance and Reformation

What does the Renaissance prove? That the reign of the 'individual' can only be short. Too much gets wasted. There is no chance at all to gather and save up, to build capital, and exhaustion follows right on its heels. These are times when everything is spent and squandered, even the very strength you need to gather, save up and pile wealth on wealth… Even the enemies of such movements are forced to waste their strength in senseless ways. They too soon become exhausted, used up, empty.

In the Reformation we have a crude, mob-like counterpart to the Italian Renaissance. It came from similar drives. The difference is that in the North, which had stayed backward and common, these drives had to dress up as religion. There, the idea of a higher life had not yet split off from the idea of a religious life.

With the Reformation, too, the individual wants freedom. 'Everyone his own priest' is really just a slogan for doing whatever you like. In truth, one phrase was enough, 'Gospel freedom', and every instinct that had good reason to stay hidden burst out like wild dogs. The

most brutal needs suddenly found the courage to show themselves, and everything seemed justified… People were careful not to understand what kind of freedom they had really meant. They shut their eyes to themselves… But shutting their eyes and wetting their lips with gushing, dreamy speeches did not stop their hands from grabbing whatever there was to grab. The belly became the god of the 'free Gospel'. Every lust for revenge and envy was satisfied with a rage that could never be filled… This went on for a while. Then exhaustion came, just as it had come in southern Europe. And here, too, it was a common, low kind of exhaustion: everyone rushing into servitude together… Then came Germany's indecent century…

24.

We cannot avoid comparing the Indian law book with the Christian one. There is no better way to see clearly how immature and amateurish the whole Christian attempt was.

25.

IX

Suppose morality has been practiced over many generations, so that it is stored up, as if in a warehouse: delicacy, caution, bravery, fairness. Then the combined strength of all this piled-up virtue shines out even into the area where honesty is rarest: the area of the mind.

Every time something becomes conscious, it shows that the body is uneasy. Something new has to be tried, nothing is ready for it, and there is effort, tension, overexcitement. All of that simply is what becoming aware means… Genius lives in instinct; so does goodness. We only act perfectly when we act by instinct. Even from a moral point of view, all thinking that happens consciously is only an at-

tempt, and mostly the opposite of morality. A thinker's scientific honesty always switches off the moment he starts to argue and reason. Try it yourself: weigh the wisest people on a jeweler's scale by getting them to talk about morality…

It can be proven that all thinking that happens consciously will also show a much lower level of morality than the same person's thinking when it is guided by his instincts.

Nothing is rarer among philosophers than intellectual honesty. Maybe they say the opposite; maybe they even believe it. But their whole trade means they allow only certain truths. They know what they have to prove. In fact, they almost recognize each other as philosophers by the fact that they agree on these 'truths'. Take moral truths, for example. But believing in morality does not yet prove that you are moral. There are cases, and the case of the philosophers is one of them, where such a belief is simply immoral.

26.

Today, when the vine pest is living in the vineyard of the German mind

27.

at whose breast the educated young people today drink the milk of science: professors and other higher-class nannies

28.

In every age, people have taken 'beautiful feelings' as arguments. They have taken a 'swelling chest' for the bellows that God breathes through. They have taken strong belief as the 'test of truth', and the needs of their opponent as a question mark against wisdom. This falseness, this faking, runs through the whole history of philosophy.

Apart from the skeptics, who deserve respect but are few, there is no sign anywhere of an instinct for intellectual honesty. Most recently, Kant, quite innocently, tried to make this corruption of thinkers look scientific with his idea of 'practical reason'. He invented a special kind of reason just for this: to say in which cases you don't need to bother about reason. Namely, when the heart's need speaks, when morality speaks, when duty speaks

29.

Decline X

Two kinds of morality must not be mixed up. One is a morality that a still-healthy instinct uses to fight back against decline as it begins. The other is a morality through which that very decline puts itself into words, justifies itself, and leads itself further downhill… The first kind tends to be stoic, hard, and tyrannical. Stoicism itself was such a morality, a kind of brake to stop the slide. The second kind is dreamy, sentimental and full of mysteries; it has women and 'beautiful feelings' on its side.

30.

Decline

'Rescue from all guilt.'

People talk about the "deep injustice" of the social contract, the deal that holds society together. They talk as if it were unfair from the very start that one person is born into good circumstances and another into bad ones. Some even say it is unfair that one person is born with these qualities and another with those. The most honest of these enemies of society declare: "We ourselves, with all our bad, sick, criminal qualities, which we admit to, are only the unavoidable results of centuries in which the strong crushed the weak." They push the

blame for their own character onto the conscience of the ruling classes. And so they threaten, they rage, they curse. They become virtuous out of outrage. After all, they don't want to have become a bad person, a scoundrel, for nothing... This attitude was invented in the last few decades. As far as I hear, it is also called pessimism, more exactly outrage-pessimism. Here people claim the right to put history on trial, to strip it of its fate-like necessity, to find someone responsible behind it and guilty people inside it. Because that is what it is all about: people need someone to blame. Those life treated badly, people in decline of every kind, are in revolt against themselves. They need victims, so that they don't end up quenching their thirst for destruction on themselves (which, in itself, might actually make sense). For this they need something that looks like a right. That means a theory that lets them shove the fact that they exist, and that they are the way they are, onto some scapegoat. This scapegoat can be God, and Russia has plenty of atheists like this, atheists out of resentment. Or it can be the social order, or upbringing and schooling, or the Jews, or noble, high-minded people, or in general anyone whom life treated well in any way. "It is a crime to be born in good conditions, because by doing so you have robbed the others of their inheritance, pushed them aside, and condemned them to vice, even to work..." "It's not my fault that I'm miserable! But somebody must be to blame, otherwise it would be unbearable!"... In short, outrage-pessimism invents responsibility so it can give itself a pleasant feeling: revenge... Old Homer already called revenge "sweeter than honey."

2.

Why is such a theory no longer met with understanding, by which I mean contempt? Because of the piece of Christianity that is still in all our blood. Because of it, we put up with things simply because, from a distance, they smell a little bit Christian... The socialists appeal to

Christian instincts, and that is still their cleverest move... Christianity got us used to the superstitious idea of the "soul": the "immortal soul," the soul as a single, separate unit. This soul is supposedly really at home somewhere else entirely. It has only fallen by chance into these or those circumstances, into the "earthly" world, so to speak, and has "become flesh." Yet its true nature is supposedly not touched by this, let alone shaped by it. In this view, social, family and historical conditions are, for the soul, only occasions, maybe inconveniences. In any case the soul is not their product. This idea lifts the individual above the world, and based on it he can give himself a ridiculous importance. In fact it was Christianity that first challenged the individual to set himself up as judge over everything and everyone. It made megalomania, thinking oneself enormously important, almost his duty: after all, he has eternal rights to claim against everything that is temporary and limited! Who cares about the state! Who cares about society! Who cares about the laws of history! Who cares about the body's biology! Here something speaks from beyond all change, something that stays the same throughout all of history. Here something immortal speaks, something divine: a soul! Another Christian idea, no less crazy, has been passed down even deeper into the flesh of modern times: the idea that all souls are equal before God. This is the original model for all theories of equal rights. Humanity was first taught to stammer the principle of equality in religious terms, and later a morality was made out of it. So it's no wonder that people end up taking it seriously, taking it practically! That is: politically, democratically, socialistically, outrage-pessimistically...

Wherever people have gone looking for who is responsible, it was the instinct of revenge doing the looking. Over thousands of years this instinct of revenge took such control of humanity that all of metaphysics, psychology and our picture of history, and above all morality, carry its mark. As far as humans have ever thought, that far they have

dragged the germ of revenge into things. They made God himself sick with it. They robbed existence as a whole of its innocence, by tracing every way of being back to a will, to intentions, to acts someone is responsible for. The whole teaching about the will, the most disastrous fake in psychology so far, was mainly invented for the purpose of revenge. It was the usefulness of punishment for society that gave this idea its dignity, its power and its claim to truth. The inventors of the older psychology, the psychology of the will, are to be found in the classes that held the power to punish, first of all the priests at the head of the oldest communities. They wanted to create a right for themselves to take revenge, or they wanted to create a right to revenge for God. For this purpose humans were thought of as "free." For this purpose every action had to be seen as willed, and the source of every action had to be seen as lying in conscious thought. The old psychology is preserved in these ideas alone. Today Europe seems to have started moving in the opposite direction. We calm and happy ones especially are trying with all our strength to pull the ideas of guilt and punishment back out of the world, to take them out, to wipe them out. Our deepest seriousness is aimed at cleaning this dirt off psychology, morality, history, nature, social institutions and their rewards and punishments, and God himself. So who must we see as our most natural enemies? Exactly those preachers of revenge and resentment, those outrage-pessimists of the purest kind, who make it their mission to make their dirt holy under the name of "outrage"... The rest of us want to win back innocence for all becoming, for the whole flow of life, and we would like to be the missionaries of a cleaner thought: that nobody gave a person his qualities. Not God, not society, not his parents and ancestors, not even he himself. Nobody is to blame for him... There is no being that could be held responsible for the fact that someone exists at all, that someone is this way or that, that someone was born under these circumstances, in these surroundings. It is a great comfort that no such being exists...

We are not the result of an eternal plan, of a will, of a wish. Nobody is using us as an experiment to reach an "ideal of perfection" or an "ideal of happiness" or an "ideal of virtue." Nor are we God's mistake, something that ought to frighten even him (and, as everyone knows, the Old Testament begins with that very thought). There is no place, no goal, no meaning onto which we could shove our existence and the way we are. Above all, nobody could do it: you cannot judge, measure, compare, let alone reject the whole. Why not? For five reasons, all of them easy to grasp even for people of modest intelligence. For example: because there is nothing outside the whole. And let me say it again: that is a great comfort. In it lies the innocence of all existence.

31.

XI

The basic insight about the nature of decline:

what people have so far seen as its causes are actually its results.

This changes the whole way we look at moral problems.

Vice:

Luxury:

Crime:

even illness:

: the whole moral fight against vice, luxury and so on looks naive, looks pointless...:

: there is no "improving" people. Against remorse.

Decline itself is not something *that should be fought*. It is absolutely necessary, and every age and every people has it. *What* must be fought

with all our strength is the spreading of the infection into the healthy parts of the body.

Do people do that? They do the *opposite*.

That is exactly what people work at in the name of *humanity*, of being kind to everyone.

How have the *highest values* we have had so far dealt with this basic question about *life and the body?*

1) Philosophy

religion

morality

art

and so on.

The cure: for example *militarism,* starting with Napoleon, who saw civilization as his natural enemy…

32.

The question of *decline*: to understand which things belong together and come from the same source, the same breeding ground

Anarchism

Women's liberation

Weakening of the body's powers to defend itself

Illness, epidemics and so on.

Resentment gaining the upper hand

Pessimism born of outrage, the gloomy view that comes from being angry at everything

Feeling sorry for everything that suffers

Pity

The lack of anything inside that holds a person back, of inner brakes

Vice, corruption (the attack on the senses and on the passions)

Things becoming uglier

The growth of ugliness (beauty as something that has to be *worked for*

"Tolerance"

Doubt about everything, "objectivity"

Feelings of weakness gaining the upper hand

The pessimists (whose bodies are in decline

The instincts that *break things apart*

Liberal institutions

The talent for playing several different people

Hypocrisy, play-acting like a performer:

The weakening of the *person*, of the self

The feeling that it is all "for nothing", that it is all "meaningless"

Nihilism (belief in nothing).

Being far too easily stirred up; women's liberation

Extreme over-sensitivity of the nerves

"Music"

The "artiste"

The "novelist"

The need for stimulants, for things that excite

Luxury as — — —

The need for drugs that numb, binge-like excess in music and alcohol (and *books* too)

The tyranny of one's surroundings

33.

The philosophies.

The religions.

The moral systems.

Not having children, staying unmarried and chaste (hatred of the senses: in Schopenhauer, for example

34.

The philosophies of pessimism:

people whose bodies are in decline

for example

Baudelaire

Schopenhauer

Leopardi:

sexual wrong turns at the start,

and impotence early on as a result

35.

People have made the shameful attempt to see Wagner and Schopenhauer as examples of the mentally ill. It would be a far more import-

ant insight to describe, precisely and scientifically, the type of decline that both of them stand for.

36.

Today's Germany works with every ounce of its strength. It counts being overloaded and growing old too early as normal side effects. Within just two generations it will pay for this with a deep wasting away of the people… For now we can only note that taste is becoming more and more mindless and more and more coarse, like the mob's — and that people need ever more vulgar ways to relax. Later times will find sick needs pushed to the front: ever stronger stimulants, and alcohol and music used like opium to dull the mind.

37.

XII

Féré, page 89.

Being unable to keep working steadily

This is the result of too much work with too little food, and above all of an exhaustion that grows ever deeper and lasts ever longer, and which brings out signs of sickness in the next generation

We also know of *overwork* that is passed down from parents to children. It is the main cause of a people wasting away — it makes them less and less able to make any productive effort

Laziness, meaning being unable to keep up an effort, belongs to this wasting away. Such individuals need not only food but special *stimulants* to raise their sinking life energy, and they want to be *kept alive* by other people's work. To get this they use trickery or violence (that is, a *one-time* burst of effort).

Three quarters of the degenerate are so because they are *poor*, and half of them have no work. But the *poverty* is already a result of being unable to work, of the idleness typical of the degenerate…

— The *one-time* burst of effort: a symptom.

Laziness, poverty, crime, living off others like a parasite,

Schooling increases people's needs and their greed, without increasing the means to satisfy them.

With compulsory schooling, a people's *reserves* of strength are used up.

Crime is highest where *exhaustion* is highest, that is, where work is done in the most senseless way: in the world of trade and industry

Overwork, *exhaustion*, the need for *stimulation* (vice), growing touchiness and growing *weakness* (so that these people become explosive)

The misshapen, the degenerate and the impotent of every kind have a sort of instinct for one another: out of this grow the *antisocial* beings

(because their parents were unable to fit into society)

they seek each other out, the insane for example

In families with nervous illnesses there is a *selection* that leads downward, a choosing that makes things worse (Goethe's novel "Elective Affinities", about people drawn to each other by hidden chemistry)

The breed born from vice and crime is *antisocial*. The *servant type* too (with light work and fairly comfortable living) prepares the ground for antisocial elements (whores, thieves, criminals of every kind)

Drinking and *wild excess* speed up the wasting away

More illnesses, because the body takes in food more slowly

Nervous disorders, madness, and crime breaking out again

Being unable to fight: that is what wasting away means

"We must get rid of fighting

— get rid of the fighters first!"

Murder and *suicide* belong together, and they rise and fall one after the other depending on people's age and the time of year

Pessimism and suicide belong together

The need for excitement and thrills:

Luxury is one of the first steps of decline. Constant stimulation creates weakness…

The degenerate feel drawn to a way of living that harms them and that speeds up their wasting away (people with weak blood, hysterical people, diabetics, people whose bodies are wasting)

38.

And in the middle of this decline come the wars for the "Fatherland" — for this ridiculous afterbirth of patriotism, which, for economic reasons, will be a comedy within just a hundred years…

this *wiping out* of the best-made men through war —

39.

XIII

This book is dedicated *to the well-made, healthy one*, who does my heart good — someone carved from a wood that is hard, delicate and sweet-smelling, so that even the nose takes pleasure in him.

He likes the taste of what is good for him

His liking for something stops at the point where it is no longer good for him

He senses the right cures for damage done to parts of him; for him, illnesses are great things that drive his life on

He knows how to make use of his bad luck

He grows stronger through the misfortunes that threaten to destroy him

By instinct, he gathers from everything he sees, hears and lives through whatever serves his main purpose. He follows a rule of *choosing*: he lets a lot fall through, like a sieve

He reacts slowly, a slowness bred into him by long caution and by a *pride* he has chosen. He examines every stimulus — where it comes from and where it wants to lead — and he does not give in to it

He is always in *his own* company, whether he is spending time with books, people or landscapes. He shows honor by *choosing*, by *letting in*, by *trusting*…

40.

That civilization brings with it the *bodily decline of a people*.

The farmer is eaten up by the big cities: the head and the senses are overexcited in a way that goes against nature. Too much is demanded of their nervous system: swollen glands, consumption, nervous diseases. Every new *stimulant* only speeds up the quick disappearance of the *weak*: epidemics carry the weak away…

The unproductive

Laziness belongs to people with weak nerves, to the hysterical, to the deeply depressed, to epileptics, to criminals

41.

It is not nature that is immoral when it has no pity for the degenerate. On the contrary, the growth of bodily and moral sickness in the human race is *the result of a sick morality that goes against nature*

The way most people feel and react is sick and goes against nature

What is the reason that humankind is *corrupt*, both morally and in body?

The body dies when one organ is *damaged*…

You cannot base the right to selflessness on the science of the body

Nor can you base the right to help, or to an equal share in life, on it: these are all rewards for the degenerate and for those life treated badly.

There is *no solidarity*, no sticking together, in a society that contains barren, unproductive and destructive elements — elements which, what's more, will have children even more degenerate than they are.

42.

"*Improvement*"

An attack on the holy lie.

XIV

That lying is allowed for pious purposes is part of the theory of every priesthood. How far it is part of their practice is what this study sets out to examine.

But the philosophers did the same. As soon as they planned to take charge of people, with the hidden aims of a priest, they quickly gave themselves a right to lie too. Plato led the way. The most impressive

version is the double lie worked out by the typically Aryan philosophers of the Vedanta in India. They had two systems that contradicted each other on every main point. But for the purpose of teaching people, the two took turns, filled each other's gaps, and completed each other. The lie of the first system was meant to put people in a state where the truth of the second could even be *heard* at all…

How far does the pious lie of priests and philosophers go? Here we have to ask what they need to be in place before they can shape and teach people. And what beliefs do they have to *invent* to meet those needs?

First: they must have power, authority, and complete believability on their side.

Second: they must have the whole course of nature in their hands, so that everything that happens to a person seems to be caused by their law.

Third: they must also control an even wider area of power, one that the people under them can never check with their own eyes. That means the punishments in the next world, in the 'after death'. And it means the means, however cheap, by which they claim to know the way to heavenly happiness.

They have to get rid of the idea that things simply follow the course of nature. But since they are clever and thoughtful people, they can *promise* a great many results, of course presented as depending on prayers or on strictly obeying their law…

In the same way, they can *order* many things that are completely sensible. The only catch is that they must not say that experience, real-life observation, is the source of this wisdom. Instead they must say it came from a revelation from God, or as the result of 'the harshest acts of penance'.

So the *holy lie* is basically about two things. First, it is about the *purpose* of an action. The natural purpose, the plain reason behind it, is hidden from view. Instead, a moral purpose, obeying the law, or serving God is made to look like the goal.

Second, it is about the *result* of an action. The natural result is explained as something supernatural. And to make sure this works, other supernatural results are promised, ones that nobody can ever check.

In this way, an idea of *good* and *evil* is created that seems completely cut off from the natural ideas of 'useful' and 'harmful', 'helping life' and 'weakening life'. And because a whole *other* life has been made up, this idea can even become openly *hostile* to the natural idea of good and evil.

In this way, finally, the famous 'conscience' is created. It is an inner voice that, with every action, does *not* judge the action's worth by its results. Instead it judges it by the intention behind it, and by whether that intention fits the 'law'.

So the holy lie has invented:

a *God who punishes and rewards*, who accepts exactly the priests' rulebook, and who sends exactly the priests into the world as his mouthpieces and official agents;

a *world beyond life*, where the great punishment machine is imagined to finally do its work. For this purpose they invented the '*immortality of the soul*';

the *conscience* inside a person, meaning the sense that good and evil are fixed for certain, and that God himself is speaking whenever it advises you to follow the priests' rules;

morality as the *denial* of everything natural. It turns every event into something caused by morals. It treats the moral effect, meaning the idea of punishment and reward, as something that runs through the whole world, as the only real force, as the creator of every change;

truth as something already given and revealed, something that is the same as the priests' teaching, and the condition for all salvation and happiness in this life and the next.

To sum up: what price was paid for this moral *improvement*?

Reason was switched off. All motives were reduced to fear and hope, that is, to punishment and reward.

People were made *dependent* on priests acting as their guardians, and on precise, fussy rituals that claim to express God's will.

A 'conscience' was planted in people, one that puts false *knowledge* in place of testing and trying things out,

as if it were already settled what should be done and what should not. This is a kind of castration of the searching mind that wants to push forward.

In short, it is the worst *mutilation* of the human being you could imagine, and it is passed off as 'the 'good' person'.

In practice, all the reason, all the inherited cleverness, subtlety and caution that the priests' rulebook was built on in the first place, gets reduced afterwards, quite randomly, to a mere *mechanical routine*.

Obeying the law already counts as the goal, the highest goal. *Life has no more problems.*

The whole way of seeing the world is dirtied by the *idea of punishment*…

Life itself has been reimagined so that the *priestly* life can be shown as the very peak of perfection. In this way, life is turned into something slandered and dirtied…

The idea of 'God' stands for turning away from life, for criticizing life, even for looking down on life itself…

Truth has been reimagined as the *priestly* lie. The search for truth has become *studying the Bible*, a way of *becoming a theologian*…

43.

The leading astray of humanity, hidden under the cloak of the holiest intention.

The criminal way the word 'truth' has been used until now.

I have a bad and disastrous story to tell. It is the story of the longest crime, the most unhappy seduction, the most carefully planned poisoning. It is the truly *black* event in human history. Under its spell, the deepest instincts of life were branded as wicked and called into question…

Priests:

they mix up *cause* and *effect*.

Priests:

they mix up calm that comes from *strength* and

calm that comes from *weakness*.

Would anyone believe it was possible to spread a mistake about *cause* and *effect*, so that people feel the effect to be the cause? It seems impossible. But under the seduction of morality, it has been done…

In every age, the priests have described the *decay* of a family line or a people as a punishment for its vices, for its lack of faith and its free

thinking. In the same way, they have described sickness, plagues, and mental illness as results of drifting away from faith.

On the other hand, they promised long life and happiness for one's family and children as a reward for being pious and obeying the law.

Today we say the opposite. A person's ability and their 'decency' are the result of long, happy marriages, and the sign of a sensible choice of partners to have children with. That is how strengths can add up over generations. They are an *expression* of the good fortune of one's ancestors.

Vice, crime, sickliness, madness, and loose living, including loose thinking, are results of decline, symptoms of it. So they *cannot be cured*…

Pious families are so far from guaranteeing healthy and happy children that, in Europe today, it is precisely among the most pious families, the ones pious for generations, that mental disorders and depression are passed down… Needing piety so badly just to bear life is the sign of a suffering, hard-pressed type of person. Our Pietists are not Christians by choice…

44.

The ranking of people turned upside down:

The pious fakers, the priests, are becoming the outcasts among us.

They are taking the place of charlatans, quacks, fakers, and sorcerers. We see them as people who corrupt the will, as the great slanderers of life who want revenge on it, as the *rebels* among those life treated badly.

On the other hand, the outcasts of the past are now on top. Leading them are the blasphemers, the *immoralists* (enemies of morality), free

spirits of every kind, artists, Jews, wandering musicians and players. Basically, all the classes of people who once had a *bad name*.

We have lifted ourselves up to *honorable* thoughts. More than that: we are the ones who *decide* what honor is on earth, what it means to be '*noble, high-minded*'…

All of us today are the *defenders*

of

life.

We *immoralists* are the *strongest power* today. The other great powers need us… We are building the world in our own image.

We have taken the label 'outcasts' and applied it to the *priests*, to the *teachers of the afterlife*, and to the *Christian society* that has grown together with them. We have added everything that comes from the same root: the pessimists, the nihilists (people who believe in nothing), the romantics of pity, the criminals, the people given to vice. That is, the whole area where 'God' is imagined as a *Savior*…

We are proud that we no longer have to be liars, or slanderers, or people who cast suspicion on life…

Note: Even if someone proved to us that *God* exists, we would not know how to believe in him.

45.

Toward an attack on the Laws of Manu (ancient Indian rulebook). —

XV

The whole book rests on the holy lie:

— Is it the good of humanity that inspired this whole system? This kind of person believes that every action is driven by *self-interest*. So was this kind of person driven by self-interest when pushing this system through, or not?

— To make humanity better: where does this aim come from? Where does the idea of "better" come from?

— We find a certain kind of person, the *priestly* kind, who feels that it is the standard, the peak, the highest form of what a human being can be. It takes the idea of "better" from itself, from its own way of being.

— It believes it is superior, and it truly *wants* to be superior. So the cause of the holy lie is the *will to power*…

*

Setting up rule: and for this purpose, making certain ideas rule, ideas that place the absolute highest power in the priesthood.

Power through lying, because they understand that they do not have power in the physical or military sense…

The lie as something added on to make up for missing power. — A new idea of what "truth" is.

It is a mistake to assume that this grew up *unconsciously and innocently*, as a kind of fooling oneself… Fanatics are not the ones who invent such carefully thought-out systems for keeping people down…

Here the most cold-blooded, clear-headed thinking was at work. It was the same kind of cool calculation that Plato had when he dreamed up his "Republic", his ideal state.

"If you want the goal, you must want the means": all lawmakers understood this politician's insight perfectly well for themselves.

We have the classic model as something specifically *Aryan*. So we may hold the best-equipped and most clear-headed kind of person responsible for the most basic lie ever told… People copied it almost everywhere: the *Aryan influence* has spoiled the whole world…

46.

That something is believed - - -

XVI

Error and ignorance are disastrous.

The claim that *the truth is here*, that ignorance and error are now over and done with, is one of the greatest temptations there is.

Suppose people believe it. Then the will to test, to search, to be careful, to try things out is crippled. That will can even be seen as wicked, namely as *doubting* the truth…

So "truth" is *more* disastrous than error and ignorance, because it cuts off the very forces that work toward clearer understanding and knowledge.

The feeling of *laziness* now takes the side of "truth";

— "Thinking is a burden, a misery!"

and so do order, rules, the happiness of owning something, the pride of being wise — in short, *vanity*.

— It is more comfortable to obey than to *question*… It is more flattering to think "I have the truth" than to see nothing but darkness all around…

— Above all: it calms you down, it gives you trust, it makes life easier. It "improves" your *character*, in the sense that it *makes you less suspicious*…

"Peace of soul", "a clear conscience": all of these are inventions that are only possible if you assume that *the truth is here*…

"By their fruits you shall know them"… The "truth" is true *because* it makes people *better*…

… And the process goes on: everything good, every success, is put down to the credit of the "truth"…

That is the proof of its strength: from now on, the happiness, the contentment, the well-being of the community and of each person are understood as the result of *believing in morality*…

— And the reverse: a *bad* outcome must come from a *lack* of belief —

47.

The morality of priests

The morality of masters

The morality of outcasts

The morality of the middle class (the "morality of the herd animal")

Philosophers

Learned professions

Artists

Statesmen

48.

What is the faking in morality?

XVII

It pretends to *know* something, namely what good and evil are.

That means wanting to know what human beings exist for, wanting to know their goal, their purpose.

That means wanting to know that human beings *have* a goal, a purpose at all —

49.

Victory over "truth".

What is still to be done: showing that *non-moral* values come before moral ones.

To prove this:

1)

moral values themselves are not "moral"

a)

neither in where they came from

b)

nor in the means of power they used to win out

50.

Kant: a machine for making concepts, fully a man of the 18th century, with a hidden basement of theologian's cunning, and a — — —

51.

What marks our 19th century is not the victory of science, but the victory of the scientific method over science.

52.

Will to truth.

XVIII

Martyrs

Anything that is built on deep respect and awe can only be fought if the attackers have a certain bold, ruthless, even shameless attitude… Now think about this: for thousands of years humanity has treated nothing but errors as sacred truths, and it even branded any criticism of them as a sign of a wicked mind. Then we have to admit, with regret, that quite a lot of *immoral behavior* was needed to get the attack started, that is, to get *reason* started… These immoralists (enemies of morality) always played the part of "martyrs for the truth", and we can forgive them for that. But the truth is this: what drove them to say no was not a drive for truth. It was a falling apart, a wicked kind of doubt, a love of adventure. In other cases it was personal grudges that pushed them into the world of big questions. They fought against ideas so that they could win against people. — But above all it is revenge that has become useful for science: the revenge of the oppressed, of those who had been pushed aside and even kept down by the truths that *ruled* at the time…

Truth, meaning the scientific method, was taken up and pushed forward by people who sensed that it could be a tool for fighting, a weapon for *destruction*… And to make their opposition look honorable, they needed the same kind of equipment as the people they were attacking. They put the idea of "truth" on display just as absolutely as their opponents did. They became fanatics, at least in how they acted, because no other way of acting was taken seriously. Persecution did the rest, along with the passion and insecurity of the one being persecuted. Hatred grew, and so there was less and less ground for staying

on the solid footing of science. In the end, all of them wanted to be right in just as absurd a way as their opponents… Words like "*conviction*" and "*faith*", the pride of being a martyr: these are all the worst possible conditions for gaining knowledge. In the end, the opponents of the ruling truths took back, of their own accord, the whole personal, subjective way of deciding what is true: through poses, sacrifices, heroic decisions. In other words, they *prolonged the rule* of the anti-scientific method.

— By becoming martyrs, they damaged their own achievement —

53.

The two most disgusting monsters born in the 18th century

the idea that the thinking self creates the world that matters to us —

the idea that reason creates the society in which — — —

the two disastrous farces: the Revolution and Kant's philosophy. The practice of revolutionary reason, and the revolution of "practical" reason.

nature denied, a morality split into two worlds | in Kant

the idea that a concept, a supposed piece of *knowledge*, should take the place of nature, that it wants to act as the sculptor, to *shape*, to *build*

the hatred of becoming, of change, and of looking carefully at how things change and grow

is shared by all *morality* and by the *Revolution*:

54.

The will to truth.

The philosopher as a problem.

The priest: inventor of morality.

Victory over "truth" (the "truths" we have had so far as symptoms of decline)

What decline is, and how far it reaches.

55.

To think fairly about morality, we have to put two ideas from animal science in its place: *taming* the beast, and *breeding a particular kind*.

Priests have always claimed that they want to make people "better"… But the rest of us would laugh if an animal tamer started talking about his "improved" animals. Taming a wild beast is usually done by harming it. In the same way, a person who has been loaded up with morality is not a better person. He is only a weakened person, one who has been thoroughly cut down, like a gelded animal, and spoiled. But he does less harm…

56.

Fighting against brutal instincts is a different thing from fighting against sick instincts.

In fact, making someone sick can itself be a way to get control over brutality.

The way Christianity treats the mind often comes down to this: it takes a wild brute and turns it into a sick animal, and therefore a tame one.

The fight against rough and savage people has to use tools that actually work on them. That is why superstitious tools cannot be replaced and cannot be done without…

57.

Demanding, as a rule in itself, that people say only what is "true" would assume that we already have the truth. But if it only means that you say what you yourself think is true, then there are cases where it matters to say it in such a way that another person also takes it as true, so that it has an effect on him.

As soon as we take morality as absolute, for example the ban on lying in the religious sense, the whole history of morality, just like the history of politics, becomes something worthless and shameful. We live on lies and faking. The ruling classes have always lied…

58.

Chapter: the will to truth

The mix-ups in how we understand the mind:

The longing to believe gets mistaken for the "will to truth" (for example, in Carlyle).

But in the same way, the longing to disbelieve has also been mistaken for the "will to truth." It is really a need to get free of some belief, for a hundred reasons, or to win an argument against some group of "believers."

What drives the skeptics, the people who doubt everything? Hatred of the dogmatists, who claim to be certain. Or else a need for peace and quiet, a kind of tiredness, as with the Greek thinker Pyrrho.

The benefits people expected from truth were really the benefits of believing in it. Because the truth in itself could easily be painful, harmful, even disastrous.

And people only fought against "truths" when they hoped to gain something by winning, for example freedom from the powers in charge.

The methods for finding truth were not discovered out of love of truth. They came from the desire for power, from wanting to be on top.

How does truth prove itself? Through the feeling of greater power ("a belief that one is certain"), through usefulness, through being something we cannot do without. In short, through benefits. In other words, through assumptions about what kind of thing truth ought to be before we are willing to accept it.

But that is a prejudice. It is a sign that this has nothing to do with truth at all…

What, for example, does the "will to truth" mean for the Goncourt brothers? For the Naturalist writers? A critique of "objectivity."

Why know things at all? Why not rather be fooled?…

What people always wanted was belief, and not truth…

Belief is created by the opposite means from the methods of research. In fact, belief shuts research out completely.

59.

The idea of a "real world" or of "God" as something completely beyond the senses, purely spiritual, purely kind, is an emergency measure. It is needed for as long as the opposing instincts are still all-powerful…

Moderation, and the humanity people have reached, show up exactly in how they make their gods more human. The Greeks at their strongest time were not afraid of themselves. They were happy with themselves. So they made their gods share in all their own passions…

So turning the idea of God into something purely spiritual is far from being progress. You feel this very clearly when you come into contact with Goethe. Next to him, the way God evaporates into virtue and spirit feels like a cruder, more primitive stage…

60.

If anything counts as us becoming more human, as real, actual progress, it is this: we no longer need extreme opposites. In fact, we no longer need opposites at all…

We are allowed to love the senses. We have made them spiritual and artistic to every degree.

We have a right to all the things that until now had the worst reputation.

61.

A. To the extent that Christianity still seems necessary today, people are still savage and dangerous…

B. In another sense, Christianity is not necessary but extremely harmful. Still, it attracts and tempts people, because it fits the sickly nature of whole social layers, whole types of people today. They give in to their own leaning when they reach for Christian ideals: people in decline of every kind.

Here we have to keep A and B strictly apart. In case A, Christianity is a medicine, or at least a way of taming. Sometimes it serves to make people sick, which can be useful for breaking savagery and roughness.

In case B, it is a symptom of the sickness itself, and it makes the decline worse. Here it works against any treatment that would make people stronger. Here it is the instinct of the sick turning against what would heal it.

62.

On one side, the party of the serious, the dignified, the thoughtful.

And facing them, the savage, dirty, unpredictable beast.

It is simply a problem of taming animals.

And in this, the animal tamer has to be hard, frightening, and terrifying to his beast.

All the essential demands have to be made with brutal clarity, which means exaggerated a thousand times over.

Even the fulfilling of the demand has to be shown in such a crude, exaggerated way that it inspires awe.

For example, the way the Brahmins, the Indian priestly caste, gave up the pleasures of the senses.

*

The fight against the rabble and the brutes: once a certain amount of taming and order has been reached, the gap between these "purified" and "reborn" ones and the rest has to be torn open as terribly wide as possible…

This gap increases the self-respect of the higher castes, and their belief in what they stand for.

That is where the outcasts come from. The contempt, and the excess of it, is completely correct psychologically. That is, it is exaggerated a hundred times so that it can be felt at all.

*

In the fight with the beast, making it sick is often the only way to make it weak. And just as the Brahmins defend themselves against the outcasts by making them sick, they also sentence criminals and

rebels of every kind to being weakened. That is the meaning of penances and the like.

63.

Taken as a whole, humanity today has reached an enormous amount of humaneness. The fact that people generally don't feel this is itself proof of it. We have become so sensitive to small hardships that we unfairly overlook what has been achieved.

Here we have to take into account that there is a lot of decline around, and that seen through such eyes, our world must look bad and miserable. But those eyes have seen the same thing in every age…

1)

A certain overexcitement, even of our moral feelings.

2)

The amount of bitterness and gloom that pessimism brings with it into how we judge things.

Together, these two have helped the opposite idea win out: the idea that our morality is in a bad state.

Look at the fact of credit, of all of world trade, of the means of transport. A huge, gentle trust in human beings is expressed in all of this… Another thing that adds to it is:

3)

Science breaking free from moral and religious aims. This is a very good sign, but it is usually misunderstood.

In my own way, I am trying to justify history.

64.

Morality is a useful mistake. Or, to put it more clearly, for the greatest and least prejudiced of those who promoted it, it was a lie they thought was necessary.

65.

What I want to make clear with all my strength:

a) that there is no worse mix-up than confusing taming with weakening,

which is exactly what has been done…

Taming, as I understand it, is a way for humanity to store up enormous amounts of strength, so that each generation can keep building on the work of its ancestors. Not just on the outside, but on the inside, growing out of them like a living thing, and growing stronger…

b) that there is a huge danger in believing that humanity as a *whole* keeps growing and getting stronger while the individual people become limp, all the same, and average… "Humanity" is just an idea, not a real thing: the goal of *taming* can only ever be the *stronger* human being, even in each single case (— the untamed person is weak, wasteful, and unsteady…

66.

The fact that the corrupt Paris novelists now smell of church incense doesn't make them smell any better to my nose: mysticism and holy Catholic wrinkles on the face are just one more kind of indulging the senses.

67.

What I warn against: mixing up the instincts of decline with *humaneness*.

: mixing up the means of civilization that *break things apart* and *necessarily push toward decline* with real *culture*.

: mixing up loose living, the rule of "let everything go," with the *will to power* (— it is actually the *opposite* principle).

68.

The *two great attempts* that have been made to get past the 18th century:

Napoleon, by waking up again the man, the soldier, and the great struggle for power — and by picturing Europe as one political unit.

Goethe, by imagining a European culture that would take over the full inheritance of the humanity that had already been *achieved*.

69.

German culture in this century makes me suspicious —

in its music, that full, freeing, and uniting element that Goethe had is missing.

The Austrians have stayed German only through their music.

70.

We are somewhat suspicious of all those delighted, extreme states in which people imagine they can "grab the truth with their hands" —

71.

How Virtue Comes to Power

The priests — and along with them the half-priests, the philosophers — have at all times called a teaching "truth" if its effect on *upbringing* was helpful, or seemed helpful — if it "made people better." In this they are like a simple folk healer and miracle man who has tried out a poison as a medicine, and so denies that it is a poison… "By their fruits you shall know them" — meaning our "truths": that is still how priests argue today. They have even, with disastrous results, wasted their cleverness on giving the "proof by power" (or "proof by fruits") first place, and in fact the final say over every other kind of proof. "What makes good must be good; what is good cannot lie" — that is how they reason, without mercy —: "so whatever bears good fruit must be true: there is no other test of truth"…

But if "making better" counts as an argument, then "making worse" must count as a disproof. You then prove an error is an error by looking at the lives of the people who stand for it: one slip, one vice, and the idea is supposedly disproved… This most indecent way of fighting, from behind and from below, the way dogs do it, has never died out either: the priests, to the extent that they are students of the human mind, have never found anything more interesting than sniffing around in their opponents' secrets. — This alone makes up their way of seeing and knowing the world: — they prove their Christianity by searching the "world" for dirt. Above all among the world's leading figures, the "geniuses": just remember how, at every point in time, people in Germany fought against Goethe (: Klopstock and Herder led the way here, setting a "good example" — like always sticks with like.)

72.

1.

You have to be very immoral to *make morality* happen through your actions… The tools moralists use are the most terrible tools anyone has ever used. If you don't have the courage to act immorally, you are good for everything else, but you are not good for being a moralist.

2.

Morality is a zoo full of caged animals. It takes for granted that iron bars can be more useful than freedom, even for the one who is caught. It also takes for granted that there are animal tamers who are not afraid of terrible tools, who know how to handle red-hot iron. This frightening kind of creature, the one that takes on the fight with the wild animal, calls itself the 'priest'.

73.

Think of the human being locked in an iron cage of mistakes. He has become a cartoon of a human being: sick, miserable, spiteful toward himself, full of hate for everything that pushes him to live, full of distrust toward everything beautiful and happy in life, a walking misery. This artificial, made-up, *after-the-fact* freak, which the priests have grown out of their own soil, is the 'sinner'. How will we manage, in spite of all this, to *justify* this thing?

74.

There is only one way to prove priests and religions wrong. You have to show that their mistakes have stopped *doing any good*, that they do more harm than good. In short, you have to show that their own 'proof by strength' no longer holds up…

75.

Niebuhr said: 'Compared with the Greeks, modern people deserve an extraordinary amount of moral respect.'

'Don't you feel it too? Hardly anything is more painful to see than a great mind that cuts off its own wings and tries to become a master of something far smaller, *by giving up what is higher*.' (This was said about Goethe's novel Wilhelm Meister.)

76.

Preface

This book speaks only to a few people: to those who have *become free*, for whom nothing is forbidden anymore. Step by step, we have won back the right to everything that was forbidden.

You show that you have reached power and self-confidence by having 'forgotten how to be afraid'. You get to trade distrust and suspicion for trust in your own instincts. You love and respect yourself in your own way of thinking, even in your own *nonsense*: a little bit clown, a little bit god. Not a gloomy person, not a brooding owl, not a blind worm crawling in the dark…

77.

That nothing is true of what used to count as true:

that the things we were once kept away from because they were called unholy, forbidden, shameful, or disastrous — all of these flowers now grow along the lovely path of truth.

This whole old morality no longer has anything to do with us. There is not one idea in it that still deserves respect. We have outlived it.

We are no longer crude and simple enough to need to be lied to in this way… To put it more politely: we are too virtuous for that…

And if truth in the old sense was only 'truth' because the old morality said yes to it, and was allowed to say yes to it, then it follows that we have no truth from the old days left either… Morality is not at all our *test* for truth. In fact, we *prove a claim wrong* by showing that it depends on morality, that it was inspired by noble feelings.

78.

The *idea of a 'strong person' and a 'weak person'* comes down to this: in the first case a lot of strength has been passed down, so that person is a sum of many things. In the other case, *still only a little* has been passed down —

— not enough has been inherited, or what was inherited has been broken up and scattered.

Weakness can be something that happens at the *beginning*: 'still only a little'. Or it can be something that happens at the *end*: 'no more'.

The starting point is where there is great strength, where there is strength to spend. The masses, being the sum of the *weak*, react *slowly*…

they push back against many things they are too weak for… things they can get no use out of,

they do *not* create anything, they do *not* move forward…

I say this against the theory that denies the strong individual and claims that 'the masses do it'.

The difference is like the difference between separate generations. Four or five generations can lie between the *person who acts* and the masses… it is a difference in *time*…

79.

Important, important: *The values of the weak* are at the top because the strong have taken them over in order to *lead* with them…

80.

Exhaustion that is *picked up* along the way, not inherited

poor *eating*, often because people don't know anything about nutrition; for example, among scholars

sexual *activity that starts too early*: this is a curse mostly on French young people, above all those from Paris. They come out of their high schools already spoiled and dirtied, and they never break free from the chain of shameful urges again. They mock themselves and treat themselves with contempt — galley slaves, chained to the oars, with all their refinement and

: by the way, in most cases this is already a sign of decline in the race and the family, like all kinds of over-sensitivity. It can also be something caught from one's surroundings, like an infection. Being easily shaped by your surroundings is itself part of decline —

Alcoholism: it does *not* come from instinct but from habit, from stupid copying, from a cowardly or vain fitting in with the system in charge. — What a blessing a Jew is among Germans! So much dullness, such flax-blond heads, such blue eyes; such a lack of wit and sparkle in face, words, and posture; the lazy stretching out, the German need to relax. And this need does not come from working too hard but from the disgusting stimulation and over-stimulation caused by alcohol…

81.

What is naive is that pessimism thinks it is giving reasons for itself this way, while in fact it is only *showing what it is*…

82.

The *lack of careful reading*: people constantly mix up the explanation with the *text itself* — and what an 'explanation' it is!

83.

There are women who turned out strong, made of good old-fashioned stuff, with the calm temper of a cow, whom even accidents hardly touch. But they call it their 'trust in God'. — They don't notice at all that their 'trust in God' is just a way of expressing their strong and steady overall health. It is a way of putting it into words, not the cause…

84.

The *fact* is 'that I am so sad'. The problem is 'I don't know what it means'… 'The fairy tale from olden times'. (These are lines from Heine's poem about the Lorelei.)

A Christian would say it was 'an old sin'. In the other case, in Heine's case, 'the Lorelei did it'.

85.

The 'inner world' and *its famous 'inner sense'*

The inner sense mixes up the effect with the cause.

The 'cause' is imagined and pinned on afterwards, once the effect has already happened. This is the basic fact of 'inner experience'.

86.

The Goncourt brothers found Flaubert had turned into a country bumpkin, too healthy, too sturdy for them. They noticed that, for their taste, his talent had *grown coarser*…

How much coarser Heine's talent must have seemed to them… That explains the hatred…

It is roughly the same as Novalis's hatred of Goethe —

87.

Notice that delicate people become *coarser* in what they dislike, while strong people become *thinner*, softer, and sicklier in what they dislike — for example, Goethe in his dislike of Kleist and of Hölderlin.

88.

There are the typical people of decline who feel that their spoiled style is *necessary*, who claim a higher taste because of it, and who would like to force their rule on *others* — like the Goncourt brothers, like Richard Wagner. They should be told apart from the people of decline who have a guilty conscience, the people of decline who *fight against it* —

89.

Ignorance about how the body works — the Christian has no nervous system. Contempt for the body's needs and a deliberate looking away from them, from the *discovery* of the body. The belief that this fits the higher nature of human beings — *that it is* necessarily *good for the soul*. Turning, as a rule, all the overall feelings of the body into moral values. Seeing illness itself as caused by morality, for example as a punishment, or as a test, or even as a blessed state in which a person

becomes more perfect than he could be when healthy (this was Pascal's idea). And sometimes even making oneself sick on purpose.

90.

The 'inner world' is only appearances

Time is turned around, so that the cause comes into our awareness later than the effect.

We have learned that pain is placed by the mind at a spot in the body without actually being located there.

We have learned that our sense impressions, which people naively assume are caused by the outside world, are actually caused by the inner world. We have learned that every real action of the outside world on us always happens without our being aware of it… The bit of the outside world that we do become aware of is born afterward. It comes after the effect that the outside has already had on us, and it is projected backward, after the fact, as the "cause" of that effect…

In the way the "inner world" appears to us, we turn the time order of cause and effect upside down.

The basic fact of "inner experience" is this: the cause is imagined after the effect has already happened…

The same is true of the order of our thoughts… We look for the reason behind a thought before we are even aware of that thought. And then the reason enters our awareness first, and only after it comes the thought that follows from it…

All our dreaming is a way of explaining overall feelings by linking them to possible causes. And it works like this: we only become aware of a state once the chain of causes we have invented for it has entered our awareness…

The whole of "inner experience" rests on this: when the nerve centers are stirred up, we look for a cause and picture one. And only the cause we have found enters our awareness. This cause does not match the real cause at all. It is a kind of groping around, based on earlier "inner experiences", that is, based on memory. But memory also keeps the habits of the old ways of explaining things, meaning it keeps their mistaken ideas about what causes what… So "inner experience" still has to carry inside it the results of all the false made-up causes of the past.

Our "outside world", as we project it at every moment, is mixed up with and tied for good to the old mistake about reasons and causes. We explain it using the ready-made pattern of the "thing".

In the same way, pain in a single case does not just stand for that single case. Rather, it stands for a long experience of what certain injuries lead to, including all the mistakes made in judging those results.

"Inner experience" only enters our awareness after it has found a language that the person understands… that is, after a state has been translated into states that are more familiar to that person.

To "understand", in the naive sense, simply means being able to express something new in the language of something old and familiar.

For example, take the judgment "I feel unwell". A judgment like that assumes that the person observing himself has reached a great and late-developed neutrality. The naive person always says: this or that is making me feel unwell. He only becomes clear about feeling unwell once he sees a reason for feeling unwell…

This is what I call the lack of philology, meaning the lack of careful reading. Being able to read a text just as a text, without mixing in an

interpretation, is the latest form of "inner experience" to develop, and maybe one that is hardly possible at all…

91.

The causes of error lie just as much in people's good will as in their bad will. In a thousand cases a person hides reality from himself. He fakes it, so that his good will does not have to suffer.

Take God, for example, seen as the one who steers human fate. Or take the way a person explains his own small fate, as if everything had been sent and planned for the sake of saving his soul. This lack of "philology", this lack of careful reading, must look to a finer mind like dirtiness and faking. And on average it is done under the inspiration of good will…

Good will, "noble feelings" and "lofty states of mind" use methods that are just as much faking and cheating as the feelings that morality rejects and calls selfish, such as love, hate and revenge.

*

Errors are the thing humanity has to pay for most dearly. And, taken on a large scale, it is the errors of "good will" that have harmed it most deeply. A delusion that makes people happy is more destructive than one that leads directly to bad results. The second kind sharpens the mind, makes it suspicious and cleans up our reason. The first kind puts reason to sleep…

Beautiful feelings, "lofty surges of emotion", belong, speaking in terms of the body, among the drugs that numb us. Abusing them has exactly the same result as abusing any other kind of opium: weak nerves…

92.

A critique of personal feelings about value.

Conscience. In the past people reasoned like this: conscience rejects this action, so this action is bad. In fact, conscience rejects an action because that action has been rejected for a long time. Conscience only repeats what it has heard. It does not create any values.

What once led people to reject certain actions was not conscience. It was insight (or prejudice) about what those actions would lead to…

When our conscience approves, when we have the good feeling of being "at peace with ourselves", this is worth exactly as much as an artist's pleasure in his own work. It proves nothing at all… Being pleased with yourself is no measure of the value of what you are pleased about, just as not being pleased is no argument against the value of something. We do not know nearly enough to be able to measure the value of our actions. On top of that, we have no way of standing back from them objectively. Even when we reject an action, we are not the judge. We are one of the sides in the case…

Noble surges of feeling that come along with our actions prove nothing about the value of those actions. An artist can be in the most intense, high-flown state of mind and still bring something pitiful into the world. One should rather say that these surges of feeling are tempting traps. They draw our eyes and our strength away from criticism, from caution, and from the suspicion that we are doing something stupid… They make us stupid.

93.

In the past, people took the states and effects of physical exhaustion to be more important than healthy states and their effects. That was because these states are full of the sudden, the frightening, the unexplainable and the unpredictable. People were afraid, and so they assumed a higher world was at work here. People have blamed sleep and dreams, shadows, night and the terrors of nature for the rise of

belief in a second world. But above all, one should look at the signs of physical exhaustion with this in mind. The old religions really train the believer into a state of exhaustion, a state in which he simply has to experience such things… People believed they had entered a higher order, where everything stopped being familiar. The mere appearance of a higher power…

94.

(See the first large brown notebook.)

Giving your life for a cause makes a great impression. But people give their lives for many things. Every single one of our passions wants to be satisfied. Whether it is pity or anger or revenge, the fact that a life is staked on it changes nothing about its value. How many men have sacrificed their lives for pretty little women, and even, which is worse, their health! If you have the temperament for it, you instinctively choose dangerous things: for example, the adventures of bold thinking if you are a philosopher, or the adventures of immorality if you are virtuous. One kind of person wants to risk nothing; the other kind wants to take risks. Are we others, then, people who despise life? On the contrary: we instinctively look for a heightened, stronger life, life lived in danger… But, to say it again, we do not want to be more virtuous than the others because of this. Pascal, for example, wanted to risk nothing and stayed a Christian. That was perhaps more virtuous. One always sacrifices something…

95.

"Great thoughts come from the heart." But one should not believe Vauvenargues on that, and so on, and so on.

96.

The best modern opera is the opera by my friend Heinrich Köselitz, the only one that is free of Wagner's Germany. It is a new setting of "The Secret Marriage". The second-best opera is Bizet's Carmen, which is almost free of it. The third-best is Wagner's The Mastersingers: a masterpiece of amateurism in music. An attempt at a rethinking of all values.

97.

Here is something people did not know before: going backwards is *not possible*. But all moralists and priests try to push people back into an earlier pattern. They try to grow virtues in them that used to be virtues long ago. Even politicians are not free of this, especially the conservatives. You can *hold back* a development. And by holding it back, you can even cause things to rot and be destroyed. But that is all you can do.

The whole romantic dreaming about ideals is wrong because it thinks going backwards is possible. In fact, the Romantics are a sick form of decline. They are very far ahead, very late in time, and completely unable to create anything new… The longing for the old days is itself a sign of a deep unhappiness and of having no future.

So the urges to go *backwards* prove the opposite of what they want. They show that you are very late, too late, that you are old…

98.

A capable young lad will give you a mocking look if you ask him: "Do you want to become virtuous?" But his eyes light up if you ask him: "Do you want to become stronger than your friends?"

How do you become stronger?

Make up your mind slowly, and hold on stubbornly to what you have decided. Everything else follows.

Those who act *on sudden impulses* and those who *keep changing*: these are the two kinds of weak people. Do not mix yourself up with them. Feel the distance between you and them, and do it early!

Beware of the good-natured, easygoing people! Spending time with them makes you soft and slack.

Any company is good if it makes you practise the defenses and weapons that lie in your instincts.

All your cleverness should go into putting your willpower to the test… *This* is what makes the difference, *not* knowledge, sharpness of mind, or wit…

You must learn to give orders, and learn it early, just as well as you learn to obey.

You must learn modesty, and *good judgment* in modesty. That means: when you are modest toward someone, it should be a way of singling them out and honoring them…

The same goes for trust: it should single people out and honor them…

What do we pay for most dearly? Our modesty. Not listening to our own deepest needs. Mistaking ourselves for someone else. Thinking little of ourselves. Losing the fine ear for our own instincts. This *lack of respect* for ourselves takes its revenge through every kind of *loss*: of health, of feeling well, of pride, of cheerfulness, of freedom, of steadiness, of courage, of friendship. Later we never forgive ourselves for this lack of real selfishness. We take it as an objection against ourselves, as a doubt that we have a real self at all…

99.

Wagner set nothing but medical case histories to music: nothing but interesting cases, nothing but very modern types of degeneration, and that is exactly why we understand them. Doctors and scientists of the body today have studied nothing better than the hysterical, half-hypnotized type of Wagner's heroine. Here Wagner is an expert. He is true to nature in this to the point of being disgusting. His music is above all an analysis of sick states of mind and body. As such it might keep its value even if taste changed completely [— — —] and it was no longer heard as music. The fact that the dear Germans manage to rave about it as if it were full of the deep ancient feelings of Germanic strength and vigor is one of the funny signs of how little the Germans understand about the mind. The rest of us, when we hear Wagner's music, feel we are in a hospital, and, let me say it again, we are very interested… With Wagner, the sickness is not intended, not an accident, not an exception. It is the very heart of his art, its instinct, its "unconscious", its *innocence*. The sensitivity, the speed of the emotions, everything takes part in it. The realm of [—] is enormously wide.

Senta, Elsa, Isolde, Brünnhilde, Kundry: a pretty gallery of medical cases. How instinctively Wagner sees woman as a sick woman is shown by Eva in The Mastersingers, who otherwise turned out more natural. Even so, Wagner cannot help giving her a pose that lasts twenty minutes, and because of it we would surely put the charming creature under a psychiatrist's watch. The first objection to Wagner's heroes is that all of them have a sick taste. They love only women who ought to disgust them… They love only women who cannot bear children. None of these "heroines" knows how to make a child. The exception is interesting enough: to help Sieglinde have a child, Wagner had to do violence to the old legend. And maybe not only to the legend: by Wagner's idea of how the body works, only incest is a guarantee of children… Brünnhilde herself — — —

100.

The Will to Power.

An Attempt

at a Rethinking of All Values.

Book One.

The Values of Decline.

A Critique of Big Words

the selfless person

Book Two.

Why Only the Values of Decline Came to Rule.

"heroic"

"pity"

on "peace of the soul"

Book Three.

Modern Times

as Values That Mean Two Things at Once.

the martyr.

Modesty (and how we pay for it…)

Book Four.

The *Value* of the Future

(as the expression of a *stronger kind of human*)

: which must first *exist*…

101.

A Picture of Decline: Its Symptoms.

How These Symptoms Overgrew the Higher Values.

Philosophy as Decline

Morality as Decline.

Religion as Decline.

Art as Decline.

Politics as Decline

102.

I.

The Values of Decline

II.

The Push in the Other Direction and What Became of It.

III.

The Problem of Modern Times.

IV.

The Great Noon (Moment of Clarity).

103.

"Deep thinking weakens you, just as losing too much of the body's fluids would." (Tissot, On the Health of Writers and Scholars, page 43, 1784)

Under the strain of difficult calculations, the body's sensitivity goes down, and so does the ability to tighten the muscles at will. The arms and legs even get thinner.

104.

What really happens when desires of every kind are made more refined and spiritual? A classic example is the Menippean satire by Petronius, the Satyricon. Read it side by side with one of the early Church Fathers, and ask yourself where the *cleaner* air blows… There is nothing in it that would not drive an old priest to despair with its immorality and its lustful high spirits.

105.

Note well: the theory that people are shaped by their *surroundings* is a theory of decline. But it has crept into the study of the body and taken control there.

106.

The theory that people are shaped by their surroundings is today the *Parisian* theory above all others. It is itself proof of a fatal breaking-apart of the personality. When the surroundings start to do the shaping, and when it is actually true that the leading talents can be seen as mere lumps grown out of their environment, then the time is over when things could still be gathered, stored up, and harvested. The *future* is over… The present moment eats up whatever it produces. And, sadly, it stays hungry even then…

107.

In short: heroism is not selfishness, because the hero is destroyed by it… Often the *way* a person's strength gets used depends on the acci-

dent of the time the great person happens to be born into. And this leads to the superstition that he is the *expression* of his time… But the same strength could have poured itself out in many other forms. And between him and his time there always remains this difference: "public opinion" is used to worshipping the instinct of the herd, that is, of the weak, while he is the *strong one, the* strong thing itself…

108.

Believers know that they owe Christianity a huge, endless debt, and so they conclude that the man who started it must be a figure of the very first rank… This conclusion is wrong, but it is the typical conclusion of people who worship. Looked at objectively, it would be possible, first, that they are mistaken about the value of what they owe to Christianity. Being convinced of something proves nothing about the thing you are convinced of. With religions, strong convictions even give a reason to be suspicious… It would be possible, second, that what people owe to Christianity should not be credited to its founder at all, but to the finished product, the whole thing, the Church that grew out of it. The word "founder" can mean so many things that it can even mean just the chance trigger that set a movement going. People made the figure of the founder bigger and bigger as the Church grew. But this very habit of looking at things through worship lets us conclude that at some point this founder was something very uncertain and unsettled — at the beginning… Just think how freely Paul handles the question of Jesus as a person, almost making him vanish like a magician's trick. He is someone who died, someone people saw again after his death, someone the Jews handed over to be killed… Just a "theme", like a few notes of a tune: Paul is the one who then writes the music around it… A zero at the beginning —

109.

The morality of masters

the priest morality

the morality of the outcasts

(The morality of servants)

The morality of the herd animal

The morality of decline

The morality of peoples and nations

110.

Altruism (living for others)

Christianity put the teaching of selflessness and love front and center. But by doing that, it did not at all rank the interest of the human species above the interest of the single person. In fact, its real effect on history, its fateful effect, is just the opposite: it pushed selfishness, the selfishness of the individual, to the extreme — all the way to the extreme of each person living forever. Christianity made the single person so important, made him count so absolutely, that he could no longer be sacrificed. But the species only survives through human sacrifice… Before God, all "souls" become equal. But that is exactly the most dangerous way of valuing things there could be! If you make individuals equal, you put the species at risk. You encourage a way of acting that ends in the ruin of the species. Christianity is the principle that works against selection. If the sick and degenerating person ("the Christian") is supposed to be worth as much as the healthy one ("the pagan"), or even more, as Pascal judged about sickness and health, then the natural path of development is blocked, and what goes against nature is made into law… In practice, this general love of

humanity means favoring everyone who suffers, those life treated badly, the degenerate. It has actually weakened and dragged down the strength, the responsibility, the high duty to sacrifice people. Under the Christian way of measuring value, the only thing left was to sacrifice yourself. But this leftover bit of human sacrifice, which Christianity allowed and even recommended, makes no sense at all from the point of view of breeding the whole species. For the species to do well, it makes no difference whether some individuals sacrifice themselves — whether in the way of monks and people who deny themselves everything, or on crosses, at the stake and on the scaffold, as "martyrs" for a mistake. The species needs the badly made, the weak, the degenerate to die out. But it was exactly to them that Christianity turned, as a force that preserves. It made even stronger the instinct that is already so powerful in the weak: to spare themselves, to keep themselves alive, to hold each other up. What is "virtue", what is "love of humanity" in Christianity, if not exactly this keeping each other alive, this sticking together of the weak, this blocking of selection? What is Christian altruism, if not the mass selfishness of the weak, who sense that if everyone looks after everyone else, each single one of them will last the longest?… If you do not feel this attitude as extreme immorality, as a crime against life, then you belong to the sick gang yourself and share its instincts… Real love of humanity demands sacrifice for the good of the species. It is hard, it is full of overcoming oneself, because it needs human sacrifice. And this fake humanity called Christianity wants to make sure of exactly this: that no one gets sacrificed…

111.

On the effect of Wagner's music

Music you cannot breathe in time with is unhealthy. When music comes along with a cheerful, godlike lightness and confidence, our

muscles celebrate too. We get stronger, and you can even measure this growth in strength. So how is it that Wagner's music drains my strength, that it stirs up a restlessness in my body which finally shows itself in a light sweat? After one act of Wagner, two at most, I run away. Let us hold on to this: any art that the body itself is against is an art that has been proven wrong… Wagner's music can be proven wrong by the body…

112.

A critique of the modern soul

The three centuries

113.

The 'good' person. Or: virtue paralyzed on one side. — For every kind of person who is strong and has stayed natural, love and hate belong together, as do gratitude and revenge, kindness and anger, saying yes and saying no. You are good on the condition that you also know how to be bad. You are bad because otherwise you would not know how to be good. So where does that sickness come from, that unnatural idea, which rejects this double nature and teaches that it is higher to be capable on only one side? Where does this one-sided paralysis of virtue come from, this invention of the 'good' person? The demand is that a person should cut out of himself, like castrating himself, the instincts that let him be an enemy, do harm, get angry, and demand revenge… This unnatural idea then matches the two-sided picture of a purely good being and a purely evil being (God, spirit, human), where the first adds up all the positive forces, intentions and states, and the second all the negative ones. This way of valuing things thinks of itself as "idealistic". It has no doubt that by setting up the idea of "the good" it has named the highest thing anyone could wish

for. When it reaches its peak, it dreams up a state where all evil has been wiped out and only good beings are truly left. So it does not even accept that good and evil depend on each other as opposites. On the contrary, evil is supposed to disappear and good is supposed to remain. The one has a right to exist; the other should not be there at all… What is it that really wants this? — —

In every age, and especially in Christian times, people have gone to great trouble to shrink human beings down to this one-sided capability, to "the good one". Even today there is no shortage of people who have been bent out of shape and weakened by the Church, for whom this aim is the same as "making people human" in general, or as "God's will", or as saving one's soul. Here the main demand is that a person should do nothing bad, that under no circumstances should he do harm, or even want to do harm… The way to get there is supposed to be this: cutting off every possibility of hostility, switching off all the instincts of resentment, and "peace of the soul" as a lasting, chronic illness.

This way of thinking, which is used to breed a certain type of person, starts from that absurd assumption. It treats good and evil as real things that fight against each other, and not as values that complete each other, which would be the truth. It advises people to take the side of good. It demands that the good person give up evil and resist it down to its very last root. And in doing so, it actually says no to life, because life, in all its instincts, holds both the yes and the no. Not that this way of thinking understands that. On the contrary, it dreams of getting back to wholeness, to unity, to the strength of life. It pictures a state of rescue, where at last there is an end to its own inner chaos, to the restless pull between two opposite drives about what is valuable. Perhaps there has never been a more dangerous set of ideas, or greater nonsense about the human mind, than this will to be good. People raised up the most disgusting type of person: the

person who is not free, the sour, pious goody-goody. They taught that only as such a goody-goody are you on the right road to God, and that only a goody-goody's way of life is a godly way of life…

And even here, life still turns out to be right, the life that cannot separate the yes from the no. What good does it do to believe with all your strength that war is evil, and to want never to harm anyone, never to say no? You still wage war! You simply can't do otherwise! The 'good' person, who has given up evil, is stuck with a kind of half-paralysis of virtue, as if one side of him were frozen, and he thinks that is a fine thing. But he does not stop waging war at all. He still has enemies, still says no, still acts against things. The Christian, for example, hates 'sin'… And what isn't 'sin' to him! It is exactly because he believes good and evil are moral opposites that his world has become overflowing with things to hate, with things he must fight forever. 'The good one' sees himself surrounded by evil, under constant attack from evil. He trains his eye sharper and sharper, until he finds evil even inside all his own thoughts and wishes. And so, logically enough, he ends up seeing nature as evil, people as rotten, and being good as a gift of grace from God, which means: something no human can manage alone. In short: he says no to life. He grasps that the good, set up as the highest value, condemns life… That should be enough for him to see his ideas about good and evil as proven wrong. But you can't prove a sickness wrong… And so he dreams up a different life, another life somewhere else!…

114.

The Typical Ways We Shape Ourselves, or: The Eight Main Questions

1)

Whether you want to be more many-sided or more simple.

2)

Whether you want to become happier, or more indifferent to both happiness and unhappiness.

3)

Whether you want to become more satisfied with yourself, or more demanding of yourself and more merciless?

4)

Whether you want to become softer, more giving-in, more humane, or more 'inhuman'.

5)

Whether you want to become cleverer, or more ruthless.

6)

Whether you want to reach a goal, or avoid all goals. That is what the philosopher does, for example: in every goal he smells a limit, a corner, a prison, a piece of stupidity…

7)

Whether you want to be more respected, or more feared? Or more despised!

8)

Whether you want to become a tyrant, or a seducer, or a shepherd, or a herd animal?

115.

What Is Noble?

Being noble means you always have to present yourself, to stand for something. It means you seek out situations where you constantly need to carry yourself with grand gestures. It means you leave happiness to the great mass of people: happiness in the sense of peace of mind, virtue, comfort, that English, angel-sweet shopkeeper spirit, the kind Spencer preached. It means you instinctively look for heavy responsibilities for yourself. It means you know how to make enemies everywhere, and if worst comes to worst, even out of yourself. It means you constantly contradict the great mass of people, not with words but with actions.

116.

The Warlike and the Peaceful

Are you a person with the instincts of war in your body? And if so, there is still a second question: by instinct, are you a fighter who attacks, or a fighter who defends?

All the rest of people, everyone who is not warlike by instinct, wants peace, wants harmony, wants 'freedom', wants 'equal rights'. These are just different names and different levels of one and the same thing.

Their aim is to go wherever you don't need to defend yourself. People like this become unhappy with themselves when they are forced to put up resistance.

Their aim is to create conditions where there is no more war at all.

And if worst comes to worst, they submit, obey, fall into line. That is still better than waging war. That is what the Christian's instinct advises him to do, for example.

In born warriors there is something like being armed: in their character, in the situations they choose, in how they develop every quality.

In the first type, the attacker, the 'weapon' is best developed. In the second type, the defender, the shield is best developed.

Then there are those without weapons and without shields. Think about what tools and what virtues they need just to hold out, and even to win in the end.

117.

On the Self-Discipline of the Strong

This strict self-discipline is only a training you pass through, not a goal. Its task is to free yourself from the old emotional reflexes that come from the values handed down to us. You learn, step by step, to walk your own way towards 'beyond good and evil'.

First stage:

to endure terrible, cruel things

to do terrible, cruel things

Second stage,

the harder one:

to endure petty, wretched, miserable things

to do petty, wretched, miserable things:

and, counted as a warm-up exercise: to become ridiculous, to make yourself look ridiculous.

To invite people's contempt, and still keep your distance from them with a smile from above, a smile no one can figure out.

To take on a number of crimes that drag you down, for example stealing money, in order to test whether you can keep your balance.

For a while, to do, say, or aim for nothing that does not stir up fear or contempt, nothing that does not force the decent and virtuous people into a state of war with you, nothing that does not shut you out…

To act out the opposite of what you are. Even better: not exactly the opposite, but just something different. That second one is harder.

To walk on every tightrope, to dance on every possibility: to get your genius down into your feet.

For a time, to deny your goals by the means you use, and even to slander them yourself.

To play, once and for all, one single character that hides the fact that you have five or six others.

Not to be afraid of the five bad things: cowardice, a bad reputation, vice, the lie, and woman.

118.

Sayings of a Hyperborean

We Hyperboreans (people from beyond the north wind) know well enough how far off to the side we live. 'Neither by sea nor by land can you find the way to the Hyperboreans': the old poet Pindar already knew that about us.

Beyond the north, beyond the ice, beyond death: there is our life! our happiness!…

Great things demand that you either keep quiet about them or speak about them in a great way. And great here means: bluntly, without illusions, and with innocence.

Even the bravest of us only rarely has the courage for what he actually… knows…

The best way to recover from what is unnatural in you, from your intellect and spirit, is in your own wild nature…

What? Is man just one of God's mistakes? Or is God just one of man's mistakes?

We distrust everyone who builds systems, and we keep out of their way. The urge to build a system is, at least for us thinkers, something that gives you away, something shameful, a kind of dishonesty.

Woman, 'the eternal feminine': a value that exists only in the imagination, and only men believe in it.

Man created woman. Out of what? Out of a rib of his god, his 'ideal'…

People think woman is deep. Why? Because you never get to the bottom of her. But woman has no bottom at all: she is the barrel of the Danaids, the barrel from the old story that has no bottom and can never be filled.

Woman is not even shallow.

Whoever laughs best also laughs last.

'To live alone, you have to be either an animal or a god,' says Aristotle. Let's prove that you have to be both…

Idleness is the beginning of all philosophy. So does that mean philosophy is a vice?

How little it takes to be happy! The sound of a bagpipe… Without music, life would be a mistake.

Don't be a coward about the things you have done! Don't abandon them afterwards! Feeling guilty and gnawing at yourself over it is indecent.

For the longest time, marriage has had a bad conscience against it. Would you believe it? Yes, you should believe it.

Everything people don't know how to cope with, everything no one has ever managed to digest, the *dung* of existence: hasn't that, up to now, been our best fertilizer?…

Do something stupid now and then, and oh, how good your own wisdom suddenly tastes again!

You need guts to allow yourself to do something bad. The 'good' people are too cowardly for that.

Men are cowards in the face of everything that is 'eternally womanly', and the little women know it.

What does not kill us, *we* kill, and that makes us stronger. Wagnerism must be killed off.

'Those were steps for me. I climbed up over them. To do that, I had to go past them. But they thought I wanted to sit down and settle on them.'

'All truth is simple': that is a lie twice over.

Everything that is simple is just imagined. It is not 'true'.

But what is real, what is true, is not one single thing, and it cannot even be boiled down to one single thing.

Can a pack donkey be tragic? Can it be tragic to be crushed under a load you can neither carry nor throw off?…

Among women. One says: 'The truth? Oh, you don't know the truth!… Isn't it an attack on all our modesty?'

'Equal things for equals, unequal things for those who are unequal: that is what justice tells us. And what follows from that: never make unequal things equal.'

Someone who can't put his own will into things at least puts a *meaning* into them. That is, he believes there is already a meaning inside them.

The grand style comes from great passion. It refuses to try to please. It forgets to try to persuade. It gives orders. It *wills*.

Artists, when they are genuine, tend to be modest in what they need. Really they only want two things: their bread and their art. Instead of the old Roman saying 'bread and circuses', it's 'bread and *Circe*', the enchantress…

People who only come into their own after their death are understood worse, but listened to more, than people who fit their own time. Or, to put it more strictly: they are never understood, and that is exactly where their *authority* comes from!

Good taste in matters of the mind: when every moral disguise that is put over our natural selves puts us off, when even in matters of the soul we only like *naked nature*.

You shouldn't be greedy. If you choose virtue and the proudly swelling chest that goes with it, you shouldn't also want the advantages that pickpockets enjoy.

Virtue remains the most expensive vice, and it *should* stay that way!

Humans are only middling egoists. Even the cleverest person treats his habits as more important than his own advantage.

Illness is a powerful spur. But you have to be healthy enough to handle the spur.

Noble, high-minded taste also sets limits on knowledge. Once and for all, it wants *not* to know a great many things.

What is chastity in a man? It is that his sexual taste has stayed noble, high-minded; that in matters of love and sex he likes neither the brutal, nor the sick, nor the clever and calculating.

If you have your 'why?' for living, you can put up with almost any 'how?'. People do *not* strive for happiness, as the English believe.

How could anyone spoil the average people's enjoyment of being average! As you can see, I do the opposite: every step away from being average leads, so I teach, into the *immoral*…

Our most sacred beliefs, the things we never change our minds about when it comes to the highest values, are really judgments made by our muscles.

'Don't you know yet what you need to multiply your strength ten times over?' Followers? No: zeros!! (Like zeros added after a number, they make it bigger without being anything themselves.)

And like everyone who is right too often, I don't care about staying right. (End of the preface)

119.

Biological lines of equal temperature

120.

What is good? Everything that increases the feeling of power, the will to power, power itself in a person.

What is bad? Everything that comes from weakness.

What is happiness? The feeling that power has grown again, that some resistance has been overcome once more.

Not contentment, but more power. Not peace at any price, but more war. Not virtue, but ability and fitness (virtue in the Renaissance style, 'virtù', virtue free of moralizing).

What is weak and badly made should perish: that is life's highest command. And we should not turn pity into a virtue.

What is more dangerous than any vice? Pity put into action for everything badly made and weak: Christianity…

*

What kind of type will one day replace humanity? But that is just a Darwinist fantasy. As if any species had ever been replaced! What concerns me is the problem of the ranking of people within the human species. I don't believe the species as a whole is making progress. My concern is the ranking of people among human types, types that have always existed and always will.

I separate a type that belongs to rising life from another type that belongs to decay, falling apart, and weakness.

Would you believe that anyone still needs to ask which of these two types ranks higher?…

This stronger type has appeared often enough already, but as a lucky accident, as an exception, never as something people *wanted*. On the contrary, it is exactly this type that has been fought hardest and *prevented* most. It always had the great masses against it, and the instinct of every kind of averageness. More than that, it had against it the cunning, the subtlety, the cleverness of the weak, and so, as a result, 'virtue' too… Until now it has almost been *the* thing people feared most. And out of that fear, people wanted, bred and *achieved* the opposite type: the tame house pet, the herd animal, the sick animal, the Christian…

*

Notebook 16: Spring–Summer 1888

1.

Turin, April 21, on the road

"My brothers," said the oldest dwarf, "we are in danger. I understand the pose this giant is taking. He is about to pee on us. When a giant pees, there is a great flood. If he pees, we are lost. And I won't even mention what horrible stuff we would drown in."

"Here is the problem," said the second dwarf. "How do you stop a giant from peeing?"

"Here is the problem," said the third dwarf. "How do you stop a great one from doing something great in a *great* way?"

"Thank you," the oldest dwarf answered with dignity. "Now the problem has been put in a more philosophical way. That makes it twice as interesting, and it paves the way for solving it."

"We have to scare him," said the fourth dwarf.

"We have to tickle him," said the fifth dwarf.

"We have to bite his toes," said the sixth dwarf.

"Let's do all of it at once," the oldest one decided. "I see we are up to this situation. This giant will not pee."

2.

The risky and ghostly, unreal side of existence —

At night, April 27

3.

Imaginary causes

4.

To put everything frightening to work, one thing at a time, by trial, step by step — that is the task a culture sets for itself. But until a culture is strong enough to do that, it has to fight these frightening things. It has to tone them down, hide them, and sometimes even curse them and destroy them. Wherever a culture labels something as evil, it is showing that it is afraid: it gives away its own *weakness*. In itself, everything good is some evil from the past that has been tamed and made to serve.

5.

This gives us a way to measure things. The more frightening and powerful the passions that an age, a people, or a single person can allow themselves, because they know how to use them as tools, the higher their culture stands. The other way around works too: the more average, weak, submissive and cowardly — that is, the more *virtuous* — a person is, the wider he will draw the borders of what counts as evil. The lowest kind of person has to see evil everywhere, meaning everything that is forbidden to him and hostile to him. —

6.

Upbringing: a system of methods for ruining the exceptions in favor of the rule. *Education:* a system of methods for turning people's taste *against* the exception, in favor of the average. That is harsh. But if you look at it in terms of saving energy and resources, it makes perfect sense. At least it does for a long period when a culture is still struggling to hold itself up, and every exception is a kind of waste of

strength — something that distracts, tempts, makes others sick, and cuts people off. A culture of the exception, of experiment, of danger, of fine shades — a *greenhouse culture* for unusual plants — only has a right to exist once there is so much strength around that even wasting it becomes affordable.

7.

The goal is to rule over the passions, *not* to weaken them or wipe them out! The greater the commanding strength of our will, the more freedom the passions may be given. The great person is great because his desires have so much room to roam freely. But he is strong enough to turn these monsters into his pets…

8.

At every stage of civilization, "the 'good' person" is the one who is both harmless and useful. He is a kind of middle. In ordinary people's minds, he stands for someone you don't have to fear, and yet whom you *still* are not allowed to look down on…

9.

There is a lot of good sense in fighting against *great people*. They are dangerous. They are accidents, exceptions, storms. They are strong enough to call into question things that were slowly built and firmly grounded. They are question-mark people when it comes to what everyone firmly believes. Such explosives should not only be set off in a harmless way. If at all possible, one should *prevent* them from forming and piling up in the first place. That is what the instinct of every civilized society advises.

10.

The high points of culture and the high points of civilization are far apart. We should not be fooled about the deep, bottomless conflict between culture and civilization. The great moments of culture were always, in moral terms, times of corruption. And on the other hand, the periods when people deliberately and forcibly *tamed humans like animals* — what is called "civilization" — were times when the most spiritual and daring natures were not tolerated. Civilization wants something different from what culture wants: maybe even the opposite…

11.

— Being decisive and sticking with it: according to Goethe, the thing most worth respecting in a person —

12.

Life itself is not a means to something else. It is simply the way power grows.

13.

Modest, hardworking, kind, moderate, full of peace and friendliness: is that how you want people to be? Is that your picture of the *good* person? But all you get that way is the "Chinese person of the future" as people imagine him, "Christ's sheep," the perfect socialist…

14.

Whoever cannot set himself up as a goal, or cannot set goals at all on his own, will honor the morality of selflessness. Everything talks him into it: his cleverness, his experience, his vanity…

15.

The fight against the "old faith" that Epicurus took up was, strictly speaking, a fight against Christianity before Christianity existed. It was a fight against the old world, which had already grown gloomy, soaked in morals, sour with feelings of guilt, old and sick.

It was not the "moral decay" of the ancient world that let Christianity take control of it. Just the opposite: it was the ancient world becoming moralized. Only under that condition could Christianity win. Moral fanaticism — in a word, Plato — destroyed paganism by turning its values upside down and giving its innocence poison to drink. — We should finally understand that what was destroyed back then was the *higher* thing, compared with what took over! — Christianity grew out of bodily decay, out of sickness. It could only take root in rotten soil…

16.

We few, or many, who dare to live once more in a world *stripped of morality*, we who are pagans in our beliefs: we are probably also the first to understand what a pagan faith really is. It means having to imagine beings *higher* than humans, but beings who are beyond good and evil. It means having to see every kind of being-higher as also being-immoral. We believe in Olympus, home of the old gods — and *not* in "the crucified one"…

17.

People seem to use history for nothing except the same mistaken conclusion, over and over: "This or that form of life died out, *so* it has been proven wrong." As if dying out were an objection, or even a *disproof*! — What does the collapse of the last aristocratic social order actually prove? That we no longer *need* such an order?…

18.

Among Germans it is not enough to have a sharp mind. You also have to take it for yourself, you have to dare to *help yourself* to it. Among the French, you need courage to be German.

19.

Now that you have become wise, be clever too! A rough burst of emotion, a vice, a bit of madness — that is now your kind of rescue!

20.

— and if my philosophy is a hell, then at least I want to pave the road to it with good sayings.

21.

What if existence itself were false at its core? What if existence had a "bad character" — and that might well be true — what would truth be then, all our truth? Just one more falsehood?

22.

If you have done something stupid, you should quickly send two clever things after it: that is how you bring it back.

23.

How poor the will must have become for someone to misunderstand the world, the way Schopenhauer did, as "will"! The will is exactly what is *missing* in the philosopher, however much he talks about will. (— Just as *spirit* is missing in the New Testament, even with all its talk of "the Holy Spirit" —)

24.

Without music, life would be a mistake.

25.

Humans are a small, overwrought kind of animal that, luckily, will only be around for a while. Life on Earth as a whole is just a moment, a passing incident, an exception that leads nowhere, something that makes no difference to what the Earth is really like. The Earth itself, like every star and planet, is a gap between two nothings. It is an event with no plan, no reason, no will, no awareness of itself. It is the worst kind of necessity: a *stupid* necessity, things that simply have to happen without any point… Something inside us rebels against this way of seeing things. Vanity, like the snake in the Garden of Eden, whispers to us: "All of this must be false, *because* it makes us so angry… Couldn't all of this just be an illusion? And besides, humans are still, in spite of everything, as Kant would put it, — — —"

26.

Imagine thinking that "evil" is an argument against existence! But what has disgusted *us* the longest? Isn't it the sight of "the good"? Isn't it the fact that there is no way to escape "the good"? Isn't it the very idea of "God"?

27.

When you are sick, you should crawl away and hide. That is the only philosophical way to handle it, and the only way an animal would handle it…

28.

There are morning thinkers, there are afternoon thinkers, and there are night owls. And let's not forget the most noble, high-minded kind of all: the *noon thinkers*, the ones in whom the great god Pan is always asleep. For them, all the light falls straight down from above, leaving no shadows…

29.

In music, we lack a proper theory of beauty, one that could lay down laws for musicians and give them a conscience. As a result, we also lack any real fight over "principles." As musicians, we laugh just as hard at Herbart's half-hearted attempts in this area as we do at Schopenhauer's. In fact, this creates a big problem: we no longer know how to *justify* ideas like "model," "mastery," or "perfection." We grope around blindly in the world of values, guided only by the instinct of old love and admiration. We almost believe that "good is whatever *we* happen to like"… It makes me suspicious when people innocently call Beethoven a "classic" everywhere. I would firmly argue that in the other arts, a "classic" means a type of artist that is the exact opposite of Beethoven's type. But when people go even further and teach and worship Wagner's style, which is obviously and completely falling apart, his so-called dramatic style, as a "model," as "mastery," as "progress," then my impatience reaches its peak. The dramatic style in music, as Wagner understands it, means giving up on style altogether, on the assumption that something else is a hundred times more important than music, namely the drama. Wagner can paint pictures with sound. He doesn't use music for the sake of music. He uses it to make gestures and poses stronger. He is a poet. And finally, like all theater artists, he has appealed to "beautiful feelings" and "heaving chests." With all this, he won over women and even the people who are hungry to seem cultured. But what do women and culture-hungry

people care about music! None of these people has any conscience when it comes to art. They don't suffer when all the first and most essential virtues of an art are trampled on and mocked for the sake of side goals, with music turned into a servant of drama, an "ancilla dramaturgica." What good is it to expand the means of expression when the thing doing the expressing, art itself, has lost its own inner law? The painterly splendor and power of sound, the symbolism of tone, rhythm, and the colors of harmony and disharmony, the way music can suggest things that belong to the other arts, the whole *sensuousness* of music, its appeal to the senses, which Wagner made dominant: Wagner spotted all this in music, pulled it out, and developed it. Victor Hugo did something similar for language. But already today, in France, people are asking about Victor Hugo whether this hasn't ruined the language… whether, by pumping up the appeal to the senses in language, he hasn't pushed down its reason, its intellect and spirit, its deep inner order. The poets in France have become sculptors, shaping images, and the musicians in Germany have become actors, performers, and people who just paint over culture with a thin coat. Aren't those signs of *decline*?

Wagner uses music to do all kinds of things that are not music. He uses it to hint at swelling emotions, virtues, and passions.

For him, music is just a tool

Hasn't music lost all its more intellectual beauty? Hasn't it lost that high, bold, playful perfection that still holds on to grace even while taking risks, that thrilling leap and dance of logic, which — — —

30.

Imagine a warrior of knowledge, someone who is always fighting with ugly truths. For him, believing *that there is no truth at all* is like a big re-

laxing bath and a good stretch of the limbs. Nihilism (belief in nothing) is *our* way of taking a break…

31.

Sometimes virtue is simply a respectable form of stupidity. Who could hold that against it? And this kind of virtue hasn't died out even today. There is a kind of honest, simple peasant innocence, though it can be found in every social class, and the only proper way to meet it is with respect and a smile. Even today, it believes that everything is in good hands, namely in the "hand of God." And when these people hold on to this belief with a modest certainty, as if they were saying that two times two is four, the rest of us will be careful not to argue. Why spoil *this* pure foolishness? Why darken it with our worries about humanity, nations, goals, and the future? And even if we wanted to, we couldn't. These people project their own respectable stupidity and kindness *into* the world around them. (For them, the old God is still alive, a short-sighted God, a "deus myops"!) We others, on the other hand, project something else into things: our puzzling nature, our contradictions, our deeper, more painful, more suspicious wisdom.

32.

How I recognize people like me. Philosophy, as I have understood it and lived it until now, means choosing, of your own free will, to seek out even the cursed and wicked sides of existence. This kind of journey was like wandering through ice and desert. From my long experience of it, I learned to see everything that philosophy has done so far in a different way. The *hidden* history of philosophy, the psychology behind its great names, came to light for me. "How much truth can a mind *bear*? How much truth does a mind *dare* to face?" That became my real measure of value. Error is *cowardice*… Every gain in knowledge *comes*

from courage, from being hard on yourself, from being honest and clean with yourself… The kind of experimental philosophy that I live even tries out, in advance, the possibility of total nihilism (belief in nothing). But that doesn't mean it stops at a No, at a denial, at a will to say No. Instead, it wants to push all the way through to the opposite: to a *Dionysian (wild, life-loving) Yes* to the world as it is, with nothing taken away, no exceptions, and no picking and choosing. It wants the eternal cycle: the same things, the same logic and lack of logic in how everything is tied together. The highest state a philosopher can reach is to stand toward existence in a Dionysian (wild, life-loving) way. My formula for this is love of fate…

— Part of this means seeing the sides of life that people have said no to until now not only as necessary, but as something to want. And not only as something to want because they help the sides people have said yes to (say, as what completes them or what they need first). No: they are to be wanted for their own sake, as the stronger, more fruitful, *truer* sides of life, where life's will shows itself more clearly. In the same way, part of this means judging the side of life that until now was the only one people said *yes* to. It means understanding where this way of valuing comes from, and how little it should bind anyone who measures the worth of life in a Dionysian (wild, life-loving) way. I pulled out and understood *what* is really saying yes here. First, the instinct of those who suffer. Second, the instinct of the herd. And third, the *instinct of the majority*, set against the exceptions. In this way I guessed how a different, stronger kind of human would have to imagine raising and lifting up humanity in a quite different direction: as *higher beings* beyond good and evil, beyond those values that cannot hide that they come from the world of suffering, of the herd, and of the majority. I searched history for the first signs of this reversed kind of ideal. I rediscovered the ideas of "pagan", "classical" and "noble, high-minded", and set them up again.

33.

If you judge Richard Wagner only by what he is worth for Germany and German culture, he remains a big question mark. He is perhaps a German misfortune, and in any case a destiny. But what does that matter? Isn't he much more than just a German event?… It even seems to me that there is no place he belongs less than Germany. Nothing there is ready for him. His whole type stands among Germans as simply foreign, strange, misunderstood and impossible to understand. But people take care not to admit this to themselves. They are too good-natured for that, too stiff and square, too German. "Credo quia absurdus est", which means "I believe it because he is absurd": that is what the German mind wants, and what it wanted in this case too. And so, for now, it believes everything Wagner wanted people to believe about him. The German mind has always lacked subtlety and the gift of seeing into people when it comes to psychology. Today, under the heavy pressure of flag-waving patriotism and self-admiration, it is visibly getting thicker and cruder. How could it possibly be up to the problem of Wagner!

34.

At bottom, Wagner's music is still literature, just as all of French Romanticism is. It is the magic of the exotic, of far-off times, customs and passions, working on sensitive idlers who hang around on street corners. It is the thrill of stepping into a huge, distant, foreign, ancient land that you can only reach through books, which painted the whole horizon with new colours and possibilities… It is the feeling that there are even more distant worlds no one has opened yet; it is scorn for the ordinary city boulevards… Make no mistake: nationalism, too, is just one more form of this love of the exotic… The Romantic musicians tell us what exotic books have made of them. People would love to live through exotic things, passions in the

Florentine or Venetian style. In the end they *settle* for looking for them in *pictures*… What really matters is a kind of *new* craving: a wish to copy, a wish to live other people's lives, to put on a costume, to disguise the soul… Romantic art is only a stand-in for a "reality" that failed to happen…

Napoleon: the passion for new possibilities of the soul… The soul gaining more room…

The attempt to *do* something new: the Revolution, Napoleon…

The will grows tired; and so the craving to feel, imagine and dream new things runs wild all the more…

This came from the extreme things people had lived through: a ravenous hunger for extreme feelings… Foreign literatures offered the strongest spices…

35.

On the future of marriage:

Single men above a certain age should pay *extra tax* on inheritances and so on, and also do extra military service, with the burden growing as they get older (within the local community).

Advantages of all kinds for fathers who bring plenty of boys into the world: in some cases, even more than one vote.

A *medical record* before every marriage, signed by the community leaders, in which the engaged couple and the doctors must answer several set questions ("family history" —

As a remedy against *prostitution* (or as a way to make it nobler): legal marriages for a fixed time (for years, for months, for days), with protection guaranteed for the children.

Every marriage to be vouched for and backed by a certain number of trusted men of the community, as a matter for the whole community.

36.

The Romantics, who all, like their German master Friedrich Schlegel, are in danger, as Goethe put it, "of choking on chewing over moral and religious nonsense again and again, like a cow chewing its cud."

What Wagner has of Schiller in him: he brings "passionate eloquence, splendid words, as a soaring of noble feelings." It is like mixing gold with a cheaper metal.

"If Schiller had lived longer, he would have become the idol of the people of his time, even of those who found their own feelings and thoughts in Iffland and Kotzebue, in Nikolai and Merkel. And honours and riches would have poured in on him too." Victor Hehn, Thoughts on Goethe, page 109.

"The heartlessness all the way through." "The worthlessness or smallness of the heroes." Think of Niebuhr, who dared to say about Wilhelm Meister that "he was annoyed by this zoo of tame cattle."

In high society people agreed that, in Jacobi's words, "an unclean spirit rules in it."

What was Goethe grateful to Schiller for? That Wilhelm Meister "swept him away and moved him deeply, and even filled him painfully with the feeling that he himself fell short. So at last, right out of the enemy camp, he had met a mind that could climb after him all the way up to this height."

Schiller wrote to Körner in 1796: "Next to Goethe I am, and I'll stay, just a poetic tramp."

In Schiller's eyes too, Goethe's star grew paler the more his own fame grew. He became the rival.

The typical hatred of the sick for the perfect. For example, Novalis against Wilhelm Meister, a book he found disgusting. "The garden of poetry is faked with straw and rags." "The reason in it is like a naive devil." "Artistic atheism is the spirit of the book." And he said this at a time when he was raving about Tieck, who back then seemed to be passing himself off as a follower of the mystic Jakob Böhme.

37.

The effect of Wagner's art is deep. Above all it is heavy, heavy as a ton weight. Why is that? Certainly not, at first, because of Wagner's music. In fact, you can only stand this music once something else has already overpowered you and, so to speak, made you *unfree*. This something else is Wagner's pathos, his grand, heavy emotion, for which he simply invented his art as an extra. It is the enormous persuasive force of this pathos, the way it holds its breath, the way it refuses to let go of an extreme feeling. It is the frightening *length* of this pathos. With it Wagner wins and will keep winning, so that in the end he even talks us into accepting his music… Is someone with such pathos a "genius"? Or can he even be one? If by an artist's genius you mean the highest freedom while following the rules, a godlike lightness, a playful ease even in the hardest things, then Offenbach (Edmond Audran) has even more right to the name "genius" than Wagner. Wagner is heavy and clumsy. Nothing is more foreign to him than moments of the most high-spirited perfection, like the ones that clown Offenbach reaches five or six times in almost every one of his comic operettas. — But perhaps genius can mean something else. — Another question, which I also mean to answer only later: is Wagner, with exactly *this* kind of pathos, German? Is he a German?… Or isn't he rather the exception among the exceptions?…

Wagner is heavy, heavy as a ton weight. So he is no genius?…

38.

Above all, Wagner needs to be cut down hard, so that only three quarters is left. Most of all, his recitative, the sung speech that drives even the most patient listener to despair… It is nothing but Wagner's ambition to *teach* us that his works are necessary down to the smallest detail… The opposite is true. There is far too much in them that is extra, random, and could be done without… He lacks the ability to feel necessity himself. So how could he *force* it on us?

39.

Buckle is the best example of how badly a crude rabble-rouser of the masses fails to get a clear idea of what a "higher nature" is. He fights passionately against the view that "great men" — individuals, princes, statesmen, geniuses, generals — are the levers and causes of all great movements. But by instinct he misunderstands this view. He thinks it claims that what is essential and valuable in such a "higher person" is simply the ability to set the masses moving — in short, the effect they have… But the "higher nature" of a great man lies in being different, in being impossible to share or pass on, in the distance of rank between him and others — *not* in any effects he has, even if he shook the whole planet. —

40.

On Art and Beauty

Basic insight: what is beautiful and what is ugly.

Nothing depends more on conditions — let us say, nothing is more *narrow-minded* — than our sense of beauty. Anyone who tried to think of it apart from the pleasure humans take in humans would at once

lose the ground under their feet. In beauty, humans admire themselves as a type. In extreme cases, they worship themselves. It is part of what a type is that it is only made happy by the sight of *itself* — that it says yes to itself and only to itself. However much a person sees the world piled high with beautiful things, he has only ever piled it with his own "beauty." That means he calls everything beautiful that reminds him of the feeling of perfection he has as a human standing among all other things. But has he really made the world *more beautiful* by doing this?… And in the end, in the eyes of a judge with higher taste, might humans perhaps not be beautiful at all?… I don't mean to say unworthy — but a little funny, maybe?…

*

2

"Oh Dionysus, divine one, why are you pulling me by the ears?" "I find something funny about your ears, Ariadne: why aren't they even longer?…"

*

3.

"Nothing is beautiful: only humans are beautiful." All our thinking about art and beauty rests on this naive idea. Let it be its first "truth."

Let us add the matching "truth" right away, and it is no less naive: that nothing is ugly except the *badly made* human being.

When a person suffers from ugliness, he is suffering from his own type going wrong, like a birth that failed. And wherever he is reminded, even in the faintest way, of such a failure, he sticks on the label "ugly." Humans have piled the world high with ugly things: which means, always only with their own ugliness… Have they really made the world *uglier* by doing this?…

*

4.

Everything ugly weakens a person and makes him sad. It reminds him of decay, danger, and helplessness. You could measure the effect of ugliness with a strength-measuring device. Wherever a person feels pushed down, something ugly is at work. The feeling of power, the will to power — it grows with beauty and falls with ugliness.

5.

A huge amount of material is stored up in our instincts and memory. We have thousands of signs that give away to us when a type is degenerating, going downhill. Wherever there is even a hint of exhaustion, tiredness, heaviness, old age, or of being unfree, cramped, falling apart, or rotting, our deepest, most basic judgment of value speaks up at once: *that is where a person hates the ugly*…

What he hates there is always the *decline of his type*. The whole philosophy of art lies in this hatred.

*

6.

If my readers have been taught well enough that even "the good person," in the great overall drama of life, is a form of *exhaustion,* then they will give credit to Christianity for being consistent, since it pictured the good person as the *ugly* one. Christianity was right about that. —

For a philosopher, it is shameful to say: the good and the beautiful are one and the same. And if he even adds "and the true as well," he

should be beaten. The truth is ugly. *We have art* so that we are not destroyed by the truth.

*

7.

The relationship between art and truth was the first thing I became serious about. Even now I stand before this conflict with a holy horror. My first book was devoted to it. "The Birth of Tragedy" believes in art against the background of another belief: that it is *not possible to live with the truth*; that the "will to truth" is already a sign of degeneration, of going downhill…

Here I set out once more the strangely dark and unpleasant idea of that book. It has an advantage over other pessimistic ideas: it is *immoral*. Unlike them, it was not inspired by the witch who bewitched philosophers — that is, by virtue. —

Art in "The Birth of Tragedy"

— — —

41.

Wagner is a *major fact* in the history of the "European mind" and the "modern soul," just as Heinrich Heine was such a fact. Wagner and Heine: the two greatest frauds that Germany has given to Europe as a gift.

42.

I moved away from Wagner when he retreated to the German God, the German Church, and the German Empire. But that very move drew other people to him.

43.

Note

Start of the Preface

The gold-maker is the only true *benefactor* of humanity.

To rethink values, to make much out of little, to make *gold* out of something worthless: that is the only kind of benefactor humanity has

they are the only ones who *make us richer*

the others are just *money-changers*, swapping one coin for another

Let us imagine an extreme case: that there were something most hated and most condemned — and that exactly this were turned into gold. That is my case…

44.

Sometimes I am almost curious to *hear* what I am like. This question is absurdly far from my own habits

My typical experience (— one has such things — — —

There really are surprises in my life. That is because I don't like to busy myself with what might be possible — proof of how much I live in my thoughts… A chance event made me aware of this a few days ago: the idea of a "future" is missing in me. I look ahead as if over a smooth, flat surface: no wish, not even a tiny little wish, no making plans, no wanting things to be different. Instead, only the very thing that holy Epicurean forbade us: worrying about the next day, about tomorrow… That is my only trick: today I know what is supposed to happen tomorrow.

"I was shipwrecked, and so I sailed well" — — —

45.

the rattlesnake luck of the great magician, into whose jaws the most innocent run on their own…

46.

the culture idiots, the "Eternal Feminine" types, — — —

47.

in Germany, where a foggy haze of ideals is not seen as an objection against an artist, but almost as his justification (— it is counted in Schiller's favor!… and when people say "Schiller and Goethe," they think the first was the higher, the more genuine one, because he was an idealist: this hero of poses!

48.

As for the hysterical, heroic woman that Richard Wagner invented and set to music, a mixed-up creature of the most doubtful taste:

the reason this type has not completely disgusted people, even in Germany, is — though this by no means makes it right — that a far, far greater poet than Wagner, the noble Heinrich von Kleist, had already given it the backing of genius there. I am far from thinking that Wagner himself depended on Kleist here. Rather, Elsa, Senta, Isolde, Brünnhilde, and Kundry are children of French Romanticism and have a — — —

49.

A musician's greatness is not measured by the beautiful feelings he stirs up in us. That is what women believe. No, it is measured by how strong and tense his will is. It is measured by how surely chaos obeys

his artistic command and takes on shape. It is measured by the sense of necessity his hand puts into a series of forms, so that each one has to follow the one before. In a word, a musician's greatness is measured by his ability to work in the grand style.

50.

I am looking for an animal that will dance after me, and that will love me, just a tiny little bit…

51.

Draft.

1.

The 'real' world and the world we see.

2.

The philosopher as a type of decline

3.

The *religious* person as a type of decline

4.

The '*good*' person as a type of decline

5.

The *push in the other direction*: art!

6.

What is pagan in religion.

7.

Science against philosophy.

8.

Politicians against the priest — against pulling people *out* of their instincts, against making them feel *not* at home. (The people, the fatherland, woman — all the forces that hold things together and pull them toward a center, against 'being *not* at home')

9.

A critique of the *present*: where does it belong?

10.

Nihilism (belief in nothing) and its *opposite*: the

followers of the 'return'

11.

The will to power as life: the high point of history's *awareness of itself* (and this awareness is what causes the *sick* form of the modern world…)

12.

The will to power: as discipline.

52.

The people of decline, seen as the *excrement* of society

nothing could be unhealthier than using them as food —

53.

A theory of exhaustion:

vice

the mentally ill (or, if you like, the artists…

the criminals

the anarchists

these are not the *oppressed* races; they are the waste thrown off by society so far, from every class…

Once we see that all our social classes are soaked through with these elements, we understand that *modern society* is not a 'society' at all, not a 'body', but a sick heap of outcasts lumped together

— a society that no longer has the strength to *get rid of its waste*

How far, because people have lived crowded together for centuries, the *sickness* goes much deeper:

modern virtue

modern intellect and spirit

our science

as forms of illness

54.

Error is the most expensive luxury a human being can allow himself. And if the error is about the body and how it works, then it becomes deadly. So what has humanity paid the most for so far, and been punished worst for? For its 'truths'. Because every single one of them was an error about the body and how life works…

55.

Worked out in terms of the body, the 'Critique of Pure Reason' is already idiocy in its early form, before it is even born. And Spinoza's system is a description of how the wasting disease of tuberculosis looks from the inside.

56.

Here is my claim, squeezed into a formula that smells old-fashioned — of Christianity, of medieval church philosophy, and of other heavy musky perfume: in the idea of 'God as spirit', God as perfection is *denied*…

57.

That thing has no children; it hardly has any senses.

58.

To the spider, the spider is the most perfect being. To the metaphysician, the thinker about what lies beyond the world, God is a metaphysician: that is, he spins webs — he spins out dreamy fancies…

59.

Ordinary people believe in made-up 'truths' of doubtful origin —

60.

Women, gold, jewels, virtue, purity, knowledge, a piece of good advice — in short, everything that is useful and beautiful — you may take, no matter where it comes from.

Through his respect for his mother, the disciple first sheds his earthly shell, his body. Through his respect for his father, he sheds that even finer form that wraps around him in the air. Through his respect for his teacher, he becomes lighter still, purer still, and rises up to the home of the god Brahma.

Let him never neglect — in the silence of the forest, or at the edge of clear springs, or in the deep, deep midnight — the prayer whose endless meaning is held in the single syllable 'Om'

Once they have finished their religious studies, the young Brahmins, the young warriors and the young merchants may join the ranks of fathers of families. The 'twice-born' man should then take his staff and set out to look for a wife from his own caste, one who shines through her good qualities and follows all the rules.

Let him beware of joining himself to a woman from a family that does not carry out its religious duty, or in which there are more daughters than sons, or in which some members have deformities, or tuberculosis, indigestion, piles and the like.

Let him run from such a family, however great its power, its name or its wealth may be.

Let him look for a woman with a beautiful figure, whose name is pleasant to say, who walks with the swaying step of a young elephant, with silky soft hair, a gentle voice and small, even teeth; a woman whose body seems covered with a light, soft down

A beautiful woman is the joy of a house. She holds on to her husband's love and gives him well-formed children

Let him beware of marrying a girl who has no brother, or whose father is unknown.

For a Brahmin who joins himself to a Sudra woman (from the servant caste) and has a son by her, there is no way at all on earth to make up for it.

61.

Wilhelm von Humboldt, the noble airhead

62.

'Each and all, in endless renewal and scattering, destroy themselves.'

Goethe.

63.

Friends of the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche will be glad to hear that last winter the brilliant Dane Dr. Georg Brandes gave a long series of lectures on this philosopher at the University of Copenhagen. The speaker, whose skill at explaining difficult webs of ideas needed no further proof, managed to stir up lively interest among an audience of more than 300 people for the new and daring way of thinking of the German philosopher. In the end, the lectures closed with a brilliant ovation in honor of the speaker and his subject.

64.

We Immoralists (Enemies of Morality)

Among Artists

A Critique of Free-Thinking

The Skeptic Speaks.

65.

Wagner's 'Mastersingers' glorifies Germany's genius, a genius that has learned nothing — except what it learned from the little birds. Genius here is understood as 'the noble [—]', and on top of that as a 'knight'

66.

For the *Preface*.

What is the only thing that can make us well again? *The sight of something perfect*. I let my eye wander about, drunk with delight: haven't we come splendidly far?

67.

Wagner's style has infected his followers too: the German written by Wagner's fans is the most flowery nonsense written since Schelling's. As a writer, Wagner himself still belongs to that very movement that Schopenhauer poured out his anger against. And the joke reaches its peak when Wagner puts himself forward as the 'savior of the German language' against the Jews. To show the taste of these followers, I will allow myself a single example. The King of Bavaria, who was a well-known lover of boys, once said to Wagner: 'So you don't like women either? They are so boring…' Nohl (the author of a 'Life of Wagner' translated into six languages) finds this opinion 'youthfully embracing'

68.

A Critic

of the Modern Soul.

69.

How does it happen, in the end, that Parsifal has a son, the famous Lohengrin? Could this be the first case of the immaculate — — —

70.

What is this about?

the religious misunderstanding.

the moral misunderstanding.

the philosophical misunderstanding.

the misunderstanding about art and beauty.

71.

Where Values Come From.

I

the made-up world

The Made-Up World

Philosophy as Decline

Thoughts on Christianity

II

the 'real' world

The Realities Behind Morality.

On the Body's Role in Art.

Why Truth?

III

A Critique of Modern Times.

The Eternal Return (Everything Happening Again Forever).

From the Seventh Loneliness.

72.

1.

Values in conflict: pessimism, nihilism (belief in nothing), doubt

2.

A critique of philosophy

3.

A critique of religion

4.

A critique of morality.

5.

The made-up world

6.

Why truth?

7.

On the body's role in art.

8.

The problem of being modern.

9.

The eternal return (everything happening again forever).

10.

From the seventh solitude.

73.

On the body's role in art

The problem of Socrates

Morality:

Taming or *breeding*: *the real things behind morality.*

The fight with the passions, and how they are turned into something of the mind and spirit.

Morality as part of nature, and turning against nature.

Our times and the people living in them.

From the seventh solitude.

"*Why truth?*"

The will to truth.

The psychology of philosophers

On the will to truth.

Civilization and culture: two opposing forces.

74.

X: painfully thoughtful

1.

Bizet's music — the philosopher

ironic

2.

The South, cheerfulness, Moorish dance, love

strange and interesting

3.

the "rescuer" — Schopenhauer

ironic

4.

the "Ring", Schopenhauer as Wagner's rescuer

strange and interesting

5.

the man in decline — *fierce and angry*!

fierce and angry!

6.

joking: "sensing", "knocking over", "lifting up"

ironic

7.

"hysteria", "style", the little treasures

strange and interesting

8.

"crushing effect", "the Victor Hugo of *language*"

"Talma" (the famous French actor), "alla genovese" (in the Genoese style)

praising, and quick

9.

"plot", "Edda" (the old Norse poems), "eternal meaning", "Madame Bovary", "no child"

ironic

10.

"literature", "idea", "Hegel", "German young man" — what is it that we *miss*?

ironic, strange and interesting

11.

praising, strong, factual: "the actor, performer"

strong, *paying tribute*

12.

three formulas

fierce and angry

on point 10: Wagner is dark, tangled, wrapped in seven layers of skin

8: this stays serious, even with Wagner's "counterpoint" (his weaving together of several melodies)

75.

Here are two formulas that help me understand the Wagner phenomenon. The first one goes like this:

Wagner's principles and methods can all be traced back to states of bodily distress. They are an expression of those states. In other words, his music is "hysteria" turned into music.

The second one goes like this:

The harmful effect of Wagner's art *proves* that it is deeply weak and frail at its living core, that it is *rotten*. What is perfect makes you healthy; what is sick makes you sick. Wagner puts his listeners into states of bodily distress: uneven breathing, upset blood flow, extreme nervous excitement followed by a sudden collapse into a kind of coma. These very states are a *disproof* of his art.

These two formulas simply draw the conclusion from a general rule, which for me is the foundation of all thinking about art and beauty. The rule is this: artistic values rest on biological values, and the pleasant feelings we get from art are, at bottom, pleasant feelings of the body and of life.

76.

There are passages where you do *not* hear passion. Instead you hear the lashes of the whip that Wagner, with insulting cruelty, wastes on his poor old horse Pegasus, the winged horse of poetry.

the *lashes of the whip* with which Wagner mistreats poor Pegasus (Act 2 of Tristan

the *poverty*: how stingy he is with ideas — a *clever* kind of poverty, but still *boring*…

the *thoughts* are missing, just as with Victor Hugo: everything is posing, — — —

77.

1.

the actor, performer

2.

the *rotting* of music —

music being led *from the outside, on a little leash*

— "it means something" —

bringing every tiny detail to life, to an extreme

a constant *change* of viewpoint

"the grand style" — decline, the powers that *hold things together* growing *poor*. — No sense of key — no good rhythm and balance ("dance") — no ability to *build* a whole ("drama") — tools for *bullying* the listener

the "fixed idea" (or the leitmotif, the tune that keeps coming back)

3.

how *harmful* this music is

the miracle

the personal quirk

4.

how much the *subject matter* is worth

his education, "style", "Hegel-talk"

5.

France — Germany

6.

The rise of the *histrio,* the play-actor

7.

the person in decline: extreme touchiness —

no sense of key

no good rhythm and balance

unable to build a whole

overdoing the details

a restless, shifting viewpoint.

an unsteady character: switching from one person to another

no pride

wild excess and *exhaustion*

poverty, cleverly hidden

as music

as a "*mythical* explanation"

8.

"How can you lose your liking for this person in decline?"

the *actor, performer*

The kind of effect he has. The history of that effect.

Music as stage speechmaking. Victor Hugo.

the "dramatist"

9.

the *harmful* one:

1. for the body

irrational

2. for the mind (the "young men"

miracle

3. leaning toward "pity"

symbolism

10.

the *art of nihilism (belief in nothing)*:

Schopenhauer's idea of what tragedy is aiming at

11.

The rise of the actor, performer

12.

Three demands

78.

Tristan and Isolde, if you truly live through it along with them, is almost a wild excess.

Really, you cannot put this choice of conscience to young women seriously enough: either Wagner or children.

79.

Wagner never learned to walk. He falls, he stumbles, he beats poor Pegasus, the winged horse of poetry, with a whip. Nothing but fake passion, nothing but fake counterpoint. Wagner is *incapable* of any style at all. —

artificial, glued together, fake, a shoddy job, a monster, cardboard.

80.

The Case of Wagner.

A Problem for Music-Makers

by

F. N.

Under this title my publishing house is bringing out a brilliant pamphlet against Wagner, which friends and enemies alike will argue about in the liveliest way. Professor Nietzsche, whom everyone will agree is the deepest expert on the Bayreuth movement, here grabs the *problem of values* hidden inside that movement by the horns; he proves *that* it has horns. The case against Wagner made in this work is not just about beauty and art: above all it is about the body and health. Nietzsche sees Wagner as an illness, as a public danger.

81.

I have given people the deepest book they own, the Zarathustra. It is a book that marks a person out so much that anyone who can say "I

have understood six sentences of it, that is, *lived* them" belongs to a higher class of human beings… But how you have to pay for that! pay it off! It almost ruins your character… The gap has grown too wide…

82.

modern ideas as false.

"freedom"

"equal rights"

"humanity"

"pity"

"genius"

the democratic misunderstanding (seeing genius as a product of surroundings, of the spirit of the times)

the pessimistic misunderstanding (seeing it as *poorer* life, as the "will" breaking away)

the misunderstanding that comes from decline (nervous illness)

"the people"

"race"

"the nation"

"democracy"

"tolerance"

"surroundings"

"usefulness as the highest goal"

"civilization"

"women's liberation"

"education for the masses"

"progress"

"sociology"

83.

Why false values are necessary.

You can disprove a judgment by showing what conditions produced it: but that does not get rid of the need to hold it. *False values* cannot be wiped out with reasons, any more than the warped vision in a sick person's eye can. You have to understand why they need *to exist*: they are a *result* of causes that have nothing to do with reasons

84.

If, "with Christ and Moses", you remove natural cause and effect from the world, you need a cause that *goes against nature*: and all the rest of the pious hypocrisy follows from there.

85.

The psychology of error.

1)

Mixing up cause and effect

2)

Mixing up truth with the effect of what people believe is true.

3)

Mixing up being aware of something with causing it

Morality as error.

Religion as error.

Metaphysics as error.

Modern ideas as errors.

86.

The Will to Power. An attempt at a rethinking of all values.

I.

The psychology of error.

1)

Mixing up cause and effect

2)

Mixing up truth with what people believe is true

3)

Mixing up being aware of something with causing it

4)

Mixing up logic with the basic rule of what is real

II.

False values.

1)

2)

3)

4)

Morality as false

Religion as false

Metaphysics as false

modern ideas as false

all caused by the *four* kinds of error.

III.

The test of truth.

1)

the will to power

2)

The signs of decline

3)

On art and the body

4)

on politics and the body

IV.

The fight between false and true values.

1)

Why a movement in two directions is necessary

2)

Why a movement in two directions is useful

3)

the weak

4)

the strong.

16 chapters: 37 pages each. — 16 chapters: 35 pages each.

The test of truth.

The will to power, as the will to live — the will of rising life.

The great errors as a result of decline.

On art and the body.

The signs of decline.

The fight of values

Why a movement in two directions is useful.

Why it is necessary.

The weak.

The strong.

87.

You should not mix up Christianity with that one root its name reminds us of. The *other* roots it grew from have been far more powerful and more important than its core. It is an abuse like no other when such horrible, rotten, misshapen growths, called the "Christian church", "Christian faith" and "Christian life", sign themselves with that holy name. What did Christ *say no to?* — Everything that is called Christian today.

88.

The worst thing is that everything cuts too deep into my heart: almost every year has brought me three or four things, unimportant in themselves, that nearly destroyed me.

Not that I blame anyone for this. Healthy people simply have no idea when they are wounding someone to death, or what will make him ill for a couple of months.

89.

The *modern* artist, whose body works much like that of a hysterical person, also has a character shaped by this sickness. The hysterical person is false: he lies for the pleasure of lying, and he is admirable in every art of pretending — unless his sick vanity plays a trick on him. This vanity is like a fever that never stops. It needs drugs to dull it, and it will not shy away from any self-deception or any farce that promises a moment of relief. Being *unable* to feel pride, and constantly needing revenge for a deep-rooted contempt for oneself — that is almost the definition of this kind of vanity. His nervous system gets excited in an absurd way. It turns every experience into a crisis and drags "drama" into the smallest accidents of life. This takes away everything predictable about him: he is no longer one person, at most a meeting place of persons, and first this one, then that one bursts out of him with shameless confidence. That is exactly why he is great as an actor, a performer: all these poor people without a will of their own, whom doctors study up close, amaze everyone with their skill at mimicking, at transforming themselves, at stepping into almost any character they are *asked* to play.

Notebook 17: May–June 1888

1.

Chapter One.

The idea of the movement of nihilism (belief in nothing) as a sign of decline.

— decline everywhere

Chapter Two.

the typical ways decline shows itself

1)

people choose whatever makes them tired and worn out faster

2)

people don't know how to resist

3)

people mix up cause and effect

4)

people long for a life without pain

(72):

in what way "hedonism", the idea that pleasure is the highest goal, is also a type that is going downhill

Chapter Three.

5)

the "real world": the idea of reality as dreamed up by people who suffer (46), first notebook

(72):

the opposite kind of nature, the Dionysian (wild, life-loving) values: (72) the tragic age

6)

the way nihilism (belief in nothing) fakes all good things

(59)

(108) (109) Love

the "mind without a will"

the genius

the art of the "person free of will"

7)

the inability to have power, powerlessness:

its sneaky tricks (98)

2.

A.

On how those who give orders have become rotten.

B.

What the highest values so far really mean.

C.

Where the highest values so far come from.

D.

Why the opposite values lost out

E.

Modern times as a time when values are unclear and two-faced

F.

— — —

3.

[…] in the book, these are looked at only as different kinds of lying. With their help, people come to believe in life. "Life ought to make us trust it: put that way, the task is enormous. To manage it, a human being has to be a liar by nature. More than anything else, he has to be an artist. And he is one. Metaphysics, religion, morality, science — all of these are just children of his will to make art, to lie, to run away from the "truth", to deny the "truth". The very ability that lets him force reality into shape by lying — this artist's ability, the human ability above all others — he shares with everything that exists. After all, he himself is a piece of reality, of truth, of nature. So how could he not also be a piece of a genius for lying!…

That the true nature of existence should be misunderstood — that is the deepest and highest secret aim behind everything we call virtue, science, religious devotion, and being an artist. Never seeing many things, seeing many things wrongly, adding many things that aren't there: oh, how clever we still are in the very moments when we are furthest from thinking ourselves clever! Love, enthusiasm, "God" — all of them are fine, subtle forms of the ultimate self-deception, all of them are temptations to live, all of them are faith in life! In the moments when a person has been fooled, when he has outsmarted himself, when he believes in life: oh, how something swells up inside

him then! What delight! What a feeling of power! How much of an artist's triumph there is in that feeling of power!… Once again, man has become master over the "raw material" — master over the truth!… And whenever a person is happy, he is always the same in his happiness: he is happy as an artist, he enjoys himself as power, he enjoys the lie as his own power…

2.

Art, and nothing but art! Art is the great thing that makes life possible, the great temptation to live, the great thing that drives life on.

Art as the only force strong enough to fight back against every will to say no to life. Art as the thing that is, above all else, against Christianity, against Buddhism, against nihilism (belief in nothing).

Art as the rescue of the one who seeks knowledge — the one who sees, and wants to see, how terrible and questionable existence is: the person who understands life as tragic.

Art as the rescue of the one who acts — the one who does not just see how terrible and questionable existence is, but lives it and wants to live it: the tragic, warrior-like person, the hero.

Art as the rescue of the one who suffers — as a road to states where suffering is wanted, made beautiful, made godlike, where suffering becomes a kind of great delight.

3.

You can see that in this book pessimism — or, to say it more plainly, nihilism (belief in nothing) — counts as the truth. But truth does not count as the highest measure of value, and even less as the highest power. The will to appearances, to illusion, to deception, to becoming and changing (that is, to deception built into the world itself) counts

here as deeper, older, and more basic than the will to truth, to reality, to fixed being. In fact, the will to truth is itself just one form of the will to illusion. In the same way, pleasure counts as older and more basic than pain. Pain comes second, as something that depends on pleasure, a side effect of the will to pleasure — the will to become, to grow, to shape things, which means the will to create. And creating always includes destroying. The book imagines a highest state of saying yes to existence, a state from which even the greatest pain cannot be taken away: the tragic, Dionysian (wild, life-loving) state.

4.

In this way, this book is actually against pessimism. That is, it teaches something stronger than pessimism, something more "godlike" than truth. It seems that no one would argue more seriously than the author of this book for a radical rejection of life — for actually doing "no", even more than just saying no to life. But he knows — he has lived through it, perhaps he has lived through nothing else! — that art is worth more than truth.

In the preface, where Richard Wagner is invited as if to a conversation between two people, this statement of belief appears, this gospel for artists: "art as the true task of life, art as life's deepest, metaphysical activity…"

5.

— — —

4.

On the

History of the Idea of God.

1.

A people that still believes in itself still has its own god, too. In that god it honors the conditions that keep it on top. It takes its joy in itself and its feeling of power and projects them onto a being that it can *thank* for them. Under these conditions, religion is a way of saying thank you. A god like this has to be able to help and to harm. He has to be able to be both friend and enemy. It never occurs to these strong, down-to-earth people to do something so unnatural as to cut a god down, to castrate him, until he is only a god *of goodness*. What good is a people that cannot be frightening? What good is a god who knows nothing of anger, revenge, envy and violence, and maybe not even the dangerous burning passion to destroy? But when a people is falling apart, things change. When it feels its faith in its future, in its freedom and its strength, slipping away; when it starts to see giving in as the most useful thing, and sees the virtues of conquered people as what it needs to survive: then, of course, its god changes too. He becomes a timid creature who keeps his head down, fearful and modest. He recommends 'peace of the soul', no more hating, going easy on others, and even love for friend and enemy alike. He crawls back into the cave of private virtue and becomes the god of the little people. He no longer stands for the aggressive, power-hungry soul of a people, its *will to power*…

2.

Wherever this will, the will to power, goes into decline, there is decline of life every time. The god of decline, cut off from his most manly parts and virtues, now becomes a god of the 'good'. His worship is called 'virtue', and his followers are 'the good and the just'. You can see at what moments it first becomes possible to have two opposing gods, a good one and an evil one. The same instinct that makes

conquered people shrink their own god down to 'goodness itself' also makes them strike out every good quality from the god of the people who conquered them. They take revenge on their masters by turning their masters' god into a *devil*.

3.

How can anyone, with the simple-mindedness of the clever writer Renan, call it *progress* that the idea of God developed from the God of Israel into a god who is the sum of everything good? As if Renan had any right to be simple-minded!… The opposite is obvious. When everything a strong, blossoming life needs is removed from the idea of God; when, step by step, God becomes a symbol of help for everything tired, worn out and merely vegetating; when he becomes the god of sinners, the god of the sick, the Savior, the Rescuer above all others: what does all of that tell us? Sure, his kingdom has grown bigger. (But did he himself have to grow bigger because of that?…) Once he had only his own people, his 'chosen ones'. Every people, at its peak, thinks it is chosen. Then he went traveling and never sat still anywhere again, until at last he became a citizen of the world and won 'the great masses' over to his side. But the god of 'the great masses' is still a god of back corners: the god of every sick corner and every unhealthy neighborhood in the whole world… His world empire is an underworld empire, a basement full of hidden misery… And he himself is so weak, so sick!… The proof: even the weakest of the weak, the metaphysicians and the scholastics, those philosophers and theologians of abstract ideas, can master him. They spin their webs around him and into him until he becomes their own image, a spider. Now he spins the world out of himself. Now he becomes the eternal metaphysician. Now he becomes 'spirit', 'pure spirit'… The Christian idea of God, God as a god of the sick, God as a spider, God as spirit, is the lowest idea of God ever reached on earth. It marks the high point

of decline in the downward history of the idea of God. God has sunk into being *the contradiction of life*, instead of being its glorification and its eternal yes. In God, war is declared on life, on nature, on the will to live. God becomes the formula for every slander against life, for every lie about a 'world beyond'. In God, nothingness is made divine, and the will to nothing is declared holy!… That is how far we have come!…

Don't people know it yet? Christianity is a religion of nihilism (belief in nothing), because of its god…

4.

The young, strong races of northern Europe did not push the Christian god away. That truly does no credit to their talent for religion, not to mention their taste. They *should* have finished off such a sick, senile offspring of decline. But a curse hangs over them because they did not finish him off. They have taken sickness, contradiction and old age into all their instincts. And since then they have not *created* a single god! Almost two thousand years, and not one new god! Instead, this pitiful god of European monotonous monotheism, the dull belief in one god, still stands, as if it were justified, as if it were the final word and the highest achievement of the god-making power, the creative spirit in human beings! This mixed-up, rotting creature made of zero, abstract idea and grandpa, in which every instinct of decline has found its blessing!…

5.

And how many new gods are still possible!… Take me. In me, the religious instinct, which means the instinct to *create* gods, sometimes wants to come alive again. And how differently, how variously the divine has shown itself to me each time!… So many strange things

have already passed by me in those timeless moments that drop into life as if from the moon, moments when you simply no longer know how old you already are or how young you will still be… I would not doubt that there are many kinds of gods… There are some you cannot imagine without a certain calm happiness and lightheartedness… Maybe light feet are even part of the very idea of 'God'… Do I need to explain that a god always knows how to stay beyond everything sensible and respectable? And also, by the way, beyond good and evil? His view is *free*, to put it in Goethe's words. And to call on the authority of Zarathustra, which can never be valued enough: Zarathustra goes so far as to declare about himself, 'I would only believe in a god who knew how to *dance*'…

Let me say it again: how many new gods are still possible! Zarathustra himself, of course, is just an old atheist. Make sure you understand him properly! Zarathustra does say that he *would*; but Zarathustra *will* not…

5.

Just think what that rapture called love can do, the rapture that is still something more than love! But everyone has their own expert knowledge about that. A girl's muscle strength actually grows as soon as a man comes near her. There are instruments that can measure this. When the sexes get even closer, the way they do in dancing and other social customs, this strength increases so much that it makes real feats of strength possible. In the end you can't believe your eyes, or your stopwatch! Of course, we have to keep in mind that dancing on its own, like any very fast movement, already brings a kind of rapture to the whole system of blood vessels, nerves and muscles. So in this case we have to reckon with the combined effects of a double rapture. And how wise it sometimes is to be a little bit tipsy in the head!… There are realities that you must never admit to yourself. That is what

being a woman is for, that is what all the feminine modesty and shyness are for… These young creatures dancing over there are clearly beyond all reality. They dance only with ideals they can touch with their hands. What's more, they even see ideals sitting all around them: their mothers!… This would be a chance to quote Faust… These pretty creatures look far better when they are a little tipsy like this. Oh, how well they know it, too! They even become charming because they know it! And finally their fine clothes inspire them as well. Their dressing up is their third little rapture. They believe in their dressmaker the way they believe in God. And who would talk them out of this faith? This faith brings bliss! And admiring yourself is healthy! Admiring yourself protects you from catching a cold. Has a pretty woman who knew she was well dressed ever caught a cold? Never, not ever! I'll even suppose the case where she was hardly dressed at all…

6.

On the history of nihilism (belief in nothing).

The most general types of decline:

1)

First: people believe they are choosing a cure, but what they choose actually speeds up their exhaustion. Christianity belongs here, to name the biggest case of an instinct that grabs the wrong thing. 'Progress' belongs here too.

2)

Second: people lose the power to resist stimulation. They become ruled by whatever happens to them by chance. They make their experiences cruder and blow them up to enormous size… This is a kind of 'loss of self', a falling apart of the will. A whole type of morality

belongs here: the selfless, altruistic morality that is always talking about pity. Its core is a weak personality, one that vibrates along with everything around it and keeps trembling like an overstretched string… an extreme touchiness and oversensitivity…

3)

Third: people mix up cause and effect. They don't understand decline as something in the body. Instead they take its results to be the real cause of feeling bad. The whole of religious morality belongs here.

4)

Fourth: people long for a state where they no longer suffer. Life is actually felt to be the source of all evils. People value the unconscious, unfeeling states, like sleep or fainting, as far more worthwhile than being awake and aware. And out of this they build a whole method…

7.

This is not at all about whether this is the best or the worst world. No or Yes: that is the question here. The nihilistic instinct says No. Its mildest claim is that not existing is better than existing, that the will to nothing is worth more than the will to live. Its harshest claim is that if nothingness is the highest thing you could wish for, then this life, being its opposite, is completely worthless, and even something to be condemned…

When a thinker is driven by values like these, he will, without meaning to, try to use all the things he still instinctively values to justify a nihilistic leaning. That is Schopenhauer's great faking. He cared deeply about many things. But the spirit of nihilism wouldn't let him count these things as part of the will to live. And so we see a series of clever and bold attempts to honor art, wisdom, the beauty of nature,

religion, morality and genius as a longing for nothingness, because they seem to be hostile to life.

8.

Lately people have badly misused a word that was picked up by chance and is wrong in every way. Everyone talks about pessimism. People argue, sometimes even sensible people, about a question that supposedly must have an answer: who is right, pessimism or optimism? They haven't grasped what is plain as day: that pessimism is not a problem but a symptom. They haven't grasped that the name should be replaced with nihilism (belief in nothing). And they haven't grasped that the very question of whether not existing is better than existing is already a sickness, a sign of decline, an odd personal quirk…

The pessimistic movement is just the expression of a decline in the body. It has its two centers in the places whose skies today show the signs of decay most [the rest of the text is missing]

9.

On the Body and Art

1. Rapture as the starting condition: what causes rapture.

2. Typical signs of rapture.

3. The feeling of strength and fullness in rapture: how it makes things look ideal.

4. The real increase in strength: the real way it makes things more beautiful. Something to think about: how far our value 'beautiful' is completely centered on human beings, based on biological assumptions about growth and progress. The increase in strength, for ex-

ample, when men and women dance together. What is sick about rapture; how art can be dangerous for the body.

5. The Apollonian (calm, ordered) and the Dionysian (wild, life-loving)… basic types that are broader than our separate, specialized arts.

6. Question: where does architecture belong?

7. How artistic abilities take part in ordinary life; using them is strengthening, like a tonic. The ugly does the opposite.

8. The question of epidemics and of how things spread from person to person.

9. The problem of 'health' and 'hysteria': genius equals nervous illness.

10. Art as suggestion, as a way of communicating, as a field for inventing ways to make the mind move the body.

11. Unartistic states: objectivity, the obsession with mirroring things, neutrality. The poor, weakened will; a loss of stored-up energy, like losing capital.

12. Unartistic states: thinking only in abstractions. The poor, weakened senses.

13. Unartistic states: wasting away, becoming poor, being emptied out: the will to nothing. The Christian, the Buddhist, the nihilist. The poor, weakened body.

14. Unartistic states: odd personal quirks (those of the weak and the average). Fear of the senses, of power, of rapture (the instinct of those who lose out in life).

15. How is tragic art possible?

16. The Romantic type: two-sided and unclear. What it leads to in the end is 'naturalism'…

17. The problem of the actor, performer: the 'dishonesty', the typical power to transform oneself seen as a flaw in character… the lack of shame, the clown, the satyr, the comic singer, the Gil Blas type, the performer who plays the role of the artist…

18. Art as rapture, seen medically: forgetting. A tonic. Complete and partial impotence.

Notebook 18: July–August 1888

1.

From the War School of the Soul.

Dedicated to the brave, the cheerful, and those who hold themselves back.

I don't want to look down on the pleasant, likable virtues. But greatness of soul doesn't go together with them. In the arts too, the grand style shuts out whatever is merely pleasing.

In times of painful tension, when you are easily hurt, choose war: it toughens you up, it builds muscle.

Those who are deeply wounded have the laughter of the Olympian gods. You only have what you need.

It has been ten years now: not a single sound *reaches* me anymore — a land without rain. You need a lot of humanity left over in you so as not to die of thirst in this *drought*.

Every *faith* has the instinct to lie. It fights back against any truth that threatens its wish to own 'the truth' — it shuts its eyes, it spreads lies about the other side…

People hold a belief because it 'makes them blissful'. They won't count as true anything that doesn't 'make us blissful'. Something to be ashamed of.

2.

Theory of the *misuse of logic as a*

test of what is real. —

3.

The outcasts are on top now, with the Jews in front. In an unsteady Europe, the Jews are the strongest race, because they are ahead of the rest thanks to how long they have been developing. The way they are built as a people takes for granted a richer growth, a more dangerous path through history, and more steps along the way than any other people can show. But that is almost a formula for being superior. — A race, like any other living thing, can only grow *or* die out; there is no standing still. A race that has not died out is a race that has kept on growing. To grow means to become more complete. How long a race has lasted necessarily decides how high it has developed: the oldest *must* be the highest. — The Jews are clever in the fullest sense; meeting a Jew can be a real blessing. By the way, you don't get away with being clever for free; it easily turns other people against you. But the big advantage still stays with the clever ones. — Their cleverness keeps the Jews from going crazy in *our* way: for example, nationalist. It seems they were vaccinated too well long ago, even a little bloodily, and among every nation. So they don't easily catch *our* madness anymore, the madness of nationalism. Today they are even a cure against this latest sickness of European reason. — In modern Europe, the Jews alone have come close to the highest form of intellect and spirit: brilliant clowning. With Offenbach and with Heinrich Heine, the power of European culture has truly been outdone; the other races aren't yet free to be witty in this way. It comes close to Aristophanes, to Petronius, to Hafiz. — Without a doubt, Paris now stands for the oldest and latest culture of Europe; the Parisian wit is its very essence. Yet the most spoiled Parisians, people like the Goncourt brothers, had no problem seeing Heine as one of the three high points of Parisian wit itself. He shares that honor with the Prince de Ligne and with Galiani from Naples. — Heine had enough taste not to be able to take the Germans seriously. In return, the Germans took him

seriously, and Schumann set him to music — to Schumann's kind of music! 'You are like a flower,' sing all the refined young ladies. — Today in Germany people treat it as a crime that Heine had taste — that he *laughed*. Because the Germans themselves now take themselves desperately seriously. —

4.

I don't trust anyone who builds systems, and I stay out of their way. The urge to build a system is, at least for us thinkers, something that disgraces us, a form of our own lack of morals. — Maybe, if you take a look *behind* this book, you'll guess which system-builder I myself only barely escaped…

5.

I have given the Germans the deepest book they own, my *Zarathustra* — and with this one I give them the most independent. What? says my guilty conscience to me about this, you want to throw your pearls — before the Germans?…

6.

The price of being an artist is this: you feel what all non-artists call 'form' as the content, as the thing itself. Of course, that means you belong to an upside-down world.

7.

You shouldn't demand of yourself anything you can't do. Ask yourself: do you want to go *along* with others? Or go *ahead* of them? Or go *on your own*? — In the second case, you want to be a shepherd: and a shepherd means the thing a herd needs most of all.

8.

— 'When we, out of the instinct for living together, make rules for ourselves and forbid certain actions, then we are being sensible: we don't forbid a way of "being", or a "state of mind", but only a certain direction and use of that "being", of that "state of mind". But then along comes the preacher of virtue, the moralist, and says: "God looks into the heart! What does it matter that you hold back from certain actions? That doesn't make you any *better*!" — Our answer: we don't want to be better at all, my dear Mister Long-Ears and Goody-Goody. We are very happy with ourselves. We just don't want to harm each other, and that's why we forbid certain actions in a certain respect, namely toward ourselves. Meanwhile, those very same actions, as long as they are aimed at our enemies — at you, for example — we can't praise highly enough. We raise our children for them; we train them up to do them. If we had that "God-pleasing" extremism that your holy nonsense recommends to us, if we were fools enough to forbid not just actions but what lies behind them, our "state of mind", then we would be cutting away our own *virtues*, the very things that make up our honor and our pride. And that's not all. By getting rid of our "state of mind", we wouldn't become "better" at all — we wouldn't exist anymore, we would have gotten rid of ourselves… You are simply a nihilist (believer in nothing)…'

9.

Russian music, with a touching simplicity, brings to light the soul of the Russian peasant, of the common people. Nothing speaks more to the heart than its cheerful tunes, which are all sad tunes. I would trade the happiness of the whole West for the Russian way of being sad. — But how is it that Russia's ruling classes don't show up in its music? Is it enough to say 'wicked people have no songs'? —

10.

Where is the lowest point of European culture today, its *swamp*? — Among the Salvation Army people, the anti-Semites, the spiritualists who talk to the dead, the anarchists, and the Wagner fans of Bayreuth. In other words, among the five specialties of European *hypocritical talk*. Because all of them claim that they alone are now the 'higher human beings'…

11.

Illness is a powerful stimulant. You just have to be healthy enough for it.

12.

Great things demand that you either keep quiet about them or speak about them in a great way: great, meaning with innocence — cynically.

13.

On: *the will to truth*

Point 1. The *easier* way of thinking wins out over the harder one — as a *fixed belief*: 'simplicity is the seal of truth'. — I say: the idea that *clearness* proves something is true is completely childish…

Point 2. The teaching of *being*, of things, of nothing but fixed units, is *a hundred times easier* than the *teaching* of *becoming*, of development.

Point 3. Logic was meant as a *way to make things easier*: as a *means of expression — not* as truth… Later it *acted* as truth…

14.

The Metaphysicians

I am talking about the *greatest misfortune* of modern philosophy — about *Kant*…

Hegel: something of the Swabian trust in God, of a cow-like optimism.

Kant: a path back to the 'old game': *having that*

All

understood

15.

The Great Noon (moment of clarity).

Why 'Zarathustra'?

Morality's Great Overcoming of Itself

16.

On: *the metaphysicians*.

On the *psychology of metaphysics*.

The influence of *fearfulness*.

The things people have *feared* most, the causes of the *strongest suffering* (the hunger to rule, lust, and so on), are the things they have treated with the most hostility. They threw them out of the so-called "real" world. In this way, step by step, they *crossed out* the *passions*. They set up God as the opposite of evil, *that is*, they placed reality in the *denial of desires and passions* (which means, in fact, in *nothing at all*).

In the same way, they hated what is *unreasonable*, random and accidental, because it caused countless physical sufferings. *So* they denied

that this element existed in things as they truly are in themselves. They pictured true being as perfectly "reasonable" and "purposeful".

In the same way, they feared *change* and the fact that everything *passes away*. This fear shows a beaten-down soul, full of distrust and bad experiences. (Take the case of Spinoza. The opposite kind of person would count this very change as part of life's *charm*.)

A kind of being overflowing with strength, one that *plays*, would *welcome* exactly these things, the *passions*, the *unreasonable* and *change*, as sources of happiness. It would welcome them along with everything they bring: danger, contrast, being destroyed, and so on.

17.

Draft of the

plan for:

The Will to Power.

An attempt at

a rethinking of all values.

— *Sils Maria*

on the last Sunday of the

month of August 1888

We Hyperboreans (people from beyond the north wind). — Laying the foundation stone of the problem.

Book One:

"*What is truth?*"

Chapter One.

The psychology of error.

Chapter Two.

The value of truth and error.

Chapter Three.

The will to truth (only justified by the

value of saying yes to life)

Book Two:

Where values come from.

Chapter One.

The metaphysicians (thinkers about what lies beyond the world).

Chapter Two.

The religious people.

Chapter Three.

The 'good' people and the improvers.

Book Three:

The battle of values

Chapter One.

Thoughts on Christianity.

Chapter Two.

On the body's role in art.

Chapter Three.

On the history of European nihilism (belief in nothing).

Pastimes for a psychologist.

Book Four:

The great noon (moment of clarity).

Chapter One.

The principle of life: "ranking of people".

Chapter Two.

The two paths.

Chapter Three.

The eternal return (everything happening again forever).

Notebook 19: September 1888

1.

1.

People often ask me why I actually write my books in *German*. My answer is always the same: I love the Germans. Everyone has their own little bit of foolishness. What does it matter to me if the Germans don't read me? That just makes me try all the harder to be *fair* to them. And who knows? Maybe they'll read me the day after tomorrow.

2.

The new Germany holds a large amount of ability, some of it inherited and some of it trained into people. So it can afford to spend its piled-up treasure of strength freely, even wastefully, for a while. It is *not* a high culture that has come to power along with it, and even less a refined taste, or a noble, high-minded "beauty" in people's instincts. But it does have more *manly* virtues than any other country in Europe can show. A lot of good courage and self-respect, a lot of reliability in how people deal with each other and in sharing duties, a lot of hard work, a lot of staying power. And it has an inborn self-restraint that needs a spur to push it forward more than a brake to hold it back. I'll add that here people still obey, without obeying making them feel humiliated... And nobody looks down on his opponent...

3.

Now that I have been fair to the Germans in this way, because I love them in spite of everything, I no longer have any reason to keep my objection from them. They were once called the "nation of thinkers". *Do they still think at all today?* They no longer have time for it... German "spirit": I'm afraid that is a contradiction in terms, like saying "a square circle". They are becoming boring, maybe they already are. Big

politics swallows up the *seriousness* that belongs to all truly great things. "Germany, Germany above everything": that is an expensive principle, but *not* a philosophical one. "Are there German philosophers? Are there German poets? Are there *good* German books?" That's what people ask me abroad. I blush, but with the courage that I keep even in hopeless situations, I answer: "Yes! *Bismarck!*"... Should I admit which books people are reading now? Dahn? Ebers? Ferdinand Meyer? I have heard university professors praise this modest, cozy, middle-of-the-road Meyer at the expense of Gottfried Keller. Cursed instinct for the average!

4.

Let me allow myself one more bit of fun. I'll tell you what a little book told me when it came back to me from its first trip to Germany. The book is called *beyond good and evil*. Just between us, it was the prelude to the very work you are holding in your hands now. The little book said to me: "I know perfectly well what my fault is. I am too new, too rich, too passionate. I disturb people's sleep. There are words in me that would break even a god's heart. I am a meeting place of experiences that you can only have 6,000 feet above every human haze and smog. That's reason enough for the Germans to *understand me*..." But, I answered, my poor book, how could you throw your pearls in front of the Germans? That was a foolish thing to do! And then the book told me what had happened to it.

5.

In fact, since 1871 people in Germany have informed themselves about me all too thoroughly: this case proved it. I am *not* surprised when people don't understand my Zarathustra, and I don't hold it against them. It is a book so deep and so strange that understanding six sentences of it, which means truly *living through* them, lifts a per-

son into a higher class of mortals. But *not* to understand that "Beyond" book, that is something I almost admire... A reviewer for the National Newspaper took the book as a sign of the times, as a true and proper philosophy of the landowning aristocrats, which the conservative Cross Newspaper simply lacked the courage to express. A small light from the University of Berlin declared in the magazine "Review", clearly with his own enlightenment in mind, that the book was a case for a psychiatrist. He even quoted passages to back this up: passages that had the bad luck of actually proving something. A Hamburg paper recognized me as an old follower of Hegel. The Literary Central Paper admitted it had lost "the thread" with me (when did it ever have it?), and as proof it quoted a few words about "the South in music": as if music that doesn't fit into Leipzig ears stops being music. All the same, what I state there as a basic principle remains true: music must be made Mediterranean. A theological innocent hinted to me that I didn't care about logic at all, but only about "beautiful style": how could anyone take seriously what I myself took so little seriously? All this might still be acceptable. But I have seen cases where the "understanding" went beyond the limits of the human and came close to the animal. A Swiss editor from the paper "The Federation" could draw nothing else from studying the book except that I was proposing the abolition of all decent feelings. You can see that he really did *think* something about the words "beyond good and evil"... But even a case like this my kindness could still handle. I thanked him for it. I even hinted to him that nobody had understood me better. And he believed it... A year later the same paper treated my Zarathustra as an advanced writing exercise, with clever hints about the flaws in my style.

And I *enjoyed* all of it: why should I keep quiet about that? You aren't a hermit for nothing. The mountains are a silent neighbor. Years go by without a single word reaching you. But the sight of living things *refreshes* you. In the end you let all the little children come to you, and

you pet every kind of animal, even if it has horns. (I always address a cow as "my dear young lady": it flatters her old heart.) Only the hermit knows real, great tolerance. *Love of animals*: that is how hermits have always been recognized...

2.

Rethinking of All Values.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

3.

Thoughts for the Day After Tomorrow.

A Short Version of My Philosophy

Wisdom for the Day After Tomorrow

My Philosophy

in Short.

Something Big in Something Small.

A Philosophy

in Short.

4.

1.

We Hyperboreans (people from beyond the north wind).

2.

The Problem of Socrates.

3.

Reason in Philosophy.

4.

How the 'Real' World Finally Became a Fairy Tale

5.

Morality as What Goes Against Nature.

6.

The Four Great Mistakes.

7.

For Us — Against Us.

8.

The Idea of a Religion of Decline.

9.

Buddhism and Christianity.

10.

From My Thoughts on Art.

11.

Among Artists and Writers.

12.

Sayings and Arrows.

5.

Much in Little.

My Philosophy

in Short.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche

6.

Idle Hours

of a Psychologist.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

7.

[...] "There are words in me that could still break a god's heart. I am a meeting place of experiences that you can only have six thousand feet above all the stuffy air that surrounds human beings. That was reason

enough for the Germans to understand me…" But, I answered, my poor book, how could you throw your pearls in front of the Germans, of all people! That was a foolish thing to do! — And then the little book told me what had happened to it.

In fact, since 1871 people in Germany have informed themselves about me only too thoroughly: this case proved it. I am *not* surprised when people don't understand my Zarathustra. It is a book so far away and so beautiful that you need the blood of gods in your veins to hear its birdsong. But failing to understand that other book, the 'Beyond' — that is something I almost admire. People understand it everywhere else, best of all in France. — A reviewer for the Nationalzeitung took the book as a sign of the times. He saw it as the true, proper philosophy of the Prussian landed nobility, the kind of thinking that the conservative Kreuzzeitung only lacked the courage to say out loud. A minor light at Berlin University — clearly thinking of how brightly he himself shines — announced in the 'Rundschau' that the book was a case for a psychiatrist. He even quoted passages to show it, passages that had the bad luck of actually *proving* something. — A Hamburg newspaper saw me as an old follower of Hegel. The Literarisches Centralblatt admitted it had lost 'the thread' when it came to me (when did it ever have it?). As its reason, it quoted a few words of mine about 'the South in music': as if music that doesn't fit into the ears of people in Leipzig stopped being music! Still, what I state there as a principle remains true: music must be made Mediterranean. — A theologian, innocent as a lamb, let me know that I didn't care about logic at all, only about 'fine style': so how could anyone take seriously what I myself took so lightly? — All this can still be put up with. But I have seen cases where the 'understanding' went beyond anything human and came close to the animal. A Swiss editor from the paper 'Der Bund' could get nothing else out of that book except that I was proposing to abolish all decent feelings. You see, he really had *thought*

something when he read the words 'beyond good and evil'… But even a case like that did not defeat my kindness toward people. I thanked him for it, and I even told him that nobody had understood me better — and he believed it… A year later the same paper treated my Zarathustra, the *deepest* book humanity has, as a fancy exercise in writing style, with clever little hints about how imperfect my style was…

— And I *enjoyed* all of it: why should I keep quiet about that? You don't live as a hermit for nothing. The mountains are a silent neighbor, and years go by without a single sound reaching you. But the sight of anything alive *refreshes* you. In the end you let all the 'little children' come to you, and you still pet every kind of animal, even ones with horns. Only the hermit knows what great tolerance is. *Love of animals* — that is how hermits have always been recognized…

Sils-Maria, Upper Engadine,

early September 1888.

8.

Rethinking of All Values.

Book One.

The Antichrist.

An attempt at an attack on Christianity.

Book Two.

The Free Spirit.

An attack on philosophy as a movement of nihilism

(belief in nothing).

Book Three.

The Immoralist (enemy of morality).

An attack on the most disastrous kind of

ignorance: morality.

Book Four.

Dionysus.

The philosophy of the eternal return (everything happening again forever).

9.

The Immoralist (enemy of morality)

The psychology of the *mistakes* that morality rests on

1)

Mixing up cause and effect

2)

Made-up causes for general feelings that really come from the body

3)

The will seen as a cause, taken to be our own "free will"

4)

The idea that people chase pleasure and avoid pain ("nobody does evil on purpose")

5)

Selfishness and unselfishness (false opposites)

The false psychology of "devotion", "self-sacrifice" and "love"

The psychology of the *means* by which morality comes to rule:

the pious fraud, the lie told for a holy cause.

10.

In the history of culture, the new German Empire is, for now, a misfortune. Europe has become poorer ever since the German mind gave up on 'mind' for good. — People abroad know something about this; I wish the Germans wouldn't lie to themselves about it! People ask: Do you have a single mind worth taking seriously? Or even three-quarters of one?… That there are no German philosophers anymore is an ending of the very first rank. Nobody is so unfair as to blame the Germans when chattering nobodies misuse the word 'philosopher' — people like Mr. E. von Hartmann, the man of the 'Unconscious', or a poisonous, bitter rabble like the Berlin antisemite Mr. E. Dühring. Among Dühring's followers you won't find one decent person, and in Hartmann you won't find one decent 'mind'.

11.

The state claims the right to have a say in questions of culture and even to decide them — as if the state were not just a tool, and a very minor tool, in the service of culture!… 'A German Empire' — how many 'German Empires' would you need to add up to one Goethe!… All the great ages of culture were times when politics was poor: —

Notebook 20: Summer 1888

1.

The Iron Silence —

Five ears — and not a single sound in them!

The world went silent…

I listened with the ears of my *curiosity*.

Five times I cast my fishing line up above me,

five times I pulled up no fish —

I asked questions — but no answer swam into my net —

I listened with the ear of my *love*.

2.

You ran too fast:

only now, when you are tired,

does your happiness catch up with you.

3.

a soul covered in snow, which

a warm, melting wind is gently talking to and coaxing

4.

a sparkling, dancing stream, which

a crooked bed

of rocks has trapped:
between the black stones
its impatience shines and twitches.

5.

Someone reckless and daring —
be careful not to warn him!
Just because of the warning,
he will run into every pit and chasm there is.

6.

Chased well,
caught badly

7.

Great people and great rivers take crooked paths,
crooked, but toward *their own* goal:
that is their finest courage —
they are not afraid of winding roads.

8.

Goats, geese, and other
crusaders, and whatever else
the Holy Spirit
has ever led along

9.

Are these stilts?

Or are they the strong feet of pride?

10.

bent and broken, slavish,

starting to rot, starting to stink

11.

Among you I am always

like oil in water:

always floating on top.

12.

a drinking shop next to every shopping shop

13.

One thing we can be sure of is our death:

so why shouldn't we be cheerful?

14.

badly married

to himself, never at peace,

his own nagging dragon of a spouse

15.

the sky is in flames, the sea
spits at us

16.

the sea bares its teeth
at you.

17.

Your God, you tell me,
is a God of love?
So the bite of a guilty conscience
is a bite from God,
a bite out of love?

18.

below my mountain peak
and my ice,
still wrapped around
by every belt of love

19.

Who is beauty right for?
Not for a man:
beauty *hides* a man, —

but a hidden man is not much use.

Step out into the open, — — —

20.

you have to go back into the crowd:

in the crowd, a person is rubbed smooth and made hard.

Being alone wears you down and makes you soft…

being alone spoils you…

21.

Don't misjudge him!

It's true, he laughs

like a flash of lightning:

but afterwards

his long thunder rumbles angrily.

22.

Already he is copying himself,

already he has grown tired,

already he looks for the paths he has walked before —

and only recently he loved everything that *no one had walked yet*!

23.

My wisdom acted like the sun:

I wanted to be a light for them,

but I blinded them;
the sun of my wisdom stabbed out
the eyes of these bats,
these creatures who only live in the dark…

24.

His pity is hard,
his loving squeeze crushes you:
don't shake hands with a giant!

25.

That is how I want it now:
and ever since I have wanted it that way,
everything has gone just as I wish —
This was my final piece of cleverness:
I wanted the very thing I had to do:
that way I forced every "must" to obey me…
since then, there has been no "must" for me…

26.

Too proud for small
advantages: wherever I see the shopkeepers'
long, grabby fingers,
I immediately feel like

taking the worse end of the deal:
that is what my picky taste demands of me.

27.

little people,
trusting, open-hearted,
but with low doors:
only low things can come in through them.

28.

Do you just want to be the monkey
who copies your God?

29.

Your big thoughts,
the ones that come from the heart,
and all your little ones
— they come from the head —
aren't they all *badly* thought out?

30.

Be careful,
don't be the drummer
who bangs out the news of your own fate!
Stay out of the way

of all the boom-boom noise of fame!

31.

Do you want to catch them?
Talk to them
as if they were lost sheep:
"Your path, oh, your path —
you have lost it!"
They will follow anyone
who flatters them like that.
"What? We had a path?"
they say quietly to themselves.
"It really seems we have a path!"

32.

Don't be angry with me for sleeping:
I was only tired, I was not dead.
My voice sounded nasty;
but it was only snoring and heavy breathing,
the song of a tired man:
not a welcome to death,
not the grave calling me in.

33.

clumsy and helpless like a corpse,

dead already while still alive, buried

34.

reach out your hand for small chance events,

be sweet to whatever comes uninvited:

You shouldn't be prickly toward your fate,

unless you happen to be a hedgehog.

35.

Are you rising,

is it true that you are rising,

you higher people?

Aren't you — forgive me for saying it —

like a ball

that is *pushed* up into the air

— by the lowest part of yourselves?…

Aren't you *running away* from yourselves, you who are climbing?…

36.

with their ambition strangled:

among people like that, I feel like

being the very last —

37.

to the murderer of God,
to the one who leads the purest astray,
to the friend of evil?

38.

There he stands, upright and righteous,
with more sense of what is right
in his left-most little toe
than I have in my whole head:
a monster of virtue,
wrapped in a white cloak

39.

But what good is it! His heart
is narrow, and all his mind
is trapped and squeezed
inside this narrow cage.

40.

You stiff wise men,
for me everything has become play

41.

Do I love you?…

I love you the way a rider loves his horse:

because it carries him to where he wants to go.

42.

narrow souls,

shopkeeper souls!

When the money jumps into the cash box,

the soul always jumps in with it!

43.

You can't stand it any longer,

your bossy, demanding fate?

Love it — you have no other choice!

44.

The will is what rescues us.

Someone who has nothing to do

gets troubled by a mere nothing.

45.

Being alone

does not plant seeds: it ripens what is already there…

And on top of that, you must have the sun as your friend.

46.

Throw what weighs you down into the depths!

Human, forget! Human, forget!

The art of forgetting is godlike!

If you want to fly,

if you want to be at home up high,

throw your heaviest burden into the sea!

Here is the sea — throw yourself into the sea!

The art of forgetting is godlike!

47.

The Witch.

We thought badly of each other?…

We were too far apart.

But now, in this tiniest of huts, tied down to one and the same fate,

how could we still be enemies?

You simply have to love each other when you can't run away from each other.

48.

Truth —

a woman, nothing better:

sly and tricky in her modesty:

the thing she would like most,

she pretends not to know about,

she covers her face with her fingers…

Who does she give in to? Only to force! —

So use force,

be hard, you wisest ones!

You have to force her,

this bashful truth…

To make her happy

she needs to be forced —

— she is a woman, nothing better…

49.

Oh, that you believed

you had to look down on things

when all you did was give them up!…

50.

Evening hour,

when even the ice

on my mountain peaks glows!

51.

Boat Trip — Fame.

You waves?

You little women? You strange creatures,

are you angry with me?

Are you roaring up in rage?

With my oar I hit

your foolishness on the head.

This little boat —

you yourselves will still carry it to immortality!

52.

Something like that may be impossible to disprove:

but does that alone make it true?

Oh, you innocent, naive people!

53.

I am at home up high,

I don't long for the heights.

I don't lift my eyes upward;

I am someone who looks down,

someone who has to give blessings:

everyone who blesses looks down…

54.

Already he is getting grumpy,

he sticks out

his elbows, sharp and jagged;

his voice turns sour,

his eyes look green, like rust on copper.

55.

a noble, high-minded eye with

velvet curtains:

rarely bright and open, —

it is an honor for the one it opens up to.

56.

Milk flows

in her soul — kind and gentle; but alas!

her mind is watery and thin, like whey

57.

a stranger's breath blows and hisses at me:

am I a mirror that gets cloudy because of it?

58.

Be gentle with things that have such delicate skin!

Why would you want to scrape the soft fuzz

off such things?

59.

Truths that no smile
has yet covered in gold;
green, bitter, impatient truths,
not yet ripe, sit all around me.

60.

Oh, all you glowing ice!
You mountain-top suns of my loneliest happiness!

61.

Slow eyes,
which rarely love:
but when they do love, something flashes up
as if from gold mines,
where a dragon guards the treasure of love…

62.

"Whoever walks your paths goes to hell?" —
Very well! The road to my hell
I will pave for myself with good sayings.

63.

Do you want to grab into thorns?
Your fingers will pay dearly for it.

Grab a dagger instead.

64.

Are you fragile?

Then watch out for *children's hands*!

The child can't live

unless it breaks something…

65.

even smoke is good for something:

that's what the Bedouin says, and I say it along with him:

you, smoke, don't you tell

the person who is out traveling

that a welcoming fireplace is close by?

66.

whoever laughs best today

also laughs last.

67.

a tired traveler,

who is greeted with harsh barking

by a dog

68.

A heart soft as milk, warm as a cow

69.

those are crabs, and I have no sympathy for them:
if you grab them, they pinch;
if you leave them alone, they walk backwards.

70.

he sat in the cage too long,
this runaway!
for too long he was afraid of a
jailer with a stick:
now he goes on his way full of fear:
everything makes him trip,
even the shadow of a stick makes him trip

71.

Beyond the north, beyond the ice, beyond today,
beyond death,
off to the side, away from everything —
our life, *our* happiness!
Not by land
and not by water

can you find the way

to us Hyperboreans (people from beyond the north wind):

that's what a wise mouth once foretold about us.

72.

oh, these poets!

there are stallions among them

that neigh in a chaste, prim way

73.

look outward! don't look back!

you sink to the bottom and are ruined

if you always keep digging down to the bottom of things to find the reasons

74.

friendly toward people and toward chance,

a patch of sunlight

on wintry hillsides

75.

my wisdom became a lightning bolt;

with a diamond sword it cut through every darkness for me

76.

take a guess, you who love riddles:

where is my virtue staying now?

it ran away from me,

it was afraid of the sneaky tricks

of my fishing hooks and nets

77.

my happiness hurts them:

for these envious grumps, my happiness turns into a shadow over them;

they shiver inside and turn green with envy as they watch —

78.

lonely days,

you want to walk on brave feet!

79.

and only when I am a burden to myself

do *you* weigh heavily on me!

80.

uncomfortable,

like every virtue

81.

a prisoner who drew the hardest lot:

working bent over,

working in a stuffy, dark mine shaft:

a scholar…

82.

where did he go? who knows?

but one thing is certain: he went down and was lost.

A star went out in bleak, empty space:

and now the space became truly *bleak*…

83.

the storm cloud is still rumbling:

but already,

glittering, silent, heavy —

Zarathustra's riches hang over the fields, like rain about to fall.

84.

this alone rescues you from all suffering —

now choose:

a quick death

or a long love.

85.

we dig for new treasures,

we new underground dwellers:

("we who are never satisfied")

people in ancient times once thought it was godless

to stir up the earth's guts in search of treasure;

now that kind of godlessness is back again:

don't you hear all the depths rumbling, like a belly with a stomachache?

86.

you're becoming absurd,

you're becoming virtuous

87.

the holy sickness:

faith

88.

are you strong?

strong like a donkey? strong like a god?

are you proud?

proud enough that you don't even know how to be ashamed of your vanity?

89.

they made their God out of nothing:

no wonder that now, for them, he has turned back into nothing —

90.

a scholar of *old* things,

a gravedigger's trade,

a life spent among coffins and sawdust

91.

in far too much of a hurry,

like leaping spider monkeys

92.

there they stand,

the heavy granite cats,

the values from the earliest times:

oh no! how do you plan to knock *those* over?

93.

their sense is nonsense,

their wit is all "yes, but" and "however" — a crazy kind of wit

94.

hardworking, cozy:

every day comes up for me bright as gold

and always the same.

95.

full of deep distrust,

overgrown with moss,

lonely,

with a will that lasts a long time,

a stranger to all greedy cravings,

a silent one

96.

he crouches, he lies in wait:

he can't even stand up straight anymore.

He has grown into his grave,

this crooked, stunted mind:

how could he ever *rise from the dead*?

97.

are you that curious?

can you see around the corner?

to see *that*, you'd need eyes in the back of your head too

98.

how cold they are, these scholars!

If only lightning would strike their food!

If only they would learn to eat fire!

99.

Scratching cats

with their paws tied up,

there they sit

and glare poison.

100.

why did he throw himself down from his height?

what tempted him?

Pity for everything low tempted him:

now he lies there, broken, useless, cold —

101.

Paper blowfly

Reader who only reads what lasts one day

102.

a wolf himself spoke up for me

and said: "you howl even better than we wolves do"

103.

You saw blacker and worse things than any prophet ever did:

no wise man has ever gone all the way through the pleasures of hell before.

104.

you wrapped new nights around yourself,

your lion's foot invented new deserts

105.

against this beauty made of stone

my hot heart cools down

106.

by a new happiness

tortured

107.

far out, into the sea of the future,

I cast my fishing line over my head

108.

Dig, worm!

109.

I am someone people swear oaths to:

swear this to me!

110.

it wasn't that you knocked down the idol:

that you knocked down the idol-worshipper inside yourself —

that was your courage

111.

my happiness from the far side!

whatever is happiness to me today

throws shadows in its own light

112.

to be guilty of the greatest guilt,

— and all the virtues should still

kneel down in front of my guilt —

113.

fooling people —

in war, that is everything.

The fox's skin:

it is my secret shirt of armor

114.

Fame

not recognized too early:

someone who has *saved up* his reputation

115.

for such ambition,

isn't this earth too small?

116.

is cunning better than force?

117.

I gave everything away,
everything I owned:
nothing is left to me anymore
except you, great hope!

118.

"you win at nothing without anger"

119.

wherever there is danger,
I am right there,
there I spring up out of the ground

120.

every general says this:
"give neither the winner
nor the loser any rest!"

121.

the great hour is coming,

the danger of all dangers:

my soul grows quiet…

122.

who could there be that could give you the right?

So *take* the right for yourself!

123.

not from his sins and his great foolishness:

it was from his perfection that I suffered, back when I

suffered most from human beings

124.

Wreckage of stars:

out of this wreckage I build my world

125.

by this thought

I pull the whole future along behind me

126.

what's happening? is the sea going down?

No, my land is growing!

a new burning heat is pushing it up!

127.

a thought,
still hot and liquid right now, like lava:
but all lava builds
a fortress around itself,
and every thought in the end crushes
itself under "laws"

128.

when no new voice was speaking anymore,
you took old words and made them into
a law:
wherever life *freezes stiff*, law piles up high.

129.

this is how I began:
I unlearned feeling sorry for *myself*!

130.

your false love
for the past,
a gravedigger's love —
it is a robbery of life;
you steal it from the future —

131.

the worst objection,

I hid it from you — life gets boring:

throw it away, so that it tastes good to you again!

132.

this cheerful depth!

What used to be called a star

has turned into a mere spot.

133.

this highest obstacle,

this thought of all thoughts —

who created it for himself!

Life itself created

its own highest obstacle:

now it leaps right over its own thought

134.

Dreamers and twilight creatures,

and everything else

that, between evening and night,

creeps, flies, and stands around on lame legs.

135.

they chew pebbles,

they lie flat on their bellies

in front of little round things;

they worship anything that doesn't fall over —

these last servants of God!

Believers!

136.

whatever you don't have

but do need,

you should just take for yourself:

that's how I took a clear conscience for myself.

137.

secretly burned,

not for his faith,

but rather because, for any faith at all,

he could no longer find the courage

138.

whatever lives around you

soon moves in and lives inside you:

wherever you sit for a long time,

habits grow.

139.

dry riverbeds,

dried-out, sandy souls

140.

stubborn minds,

refined, petty

141.

their coldness

makes my memory freeze up?

Did I ever really feel this heart

glowing and beating inside me?…

142.

(At night, under a starry sky)

oh, this noise that is silent as death!

143.

on a wide, slow staircase

to climb up to your happiness

144.

by earthly lights,

by the reflected glow of other people's happiness,

lit up ash-gray:

a creature that creeps around by moonlight and at night

145.

"love your enemy,

let the robber rob you":

the woman hears it and — does it

146.

in the twelve stars of my virtue: it has all the seasons

147.

our hunt for truth —

is it a hunt for happiness?

148.

You only stay good if you forget.

Children who remember their punishments and scoldings

turn sly and sneaky —

149.

The dawn,

with a cheeky kind of innocence,

saw it and disappeared.

Storm clouds came after her.

150.

restless, like horses:
doesn't our own shadow sway
up and down?
someone should lead us into the sun,
toward the sun —

151.

Truths for our feet,
truths you can dance to

152.

Scary ghosts,
tragic, twisted faces,
moral gargling noises

153.

Storm clouds — who cares about you!
For us, the free, airy, cheerful spirits

154.

are you women,
that you want to suffer

from the very thing you love?

155.

whispered into the ears of the lazybones:
"Whoever has nothing to do
gets troubled by a nothing."

156.

When the lonely one
is struck by the great fear,
when he runs and runs
and doesn't even know where to?
when storms roar behind him,
when the lightning testifies against him,
when his cave, full of ghosts,
makes him afraid —

157.

I am only a maker of words:
what do words matter!
what do I matter!

158.

far too soon
I am laughing again:

an enemy has

little to make up for with me

159.

Under a cloudy sky,

when you shoot arrows

and deadly thoughts

at your enemy

160.

like the strokes of a bell that have lost their way

in the forest

161.

To the brave, to the cheerful,

to those who hold themselves back,

I sing this song.

162.

War Songs of the Soul.

The Victorious One

From the Seventh Loneliness.

163.

The Road to Greatness

Songs

of Zarathustra

164.

The Grave of God.

165.

The Songs

of Zarathustra.

Part One:

The Way of Greatness

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

166.

The Songs of Zarathustra.

Part One:

On the Poverty of the Richest One

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

167.

The Eternal Return (everything happening again forever).

Zarathustra's

Dances and Parades.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche

168.

The Songs

of Zarathustra

Part One:

The Road to Greatness

Notebook 21: Autumn 1888

1.

Teichmüller

The Greek Skeptics

Spir

August Müller, Islam

2.

In the *evening*, go to the Café *Livorno*.

From 3 to 5, go to the Café *Florio*.

Do *not* go to Roma's.

Do *not* go to Löscher's.

Do *not* put on glasses in the street!

Do *not* buy any books!

Do *not* go into crowds!

In the evening, walk through the Valentino *Park* as far as the *castle*, then

come back into town as far as the end of the *square*

Vittorio Emanuele I, and then go to the *Café Livorno*.

At the theater, a numbered seat in the gallery:

give it a try!

3.

A *chapter* about faith

A *chapter* about Paul

the ways of making people *sick*

the ways of driving people *mad*

4.

Do *not* write any letters!

Do *not* read any books!

Take something to read along to the *café*!

Notebook!

5.

Drink *water*.

Never any strong alcohol.

From time to time, rhubarb.

In the morning, one glass of tea: let it go *cold*!

At night, warm something up!

At the theater, a numbered seat in the gallery.

Do *not* wear glasses in the street.

Do *not* go into crowds!

Do *not* go to Löscher's!

Do *not* go to Roma's!

Do *not* write any letters.

In the *evening*, warm clothes!

6.

Oh, what a blessing a Jew is among German cattle! The gentlemen who hate Jews underrate that. What actually is the difference between a Jew and an anti-Semite? The Jew knows *that* he is lying *when* he lies. The anti-Semite does not know that he is lying all the time.

7.

These days you quite often see young men from respectable families vanish into movements that are thoroughly shady. For a long time they have not known how to give their lives any meaning. In the end, having *some* meaning, any meaning at all, becomes an almost bullying need inside them. Finally, chance decides. They fall into the hands of a party that has a "meaning", even though deep down not only their taste but their very *sense of smell* rebels against it,

a party that, deep down, not just their taste but their sense of smell rebels against. The anti-Semites, for example. They join simply because the anti-Semites have a goal that is so easy to grab hold of that it is shameless: *Jewish money*…

they do not know how to give their lives any meaning, and in the end they fall into the hands of a party that has a meaning. The anti-Semites, for example, whose goal is so easy to grab hold of that it is shameless: *Jewish money*.

For example, they become anti-Semites, simply because the anti-Semites have a goal that is so easy to grab hold of that it is shameless: *Jewish money*…

Definition of the anti-Semites: Envy, resentment and powerless rage as the main theme running through their instincts. The claim to be "the

chosen ones". Complete moralizing self-deception, which allows them to talk about virtue and all the big words constantly. But here is the *typical* sign: they do not even notice *whom* they look so much like that you could mix them up. An anti-Semite is an "envious" Jew, which means the most stupid kind of Jew.

8.

I dare to hint at one more special feature of my nature, especially since it is almost *the* special feature. I have something I call my inner nostrils. Whenever I come into contact with people, the first thing that gives itself away to me is how clean they are on the inside [— — —]. And it is exactly the so-called "beautiful souls" that smell especially dirty to me. How someone stands with himself, or how someone fools himself; whether he makes a point of dealing with himself honestly and clearly; whether someone can *bear* himself or needs an "ideal"… The idealist smells bad to me…

I would like to dare to name a scholar of Jewish descent. Through a noble, high-minded coolness and clearness toward himself, which had become pure instinct in him, he always gave me a deep feeling of beauty, of *cleanliness* in my sense of the word. He never compared himself with anyone for a moment. He was never someone other than himself. He did not hide, whether people were watching or not. That takes more than being completely used to being hard and frank with yourself. It also takes great strength to resist, so that you do not change under the pressure of company, or your job, or chance events. It is just as much a sign of strength as the so-called — — —

The opposite of these *clean* types I have described is given to me, on the whole, by almost all the Germans I know. Above all by the gentlemen anti-Semites, whom I feel to be the perfect example of [—]. Bad

instincts, a ridiculous ambition, vanity, [— — —], and on top of it all the pose of "higher values", of "idealism"…

Notebook 22: September–October 1888

1.

A note in the margin of a piece of English silliness. "Don't do to other people what you wouldn't want them to do to you." People take this as wisdom. They take it as good sense. They take it as the foundation of morality, as a "golden rule." John Stuart Mill believes in it, and so does just about every Englishman… But the saying can't survive even the gentlest attack. The calculation "do nothing that you wouldn't want done to yourself" forbids actions because of their harmful results. The hidden thought behind it is that an action always gets *paid back*. So what if someone took this "principle" in hand and said: "These are exactly the actions we *must* do, so that others don't beat us to it, so that we make others unable to do them to *us*"? On the other hand, picture a man from Corsica whose honor demands a vendetta, a blood feud. He doesn't want a bullet in his body either. But the prospect of one, the likelihood of a bullet, does *not* stop him from doing what his honor demands… And in all our *decent* actions, aren't we deliberately indifferent to what comes back to us from them? Avoiding any action that would have harmful results for us would amount to a *ban* on decent actions altogether…

Still, the saying is valuable, because it gives away a *type of person*. What finds words in it is the *herd instinct*: everyone is equal, everyone treats each other as equal, as I do to you, so you do to me. Here people really do believe that actions can be *equal to one another,* and in real life that simply never happens. Not every action *can* be returned. Between real "individuals" *there is no such thing as the same action,* and so there is no such thing as "paying back" either… When I do something, the thought that anyone else could do anything like it is completely

foreign to me. It belongs to *me*… Nobody can pay me back. Whatever they did to me would always be a "*different*" action.

2.

Chapter on

Paul

the

Jewish family of the diaspora, the Jews scattered outside their homeland

the

"love"

the

"free" reshaping of Jesus to suit his purposes

entirely in the manner of Jewish priests

a)

death *for* our sin

b)

the "rescuer" cannot die

the deep hatred of *culture* and of knowledge, already Jewish (Genesis 52

the soul that "never dies"

psychology of the "dying" 18

the priest as "evil angel" 10

everything that has been *spoiled* by the Church

1) self-denial, the harsh discipline of giving up pleasures

2) fasting 66

3) the "monastery"

4) festivals

5) kind-heartedness

love, goodness, heroism 243

psychology of the first Christians

197 63

"judge not" 11

Protestant 184

the *great lie* of history 17

3.

Book 2

To prove that thinking in the way of nihilism (belief in nothing) is the *result* of believing in *morality* and in *priest-values*: if you have set your values wrongly, then once you see that they are false, the world seems to have *lost its value*…

Book 3

morality, judged by how it came about, by its methods and by its aims, is the most immoral fact in history… it *refutes itself,* because to keep its values standing it has to *practice* the opposite values…

4.

Paul: he looks for power *against* the ruling Jewish establishment, but his movement is too weak… A rethinking of what the word "Jew" means: "race" is pushed aside. But that meant denying the very *foundation*: the "martyr," the fanatic, the value of every *strong* belief…

Never admit that the *humane, charitable effects* of Christianity count in its favor…

Christianity is the *form of decay* the ancient world took when it was at its weakest and most helpless, so that the sickest and least healthy layers of society, and the sickest needs, rose to the top.

5.

So other instincts had to come to the front in order to *create* a unity, a power that could defend itself. In short, a kind of emergency was needed, like the one from which the Jews had gained their *instinct to survive*…

The persecutions of the Christians were priceless for this: sharing the danger together, and *mass conversions* as the only way to put an end to people being hunted down one by one. (So people took the idea of "conversion" as lightly as possible.)

6.

Hammer for Idols.

or

Cheerful Moments

of a Psychologist.

Hammer for Idols.

Or:

How a Psychologist Asks Questions.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

Hammer for Idols.

The Idle Hours

of a Psychologist.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

Hammer for Idols.

Or:

How a Psychologist Asks Questions.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche

Leipzig,

Published by C. G. Naumann

1889.

Twilight of the Idols.

Or:

How to Do Philosophy with a Hammer

(end of title)

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

7.

To me, explaining things in the Christian way is a sign of *deep carelessness*. Explaining your own life the way Christians in Swabia do seems to me downright indecent. You have to lack the great honesty not to notice [— — —] to interpret something, and that it is a *pathetic* little trick. When a scientific attitude doesn't guide your *conscience*, there is always a *leftover* of solid character needed, so as not to make sense of your life in a weak, cowardly, mindless, Christian way, as is still possible in backward regions, in Swabia for example. What lagged behind there was *honesty*… *Not* "intelligence": because you don't need to be sharp to see through the "swindle" that is being pulled there.

8.

A faith that leans on holy books which nobody accepts as mere books; books handed down through revelation to people who see truth as something already given, something fixed, *not* as something for which [— — —] and with enormous self-control and self-discipline; a faith that never has the will to understand its own holy books, which [— — —] is made secure by "revelation": that is its typical condition.

9.

The Germans should never be forgiven for robbing the Renaissance of its goal, of its *victory*: the victory over Christianity. The German Reformation is its *dark* curse… And three more times this disastrous people got in the way and held back the progress of culture: German philosophy, the Wars of Liberation against Napoleon, and the founding of the German Empire at the end of the nineteenth century. Nothing but great disasters for culture!

10.

Chapter 57)

the holy purpose: what Manu, the lawgiver of the Laws of Manu (ancient Indian rulebook), was thinking as he told his lie.

Chapter 58)

never admit that Christianity had any *humane, charitable* effects. It spoiled everything. The terrible *loss* that all valuable things have suffered, because seriousness was wasted on imaginary things, on *harmful* things; so that only in the *middle of this century* were questions of *food, housing* and *health* taken seriously.

Chapter 59)

the great attempt at the opposite values, and the mission of the Germans

Chapter 60. My *demands*.

1.

Stay away from people who still remain Christians, even now. Do this for reasons of cleanliness.

2.

Think about the cases where Christianity is clearly just a result and a symptom of weak nerves. In those cases, use every possible means to stop the infection from spreading out from such sources.

3.

That the Bible is a dangerous book, that people have to learn to be careful with it — that it must not simply be put into the hands of age groups who are not yet mature

4.

that priests should be seen as a kind of outcasts, and treated that way too

5.

Clean all places, all institutions, and all education of the stain left by the priest

6.

Holidays and holy 'rescuers'

7.

How we count the years

11.

I have seen cases where young men from respectable families, who for a long time could not give their lives any goal, end up disappearing into truly dirty movements — only because those movements give them a goal… Some of them, for example, even become anti-Semites…

12.

58. What we owe to Christianity

the terrible loss, because everything that has value, everything that matters most, was not taken seriously… — only now are we starting to take health, clothing, food and housing seriously… the waste of all great passion, all enthusiasm, all depth and fineness of mind

13.

On the higher human being.

Or:

Zarathustra's temptation.

Zarathustra's Temptation.

Or:

for whom pity would be a sin.

Zarathustra's Temptation.

Or:

how pity becomes a sin.

for whom pity would turn into a sin.

14.

Rethinking of All Values.

The Antichrist.

An attempt at an attack on Christianity.

The Immoralist (enemy of morality).

An attack on the most disastrous kind of

ignorance: morality.

We Who Say Yes.

An attack on philosophy as a nihilistic (believing-in-nothing)

movement.

Dionysus.

Philosophy of the eternal return (everything happening again forever).

Zarathustra's Songs

From

seven lonelinesses.

15.

Zarathustra's Temptation.

Or:

for whom pity would turn

into a sin.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

16.

The Wagner Case.

A Musician's Problem.

Twilight of the Idols. Or:

how to do philosophy with a hammer.

Zarathustra's Temptation.

Or: for whom pity would turn

into a sin.

17.

what causes our actions

the goals have been set up wrongly:

Happiness

a)

one's own

'selfish'

b)

someone else's

'unselfish'

(— The deepest lack of self-reflection is in Schopenhauer, who also

adds c) someone else's suffering and d) one's own suffering: which of course are only special cases of the idea 'one's own happiness' (a)

If happiness is the goal of an action, then dissatisfaction must come before the action: that is a pessimistic twisting of the facts. Displeasure as the motive for acting.

My theory: pleasure, displeasure, 'will' and 'goal' are completely just things that come along with an action — never its causes. All so-called 'mental' causes are made up.

What Causes Our Actions

Displeasure and pleasure as motives

the will as the cause of acting

This assumes: that everything leading up to an action happens inside our conscious awareness

that the real cause is a mental one…

that the 'soul' knows what it wants, and that the worth of an act of will depends on what the soul knows…

that the soul is free from the will, and therefore — — —

18.

Bad actions, the actions of people in decline, are marked precisely by their lack of 'selfishness' — they are not aimed at what truly benefits them in the end

The psychology of so-called unselfish actions — in truth they are very strictly steered by the instinct to keep oneself alive

With so-called selfish actions, it is the other way round:

here the guiding instinct is exactly what is missing — the deep sense of what is useful and what is harmful

All strength, health and vitality show a greater tension, a tighter pull toward the self's commanding instinct

all loosening up is decline

19.

Claims

:

:

:

there is no such thing as an unselfish action

there is no such thing as selfish acting either

Happiness is never the goal of acting, and displeasure is never its cause

(— the displeasure could be as great as you like: if the machinery were not free to move, there would still be no action.

Pleasure and displeasure are not causes; they

only set something in motion — they go along with it…

To what extent all the low, the vicious,

the brutal, the cunning and sly are merely symptoms of

degeneration

the herd instinct

An attack on feelings for others

An attack on feelings about oneself

Why truth?

20.

False conclusions that come from believing in the 'ego', the 'I'

People strive for happiness: but in this sense there is no single unit 'that does the striving'…

and what all these units strive for is not happiness at all — happiness is just something that comes along when they release their strength. What makes us act is not need but fullness, an overflow of energy that pours out when something sets it off

'displeasure' is not what activity requires first; that tension is a great stimulus…

against the pessimistic theory, as if all action came down to wanting to get rid of some dissatisfaction, as if pleasure in itself were the goal of any action at all…

21.

There are no 'selfless' actions at all.

Actions in which a person betrays his own instincts and chooses what harms him are signs of decline

(— many of the most famous so-called 'saints' are simply exposed, by their very lack of 'selfishness', as people in decline

Acts of love and of 'heroism' are so far from 'unselfish' that they are exactly the proof of a very strong and rich self

— being able to give things away is not something the 'poor' can choose… and neither is the great daring and love of adventure that belong to 'heroism'

not 'sacrificing oneself' as the goal, but pushing through goals without worrying about their results, out of high spirits and self-confidence — simply not caring about them…

22.

a)

the false idea of cause

pleasure, displeasure, will, goal, 'mind'

b)

the false unity: 'soul', 'I', 'person'

maybe even an 'immortal person'

— and with that comes a false altruism, a false putting-others-first

'I' and 'others'

(egoism — altruism)

'subject', 'object'

c)

Total contempt for the body kept people from seeing the individual person: the perfect, extremely detailed way its organized workings play together to keep it alive and to purify its kind, its species. In other words, it kept them from seeing the endless value of the individual person as the carrier of the life process, and therefore its very highest right to be selfish — just as it is completely impossible for it not to be…

In fact, everything 'unselfish' is a sign of decline.

23.

The Bible's rule 'you shall not kill' is naive compared with my rule for those in decline: 'you shall not have children!' — it is even worse than that, it is the opposite of it… The highest law of life, as Zarathustra put it, demands that we have no pity for all the rejects and garbage of life — that we destroy whatever would only be a block, a poison, a plot, a hidden underground enemy to rising life — in a word, Christianity… It is immoral in the deepest sense to say: you shall not kill…

24.

I.

II.

III.

IV.

Rescue

from

from

from

from

Christianity: the Antichrist

morality: the immoralist (enemy of morality)

'truth': the free spirit.

Nihilism (belief in nothing):

nihilism as the necessary result of Christianity, of morality, and of philosophy's idea of truth.

The signs of nihilism…

By 'freedom of the spirit' I mean something very specific: being a hundred times better than the philosophers and the other followers of 'truth' through being hard on yourself, through purity and courage, through the absolute will to say No where saying No is dangerous. I treat the philosophers so far as contemptible playboys hiding under the hood of the woman called 'Truth' — chasing her while pretending to be pious.

25.

The Immoralist (enemy of morality).

Judged by where it comes from, morality is the sum of the conditions needed to keep alive a poor kind of human being, one that is half or entirely badly made. This kind can be 'the great majority' — and that is why it is dangerous.

An attack on the 'improvers'

Judged by how it is used, morality is the main tool of the priests, who live like parasites, in their fight against the strong, against those who say yes to life. With it they win over 'the great majority' (the low, the suffering, in every class — the unlucky of every kind) — a kind of general uprising against the small number of the well-made…

An attack on the 'good'

Judged by its results, morality brings deep falseness and rot even to those exceptional classes. In the end, just to be able to put up with themselves, they can no longer be honest with themselves about any-

thing: total psychological corruption, with everything that follows from it: — — —

26.

The clever trick of my life lies in modesty — in the will and the strength to make myself small… Not to pretend to be small, but, so to speak, to forget something, to detach it from myself, to create a distance inside myself. To put it another way: in the awareness of complete freedom [— — —] the task, the will, the merciless instinct that this freedom requires…

The trick was to use the many poor, weak and painful things in my life as helpers, so that I would not be destroyed by a great task. It was to split myself in two, so to speak — and to keep the other half for friendliness, kindness toward people, patience, and openness to everything small and smallest. This is also the side where I am refined and smart about enjoying things — a good reader, a good listener… On this side I also like things that perhaps ask more for a big generous heart in kindness than for a sharper mind. For example, Petronius, also Heinrich Heine, and Offenbach with his tricks that will never die…

Almost every time I dealt with people, it gave me the idea of an animal, with humor that was not meant to be funny. But this did not exactly make me look down on them. In every case where some kind of grudge or savagery against me came out into the open, I tried to do something [— — —] to wipe away the memory of it.

27.

I have never suffered from not being honored — I find an advantage in it. On the other hand, I have experienced so much recognition and honor in my life, from my early youth onward, that I — — —

28.

The art of separating myself — of keeping things apart, of forgetting one half for years…

Getting advantages out of my illness: relief from the great strain.

Learning to take a loving kind of revenge on small things.

It would be impossible for me to explain what I see as the worst accident of my life. It would not only sound strange and contradictory — it would sound ungrateful and low.

The kind of goodwill I have received has, in many cases, left a worse impression on me than any kind of nastiness or hostility. There is so much pushiness, so little sense of keeping a proper distance, in believing that one can do good to someone. I have often counted the wish to do good under the general idea of brutality.

Why I have never suffered from being "unrecognized", from not being read.

Even when I was 45, scholars at the University of Basel, in all good nature, let me know that the literary form of my writings was the reason people did not read me, and that I ought to do it differently.

29.

I have never gotten rid of a feeling of distance, one that may in the end be physical, even toward the people closest to me [—]. I feel the distance of being different in every sense — as if I cannot be mixed with others, like something that floats on top compared to every cloudy, murky element.

My privilege, my head start over people in general, is that I have lived through a wealth of the highest and newest states of mind and feeling. With these states, trying to separate mind from soul would be

cynical. Without doubt, you have to be a philosopher, deep all the way down to [—], to step out of such a flood of light. But a true and accurate feeling, and the long tyranny of a great task, are even more necessary conditions for it.

Notebook 23: October 1888

1.

Another rule that comes from love of people. There are cases where having a child would be a crime: for people who are chronically ill, and for people with severe nervous exhaustion, the worst kind. What should be done there? You could at least try to encourage such people not to have sex, maybe with the help of the music from Wagner's opera Parsifal. Parsifal himself, that typical idiot, had more than enough reasons not to have children. The trouble is that a certain inability to "control yourself", meaning being unable *not* to react to temptations, even very small sexual ones, is one of the most common results of being worn out in body and mind. You would be making a mistake if you imagined someone like the poet Leopardi as a person who kept away from sex. The priest and the moralist are playing a losing game here. You would do better to send someone to the pharmacy. In the end, society has a *duty* to carry out here. There are few demands on society that are this urgent and this basic. Society acts as life's main representative, its chief agent. So it has to answer *to* life itself for every life that has gone wrong, and it also has to pay for it. That means it *should* prevent it. In many cases society *should* stop people from having children. To do this, it may keep the harshest forced measures ready, no matter what a person's family, rank or intelligence: taking away their freedom, and in some cases castration. The Bible's command, "You shall not kill!", is naive compared with how serious life's own command is to the people in decline: "You shall not have children!" Life itself does not accept any solidarity, any "equal rights", between the healthy parts of a body and the parts that are breaking down. The breaking-down parts must be *cut out*, or the whole body

dies. Pity for the people in decline, *equal rights* even for the badly made: that would be the deepest immorality. That would be what goes against nature, dressed up as morality!

2.

On life's good sense. Being fairly restrained about sex, being carefully and wisely cautious about erotic things, even in your thoughts, can be part of life's great good sense. This is true even for people who are richly gifted and whole. It applies especially to *artists*. It is one of the best pieces of life wisdom they have. Voices you could never suspect of prudishness have already said this: I mean the writers Stendhal, Théophile Gautier, and Flaubert too. By his very nature, an artist may have to be a sensual person: easily excited in general, open in every sense, someone who reaches out to every temptation, even to the mere hint of a temptation from far away. Even so, on average, under the pressure of his task, of his will to become a master, he is in fact a moderate person, and often even someone who stays away from sex. His strongest instinct *wants* him to be that way. It doesn't let him spend himself in this way or that. The energy you spend when you dream up a work of art and the energy you spend in the sexual act are one and the same. There is only one kind of energy. To give in *here*, to waste yourself *here*, gives an artist away. It reveals that he lacks instinct, lacks will in general. It can be a sign of decline. In any case it lowers the value of his art to a degree no one can measure. Let me take the most unpleasant example, the case of Wagner. Wagner was under the spell of an unbelievably sick sexuality, which was the curse of his life. He knew all too well what an artist loses when he loses his freedom and his *respect* for himself. He is condemned to be an actor, a performer. His art itself turns into a constant attempt to run away, a way to forget himself, to *numb* himself. And in the end this changes his art and decides what kind of art it is. Someone who is "not free"

like this needs a hashish world: strange, heavy fumes that wrap around him, every kind of exotic thing and every kind of symbolic ideal, just to get away from *his own* reality for once. He needs Wagner's music. Above all, when an artist's ideal has a sort of Catholic feel to it, that is almost proof that he despises himself, that he is stuck in a "swamp". Look at the case of Baudelaire in France, Edgar Allan Poe in America, Wagner in Germany. Do I still need to say that Wagner also owes his *success* to his sensuality? That his music talks the lowest instincts into coming over to it, to Wagner? That the holy fog of ideas about ideals, his three-eighths Catholicism, is just *one more* trick of seduction? It lets you feel the "magic" working on you while you stay unaware, innocent, *Christian*. Who would dare to say the word, the *real* word, for the burning passions in the music of Tristan? I put on gloves when I read the score of Tristan. The Wagner craze, which keeps spreading further and further, is a mild epidemic of sensuality that "doesn't know it". When it comes to Wagner's music, I think every kind of caution is called for.

3.

We Hyperboreans (people from beyond the north wind).

1.

If we are philosophers at all, we Hyperboreans (people from beyond the north wind), it seems at least that we are philosophers in a different way from how people used to be philosophers. We are not moralists at all… We can't believe our ears when we hear them talk, all these people from the past. "Here is the road to happiness!" With that, each one of them jumps at us, holding a recipe in his hand, with a holy, preachy tone coming out of his priestly mouth. "But what do we care about happiness?" we ask, quite amazed. "Here is the road to happiness," they go on, these holy, ranting devils, "and this here is virtue, the new road to happiness!"… But please, gentlemen, we beg you! What do we care about your virtue, of all things! Why do people like us go off on our own and become philosophers? Why do we become a rhinoceros, a cave bear, a ghost? Isn't it to get rid of virtue and happiness? We are, by nature, much too happy and much too virtuous not to feel a little tempted to become philosophers, which means immoralists (enemies of morality) and adventurers… We have a special curiosity about the labyrinth, the great maze. We go out of our way to meet Mr. Minotaur, the monster in the maze, about whom dangerous stories are told. What do we care about your path leading up, about your rope that leads out of the maze? About a rope that leads to happiness and virtue? That leads to you, I'm afraid… You want to rescue us with your rope? And we, we beg you with all our hearts: go and hang yourselves with it!…

2.

In the end, what else can be done! There is no other way left to bring philosophy back into honor: first you have to hang the moralists. As long as they talk about happiness and virtue, the only people they win over to philosophy are old women. Just look them in the face, all the

famous wise men of thousands of years: nothing but old women, nothing but elderly women, nothing but "Mothers," to put it in the words of Faust. "The Mothers! Mothers! It sounds so creepy." We turn philosophy into a danger. We change what the word means. We teach philosophy as an idea that puts your life at risk. How could we help it more than that? An idea will always be worth as much to humanity as it costs humanity. Nobody hesitates to sacrifice huge numbers of victims for the idea of "God," "fatherland," or "freedom." History is the great cloud of smoke rising from these kinds of sacrifices. So how could the idea of "philosophy" prove that it ranks higher than such popular values as "God," "fatherland," and "freedom"? Only by costing more, by demanding even bigger mass sacrifices… The rethinking of all values: that will be expensive, I promise you.

3.

This beginning is cheerful enough. Now I'll follow it right away with my serious side. With this book, war is declared on morality. And in fact, I deal with all the moralists first and finish them off. People already know the word I made for myself for this fight: the word immoralist (enemy of morality). People also know my formula, "beyond good and evil." I need these strong opposite ideas. I need the bright light they give off, so that I can shine it down into that deep pit of carelessness and lies that until now was called morality. The thousands of years, the nations, the first and the last, the philosophers and the old women: on this point they are all equally bad, all worthy of one another. Until now, man was the moral creature, an oddity like no other. And as a moral creature, he was more absurd, more full of lies, more vain, more careless, and more harmful to himself than even the greatest hater of mankind could ever dream. Morality is the nastiest form of the will to lie, the real witch who bewitched humanity: the thing that ruined it. What fills me with horror when I look at this is

not the mistake as a mistake. It's not the thousands of years of lacking "good will," discipline, decency, and courage in matters of the mind. It is the lack of nature. It is the horrible fact that what goes against nature itself was given the highest honors as morality, and stayed hanging over humanity as its law… To go so wrong, to this degree, not as one person, not as one nation, but as all of humanity! What does that point to? It points to this: people were taught to look down on the most basic instincts of life. They saw selfishness, which life needs most deeply in order to grow and do well, as the principle of evil. And they saw the typical goal of decline, which is having instincts that fight each other, as basically a higher value. I mean being "selfless," losing your center of gravity, "giving up your own personality," and "love of your neighbor." What am I saying! They saw it as the one true value in itself!

What? Could humanity itself be in decline? Could it always have been? What is certain is that humanity was taught only the values of decline as its highest values. The morality of giving up your self is the typical morality of decline, the perfect example of it. Here one possibility would remain open: that it is not humanity itself that is in decline, but those teachers of it!… And in fact, that is my claim: the teachers and leaders of humanity were people in decline. That is why all values were rethought in the direction of nihilism (belief in nothing), toward "the world beyond"…

4.

What, on the other hand, may an immoralist (enemy of morality) ask of himself? What task will I set myself with this book? Maybe also to "improve" humanity, only in a different way, the opposite way: namely to rescue it from morality, and above all from the moralists. To push its most dangerous kind of ignorance into its awareness, into its conscience… Bring back humanity's healthy selfishness!

4.

The Immoralist.

A. The psychology of the good person: someone in decline

or the herd animal

B. How completely harmful he is:

as a kind of parasite, living at the expense of truth and of the future

C. The cunning, ruthless scheming of the good, like Machiavelli's

their fight for power

their ways of luring people in

their cleverness in giving in and bowing down

for example

before priests

before the powerful

D. "The woman" inside the good person

"Goodness" as the subtlest cleverness of a slave: it shows consideration everywhere, and so it gets consideration back.

E. The body and biology of the good

at what point the good person shows up in families and in nations

at the same time as nervous disorders show up

The opposite type: true goodness, nobility, greatness of soul, which comes from richness, from... (unfinished) ...which does not give in order to take; which does not want to lift itself up by being kind. Giving lavishly, even wastefully, as the model of true goodness. Being rich as a person is what this needs first.

The idea of "duty": a way of giving in, a result of weakness, so that you no longer have to ask questions and make choices

the weakness of the herd animal creates a

morality very much like the one created by the weakness of those in decline:

they understand each other, they join forces…

the great religions of decline always count on support from the herd…

In itself, the herd animal has nothing sick about it; it is even priceless. But it can't lead itself, so it needs a "shepherd." The priests understand that…

the "state" is not close and private enough; it can't take charge of people's consciences

In what way does the priest make the herd animal sick?

The instinct of decline in the good person

1)

Laziness: he doesn't want to change anymore, doesn't want to learn anymore. He sits inside himself like a "beautiful soul"…

2)

Being unable to resist: for example in pity, he gives in ("easygoing," "tolerant"… "he understands everything"). "Peace on earth, and goodwill to men."

3)

He is drawn in by everything that suffers and by those life treated badly. He loves to "help." By instinct he is a conspiracy against the strong.

4)

He needs the big drugs to numb himself, like "the ideal," the "great man," the "hero." He gets carried away with wild enthusiasm…

5)

Weakness, which shows itself as fear of strong feelings, of a strong will, of saying a clear yes or no. He is pleasant and charming so that he doesn't have to be anyone's enemy, so that he doesn't have to take sides.

6)

Weakness, which gives itself away by not wanting to see, wherever resistance might become necessary ("humanity," "kindness to all")

7)

is led astray by all the great figures of decline: "the cross", "love", the "saint", *purity*. At bottom these are all ideas and people that put life in danger.

—

also the great *faking* that goes on with ideals

8)

being *corrupt* in the way one thinks

—

hatred of the truth, because it does not bring along "nice feelings"

—

hatred of truthful people, — — —

the *instinct of the good to keep itself alive*, which sacrifices the *future* of humanity to itself: at bottom it already pushes back against

politics

any *wider* point of view at all

any searching, any adventure, any feeling of not being satisfied

it *denies* goals and tasks in which it does not come first

it is *cheeky* and *arrogant*, calling itself the "highest" type, and it wants not just to have a say about everything, but to *judge* everything.

it feels superior to those who have "weaknesses": but these "weaknesses" are the *strengths* of instinct, and part of that strength is the courage not to be ashamed of them

The 'good' person as a *parasite*. He lives *at the cost*

of life:

as someone who lies reality away

as an enemy of life's great instinctive drives

as someone who enjoys a small, cozy happiness and turns down the *great* kind of happiness as *immoral*

— since he never rolls up his sleeves and does the work, and keeps causing mistakes and false hopes, he disturbs every real life. In fact he *poisons* it, through his claim that he stands for something *higher*

— because he imagines he is higher, he does not *learn*, he does not change. Instead he *takes his own side*, no matter how much misery he has caused.

5.

The Immoralist (Enemy of Morality)

1. The *type* of the 'good' person (see the page *after next*

page.)

2. the 'good' person turns himself into

a theory of what ultimately exists

a theory of the mind

a path to truth

a politics

a way of living and of raising children

3. *Result: an utterly harmful kind of human being* // harmful toward truth, toward the future of humanity // this is the reason why the important things have only been taken seriously for the last 20 years

4. *Problem: what actually is the 'good' person?*

the 'good' person as an *instinct*

first, the *weak* one: he *wants* all

people to be weak

second, the *narrow-minded* one: he *wants* all people to be narrow-minded

third, the *herd animal*, the creature with no rights of its own: it *wants* all people to be herd animals.

5. "The 'good' person" misused for *other* purposes

he fights against evil…

put to work by the *priest*, against the powerful,

against the strong and the *well-made, healthy ones*

as a tool

"liberal", "equal" rights

put to work by the revolutionary politicians, the *socialists*, people full of *resentment* against those *in charge*

on point 3: *the most harmful kind of human being*

A. He *invents* actions *that do not

exist*

the selfless ones, the holy ones

abilities that do not exist

"soul", "spirit", "free will"

beings *that do not exist*

"saints", "God", "angels"

an order in events *that does not exist*

the *moral* order of the world, with reward and punishment

— which destroys the natural chain of cause and effect

B. with these made-up things he *takes the value away* from

1)

the only actions there are, the selfish ones

2)

the body

3)

the truly *valuable* kinds of people, the *valuable*

drives

4)

all the reason there is in what happens. He blocks us from learning from it, from observing, from science, from every *step forward* that life could take through knowledge…

6.

I.

the lack of suspicion

dutiful respect

giving in to the will of God, "piety"

the "good heart", the "helping hand" — that is *enough*…

seriousness, aimed at *higher* things. Meanwhile one must not take lower areas, like the body and its well-being, too seriously

duty: one has to do what one owes, —

beyond that, one should leave everything to God —

I ask quite seriously: have I not just *described* the '*good*' person? Don't people believe that this is a *desirable* person? Wouldn't people like to be like this? Would anyone want their children to be any different? —

II. Let us look at how *the good* turn themselves into

1.

a *theory of what ultimately exists*

2.

a *theory of the mind*

3.

a *politics*

4.

a *way of living and of raising children*

5.

a method for reaching *truth*

7.

My claim is this: 'good' people are the *most harmful* kind of people. People answer me: "But there are only a few good people!" — Thank God! People will also say: "There are no completely good people at all." — So much the better! But I would still insist that to the degree a person is good, he is *harmful*.

Why is it that only in the last 20 years people have taken the *first and most basic* questions of life seriously? That people see *problems* where, before, they let everything slide once and for all?

:

the lack of suspicion

:

laziness, the fear of thinking hard

:

a personal feeling of comfort, which finds no reason to see problems in things

:

the belief that a *good heart* and a *helping hand* are the most valuable things, — and that people must be raised to have them

:

giving in, — the belief that everything is in good hands…

:

the faking in the way things are explained, which finds this "good" God everywhere

:

the belief that "saving one's soul", and *moral* things in general, are separate from all such earthly, bodily questions: it is considered *low* to take the body and its well-being so seriously…

:

deep respect for tradition: it is considered disrespectful to say no, or even just to criticize what has been handed down

There you have it! And this kind of person is the

most harmful kind of person

8.

IV.

Dionysus

The type of the lawgiver

9.

At the risk of giving the gentlemen antisemites a "well-measured" kick, I confess this: the art of lying, the "unconscious" stretching out

of long, far too long fingers, the *gobbling up* of other people's property — so far I have seen all this more plainly in every antisemite than in any Jew. An antisemite always steals, always lies — he simply can't help it… *For he has* [— — —]… We should feel sorry for the antisemites; we should take up a collection for them. "— — —

10.

The Bible's command "you shall not kill!" is naive compared to *my* command to the people in decline: "you shall not have children!" — It is even worse: it contradicts me… The highest law of life, first put into words by Zarathustra, demands that we have *no pity* for all of life's rejects and rubbish. It demands that we destroy whatever would only be a block, a poison, a plot, a hidden underground enemy to rising life — in one word, *Christianity*… It is immoral, it goes *against nature* in the deepest sense, to say "you shall not kill!" —

The Bible's command "you shall not kill!" is naive compared to *my* command to the people in decline: "you shall not have children!" — It is even worse… Toward life's rejects and rubbish there is only one duty: *destroy*. To feel pity here, to want to keep these alive at any cost, would be the highest form of immorality, the true thing that goes against nature, a deadly hostility toward life itself. —

The Bible's command "you shall not kill!" is naive compared to my command to the people in decline: "you shall not have children!" — It is even worse… Toward life's rejects and rubbish there is only one duty: to recognize no solidarity with them. To be "humane" here, to declare equal rights here, would be the highest form of what goes against nature: what goes against nature, the *denial* of life itself. — Life itself recognizes no solidarity between the healthy parts and the rotting parts of a living body. It has to *cut out* the rotting ones, or the whole thing dies…

The Bible's command "you shall not kill!" is naive compared to how serious the command to the people in decline is: "you shall not have children!" — Life itself recognizes no solidarity, no "equal rights", between the healthy and the rotting parts of a living body: the rotting parts must be *cut out*, or the whole thing dies. Pity for the people in decline — that would be the deepest immorality, what goes against nature itself dressed up as morality. —

11.

It has grown up far away from the drafts of any doubt, far from any subtle questioning. Fat, Swabian, with round eyes, round itself like an apple, this kind of virtue sits on the firmest ground there is: the ground of stupidity — the ground of "faith"…

This kind of virtue *still* believes today that everything is in good hands, meaning in the hands of God. It states a sentence like that with a humble kind of certainty, as if it were saying that two times two is four.

Stupidity has its special rights, and one of them is virtue… Stupidity sees its own reflection in everything around it. It takes all things and makes them happily simple, as plain and honest as a Swabian countryman, and it calls this the "good old God"… The rest of us see something different in things. We make God *interesting*…

12.

We are immoralists (enemies of morality): we say this with pride, as if we were saying — — — We deny that people strive for happiness. We deny that virtue is the road to happiness. We deny that the actions people have so far called moral actions, the "selfless" ones, the "unselfish" ones, exist at all. All these claims we meet with a No as hard

as iron, and in that No there is a complete and eerie [—] about everyone who has taught and raised humankind until now:

13.

The Free Spirit

An attack on philosophy

as a movement of nihilism (belief in nothing)

The Immoralist

An attack on morality

as the most dangerous kind of ignorance

Dionysus the Philosopher

14.

On this perfect day, when everything is ripening and it is not only the grapes turning golden, a ray of sunlight just fell on my life. I looked back, I looked out ahead, and I never saw so many good things all at once. It is not for nothing that I have just buried my forty-fourth year. I had every right to bury it: whatever was alive in that year has been saved, it *is* immortal. The first book of the rethinking of all values; the first six songs of Zarathustra; Twilight of the Idols, my attempt to do philosophy with a hammer — all of these were gifts of this one year, and even of its last three months. How could I not be grateful to my whole life!…

And so I tell myself the story of my life.

Anyone who has even the smallest idea of who I am will guess that I have lived through more than any other human being. The proof is even written in my books. Line by line, they are books that were truly

lived, coming out of a will to live. And so, as things I *created*, they are a real addition to life, they add something more to life itself. There is a feeling that comes over me often enough. It is just what a German scholar once said about himself and his work, with a wonderful innocence: every day brings this man more than their whole lives bring the others! That includes *bad* things, among others — there is no doubt about that! But this is life's highest honor: that it also sets its strongest opposition against us…

Notebook 24: October–November 1888

1.

Ecce Homo ('Behold the man')

Or:

why I know a few things more.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche.

1.

— I now come to a problem that, at least as I see it, is rather more serious than the problem of whether God exists and other Christian questions like that. I mean the problem of *food*. Put simply, the question is this: how should *you* feed yourself so that you reach your greatest possible strength, your 'virtù', your virtue in the Renaissance sense of the word, meaning strength and skill rather than goodness? — My own experience here is as bad as it could be. I am amazed that I came to my senses so late on exactly this point. In a way, too late. And the only thing that partly explains why I was so backward here, backward to the point of 'holiness', is how utterly worthless our German education is. This so-called 'education' teaches you from the very start to lose sight of *real things* on principle, so that you can chase very doubtful so-called 'ideal' goals, for example a so-called 'classical education'! As if it weren't laughable from the outset to put the words 'classical' and 'German' in the same sentence. Just imagine a 'classically educated' person from Leipzig! — In fact, right up to my most grown-up years, I only ever ate *badly*. To put it in moral terms, I ate 'impersonally', 'unselfishly', 'for the sake of others'. Through Leipzig cooking, for example, I was saying no to my 'will to live'. On top of not getting enough nourishment, also ruining your stomach while you're at it: this cooking solves that problem admirably. But German cooking in general — how much it has had on its conscience since ancient times! The soup served *before* the meal (which Italian cookbooks of the 1500s already called 'alla tedesca', the German way). The meats boiled until nothing is left in them. The vegetables made greasy and heavy. The kinds of flour-based dishes and puddings you simply cannot digest. Add to that the downright animal need of the solid, respectable German man to keep washing it all down with drink, and you understand where the 'German spirit' comes from: from an upset

stomach… But *English* food too, which compared with German food is a true return to 'nature', meaning to roast beef, and also to good sense, goes deeply against my own instinct. It seems to me that it gives the mind 'heavy feet', like the feet of Englishwomen… I also understood a bit too late that alcohol is bad for me. Just one glass of wine or beer a day is quite enough to turn my life into a 'valley of tears', as Schopenhauer called it. Really, I had *experienced* this since I was a small child. As a boy I thought that drinking wine, like smoking tobacco, was at first just a way for young lads to show off, and later on a bad habit. Maybe the wine from Naumburg, my hometown, was partly to blame for this too. To believe that wine *cheers you up*, I would have to be a Christian, which means believing something that for *me* is nonsense. Oddly enough, even though small amounts of alcohol, strongly watered down, put me in a terrible mood, I hardly react at all to strong doses. A grog strong enough for a sailor is the thing least likely to knock me over. Back when I was a pupil at the respected boarding school of Pforta, I would write a long essay in Latin in a single night without sleep, secretly hoping to match my model, the Roman writer Sallust, in how tight and compact it was. That did *not* go against my body's nature, nor against Sallust — however much it went against the respected school of Pforta!… Later on, around the middle of my life, I did of course turn more and more firmly against any kind of 'spirits', meaning alcoholic drinks. I prefer places where you can draw water from running fountains everywhere (Nice, Turin, Sils). I never wake up at night without drinking water. People say 'in vino veritas', 'in wine there is truth'. It seems that here again I disagree with the whole world about what 'truth' means. With me, the spirit hovers *over the water*…

2.

I should be the last person to underrate the good things illness brings. But one thing I would hold against it is that it weakens a person's *instincts to defend and protect himself*. For many years I didn't know how to defend myself well enough, either against well-meaning people pushing their help on me, or against clumsy 'admirers' who barged into my home, and other pests like that. And that's not even counting, of course, the cases nobody escapes, such as when young, sloppy scholars barge into your house claiming to 'admire' you, just to borrow money. A sick person has trouble getting rid of things and people, and memories too. A kind of fatalism, a giving in to fate, is part of his instinct to keep himself alive: a fatalism that 'lies down in the snow', like a Russian soldier who finally finds the march too hard, a fatalism without any rebellion. You understand a great deal about woman, as a being condemned to suffer and fatalistic *against her will*, once you grasp *this* kind of instinct to survive. Spend as little strength as possible. Don't *waste* yourself by reacting to things. A certain thriftiness, mostly because you have so little strength to spare: this is the *great* wisdom in fatalism. In terms of the body: the body uses up its fuel less and more slowly. Nothing burns you out faster than strong emotions. Resentment, anger, the craving for revenge: for sick people these are the most harmful states there are. That is why a religion like Buddha's, which mainly dealt with people who were highly refined in mind and physically worn out, aimed the main weight of its teaching *against* resentment. 'Hatred does *not* end through hatred. Hatred ends through friendship.' Buddhism was not a morality. It would be a deep misunderstanding to drag it down to the level of such crude, common things as Christianity. It was a kind of *health care*, a way of keeping clean and well. — For years I stubbornly held on to almost unbearable situations, places, homes and company, once chance had put me there. I did *not* do this on purpose. I did it from that instinct, and in

any case it was wiser than changing things, than 'experimenting'. *Experimenting* goes against the instinct of someone who is suffering. In a high sense, you could even call it the proof that you are strong. To turn your own life into an experiment: only that is *freedom* of the mind. Later on, that became my philosophy…

3.

Boredom, it seems to me, is not really one of the things that suffering people suffer from. At least I have no memory of it at all. On the contrary, the bad time in my life was rich for me because of a certain new inventiveness: the art of fine shades of difference, the delicate skill of handling these fine shades. I would understand refinement in general as a sense of *touch* that has grown so delicate it reaches right up into the most spiritual things. That loving consideration and caution in understanding that sick people have also belongs here: they shy away from being touched too closely… In these states you hear even ordinary things in an extraordinary way. You shift them into another key, as it were, like music. The chance events of everyday life get sifted through a lofty sieve and no longer look like themselves. In the end, back then, I was enormously grateful whenever something free and choice in intelligence or character happened to drift near me. Meanwhile, a certain impatience with Germans and everything German was becoming more and more of an instinct in me. Around Germans I lost my good mood, my wit — and *just as much* my time… Germans make time drag… It's different when the German happens to be a Jewish man or woman. It's strange, when I count it up, that between 1876 and 1886 I owe almost all my pleasant moments to chance meetings with Jewish men or women. Germans underestimate what a blessing it is to meet a Jew: you no longer have reasons to feel ashamed, you are even allowed to be intelligent… In France I don't see why there need to be Jews; in Germany I see it all the more. Meil-

hac and Halévy, the best writers, to whom my taste promises immortality, reach this height as Frenchmen, *not* as Jews. — I'd like to say the same about Offenbach, that *unmistakable* musician who never wanted to be anything other than what he was: a brilliant comic, at bottom the last musician who still made music and not just chords!…

4.

At bottom, I am one of those teachers who teach without meaning to, who neither need nor have any principles about how to bring people up. One single fact goes some way to prove this. In seven years of teaching the top class at the high school in Basel, I never once had reason to give out a punishment. And, as people told me later, even the laziest students worked hard in my lessons. I still remember one small clever trick from that time. Whenever a student did a really poor job of repeating what I had explained in the lesson before, I always took the blame myself. I would say, for example, that if I had expressed myself too briefly or too unclearly, everyone had the right to ask me to explain it again or repeat it. A teacher's job, I said, is to make himself understandable to every kind of mind... I was told that this trick worked better than any scolding. — I never had any trouble dealing with schoolboys or with university students, even though at the start, at twenty-four, I was hardly older than they were. In the same way, examining people for their doctor's degrees never made me pick up any special tricks or methods. What I did by instinct was not only the kindest thing to do in such cases. I myself only felt completely at ease once I had steered the candidate into calm, safe waters, where things went smoothly. In these situations, everyone has as much brains — or as little — as the honorable examiner has... Whenever I sat and listened, it always seemed to me that really it was the examiners who were being tested. —

5.

I have never understood the art of turning people against me, even when it seemed very worthwhile to manage it. You can turn my life this way and that, and you will not find any sign that anyone ever wished me harm. My experiences, even with people whom everyone else has bad experiences with, have all, without exception, spoken in their favor. Also, as long as I was not ill, every person I dealt with was like a musical instrument from which I could draw delicate, very unusual notes. How often I have heard this, a kind of surprise at themselves from the people I was talking with: "Nothing like this has ever crossed my mind before"... Perhaps the most beautiful case was Heinrich von Stein, who died unforgivably young. Once, after carefully asking permission first, he turned up in Sils for three days and told everyone that he had not come for the sake of the Engadine, the mountain valley there. This excellent man had waded into the Wagner swamp right up to his ears, with all the brave simplicity of his nature. "I understand nothing about music," he admitted to me. Yet for those three days he was like a different person, carried along by a stream of freedom, like someone who suddenly finds himself in the place where he belongs and grows wings. I kept telling him it was the good air up here, that it worked that way on everyone, but he would not believe me... If, in spite of all this, many wrongs, big and small, have been done to me, then it was not "will" that caused them, and least of all ill will. If anything, I would have more reason to complain about good will, which has caused nothing but trouble in my life. My experience gives me the right to distrust, in general, the so-called "love of your neighbor" that is always ready to help, always rushing in with advice and action. My complaint against it is that it easily loses its sense of tact and delicacy. With its helping hands it reaches into a great destiny, into a loneliness full of wounds, into someone's special right to suffer greatly — and sometimes it simply destroys these things. —

It was not for nothing that I wrote, as "the temptation of Zarathustra," a scene where a great cry for help reaches him, where pity tries to overpower him like a final sin. To stay master of himself here, to keep the height of his task pure and free from the much lower and more short-sighted urges at work in so-called selfless actions — this is a test, the final test, which Zarathustra, and anyone like him, has to pass in front of himself. —

6.

Like everyone who never lives among his equals, and who in the end turns this fate of his into his art and his kindness toward people, I hold back from striking back when some small or very big stupidity has been done to me. The only response I allow is to send a piece of good sense after the stupid act as quickly as possible: that way you might still catch up with it and undo it. If someone does me harm, I pay it back, you can be sure of that: before long I find a chance to thank the wrongdoer for something, or to ask him for something (— which binds a person more than giving does...). It also seems to me that even the rudest letter is kinder than silence. People who stay silent lack delicacy and courtesy of the heart. — If you are rich enough inside for it, it is a happy thing to be in the wrong. People get along with me best when they give me, now and then, a chance to be in the wrong. Nothing improves my friendship so deeply; nothing keeps making it fresh again... There are well-known cases where I say a firm No, all the way to a fight to the death. In those cases it would be a bad mistake to assume that a pile of bad personal experiences is hidden in the background. Anyone who understands me can conclude the opposite. I do not allow myself to fight against a cause as long as even the slightest personal quarrel is mixed up in it. If I wage war on Christianity, I have the right to do so only because I have never had any gloomy or sad experiences from that side. On the contrary, the

most admirable people I know have been Christians without any falseness in them. I am the last person to blame individuals for what is the doom of thousands of years. My own ancestors were Protestant ministers. If I had not inherited a high and clean way of thinking from them, I would not know where my right to make war on Christianity came from. My formula for it is this: the Antichrist is itself the necessary logical next step in the growth of a true Christian; in me, Christianity overcomes itself. Another example: from my relationship with Wagner and with Mrs. Wagner I have kept only the most refreshing and uplifting memories. Exactly this allowed me to look at things neutrally, to see the whole problem of Wagner as a problem of culture, and perhaps to solve it... Even for antisemites, whom, as everyone knows, I like least of all, I could say a fair number of good things, based on my quite considerable experience. This does not stop me — in fact, it is exactly what makes it possible — from waging a merciless war on antisemitism. It is one of the sickest growths of that absurd, utterly unjustified habit of the new German Empire of staring at itself in admiration...

7.

It is *not* in my nature to love many things, or many different kinds of things. Even with books, my instinct is, on the whole, more hostile than tolerant. I don't easily "let things come close." It has been that way since I was a small child. In the end, only a small number of books really count in my life, and the most famous ones are not among them. My feeling for style, and for the epigram as a style (short, sharp, tightly packed sayings), woke up almost all at once the first time I read Sallust, the Roman historian. I will never forget how amazed my respected teacher Corssen was when he had to give the very top grade to his worst Latin student. He invited me to his home… Tight, strict, with as much *substance* underneath as possible,

and a cold, wicked dislike of the "beautiful word" and the "beautiful feeling": in that, I recognized myself. All the way up to my Zarathustra, you will find a very serious ambition to write in a *Roman* style. I aimed for the "magnum in parvo," which means "much in little," and for the "aere perennius," which means "more lasting than bronze." It was the same for me the first time I read *Horace*. To this day, I have not found in any other poet the same artistic delight that one of Horace's odes gives me. In some languages, German for example, what he achieves here cannot even be *attempted*. Think of this mosaic of words, where every word, through its sound, its place and its meaning, sends its power out to the right, to the left and across the whole poem. Think of this smallest possible number of signs, and the greatest possible energy in each sign that comes from it. All of that is Roman and, if you will believe me, *noble, high-minded* above everything else. Next to it, all the rest of poetry turns into mere gushing chatter about feelings. Least of all would I want to forget the charm that lies in the contrast between this form, hard as granite, and the most graceful naughtiness and free living in what it says. My ear is delighted by this clash between the form and the meaning. The third impression I owe to the Latin writers, and one that nothing can match, is Petronius. There is the breakneck speed of his high spirits in his words, his sentences and the jumps of his thoughts. There is the cleverness with which he mixes street Latin with "educated" Latin. There is his wild good mood, which is afraid of nothing and jumps gracefully over every kind of animal crudeness in the ancient world. And there is his lordly freedom from "morality," from the virtuous, pitiful smallness of "beautiful souls." I could not name a single book that came even remotely close to making a similar impression on me. My most personal instinct quietly tells me that this poet came from Provence, in the south of France: you have to have the devil in you to make leaps like that. Sometimes, when I needed to free myself from some low, cheap impression, for example from a speech by the Apostle Paul,

a couple of pages of Petronius were enough to make me completely healthy again.

8.

I owe nothing like these impressions to the Greeks. When it comes to Plato, I am too deep a doubter, and I have never been able to join in the admiration of Plato as an artist that is usual among scholars. It seems to me that he throws every kind of style together into a jumble. He has something similar on his conscience to what the Cynic philosophers have, who invented the Menippean satire, a messy mix of prose and verse, the serious and the silly. To find the Platonic dialogue, with its terribly smug and childish way of arguing, attractive at all, you would have to have never read any good French writers. In the end, my distrust of Plato goes deep. I find him so far strayed from all the basic instincts of the Greeks, so "Jewish-ified" as I put it, so Christian already, before Christianity, in his final aims, that I would rather use the harsh phrase "higher fraud" for the whole Plato phenomenon than any other word. People have paid dearly for the fact that this Athenian went to school with the Egyptians (probably with the Jews in Egypt…). In the great disaster of Christianity, Plato is one of those disastrous double meanings that made it possible for the nobler people of the ancient world to step onto the *bridge* that led to the "Cross"… My relief, my favorite, my cure for all Platonism has always been *Thucydides*, the Greek historian. Thucydides, and perhaps Machiavelli's "The Prince," are the ones most like me, because of their total determination not to fool themselves, and to see reason in reality itself, not in "reason," and even less in "morality"… Educated Germans who study the classics reap a pathetic, sugar-coated picture of the ancient world as their reward for being so "serious" about it. Nothing cures you of that as completely as Thucydides. You have to turn him over line by line and read what he leaves unwritten as clearly

as you read his words. There are few thinkers so packed with *substance*. In him, the culture of the Sophists, which means the *culture of the realists*, reaches its complete expression. It was a priceless movement, right in the middle of the fraud about morals and ideals from the schools of Socrates, which was just then breaking out everywhere. Greek philosophy is already the *decline* of the Greek instinct. Thucydides is the great sum of all the strong, strict, hard sense of fact that the older Greeks had in their instincts. What separates people like Plato and Thucydides is *courage*. Plato is a coward, and so he runs away into the ideal. Thucydides has control of *himself*, and so he also keeps control of things.

9.

Some people look at the Greeks and find 'beautiful souls', 'harmonious works of art', and the 'noble simplicity' that Winckelmann talked about. The psychologist I carried inside me kept me safe from that kind of German silliness. I saw their strongest instinct, the will to power. I saw them tremble before the wild, untamed force of this drive. I saw all their institutions grow out of safety measures, ways of protecting themselves from one another, from the explosive stuff inside them. This huge pressure inside then burst out as terrible hatred of everything outside: the city-states tore each other to pieces, so that, at this price, the citizens of each city would not tear each other to pieces. They needed to be strong. The splendid, flexible bodies of the Greeks were a necessity, not something they were simply 'born with'. Those bodies came afterwards; they were not there from the start. And with their festivals and their arts, too, they wanted nothing else than to feel stronger, more beautiful, more perfect all the time. These were ways of praising themselves, ways of boosting the will to power. And yet people judge the Greeks by their philosophers! They use the moral wisdom of the philosophy schools

to explain what was truly Greek! I have always taken that sort of thing simply as proof of the fine psychological sense the Germans are known for... But the philosophers are the ones in decline within Greek culture. They are the push in the other direction against the classical taste, against the noble, high-minded taste! The virtues of Socrates were preached because the Greeks were starting to lack them... I was the first person who, in order to understand the older Greeks, took seriously again that wonderful thing that goes by the name of Dionysus. My highly respected friend Jakob Burckhardt in Basel fully understood that something important had been done here. He added a whole section about this problem to his book on Greek culture. If you want to see the opposite, look closely at the shameful carelessness with which the famous scholar of ancient languages, Lobeck, handled these things in his day. Lobeck crawled into this world of mysterious states of mind like a worm that has dried out between books, with all the solemn confidence of such a worm. He convinced himself that he was being scientific simply because he was dull and miserable to the point of disgust. With a great show of learning, he let it be understood that all these odd customs really meant nothing at all. Perhaps, he said, the priests did tell the people taking part in these wild festivals a few things, for example, that wine makes you want pleasure, that people live on fruit, that plants bloom in spring and wither in winter. When it comes to the wealth of rituals and myths that came from these wild festivals, he becomes even more 'clever'. The Greeks, he says in his book Aglaophamus, volume one, page 672, when they had nothing else to do, laughed, jumped and raved around; or, since people sometimes feel like that too, they sat down, cried and wailed. Other people then came along later and looked for some reason behind this strange behavior, and so, to explain those customs, countless festival legends and myths came into being... On the other hand, he says, people believed that the funny goings-on that once happened on feast days must now also belong to the celebration, and

they held on to it as a necessary part of worship. But even setting aside this shameful nonsense, one could point out that the Dionysian (wild, life-loving) element does not fit at all with the whole idea of 'Greek', and even less with the idea of 'classical', as Winckelmann and Goethe had shaped them. I fear that Goethe himself, as a matter of principle, ruled out anything like this as something the Greek soul could ever contain. And yet only in the Dionysian mysteries, the secret religious rites of Dionysus, does the whole deep foundation of the Greek instinct come out. For what did the Greek make sure of through these mysteries? Eternal life, the eternal coming back of life; the future promised and made holy in the act of making children; the triumphant 'yes' to life beyond death and change; true life as life going on together in the community, the city, the family line. The sexual symbol was for them the most honored symbol of all, the very heart of all the religious feeling of the ancient world. There was the deepest gratitude for every single part of making a child, of pregnancy, of birth. In the teaching of the mysteries, pain is declared holy: the 'labor pains of the woman giving birth' make all pain holy. All becoming, all growing, everything that promises a future requires pain. For there to be the eternal joy of creating, there must eternally be the agony of the woman giving birth... I know of no higher symbol than this. It was Christianity that first turned sexuality into something dirty. The idea of the 'immaculate conception', of Mary conceiving without sin, was, for example, the lowest, meanest thing a mind has ever reached on earth so far. It threw dirt on the very beginning of life...

The psychology of wild, ecstatic celebration, understood as a feeling of life so full that it overflows, a feeling in which even pain only works as a spur, gave me the key to the tragic feeling. This feeling has been misunderstood both by Aristotle and, above all, by the pessimists. Tragedy is so far from proving that the Greeks were pessimists in Schopenhauer's sense that it is, on the contrary, the most extreme

opposite of that. Saying 'yes' to life even when facing its strangest and hardest problems; the will to live enjoying its own endless supply even as it sacrifices its greatest kinds of people: that is what I called Dionysian (wild, life-loving). That is what I saw as the real bridge to understanding the mind of the tragic poet. The point is not to get free of terror and pity, and to cleanse yourself of a dangerous emotion by letting it out in a violent burst. That was Aristotle's way. The point is, beyond terror and pity, to enjoy the eternal joy of creating and becoming, to have one's terror and one's pity beneath oneself, under one's control...

10.

The good fortune of my life, and maybe what makes it unique, lies in its fate. To put it as a riddle: as my father, I have already died; as my mother, I am still alive and growing old. This double origin, as if I came from both the top rung and the bottom rung of the ladder of life, makes me someone in decline and at the same time a *beginning*. If anything explains it, this explains the neutrality that sets me apart: I don't take sides when it comes to the big overall problem of life. I know both sides, and I am both sides. My father died at the age of thirty-six. He was gentle, kind and sickly, like a being meant only to pass through, more a kind memory of life than life itself. In the same year of my life that his life went downhill, mine went downhill too. At thirty-six I reached the lowest point of my strength. I was still alive, but I couldn't see three steps ahead of me. In 1879 I gave up my job as a professor in Basel. I spent the summer in St. Moritz living like a shadow, and the next winter, the winter with the least sunshine of my whole life, in Naumburg. That was my lowest point. During that time I wrote "The Wanderer and His Shadow." There is no doubt about it: back then I knew myself as a shadow… The following winter, my first winter in Genoa, I wrote "Daybreak." It came out of a strange state in

which my mind became very sharp and spiritual, a state that almost always comes with having very little muscle and blood left. For me, a mind that is completely clear and cheerful goes together not only with the deepest bodily weakness, but even with extreme pain. In those torments of hell, with constant pain and exhausting vomiting of mucus, I had the clearest power of argument there could be. I thought things through that, in healthier times, I am not a good enough climber, not sharp enough, to reach. (My readers know in what sense I see clever arguing as a sign of decline, for example in the most famous case of all, the case of Socrates.) All the sick disturbances of the mind, even the half-dazed state that comes with a fever, are still completely unknown to me today. I had to learn from books how common they are. My blood runs slowly. In my years of illness I had the slow pulse of Napoleon. No one has ever been able to find a fever in me. A doctor who treated me for a long time as someone with nerve trouble finally said himself: "No! It isn't your nerves. *I'm* the one who is nervous." No damage to any one part of my body could ever be proven. I had no stomach disease caused by a damaged organ, however badly my whole digestive system grew weak as a result of my exhausted brain. My eye trouble too, which came dangerously close to blindness, was a result and not the cause. So every time my life strength grew, my eyesight grew too, as [— —]. For me, a long, far too long string of years means getting better. Sadly, it also means falling back, breaking down, and a kind of decline that keeps coming back in cycles. Do I need to say that I am experienced in matters of decline? I have spelled it out forwards and backwards. Even my skill at grasping and understanding, my fingers for fine shades of difference, my whole way of reading people by "seeing around corners," which may be what sets me apart, I learned back then. It is the real gift of that time, when everything became finer, both what I observed and the senses I observed with. To look from the point of view of a sick person toward healthier ideas and values, and then the other way

round, to look down from the richness and self-confidence of a full life into the delicate, lace-like workings of the instinct of decline: that has been my greatest practice and my longest experience. If I am a master at anything, it is this. I have it in my hand, I have the knack, *to switch points of view*. That is why I alone was able to attempt a rethinking of all values at all.

11.

Apart from the fact that I am someone in decline, I am also its complete opposite. My proof is this: by instinct I always chose the right remedies *against* those bad states, whereas a person in decline can always be recognized by choosing the harmful ones. Taken as a whole, I was healthy. Only in one corner, in one special area, was I in decline. That energy of cutting myself off completely, of pulling myself away from my usual surroundings and duties, of forcing myself not to let others look after me, wait on me, or *fuss over me like doctors*: all this shows an absolute, instinctive certainty about what was needed. I took myself in hand and made myself healthy. Any expert on the body will agree that the condition for this is that, deep down, one *is* healthy. A person who is sick by nature does not get well. But for a person who is healthy by nature, being sick can be a powerful push forward. That, in fact, is how that long period of illness looks to me in the end. I discovered life almost anew. I tasted all the good things, even the small ones, in a way that others would hardly have tasted them. I turned my will to be healthy, my will to *live*, into my philosophy… Pay attention to this: it was in the years when my strength was lowest that I *stopped* being a pessimist. My instinct to heal myself *forbade* me a philosophy of poverty and discouragement… So how, really, do you recognize someone who has turned out well? A person who has turned out well is carved from wood that is hard, delicate and sweet-smelling at the same time; he is even pleasant to our

sense of smell. He enjoys what is good for him; his pleasure and his liking stop where the limit of what is good for him is crossed. He guesses the cures for whatever harms him, and he uses bad accidents to make himself stronger. Out of everything he sees, hears and lives through, he instinctively collects *his own* total. He is a principle that picks and chooses; he lets a lot fall through, like a sieve. He is always in *his own* company, whether he is dealing with books, people or landscapes. He shows respect by *choosing*, by *letting in*, by *trusting*. He reacts slowly to every kind of stimulus, with a slowness that long caution and a deliberate pride have bred into him. He tests whatever is coming toward him; he is far from rushing out to meet it. He believes neither in "bad luck" nor in "guilt." He is strong enough that everything has to turn out for the best for him. Well then: I am the opposite of a person in decline, because what I have just described is myself.

2.

The contradiction in the body.

On the criminal.

What I owe to the ancients.

Philosophy.

Music

the books *described*.

In the middle of life.

Notes of a

grateful man.

By

F. N.

3.

Ecce Homo ('Behold the man')

Notes

of a man of many sides.

1.

The psychologist speaks

2.

The philosopher speaks

3.

The poet speaks

4.

The musician speaks

5.

The writer speaks

6.

The teacher speaks

4.

Fridericus Nietzsche

On his own life.

Translated into German.

5.

The Mirror

An attempt

to size myself up.

By

Friedrich Nietzsche

6.

My instinct is clever in this way: it senses which troubles and dangers are truly serious for me, and it knows them for what they are.

It is just as good at guessing the ways to avoid them, or else to fit them in to my own advantage, arranging them, so to speak, around a higher purpose.

The struggle

with loneliness

with illness

with the chance of where I came from, how I was educated, the people around me…

with the great, crushing weight of responsibility

with the many different conditions my task demands (— what isolation they need

7.

The greatest cleverness: letting a great destiny come into your awareness as little as possible, — keeping a sense of shame and modesty toward it

hiding from it, as it were, behind modesty, playful mischief, a refined taste, even behind times of illness and weakness…

You only have to carry out its orders, without wanting to know what it is, or when it is giving those orders…

You must have no speeches, no slogans, no poses for it, — you must suffer without knowing why, you must do your very best without understanding yourself in it…

8.

Vademecum: a pocket guide.

On the good sense of my life.

9.

Spending time with the ancient Greeks and Romans.

Appendix

Ecce Homo ('Behold the man').

10.

As for Goethe: my first impression of him, a very early one, settled everything. The novella about the lion, oddly enough the first thing of his I came to know, gave me once and for all my idea of Goethe, my taste for what 'Goethe' means. It was a pure, glowing, autumn-like quality: enjoying things, letting them ripen, waiting, — like an October sun that reaches all the way up into the highest things of the mind. Something golden and sweetening, something gentle, not cold marble — that is what I call Goethe-like. Later, because of this very idea of 'Goethe', I took Adalbert Stifter's novel 'Indian Summer' deeply to heart: really the only German book after Goethe that has any magic for me. — 'Faust' is another matter. For someone who knows by instinct the earthy smell of the German language, for the poet who wrote Zarathustra, it is a pleasure like no other. But it is not a

pleasure for the artist I am, because 'Faust' handed me patchwork on top of patchwork, bits and pieces that do not fit together. — And it is even less of a pleasure for the philosopher, who dislikes how completely random and accidental everything is in Goethe's work: all its characters and problems are shaped by the chance circumstances of his culture. When you read 'Faust', you are studying the eighteenth century, you are studying Goethe; you are a thousand miles away from anything necessary, from characters and problems that simply had to be. —

Notebook 25: December 1888 to Early January 1889

1.

Big Politics.

I bring war. Not war between one people and another. I have no words strong enough to express how much I despise the cursed politics of self-interest played by Europe's ruling families. They stir up the selfishness and arrogance of nations against each other, and they turn this into a principle, almost into a duty. Not war between social classes, either. For we have no higher classes, and so we have no lower classes either. Whatever sits on top in society today is doomed by its own body and biology. On top of that, and this is the proof, its instincts have become so poor and so unsure that it openly admits, without any qualms, to the very opposite principle of what a higher kind of human being stands for.

I bring war straight across all the senseless accidents of nation, class, race, job, upbringing and education. It is a war like the one between rising and decline, between the will to live and the thirst for revenge against life, between honesty and sneaky, deceitful lying… That all the 'higher classes' take the side of the lie is not something they are free to choose. They must do it: nobody can simply keep bad instincts away from their own body. — Never more than in this case does it become clear how little there is to the idea of 'free will'. You say yes to what you are, and you say no to what you are not… The numbers are on the side of the 'Christians': the commonness, the vulgarity of sheer numbers… After humanity has been treated for two thousand years with things that make no sense for the human body, decay must surely have won out, meaning that instincts which contradict each other have gained the upper hand. Isn't it a thought that makes you

shudder, that only for about the last 20 years have the questions that matter most right after these, the questions of food, clothing, diet, health and having children, been treated with strictness, with seriousness, and with honesty?

First point: big politics wants to make the science of the body the master over all other questions. It wants to create a power strong enough to breed humanity as a whole into something higher. This power would show merciless hardness against everything in life that is degenerate and that lives like a parasite on others, against whatever spoils, poisons, slanders and ruins… and against whatever sees in the destruction of life the badge of a higher kind of soul.

Second point: a war to the death against vice. And every kind of what goes against nature is a vice. The Christian priest is the most vice-ridden kind of human being, because he teaches what goes against nature.

Second point: to create a party of life, strong enough for big politics. Big politics makes the science of the body the master over all other questions. It wants to breed humanity as a whole. It measures the rank of races, of peoples and of individuals by their future-[word missing], by the promise of life that they carry inside them. It puts a ruthless end to everything degenerate and parasitic.

Third point. The rest follows from that.

2.

What I forgive the Germans least is that they do not know what they are doing… when they lie. Compared with a German, a liar who knows that he is lying is a model of virtue…

3.

The novel Gil Blas is a pleasant country where no Germans show up. Prosper Mérimée is an even more pleasant one: nowhere do you trip over a virtue.

4.

'Petits faits vrais', meaning small true facts

Fromentin

De Vogüé

5.

Mr. Köselitz really does have an idea of who I am. That still amazes me just as much as the opposite leaves me cold. Sometimes I look at my hand and think that I hold the fate of humanity in it. I break humanity invisibly into two pieces: the time before me, and the time after me…

6.

1.

I know what my fate is. One day my name will be tied to the memory of something huge. It will be linked to a crisis like no other the earth has ever seen, to the deepest clash of conscience, to a decision that was called up *against* everything that people had believed in, demanded, and held sacred. And yet, with all of that, there is nothing of the fanatic in me. People who know me think of me as a simple scholar, maybe a little mischievous, who knows how to be cheerful with everyone. I hope this book gives a completely different picture from that of a prophet. I wrote it to tear out, right at the root, every myth about me. There is still something playful and cheeky even in my seriousness. I love the smallest things as much as the biggest ones. Even in moments of terrible decisions, I can't seem to lose my happiness. My soul has the greatest range, the widest reach, that any human being has ever had. Fateful, and at the same time either a god or a clown: that is the part of me I can't help, that is who I am. And in spite of that, or rather *not* in spite of that, because all prophets until now have been liars, the truth speaks through me. But my truth is *terrible*, because until now people have called the *lie* the truth. The rethinking of all values: that is my formula for a moment when humanity looks into itself more deeply than ever before. My fate demands that I look down into the questions of all ages more deeply, more bravely, and more honestly than any human being before me ever had to *discover*. I am not challenging the people alive now. I am challenging several thousand years to stand against me. I contradict, and yet I am the opposite of a spirit that only says no. Only starting with me are there hopes again. I know of tasks so lofty that until now there wasn't even a word for them. I am the bringer of good news above all others, however much I must also be the man who brings doom. Because when a volcano erupts, the earth is shaken by upheavals like none before. The

idea of politics will be completely swallowed up in a war of minds and ideas. All the structures of power will be blown sky-high. There will be wars like none the earth has ever seen.

2.

What is going on right now disgusts me too much for me even to act as an onlooker. I know of nothing that goes more deeply against the *lofty* meaning of my task than this damnable stirring up of national selfishness and racial selfishness, which now claims the name 'big politics'. I have no words to express my contempt for the low level of mind that now believes it has been called to steer the history of humanity. That mind shows itself in the German Chancellor and in the Prussian officer poses of the House of Hohenzollern, the royal family. This is the lowest kind of human being. It has not even learned to ask questions in places where I need answers that strike like shattering bolts of lightning. On these people, centuries of work toward honesty of mind have been wasted. All of this stands too far *beneath* me even to deserve the honor of having me as an enemy. Let them build their houses of cards! To me, 'empires' and 'triple alliances' are houses of cards. They rest on foundations that *I* hold in my hand. There is more dynamite between heaven and earth than these idiots in royal purple ever dream of.

7.

5.

One last point of view, maybe the highest one: I *justify* the Germans, I alone. We are opposites. We can't even touch each other. There is no bridge between us, no question, not even a glance. But only that makes possible the extreme degree of selfhood, of rescuing myself on my own, that became a human being in me. I am *loneliness* in human

form. The fact that no word from others ever reached me *forced* me to reach myself. I would not be possible without an opposite kind of people: without Germans, without *these* Germans, without Bismarck, without 1848, without the so-called 'Wars of Liberation', without Kant, even without Luther. The great crimes the Germans have committed against culture are justified within a higher bookkeeping of culture, a bigger plan where everything balances out. I don't want anything to be different, not even looking back. I was not *allowed* to want anything different. Love of fate. Even Christianity becomes necessary. Its form of saying no to life is the highest, the most dangerous, the most tempting one, and only that calls out life's highest yes in reply: *me*. What, in the end, are these two thousand years? Our *most instructive* experiment, like cutting open a living body to study life itself. Only two thousand years!

8.

Stendhal came out of training in the best *strict* school of philosophers in Europe, the school of Condillac and Destutt de Tracy. He looked down on Kant.

9.

Fromentin, Feuillet, Halévy, Meilhac, the Goncourt brothers, Gyp, Pierre Loti... or, to name one from the deeper kind, Paul Bourget, who of all of them came closest to me on his own...

10.

The old Italians, with their deep, sad sweetness of feeling. They are the noble, high-minded musicians above all others. In them, the finest thing about the human voice lives on as pure sound.

Take the Requiem by Niccolò Jommelli from 1769, for example. I heard it yesterday. Ah, that comes from a different world than a Requiem by Mozart.

11.

One last word. From now on I will need countless helping hands, immortal hands! The *rethinking* is supposed to come out in two languages. It would be a good idea to set up clubs everywhere, so that at the right moment a few million followers are placed in my hands. I care about winning over, first of all, the army officers and the Jewish bankers. Together, these two stand for the *will to power*.

When I ask who my natural allies are, the answer is first of all the officers. With military instincts in your body, you *can't* be a Christian. Otherwise you would be a fake Christian, and a fake soldier on top of that. In the same way, the Jewish bankers are my natural allies. By their origin and their instinct, they are the only international power that *ties* the peoples together again, after a damnable politics of self-interest has turned the selfishness and arrogance of nations into a duty.

12.

In this time, everything that had [...] comes out. I give the highest honor to the one who had to work hardest for it: my maestro Peter Gast. In the end he would not need any honor at all if [...]. He is the first and most solid musician alive today.

I only pay what I owe him when I call him the deepest and most solid musician alive today.

13.

War to the death against the House of Hohenzollern

As the one I must be, not a person but a fate, I want to put an end to these criminal idiots, who for more than a century have done the big talking, the biggest talking of all. Ever since the days of Frederick the *Great* Thief, they have done nothing but lie and steal. I have to make one single exception: the unforgettable Frederick the Third, the most hated and most slandered of the whole family. Today a shameful party is on top. A Christian gang is sowing the cursed dragon's seed of nationalism between the peoples, seeds that grow into war. And out of love for slaves, this gang wants to 'free' the Black house servants. At a time like this, we have to bring the dishonesty, and the innocent face that this lying wears, before a court of world history.

Their tool, Prince Bismarck, the biggest idiot of all statesmen, never thought a single inch beyond the Hohenzollern family.

But that has had its time. I want to lace the empire into a shirt of iron and push it into a desperate fight. I will not have my hands free until I have in my hands the emperor, that Christian hussar, that young criminal, *together with* everything that goes with him. That means destroying the most pitiful freak of a human being who has ever come to power.

14.

So that this house of fools and criminals can feel it is on top, Europe now pays 12 billion every year. Because of it, deep gaps are being torn open between the nations that are just now forming. Because of it, Europe has fought the most brainless wars ever fought. Prince Bismarck, to serve his own family politics, destroyed everything that great tasks would need. He destroyed the ground for goals that matter to world history, and for a nobler, finer intellect and spirit. And he did it with a damnable sureness of instinct, as if he knew exactly what to wreck. And just look at the Germans themselves. They are probably

the [—] lowest, stupidest, most vulgar race on earth right now. They have been so shaped by the Hohenzollern rulers that they hate the mind and hate freedom. Just look at their so-called "genius", Prince Bismarck. He is the idiot among the statesmen of all time, a man who never thought even a hand's width beyond the Hohenzollern dynasty. The idiot on the cross was [— — —]… And when this race did have genius, it was a genius for crime…

Last Thought

In the end we could even do without wars. In some cases, simply having the right opinion would be enough. A wagon with iron bars, a cage, for the Hohenzollerns and the other "Swabians"… The rest of us would go on, without stopping, with the grand and lofty work of living. We still have everything left to organize. There are better ways to honor the health of the body than military hospitals. I would know a better use for the 12 billion that this "armed peace" costs Europe today. And, in short — — —

But that has had its time. Let this young criminal be handed over to me. I will not hesitate to destroy him. I want to set the torch blazing myself, inside his damnable criminal mind.

15.

Simply by branding this criminal madness, I am always branding the two most damnable institutions that have made mankind sick until now. They are the real institutions of deadly hatred against life. The first is the institution of dynasties, of ruling families, which grows fat on the blood of the strongest, the well-made, healthy ones, and the most splendid. The second is the institution of the priest, which, with a horrible cunning, tries to destroy those very same men, the strongest, the well-made, healthy ones, the most splendid, right from the start. Here I find emperor and priest in agreement. I want to be

the judge here. I want to put an end to thousands of years of the criminal madness of rulers and priests… Mankind has grown so used to this madness that today it believes it needs armies in order to have wars… It seems I just said something absurd… No one demands more strictly than I do that every man be a soldier. There is simply no other way to train a whole people in the virtues of obeying and commanding, in tact, in good posture and bearing, in a cheerful and brave way of being, [—], and meanwhile in freedom of mind. By far our first piece of good sense in education is that every man be a soldier. There is also no other way to spread a manly goodwill between people across a whole nation, across every gap of rank, of mind, and of task. "Service and duty" [— — —], "the blessing of work": that is how the cursed dynasty always talks when it needs people. But then to take such a chosen group of strength, youth and power and put it in front of the cannons is madness.

16.

I will never accept that some Hohenzollern scoundrel can order anyone to commit crimes… There is no right to obedience when the one giving orders is merely a Hohenzollern.

17.

My friends, just take a look at a priest. He is something solemn, pale and downcast, with cowardice in his eyes and with very long, pale fingers. Above all, inside this business of becoming holy there hides a vengeful, cunning animal, one that you [— — —] Let us not underestimate the priest. He is [—]. He is also holy… We, on the other hand, with a little blood in us and some curiosity, we for whom a little devilry in the head is part of being happy, we are unholy… How ashamed we are!

18.

The German Empire itself is a lie. No Hohenzollern, no Bismarck, has ever thought about Germany… That is why there was such fury against Professor Geffcken… Bismarck preferred to bang on the table with the word "German" in his mouth, using police laws… I think people are laughing at the royal courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg. They know our upstart fellow very well, a man who so far has never said a single clever word, not even by accident. This is not at all a man who cares about keeping the Germans alive and well, as he claims.

and perhaps even more, a piece of stupidity!

19.

Last Thought

If we could do without wars, so much the better. I would know a more useful way to spend the twelve billion that the armed peace costs Europe every year. There are other ways to honor the health of the body than military hospitals… In short, and very good indeed: now that the old God has been done away with, I am ready to rule the world…

20.

Let the young criminal be handed over to me. I will not hesitate to destroy him and to set his criminal mind on fire…

21.

In Latin: "condamno te ad vitam diaboli vitae", which means: I condemn you to the life of the devil's life.

By destroying you, Hohenzollern, I destroy

the lie.

sun | *Intelligent Audio*



sunapp.ai/download